



Date: January 19, 2022

To: Senate

From: Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching

Re: **Proposed addition of Course Delivery Mode Definitions to the Academic Calendars**

At its meeting on January 6, 2022, the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching reviewed the attached addition to the academic calendars regarding definitions of course delivery modes. At this same meeting, the committee approved the proposal.

Recommended Motion:

That Senate approve the addition of Course Delivery Mode Definitions in the academic calendars as described in the memo "Course Delivery Modes Framework", dated December 21, 2021.

/attachment

Respectfully submitted,

2021/2022 Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching

Alexandra D'Arcy (Chair), Faculty of Humanities

Elizabeth Adjin-Tettey, Acting Associate Vice-President Academic Planning

Tim Anderson, Faculty of Education

Tina Bebbington, Library Reference Services

Elizabeth Borycki, Faculty of Human and Social Development

Erin Campbell, Faculty of Fine Arts

Andrea Giles, Executive Director, Cooperative Education & Career Services

Sean Hier, Faculty of Social Sciences

Navinder Hundal, Student Senator

Nicole Kent, GSS representative

Brian Leacock, Peter B. Gustavson School of Business

Alex Li, Student Senator

Wency Lum, Chief Information Officer

Michael McGuire, Faculty of Engineering

Scott McIndoe, Faculty of Science

Mariel Miller, Technology Integrated Learning

Dipayan Ng, UVSS Representative

Tim Richards, Faculty of Law

Laurene Shields, Executive Director, Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation

Laura Vizina, Division of Continuing Studies

Rebecca Warburton, Convocation Senator

Jennifer Whately, Alumni Association Representative

Jennifer White, Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies

Ada Saab (Secretary), Associate University Secretary

Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost

Michael Williams Building
University of Victoria
T 250-721-7013 | F 250-721-7216
provasst@uvic.ca | uvic.ca/vpac


TO: Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching
FROM: Elizabeth Adjin-Tettey, Acting AVP Academic Planning
CC: Valerie S. Kuehne, Vice-President Academic and Provost
Susan Lewis, Acting Vice Provost
DATE: December 21, 2021
RE: **Course Delivery Modes Framework**

Seeking the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching's review and recommendation for Senate approval of the proposed Course Delivery Modes Framework set out below (pp 6-7) to be implemented in Winter Session 2022/23.

Introduction and background

UVic is committed to providing and maintaining high-quality educational experiences for all our students. The UVic student experience also includes creating and fostering relationships, community and networks among students and with instructors. Pre-pandemic, about 93% of undergraduate courses and 90% of graduate courses at UVic were offered face-to-face (F2F) with instructors using a variety of teaching modalities and learning technologies appropriate to their disciplines and pedagogies. Historically, UVic has had a small but significant number of high-quality, predominantly online programs and courses to best deliver specific academic programs to meet the learning needs of students and the long-term needs of professional programs.

Following a predominantly online academic year, in 2021/22, 78% of undergraduate courses and 74% of graduate courses were offered F2F. We saw an increase in enrolment in 2021/22, with fall 2021 being our biggest entering class to date. Even with the return to mostly in-person education, UVic instructors increasingly relied on technologies to augment and enhance learning and accessibility (e.g. recording classes, online-based assessments, feedback, and interactions with and among students). The number of



unique users and activity on Brightspace, UVic’s primary learning management system, continues to increase and is higher in fall 2021 than in fall 2020.

Consultations and principles

University leaders have been actively exploring the future of course and program delivery at UVic, building on our expertise pre-pandemic and applying learnings from the past year-and-a-half. In fall 2020, the Vice-President Academic and Provost and Acting Vice-Provost met with each Faculty Council to hear their thoughts about the future of teaching and learning at UVic. We also surveyed students about their academic experience during the pandemic, which included feedback on their online courses. Then, in summer 2021, the Vice-President Academic and Provost established the Course Delivery Modes (CDM) Working Group to provide clarity and establish standard definitions of various course delivery modes at UVic.

Role	Name
Acting Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (chair)	Dr. Elizabeth Adjin-Tettey
Acting Vice-Provost	Dr. Susan Lewis
Dean representative	Dr. Allana Lingren (Fine Arts)
Chair representative	Dr. Sudhakar Ganti (Computer Science)
Chair representative	Dr. Michael Nowlin (English)
Executive Director, Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation	Dr. Laurene Sheilds
Executive Director, Academic Resource Planning	Mr. Tony Eder
University Registrar	Ms. Nicole Greengoe
Associate University Secretary	Ms. Ada Saab

Table 1: Members of the Course Delivery Modes Working Group and their roles.

The following principles grounded the work of the working group:

- While UVic will remain primarily face-to-face, there is a recognition of a full spectrum of course delivery modes from face-to-face to fully online, with many pedagogical and human factors to consider.
- UVic is also committed to enhancing student accessibility. We aim to build some flexibility into academic programming whereby instructors can integrate learning technologies into their teaching and course delivery to enhance student learning and increase accessibility, should they wish to do so.
- The UVic student experience includes coming to campus, engaging in student life, and benefiting from hands-on experiences both in and out of the classroom. In most instances, online elements

should augment and enhance but not replace the in-person learning and teaching experience. This will continue to be important even if we decide to increase the number of individual courses offered online or in a blended format.

- The focus at UVic is on ensuring high-quality academic programming with a strong emphasis on student retention and success, across all modes of course delivery.

Well-developed online learning may also further our commitment to decolonization. The importance of ‘place’ in learning has also been one of UVic’s historically distinguishing features evidenced by our deep commitments to truth, respect and reconciliation. We expect that with the development of new UVic strategic and Indigenous plans, there will be even greater importance placed on decolonizing learning and teaching, and new opportunities created to realize this important aspect of an UVic education and experience.

The proposed Framework (set out below, pp 6-7) provides clarity, consistency and transparency for instructors as they plan their courses, and for students as they plan their schedules and register for courses.

Recognizing that the working group could not represent the diversity of campus perspectives on course delivery modes, the group consulted extensively with deans, associate deans, chairs/directors, faculty, instructors, student leaders and students, as per the following table.

Group	Method of consultation (and timing)
Deans’ Council	Meetings (summer and fall 2021)
Associate Deans, Chairs and Directors	Meetings (fall 2021)
Faculty Association	Meetings (fall 2021)
UVSS, GSS and accessibility groups	Meetings (fall 2021)
All faculty, librarians and instructors	Academic forum (December 2021)
Student leaders (e.g. in course unions)	Student forum (December 2021 and January 2022)
All students	Online questionnaire with almost 2,000 students responding (December 2021)

Table 2: Groups consulted by the Course Delivery Modes Working Group.

The majority of faculty, instructors and students consulted indicated a preference for an in-person campus experience, including face-to-face learning and teaching. Many also said that they appreciated aspects of the learning technologies now available. For example, of the students who responded to the questionnaire, 75% indicated that they appreciated being able to watch or listen to recorded lectures multiple times. A small proportion of students expressed that the online learning experience improved their access to post-secondary education, and that online course options help them to balance their

schooling with other priorities. Faculty and instructors have also indicated that they appreciate the flexibility in delivery modes. In the future, it will be important to conduct periodic surveys of students, faculty and instructors to hear about their experiences with different learning and teaching modalities, the impact of those modalities on student success, and whether students and/or instructors require additional supports for particular forms of delivery.

Changing course delivery modes

Instructors and programs have autonomy for their F2F courses. No approval is required as long as the stated threshold of online elements in the Framework is not exceeded. Review and approval will be required to shift delivery mode of courses or programs as approved by Senate (e.g. shifting from F2F to blended, fully online or online with some F2F). After significant consultation, the working group recommends that academic units and programs are best suited to determine their own delivery modalities. As such, and following Senate's approval of the course codes and definitions as articulated in the following Framework, the working group recommends that chairs and directors (or associate deans in non-departmentalized faculties) bring forward requests for changes to course delivery modes (individual courses as identified by CRN) to their dean. Approval by the dean will be based on factors such as individual course requirements and learning outcomes; program requirements and outcomes; accreditation and other regulatory requirements; maintainance of program standards such as academic integrity; student needs; alignment with principles of equity, diversity and inclusion; and creating the best possible academic and graduation outcomes for students. Instructors' personal preferences alone are insufficient to justify changes to delivery modes.

Changes must be in keeping with the overall quality of the academic program and not undermine the academic intent and content of the program, as approved by Senate, and relevant academic policy and regulations. Chairs, directors and deans will ensure the balance of teaching modes is appropriate to the discipline. Where the approving authorities in cross-listing units disagree, the dean(s) of the faculty(ies) shall consult with the AVP Academic Planning, who will be responsible for making a final decision regarding course delivery mode.

Oversight and accountability

All academic leaders, faculty and instructors are accountable to our students, to ensure they receive a high-quality education. As an institution, we are also accountable to the provincial government regarding the delivery modes of our academic programming. As such, the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost will annually monitor overall delivery modes for the university to ensure we remain a

predominantly face-to-face institution and uphold our commitments to both government and our students.

The Provost (or designate) will continue to have oversight of all changes to delivery modes through the normal review and approval of the course timetable prior to publication. The working group recommends that the Provost submit to Senate an annual institutional report of course delivery modalities (including changes to course delivery modes) in the faculties, for information. This report will include a summary of the number of courses requested to be delivered in alternate modes in an academic year, patterns of shifts in delivery modes, rationale for the shifts, student impacts, the overall institutional impact, etc.

Academic units/programs that intend to make significant changes to delivery modes must seek Senate Committee on Planning review and approval and, ultimately, Senate approval as well.

Timelines

Following Senate's approval of the proposed Framework for course codes and definitions, academic leaders should submit approved requests for alternate course delivery modes to the Office of the Registrar (OREG) in accordance with established timetabling and publication timelines. Students will be responsible for reviewing the registration guide and timetable to ascertain the mode of delivery of courses prior to course registration. To provide as much clarity as possible to students, relevant course delivery information will be provided to students through the revised timetable format (e.g., asynchronous and synchronous elements for fully online courses, mode of assessments, etc.).

As is currently the case, in exceptional circumstances, changes to a course's Instructional Method Code may be necessary after publication of the timetable, for example due to unanticipated instructor availability for core courses, enrolment challenges, etc. Students already registered in the course will need to be informed of the change in mode of delivery and options for re-registration as necessary and as early as possible. Consistent with current practice, efforts should be made to ensure students already registered in the course are not negatively impacted by the change in delivery mode.

Course Delivery Modes Framework

Below are the proposed course codes and definitions to be included in the Academic Calendar and used for timetabling. These will go to Senate for final approval, to be implemented in Winter Session 2022/23.

Delivery Mode	Definition	Alternate Delivery Modes Threshold	Assessment
Face-to-face (F2F)	Instruction primarily F2F in a physical location	At least 2/3 of instruction in-person synchronous ⁽¹⁾ with up to 1/3 incorporating online elements into instruction ⁽²⁾ The course syllabus must clearly indicate all student expectations re: F2F and online elements	In-person and/or online assessments Instructor must notify students of modes of assessment in the course syllabus by the course start date
<p>(1) Students and instructors are in the same physical location and at times designated in the timetable, e.g. campus classroom, etc.</p> <p>(2) May include use of learning technologies to enhance learning and teaching, e.g. posting course materials, learning activities, discussion groups, online preparation for F2F class using online platforms (e.g. Brightspace, Zoom, Echo 360, Microsoft Teams, Online Academic Community, etc.), virtual guest lectures (i.e. guests joining in-person class remotely), etc.</p>			
Blended	Instruction combines F2F with extensive use of online elements ⁽³⁾	At least 1/2 of instruction in-person synchronous ⁽⁴⁾ with up to 1/2 delivered incorporating online elements into instruction ⁽⁵⁾ The course syllabus must clearly indicate all student expectations re: F2F and online elements	In-person and/or online assessments Instructor must notify students of modes of assessment in the course syllabus by the course start date
<p>(3) Online instructions may include synchronous components (e.g. live online lectures and discussions) and asynchronous components (e.g. recorded lectures, flipped classroom, online discussion boards, online activities, etc.).</p> <p>(4) Synchronous components occur within times designated in the timetable.</p> <p>(5) E.g. up to 1.5 hours of a class timetabled for three hours per week, excluding labs, tutorials, assessment times scheduled outside of scheduled class times, etc.</p>			
Online with some face-to-face	Primarily online with some mandatory in-person components	Over 1/2 of instruction delivered online (synchronous or	In-person and/or online assessments

		asynchronous) with some in-person synchronous components Course syllabus must clearly indicate extent of in-person elements	Instructor must notify students of modes of assessment in the course syllabus by the course start date
Fully online	Instruction and learning entirely online using learning technologies ⁽⁶⁾		Online only; ⁽⁷⁾ may be synchronous or asynchronous Instructor must notify students of modes of assessment in the course syllabus by the course start date ⁽⁸⁾
<p>(6) May include synchronous components (e.g. live online lectures and discussions) and/or asynchronous components (e.g. recorded lectures, discussion boards, online activities, etc.). Synchronous components occur within times designated in the timetable.</p> <p>(7) Assessments will not be in-person for fully online courses.</p> <p>(8) Date and time of synchronous assessments (with the exception of the exam period) must be provided.</p>			

Multi-Access

Definition	Assessment	Comments
Course instruction offered F2F and remotely simultaneously (e.g. live streaming a lecture with discussion enabled for both F2F and online students). Students may access course F2F and/or online throughout duration of the course. Components may be synchronous or asynchronous. ⁽⁹⁾	Assessments may be in-person or online ⁽¹⁰⁾	Requires separate course code for purposes of room booking and for students to understand the multimodal format
<p>(9) Multi-access encompasses all course delivery modalities. Students can access the course in-person or online in real time.</p> <p>(10) Students who are taking the course through a fully online format will be provided the option of fully online assessments unless notified in the course syllabus that there is a requirement to attend in-person.</p>		