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Academic Senate Leadership Response to Undergraduate Students

Updated February 25, 2022

Immediate Past Chair Shane White, Vice Chair / Chair-Elect Jessica Cattelino, and Executive Director April de Stefano found our February 16, 2022, meeting with undergraduate students in Murphy Hall to be productive and instructive. We were dismayed to learn that DSU student leaders were disrespected. We are sorry, and we commit to Academic Senate dialogue, rigorous examination, and deliberation on a range of issues concerning accessibility and instruction, moving forward. We also commit to more consistent and respectful engagement with student representatives to Academic Senate committees and councils. Whether or not we all reach precisely the same conclusions about the best path forward, we are eager to deeply examine and consider possible actions in light of lessons learned from the pandemic and our shared commitment to inclusive education as integral to academic excellence at UCLA.

(1) Flexibility in Instruction.

The Academic Senate will undertake the following steps to address student concerns:

1. To discuss issues regarding flexibility in instruction, and to address Senate commitments and next steps, Academic Senate leadership and Academic Senate Executive Director agree to meet by the end of winter quarter, upon invitation by the USAC President, with the chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, the Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and the DSU leadership. (Winter 2022)

2. The Academic Senate chair will join the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs in signing a BruinPost that, consistent with Academic Senate policy, endorses faculty use and sharing of recordings and/or livestreams for students who are absent for COVID-related reasons, affirms that posting videos or offering livestream can be a valuable addition to many courses, and supports faculty flexibility in reasonably addressing students’ instructional needs. (Winter 2022)

3. Effectively immediately, the Academic Senate will amplify our advocacy for, and advisement to, Administration on classroom technology assessment and campus commitment to providing resources to meet those needs as well as resources to address digital divides. We will do the same with regard to resource commitments that aim to support students in attending in-person classes. (Winter 2022 and thereafter).

4. The Academic Senate commits, by the end of the Spring Quarter, to establish and issue a set of principles that will guide Academic Senate deliberation on the future of instruction beyond the pandemic. (Winter and Spring 2022)

5. The Academic Senate also commits by the end of the spring quarter to establish a process, based on both evidence and principles, that will result in a fuller understanding of the lessons learned from pandemic instruction and of how those could lead to policy
changes that will not only maintain but improve UCLA’s academic excellence. We anticipate a process that will include informational, consultative, and deliberative components. (Winter and Spring 2022, to be followed by implementation in AY22-23 and possibly beyond)

6. During our monthly meetings with USAC Leadership, we will invite USAC to join the Academic Senate in calling for increased hiring of tenure-track faculty and reversal of the decline in faculty-to-student ratio, as a necessary condition for augmented instructional options that require more faculty labor. (Winter and Spring 2022)

(2) Student Representation on Academic Senate Committees

1. The Academic Senate will update its materials and resources for the orientation of committee and council chairs as well as members, in order to improve their interactions with student representatives and increase the accountability of members to adhere to the Faculty Code of Conduct regarding appropriate behavior. We aim to create a more consistently respectful and collaborative relationship with student representatives and acknowledge the need to do so.

2. During our monthly meetings with the USAC President and the USAC Vice President for Academic Affairs, we have begun an on-going dialogue to understand student concerns about serving as representatives to Senate committees and councils, as well as ideas about ways to increase the attendance and engagement of USAC-appointed student representatives to Academic Senate committees and councils. (Winter and Spring 2022)

3. If requested by USAC, the Academic Senate will join in advocating for the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to provide additional support via SOLE for the selection, skills-building, onboarding, and engagement of USAC-appointed student representatives to UCLA Academic Senate committees and councils. (Winter and Spring 2022)

4. We will ask the USAC President and USAC Academic Affairs Commissioner to provide feedback on [https://www.senate.ucla.edu/about/senate-service#student-representatives](https://www.senate.ucla.edu/about/senate-service#student-representatives) in order to improve our resources and onboarding materials for student representatives. Executive Director April de Stefano will work with USAC Leadership and Academic Senate staff to make these improvements. (Spring and Summer 2022)

5. We will offer dedicated onboarding meetings between the USAC-appointed student representative to each Academic Senate committee and council and that committee’s/council’s Chair and Analyst. We will also offer an orientation meeting for all new student representatives. (Summer and Fall 2022)

6. Executive Director de Stefano will join USAC Leadership and the USAC advisors to discuss ways to increase the capacity of USAC-appointed student representatives to
Academic Senate committees and councils to participate and engage most effectively. 
(Summer and Fall 2022)

(3) Advocacy Regarding Attendance Requirements and Faculty Development

1. Academic Senate leadership and the Senate Executive Director agree to meet to discuss attendance requirements by the end of winter quarter, upon invitation by the USAC President, with the chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, the Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and the DSU leadership. This meeting would be in conjunction with the one mentioned in item 1.1 above.

2. Beginning in spring quarter, the Academic Senate will amplify our advocacy for, and advisement to, Administration efforts and resource commitments to facilitate students’ attendance in in-person classes.

3. The Academic Senate will advocate with Administration for a working group to address faculty development in the area of pedagogy and accessibility, in order to provide additional resources and support to instructors. Academic Senate leadership recognize the need for more dissemination to faculty of information about accessibility and instruction, as well as the need for, to varying degrees across the campus, a cultural shift when it comes to accessibility and instruction.

(4) The Role of Academic Freedom in Teaching and Learning

1. To discuss the role of academic freedom in teaching and learning, the Academic Senate leadership and Executive Director agree to meet by Week 3 of spring quarter with the chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, the Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the USAC President and Academic Affairs Commissioner, and DSU leadership.

2. The Academic Senate leadership will provide a response to the demand by DSU leadership for citations to policy concerning academic freedom and instruction and for the policy rationale for not mandating universal dual modality. (By February 28, 2022)

3. The UCLA divisional Academic Senate leadership has informed the systemwide Academic Council about student demands, in light of the systemwide nature of academic freedom policies and discussions, and commits to informing USAC and DSU leaders of systemwide developments in this area.

Addendum:

As discussed in our meeting, the Academic Senate offers defining terms for instructional modalities.
Different teaching modalities are defined in the Graduate Council document on UCLA Graduate Distance Education Course Approval Policy [https://ucla.app.box.com/v/Graduate-Distance-Education](https://ucla.app.box.com/v/Graduate-Distance-Education) and listed below for easy reference:

1. **In-person (Classroom based courses)** are those in which 100% of the primary offering time occurs in-person, meaning all students and instructors are physically in the same location. In-person courses require a physical classroom.

2. **Distance education courses** are those in which (i) less than 100% of the primary offering time occurs in person; (ii) meet UCLA’s high standards mentioned above; and (iii) employ (primarily or exclusively) technologically mediated formats. Four types of distance education courses may be offered provided the respective conditions are satisfied.

   a) **Fully Online Courses.** Consist only of online contact hours (e.g., online primary offerings or discussion sections, without the option for classroom attendance) and offer at least 1 hour of weekly synchronous interaction with the instructor of record. Most or all the course content is designed intentionally for digital delivery and encompasses the thoughtful design of instruction, assignments, engagements, and interactions that promote successful learning in a fully online environment.

   b) **Remote Courses.** Course content is delivered remotely without being intentionally designed for a fully online course. All primary offerings shall be synchronous (e.g., a 4-unit course must have at least 3 hours of synchronous instructor-student interaction per week) and have the technology to enable instructor-student interaction. The required amount of remote synchronous contact does not include office hours, TA-led secondary sections, or time spent in exams.

   c) **Hybrid Courses** are a non-trivial combination of (i) in-person, (ii) online, and/or (iii) remote primary offerings. Hybrid instructors consciously tailor learning activities to the appropriate content. At least 50% of the primary offerings must have synchronous instructor-student interaction.

   d) **Hy-Flex Courses [now more commonly described at UCLA as “dual modality”]** meet simultaneously in both online and non-remote environments. Remote students watch a live-stream of the physical class, participating through facilitators, chat, video, and audio. Before considering such courses, instructors must develop a detailed plan specifying the existence of, or investment in, significant technological resources to ensure communication between students attending remotely and the instructor is as rich as that of physical participants. All primary offerings shall be synchronous (e.g., a 4-unit course must have at least 3 hours of synchronous instructor-student interaction per week). Such courses require a plan to monitor that online learners do not have trouble hearing, and participating fully in class.

3. **Synchronous.** Synchronous (learning) means synchronous in time so that students and instructors interact simultaneously. Explicitly, faculty and students participate
simultaneously in learning activities in face-to-face classrooms or via a video conferencing platform such as Zoom. In-person classes are by their nature synchronous.

4. **Asynchronous.** Asynchronous (learning) means asynchronous in time so that students’ learning can occur at different times and is particular to each student. Students engage in course content at times that best fit their schedules.

5. **Physical.** Physical means that instructor and students are in the physical presence of each other.

6. **Remote.** Remote means that the instructor and student are not in the physical presence of each other.
Letter on Academic Freedom and Instruction

February 25, 2022

Note: This letter comprises the views of the individual signatories. Because of the urgency of responding to undergraduate students at UCLA, this statement could not be examined or approved through full deliberation of the Senate’s councils, committees, and Executive Board. In light of this and, importantly, of discussions being held at the UC systemwide level (see below), this version may be subject to revision. In that case, we promptly will convey any revised version or new documents to USAC and DSU.

This letter responds to student demands for: 1) the identification of university policies addressing academic freedom; and 2) a policy rationale for why the UCLA Academic Senate cannot mandate universal dual modality instruction. Moving forward, campus Academic Senate leadership looks forward to meeting with student leaders about these issues, as we have committed to doing.

Given the principles and policies of academic freedom, the default position at the University of California is that faculty have autonomy over how they teach. Individual faculty hold professional authority in the delivery of their instruction: “The principles of academic freedom protect freedom of inquiry and research, freedom of teaching, and freedom of expression and publication.” (APM 010)

In addition to being a foundational principle in higher education (e.g. the AAUP 1940 Statement), academic freedom is defined in Regental policy at the University of California (UC Regents 1970 Policy on Academic Freedom). It is codified in the systemwide Academic Personnel Manual, principally in APM-010, a systemwide policy issued by the systemwide Provost and Executive Vice President on behalf of the President. Academic freedom is not based in the policies of any one UC campus, such as UCLA; rather, it is governed by systemwide policy.

Neither the UCLA Administration nor the UCLA division of the Senate has the authority to constrain the academic freedom of the individual faculty member.

Nonetheless, while the bedrock principle of, and policies regarding, academic freedom across the UC assume the default position of faculty autonomy in the classroom, that autonomy is not absolute. Across the US, academic freedom is bounded by applicable anti-discrimination laws including the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

Across the UC system the exercise of academic freedom also entails the corresponding duties of professional care when teaching, conducting research, or otherwise acting as a member of the faculty [APM-010], as set forth in the Faculty Code of Conduct [APM-015].

Academic freedom is intrinsic to curricula and courses, which are designed and offered by academic programs and individual faculty members. But those curricula and courses are also authorized by the Academic Senate, which is responsible for reviewing and approving them according to rigorous standards (see Regents Bylaw 40.1).
In March 2020, the pandemic forced Chancellor Block to close the campus to in-person teaching and learning for health and safety reasons on an emergency basis. Subsequently, Los Angeles County public health policies also restricted the campus’s in-person activities. To maintain student progress during the emergency, the Academic Senate created temporary guidance for flexible teaching modalities using technology, as well as temporary changes to regulations governing examinations, syllabus revision, P/NP grading options, students’ drop deadlines, and so on. When the County and Chancellor deemed it safer to return to in-person teaching, the default in-person format for instruction at UCLA returned to its pre-March 2020 status.

We are in a watershed moment in higher education, as we are learning the lessons of the pandemic, including for instruction. The Academic Council of the systemwide Academic Senate has been taking up questions raised by the systemwide University Committee on Academic Freedom on the issue of whether mandating class recordings is consistent with academic freedom, as well as other issues. UCLA’s division of the Academic Senate looks to the systemwide Academic Senate, the systemwide Provost and Executive Vice President, and the Board of Regents as holding authority in this domain. As discussions continue, we will engage actively with USAC and DSU representatives regarding the interpretation of academic freedom and of its implications for the work of individual faculty members and students in the classroom. In the meantime, we will advance best practices to improve instruction: indeed, we see considerable room for improvement within the current policy framework. We take it as our duty to work toward and advocate for improved accessibility in instruction.

Jessica Cattelino, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Division of the Academic Senate

Shane N. White, Immediate Past Chair UCLA, Division of the Academic Senate
Dear Academic Senate,

While we appreciate your apology, commitment to dialogue, and acknowledgement of inclusive education as integral to academic excellence at UCLA, we are dismayed by the continued lack of concrete action being taken that would create this inclusive environment now, especially as it relates to such time-sensitive matters. Further discussion without action fails to deliver results to students who are at-risk themselves, or living with individuals who are at-risk, for contracting COVID-19; stalled action in the name of discussion forces students to make decisions that place their own and their loved ones’ safety and well-being in jeopardy. There are a number of other, non-COVID-19 related reasons that point to universal dual modality being incredibly beneficial, as we have discussed at length. As students, we should be able to focus on our studies and commitment to academic research and performance. Instead, we are forced to continuously shoulder the burden of advocating for changes that are not materializing in time to protect the UCLA community, especially its most vulnerable members. As we emphasized in our most recent meeting, action must be taken now.

As paid decision-makers with great institutional power, we call on the Academic Senate to immediately take responsibility for removing this burden placed on students, one we battle while struggling to maintain our health and well-being. The sheer number of UCLA students and student workers (both graduate and undergraduate) who support our demands compared to the number of professors who object to dual modality clearly show that the DSU is asking for the most equitable policy solution. As you know, we are in consultation with disability rights lawyers from multiple organizations and are fully prepared to “say go” if no progress is made in the next few weeks.

Moreover, for faculty, lecturers, and teaching assistants, having to adjust modalities with little notice is disruptive to the educational process. We have seen time and time again that waffling and taking our time leads to an additional burden on the entire UCLA community. Starting to implement dual modality now, though more work in the short term, will allow for those in teaching positions to adjust for future calls for remote learning (as was done by Administration in March 2020 and January 2022). It will be the much needed push toward universal access we’ve been asking for since August 2021.

Further, through feedback received from students (as also mentioned in our most recent meeting), there are imminent deadlines for students to receive access to their course materials for Spring quarter. Immediate action is needed to enable BruinCast for classrooms that have the capacity for this technology. Shockingly, professors have to request BruinCast services for the Spring 2022 quarter by today (Wednesday, March 9th and the middle of Week 10), and if they miss this deadline, their requests may not be handled until Week 1 or 2 of next quarter. The lecture halls and classrooms that have the capability for audio and/or video recordings and/or
livestreams are already listed on the BruinCast website and should have those capabilities automatically enacted. Enacting all BruinCast systems now at the very least increases access to those in eligible rooms with little to no cost to those in teaching positions.

Additionally, we would like to remind you that our demands for access include not only undergraduate students, but graduate students, student workers, and faculty/lecturers; we expect that every one of these groups be explicitly included in any and all future discussions.

Below are specific responses to many line items from your revised letter. Those we have not explicitly addressed have already been discussed (i.e. they remain consistent with your last letter), fall more under the requests/jurisdiction of USAC, or will be discussed in our upcoming meeting.

1.2 This statement must endorse the use/sharing of recordings and/or live streams for students who are absent for any reason, as well as remote exams (which Administration has specifically discouraged). Moreover, DSU leadership must be able to read and approve the BruinPost before it is distributed. This BruinPost must also include guides for how to use BruinCast (if it is equipped), what Zoom assistants are and how to request them, and how to livestream / record lectures using Zoom. There must also be guides on implementing dual modality for lab/performance courses. Many DSU members have expressed a willingness to advise on the creation of these guides and implementation of ‘teach-ins’ in order to educate professors on this technology and its importance; this offer still stands, with the specification that we will serve as consultants on the development and implementation of these materials, although we are open to dedicating more of our time and resources if fairly compensated.

1.3 We need a deadline, much sooner than May 31, 2022, for the cost and needs assessment for BruinCast audio and visual technology, as well as the current capacity of said system (including Zoom assistants). Within the cost assessment, there must be evaluations for providing extra compensation for professors, lecturers, and teaching assistants for implementing dual modality in their classrooms. For technology that does exist, the above system should be instituted and guidance must be sent to all faculty and students on how to access their rooms’ capabilities, including how to request a Zoom assistant. Moreover, as implied future deadlines for requesting the use of BruinCast must be abolished; faculty should be able to access BruinCast at any time.

1.4 DSU expects to receive a copy of the principles produced by the end of Spring Quarter 2022.
DSU looks forward to receiving a copy of the developed processes. Additionally, clarification regarding why policies would be “possibly” implemented in the foreseeable future, rather than surely, would be appreciated.

1.6
These meetings must also include discussions of and commitments to advocating for extra compensation for faculty, lecturers, etc who implement dual modality.

3.1
As mentioned in the opening of this letter, our hybrid access demands are inclusive of, but not limited to, undergraduate and graduate students, student workers, and faculty/lecturers. DSU is proud to be comprised of both undergraduate and graduate students and therefore, we request the meeting invitation of both the GSA Vice-President of Academic Affairs and the Director of the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs, both housed under the Office of Academic Affairs.

3.2
To reiterate what has been repeatedly communicated by DSU: no amount of advocacy or advisement in order to facilitate in-person class attendance will ameliorate the barriers that disproportionately affect the disabled student population. As we have continually stated, the only way to equitably mitigate this issue is to remove any and all forms of punitive attendance requirements. Doing so will ensure that (1) students are not revealing personal information or diagnoses to get an excused absence (which often is rarely granted, and almost never allowed retroactively) and (2) that all students affected by other institutional barriers (e.g. being physically unable to navigate campus, working full-time to support yourself) will be fairly treated.

3.3
This cultural shift must come from you. As we’ve witnessed with past accessibility legislation, it took disabled people risking not only their reputations, but their literal bodies in order to have those in power change policy, something you witnessed us do just a few weeks ago. UCLA prides itself on being the #1 public university in the US, proudly showing off the ‘diversity’ of its campus and student body. However, our disabled community is consistently excluded from campus activities, faced with various inaccessible campus buildings and locations, and prevented from equal access to a UCLA education. Culture will not change without a concrete push to do so, in the form of enforceable policies that disallow professors from being inaccessible and perpetuating ableism in higher education. Student culture surrounding dual modality is progressing, and thousands of students have expressed support for this change, but professors, Administration, and you, the Academic Senate, have barred it from happening. We need to universally implement dual modality now.
4.2
Although we appreciate the more in-depth look at what academic freedom is in general, and where the documents it stems from, nowhere did you reference which tenants of academic freedom are being violated by mandating dual modality instruction. In fact, in your letter you stated “In March 2020, the pandemic forced Chancellor Block to close the campus to in-person teaching and learning for health and safety reasons on an emergency basis.” This assumes that the university has, and has wielded, the power to violate academic freedom. (Once again, we are left unsure if and how this violation occurs, given the lack of concrete policy details.) Case in point, according to the CDC’s latest numbers, the 7-day average for new COVID-19 cases as of March 2, 2022 is ~53,000; during the entirety of Spring quarter 2020 (when we were suddenly pushed online), the 7-day average was at or below 30,000. The Academic Senate should have been mandating continued remote access to courses this entire time, but has refused to do so on the basis of “academic freedom,” despite it’s (claimed) violation being clearly justified and supported by the University in the past. If you are truly committed to seeing change in this area, you must prioritize student needs and lives over non-specific “policies” that are contradicted by your own words and actions\(^1\).

4.3
As stated previously, DSU is composed of both graduate and undergraduate students, and our advocacy work therefore is on behalf of both student populations. Please be sure to include GSA in all future systemwide developments in this area, in addition to USAC and DSU leaders.

We were interested to learn of the systemwide nature of academic freedom policies in Academic Senate’s letter to DSU\(^3\) on 2/28/22, considering there has been discussion of academic freedom violation due to mandating dual-modality long before we received this letter.

Given this new information that has come to light, we request that any and all relevant contact information of members within the systemwide Academic Council be shared with DSU.

Addendum
We appreciate you clearing up terminology. Know that in our advocacy, we are fighting for universal dual modality / hy-flex. We will continue to use “hybrid access” as a synonym because we have been doing so for 6+ months, so know that if/when we use that term, we are referencing our demands for universal dual modality.

We look forward to meeting with you before the end of Winter Quarter 2022.

Signed,
The Disabled Student Union at UCLA (DSU)
DOES USING BRUINCAST CHANGE HOW I TEACH MY CLASS?

Not really. The BruinCast service is designed to be hassle-free and unobtrusive. In general, you can conduct your class sessions as you ordinarily would.

For your classes to be recorded properly, you must wear a wireless lavalier microphone during every class session. This small microphone is easily clipped to your shirt, collar or lapel, and is connected by a thin cord to a transmitter that you put in your pocket, clip to your belt or carry. The microphone is supplied to you at no cost by Audio Visual Services (AVS) for use throughout the quarter.

Most video recordings and all audio-only recordings are accomplished with permanently installed equipment that you or your students will not even be aware of. For some video-recorded courses in rooms without a remotely controlled camera, a video crew will attend each of your class sessions and record them from the back of the room.

You can use slide presentations, write on the whiteboard/chalkboard, conduct demonstrations, move around freely, interact with students and otherwise teach your class like you always do.

WILL A LOT OF STUDENTS WATCH THE LECTURES ONLINE INSTEAD OF ATTEND CLASS IN PERSON?

Published research has consistently shown that making recorded lectures available to students results in little or no negative impact on classroom attendance.

According to past surveys of UCLA students, the majority used BruinCast as a study tool during the quarter, particularly before midterms or finals, or to watch/listen to a lecture they had a legitimate reason for missing. The large uptick in streaming traffic before midterms and especially finals also suggests students often review all or parts of lectures to prepare for tests.


Dear Disabled Student Union (DSU),

Thank you for your communication dated March 9, 2022.

We are including a timeline of Academic Senate plans to engage the issues raised by DSU as well as several others we are tackling as the campus and the university consider lessons learned during the pandemic. The Academic Senate is a deliberative legislative body comprised of committees and councils with expertise on many matters. We cannot predict where our committees and councils will steer the Academic Senate as principles and plans for the future of instruction will be derived. We are not an executive body, and we do not control campus resources and offices relevant to instruction. Therefore, some matters, such as BruinCast or classroom technology assessments, are not ones that the Academic Senate can address, except insofar as we can raise them with administrators.

We consider the timeline to be our guide. In addition, we have highlighted below some points in your March 9 demands for which a response is indicated. Other points were heard and considered but did not call for a direct response.

As UCLA Academic Senate leaders, we wish to emphasize that we take the issues of equity and accessibility raised by DSU very seriously.

We also are fulfilling our commitment to keeping you informed about relevant systemwide communications. A recent letter from the Academic Council, signed by systemwide Senate Chair Robert Horwitz, is linked here.

You asked for the contact information for Academic Council members; the roster can be found at: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/rosters/committees.php?admin_task=committee_details&commit_name=council. Please note that UCLA Academic Senate Chair Jessica Cattelino assumed the duties of the chair on March 1; therefore, she has not yet attended an Academic Council meeting as a member.

Direct responses:

1.2 The response is being drafted, with administration leading the drafting. It endorses ongoing flexibility this quarter in the pandemic context re: livestreams/recordings, and it establishes that a process has commenced for considering questions of instruction that are not limited to the pandemic emergency context.

1.3 These are issues for the Administration, not the Academic Senate, which has no purview over these offices and projects. That said, we are raising these issues in meetings with the Administration.

1.4 Absolutely.

1.5 The Academic Senate will share the processes. Academic Senate leadership cannot commit in advance to policies that might be implemented. The Academic Senate is a legislative body with authority over many matters vested in our councils, not an executive body like the Administration. Therefore, the Academic Senate leadership cannot commit to what our committees and councils will do. The
Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council have direct authority over many matters of instruction, such as curriculum and instructional policy.

1.6 Thank you for this. We agree that funding is required not only for equipment but also for instructional labor, though our primary concern for faculty is less about compensation than time and size of the faculty body. Thus, key funding would be for hiring more tenure-track faculty, to spread out any increased instructional workload and ensure that faculty maintain research capacity, capacity for service to the university, and capacity for training graduate students, along with other faculty duties.

3.1 We are delighted that both USAC and GSA are now issuing the invitation and facilitating the upcoming meeting. We agree wholeheartedly that graduate students must be involved, and indeed we had been having the same conversation in parallel. We will reach out to GSA and USAC about scheduling the second meeting.

3.2 We look forward to ongoing discussions about attendance at in-person classes. While we understand that there can be many challenges, there are opportunities for the university to do more. For example, review of financial aid packages might mitigate the need for some students to work fulltime. Enhanced CAE-related services could better support students and faculty. A housing guarantee at affordable rates and improved transportation might contribute to student wellbeing in ways that make attending class more feasible for more students. We emphasize that we are not saying this would be the case for all, and we recognize that your focus is on attendance policies. We appreciate raising awareness about how some types of attendance policies may have negative consequences.
March 18, 2022

**UCLA Academic Senate Leadership Timeline in re Responses to Undergraduate Students**

**February 28, 2022**

COMPLETED The Academic Senate leadership will provide a response to the demand by DSU leadership for citations to policy concerning academic freedom and instruction and for the policy rationale for not mandating universal dual modality. (By February 28, 2022)

COMPLETED As discussed in our February 16, 2022, meeting, the Academic Senate offers defining terms for instructional modalities.

**March 17, 2022**

COMPLETED To discuss issues regarding flexibility in instruction, and to address Senate commitments and next steps, Academic Senate leadership and Academic Senate Executive Director agree to meet by the end of winter quarter, upon invitation by the USAC President, with the chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, the Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and the DSU leadership. (Winter 2022)

COMPLETED Academic Senate leadership and the Senate Executive Director agree to meet to discuss attendance requirements by the end of winter quarter, upon invitation by the USAC President, with the chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, the Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and the DSU leadership. This meeting would be in conjunction with the one mentioned in item 1.1 above.

**March 24, 2022**

AWAITING RESPONSE Per March 17, 2022, meeting between USAC, GSA, DSU, Academic Senate and Student Affairs, Academic Senate Leadership will check with EVCP’s office on the status of a classroom equipment inventory and provide an update to USAC and GSA Presidents.

**March xx, 2022**

IN PROGRESS The Academic Senate chair will join the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs in signing a BruinPost that, consistent with Academic Senate policy, endorses faculty use and sharing of recordings and/or livestreams for students who are absent for COVID-related reasons, affirms that posting videos or offering livestream can be a valuable addition to many courses, and supports faculty flexibility in reasonably addressing students’ instructional needs. (Winter 2022)

**March 28, 2022 (first day of instruction)**

COMPLETED Academic Senate Leadership will respond to the DSU letter received on March 10, 2022.

**April 15, 2022**

ASKING STUDENT AFFAIRS TO SCHEDULE To discuss the role of academic freedom in teaching and learning, the Academic Senate leadership and Executive Director agree to meet by Week 3 of spring quarter with the chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, the Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the USAC President and Academic Affairs Commissioner, and DSU leadership.
June 10, 2022 (end of spring quarter)

IN PROGRESS The Academic Senate commits, by the end of the Spring Quarter, to establish and issue a set of principles that will guide Academic Senate deliberation on the future of instruction beyond the pandemic. (Winter and Spring 2022)

The Academic Senate also commits by the end of the spring quarter to establish a process, based on both evidence and principles, that will result in a fuller understanding of the lessons learned from pandemic instruction and of how those could lead to policy changes that will not only maintain but improve UCLA’s academic excellence. We anticipate a process that will include informational, consultative, and deliberative components. (Winter and Spring 2022, to be followed by implementation in AY22-23 and possibly beyond)

September 9, 2022

The Academic Senate will update its materials and resources for the orientation of committee and council chairs as well as members, in order to improve their interactions with student representatives and increase the accountability of members to adhere to the Faculty Code of Conduct regarding appropriate behavior. We aim to create a more consistently respectful and collaborative relationship with student representatives and acknowledge the need to do so.

We will ask the USAC President and USAC Academic Affairs Commissioner to provide feedback on https://www.senate.ucla.edu/about/senate-service#student-representatives in order to improve our resources and onboarding materials for student representatives. Executive Director April de Stefano will work with USAC Leadership and Academic Senate staff to make these improvements. (Spring and Summer 2022)

Executive Director de Stefano will join USAC Leadership and the USAC advisors to discuss ways to increase the capacity of USAC-appointed student representatives to Academic Senate committees and councils to participate and engage most effectively. (Summer and Fall 2022)

October 7, 2022

We will offer dedicated onboarding meetings between the USAC-appointed student representative to each Academic Senate committee and council and that committee’s/council’s Chair and Analyst. We will also offer an orientation meeting for all new student representatives. (Summer and Fall 2022)

On-Going Efforts

Effectively immediately, the Academic Senate will amplify our advocacy for, and advisement to, Administration on classroom technology assessment and campus commitment to providing resources to meet those needs as well as resources to address digital divides. We will do the same with regard to resource commitments that aim to support students in attending in-person classes. (Winter 2022 and thereafter). UPDATE: we have contributed ideas for the faculty survey about pandemic instruction, confirmed the importance of the classroom technology assessment, and are writing a letter from the Executive Board to the administration re: the need for more instructional resources.

During our monthly meetings with USAC Leadership, we will invite USAC to join the Academic Senate in calling for increased hiring of tenure-track faculty and reversal of the decline in faculty-to-student ratio, as a necessary condition for augmented instructional options that require more faculty labor. (Winter and
Spring 2022) UPDATE: we have been making this point in many meetings and are doing so in the letter we’re writing.

During our monthly meetings with the USAC President and the USAC Vice President for Academic Affairs, we have begun an on-going dialogue to understand student concerns about serving as representatives to Senate committees and councils, as well as ideas about ways to increase the attendance and engagement of USAC-appointed student representatives to Academic Senate committees and councils. (Winter and Spring 2022)

If requested by USAC, the Academic Senate will join in advocating for the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to provide additional support via SOLE for the selection, skills-building, onboarding, and engagement of USAC-appointed student representatives to UCLA Academic Senate committees and councils. (Winter and Spring 2022)

Beginning in spring quarter, the Academic Senate will amplify our advocacy for, and advisement to, Administration efforts and resource commitments to facilitate students’ attendance in in-person classes.

COMPLETED The Academic Senate will advocate with Administration for a working group to address faculty development in the area of pedagogy and accessibility, in order to provide additional resources and support to instructors. Academic Senate leadership recognize the need for more dissemination to faculty of information about accessibility and instruction, as well as the need for, to varying degrees across the campus, a cultural shift when it comes to accessibility and instruction.

The UCLA divisional Academic Senate leadership has informed the systemwide Academic Council about student demands, in light of the systemwide nature of academic freedom policies and discussions, and commits to informing USAC and DSU leaders of systemwide developments in this area.
March 24, 2022

MICHAEL DRAKE, PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Academic Council Response to Calls for Universal Hybrid Instruction

Dear President Drake:

At its February 2022 meeting, the Academic Council discussed the recent call from UCLA students, led by the Disabled Students Union (DSU), to mandate universal and permanent dual modality (sometimes referred to as hybrid) instruction, in which faculty teach students in the classroom and online simultaneously or recorded for asynchronous viewing.

The Council agreed that a systemwide response to these calls would be appropriate given that similar demands or requests are likely to emerge on other campuses, and that student-led efforts to expand instructional modalities as the University standard for all courses affects all campuses. These calls are of immense importance to faculty as they affect faculty academic freedom, expertise, prerogative, effort, ability, resources, and autonomy. They propose a fundamental transformation of instruction on our campuses, at a time when we are and should be considering the long-term implications of the pandemic for the future of instruction.

First, we understand that students with disabilities face serious challenges. Faculty are open to dialogue with students and campus administrators on how to better accommodate the needs of disabled students, to work more effectively with campus disability offices, to advocate for better instructional support and disability services, and to encourage and disseminate best practices in teaching that support disabled student learning.

At the same time, the Council is aware that many student requests for remote learning accommodation are likely related more to a desire for greater choice of learning engagement or to pressing issues such as housing availability and costs and concerns about health and safety than to a disability. While it is understandable that students may want the flexibility of remote instruction, they have not shown how it will benefit their learning. Indeed, data are beginning to show, and many UC faculty report, that remote instruction is not a particularly effective pedagogical modality for many of the key pedagogical outcomes that faculty build their courses to achieve. Many faculty who taught remotely during the pandemic testify that learning outcomes were largely much worse than with in-person instruction. While some of this might be attributed to the effects of a pandemic and all the upheaval it has caused, it is still the case that
emergency remote instruction and planned-for online instruction share many common properties, and that teaching well in dual modalities is far more pedagogically demanding than either one alone.

The current market-oriented discourse around education focuses on students as consumers and faculty as needing to tailor course modality to meet consumer demands. This approach neglects the authority of the faculty as experts in pedagogy and their prerogative as teachers who understand the benefits of in-person instruction. Faculty know that instruction is not simply a transmission of information over a wire, but a matter of interaction and participation. They know that the value of a UC degree derives from the student’s experience on a UC campus learning with faculty and other students in classrooms, labs, performance spaces, and other campus research settings. Faculty are committed to their students’ success. They define educational quality; and they know how students learn, and learn most effectively.

Many students want more individualized approaches, and they may not be aware how much extra work it is to teach well in dual modality. Faculty who have taught in hybrid mode attest that it is more than double the work of teaching a course in a single modality: the issues are not simply technological but rather involve fundamental course design, assessment, equity across modalities, participation, interactive teaching and learning, and more. Some faculty are open to discussions about moving toward greater accommodation for course recording and teaching modality. However, quality remote instruction is expensive and this cannot happen without a serious commitment of resources from campus administrations. Without additional investment in resources and more faculty hiring to provide this ‘individualization’ mode of instruction, the University is diverting a faculty hired to conduct research, teach, and provide service to a very time-consuming effort in instruction alone. This is not consistent with the comprehensive needs of an R1 University system.

Council understands that the issue of accessible instruction is broader than student disability and touches all students, and the post-pandemic period can be an opportunity to consider the future of education in a way that helps students as a whole, including disabled students. This takes time and concerted effort well suited to shared governance. It requires data and deliberation. Emergency pandemic response is one thing, but now we have the responsibility to establish principles and planning for the future of instruction. Academic Senate processes are not impediments to such an important effort, but rather are powerful mechanisms to harness faculty knowledge and authority toward shared goals.

The University’s approach to the post-pandemic world should also acknowledge the threats to the social contract between students, faculty, and staff, each of whom is proposing largely individualized solutions that could undermine the integrity of UC as we know it. We need to reestablish mutual obligations and commitments to reconstitute the UC as an intellectual community. We hope this letter (and our recommendations to Senate divisions on the mandated recording of classes1) will help serve as a basis for a dialogue on these issues among faculty, students, and administrators on campuses.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Provost Brown
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    Chief of Staff Kao
    Chief of Staff Peterson
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    Executive Director Baxter