FEEDBACK SUMMARY STATEMENT
THEME 1: EDUCATION INNOVATION

Student Response Summary
Overall support was expressed for the plan, although specific comments focused on the following needs: additional study space; ability to secure requisite classes; better professors; more online courses and online discussion with TAs; formal TA training programs with incentives, Teaching Professorships, and undergraduate opportunities; more personalized and flexible learning environments – outdated classroom formats present an obstacle to active engagement (i.e., desks bolted to the floor). In addition, teaching evaluations should be mandatory and experienced professors need to be more innovative with integrating new technologies and teaching current topics with relevant ideas. It was also noted that there is no mention of consideration for moving to the semester system and the resulting benefits.

Two additional recommendations:
• There needs to be a major overhaul of the curriculum for undergraduate students as the concentration system is outdated. Offering concentrations in multiple disciplines and a better integrated curriculum that establishes a sense of community for incoming freshmen would better serve the spirit of innovation.
• “The humiliatingly low stipend and soaring housing costs make the university extremely unattractive to graduate students, hence the declining enrollment for graduate programs in the past decade.” UCLA would benefit from the working example of the University of Chicago which has climbed in academic ranking and reputation significantly in the last decade as a result of aggressive expansion that has led to new dorms in Hyde Park and an innovation center – The Polsky Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation – that operates as a co-working space.

Faculty Response Summary
There was substantial support expressed for the plan; however, several responses mirrored concerns raised in the student feedback with regard to class size, teaching evaluations, quarter system challenges, classroom renovation, and flexible learning environments.

Additional specific comments submitted include:
• Faculty growth at UCLA has not kept pace with undergraduate enrollment – a gap that is anticipated to widen even more over the next 15-30 years. Hire more professors to teach smaller classes and provide more individual student contact. One professor stated that he
tries very hard to meet and work with students, but has 6 TAs and 250 undergraduate students, so there is only so much he can do

• The current student evaluations are useless. Instead, why not have a center on campus that offers a learning program where faculty can improve their teaching skills?

• Support for the idea of more inclusive and non-traditional teaching opportunities. Specifically targeting the teaching grants to co-teaching and cross-disciplinary efforts would meet a need at UCLA and advance our larger, interdisciplinary academic goals.

• The only way to achieve excellence is to not offer online classes. It destroys the learning environment.

• Consideration should be given to utilizing existing resources; to consolidating some of the existing units referenced as collaborators rather than creating a new center. A campus-wide strategic goal should be to reduce the bureaucracy and duplication of efforts to enhance budget and physical space so that the specific aims of the plan can be achieved.

• This is a very well thought-out and valuable report. Without significant changes to the Academic Personnel system, however, little will change. Recommend that the Task Force members meet with the Committee on Committees to create a list of educational innovators who could be actively recruited to CAP (Committee on Academic Personnel). Without major changes to the current system, research publication counting will continue to dominate teaching creativity and innovation, and UCLA will continue the status quo.

• Hybrid teaching works – grades improve and classroom work is more productive. Students want to be connected to the professor, each other, and UCLA. For hybrid to be successful and scale further more help needs to be provided to instructors for video production, content development, production and editing.

• Preparation for the labor market could be achieved through entrepreneurship or an undergraduate business major. The emergence of online education, reduction of state support, and increased competition for students has called into question the old way of doing things, particularly for undergrads. Hybrid, 3+2, curriculum enhancement and leadership training would seem to be good first steps.

• Several Physics and Astronomy faculty members are developing novel educational materials using www.kudu.com. It is free to use for "bring-your-own" materials and the built-in "clicker" function is also free of charge for students. This platform is very helpful for creating an active learning environment. An offer is extended to share this experience with the panel and to discuss future opportunities for course enhancement. NOTE: See the Alumni Response comments section that references development of this platform and an additional offer of assistance.
• The report as a whole suffers from a lack of specificity and little sign of engagement with those who actually specialize in pedagogy. What we need is a culture of teaching at the departmental level and recognition of teaching in academic promotions. In addition, there is an emphasis on metrics without any explanation of how they might work or what they might consist of.

• Discussion of education innovation and increasing teaching staff through the use of Teaching Professors needs to take into account Lecturers and Postdoctoral Scholars. Lecturers account for 1/3 of all UCLA faculty, teach about the same fraction of classes, and often have similar qualifications as ladder faculty. Recent PhDs have difficulty securing tenure-track jobs, and many campuses – Stanford, Columbia – largely staff their introductory courses with these postdocs.

• Formal T.A. training should be provided to graduate students as well and should include activities that address diversity and inclusivity.

Staff Response Summary
Specific comments submitted by staff include the following:

• UCLA needs to offer more non-traditional class times and a plan to incentivize faculty to teach courses evenings and weekends as students take on more responsibility with families and jobs while in school.

• There is little mention of how technology will create a more innovative teaching and learning experience: Field trips via VR, hybrid learning, using technology more in the classroom to make learning more efficient and more hands-on. Defining the leaders in technological learning and assessing similar or improved implementation should be a key commitment.

• It is troubling that staff are not viewed as contributing factors to solutions. The Education Innovation report provides no point of entry for staff members to participate in this process other than to provide feedback.

• UCLA hosts prestigious scholars from all over the world. The campus should do a better job of integrating them as "non-traditional teachers" from the global community.

• The focus on expanding the educator pool through the Teaching Professor/Teaching Scholar series and inclusion of non-traditional community members adds value to the educational experience, helps mitigate impacted course capacity, and potentially attracts another category of talented faculty with the same job security as research-focused tenure. Although these are great opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students to teach and serve as TAs, they should not be used to fill the teaching capacity gap in place of hiring new faculty.
• The report makes no reference to the many existing creative educational innovations already in place on campus. Three examples that should be considered: Summer Institutes, Study abroad, and co-curricular programs like Startup UCLA that support and build off of student innovations using a pedagogic approach. There was also no mention of the potential for increasing Study Abroad opportunities (along with financial aid) as a strategy to prepare students for success after graduation and to lessen the burden of space constraints as we attempt to manage a growing student body.

• The campus-wide entity to provide strategic leadership for driving education excellence is a costly undertaking and should only be implemented if the campus identifies existing units that can be scaled back. The Teaching Professor title is overdue; our undergraduate population has grown and we have adapted by adding more non-ladder faculty members already. The Teaching Professor title would regularize this, enhance quality of instruction and provide stability.

• Faculty/student ratio is too high for a quality experience. Minimize classes that have 350-450 students as there is no interactive learning taking place when those numbers are so large. Experiential learning stays with an individual far longer than memorized lecture

• Consideration should have been given to a range of options should a $200M institute not be viable given funding constraints. The issues in this section are critical to UCLA’s success, but it may be worth considering whether the Institutional Effectiveness Committee’s recommendation for a ‘train the trainer’ program is a viable and cheaper alternative to another enormously expensive institute on campus.

Alumni Response Summary

• Tapping into UCLA's rich and underutilized alumni base and engaging key external stakeholders could prove helpful with closing the gap between the classroom and professional world in order to prepare students for the fast changing workforce.

• An offer was extended by an alumnus who has taught at UCLA and founded an education tech company to help train professors on a platform to bring active learning techniques into their courses. He has been working with professors at UCLA and UCSD to develop viable textbook replacements. NOTE: See the Faculty Response comments section that cites positive use of this platform by UCLA Physics and Astronomy professors.

• Emphasize learning labs, field work, and connections to research centers. Greater clarity is needed regarding the strategy to support the cadre of long time lecturers and incorporate them into the teaching and learning framework. Lecturers continue to play a key role in both entry and elective major classes.
• Administration and infrastructure have been barriers to advancing technology to enhance the educational experience of UCLA students. In addition, the small number of full-time faculty positions relative to the number of part-time lecturers makes it difficult for students to find true mentorship.
• Education innovation should be tied to training the next generation for the future of work/society...the standard education model is not preparing our graduates for the types of jobs or roles that will be required in 10 years. There should always be language about the bridge to employment in the changing economy/workplace.

**Donor Response Summary**
• Prioritizing teaching excellence, Teaching Professors, and a learning outcomes repository are all good ideas, as there is too much emphasis on bringing in revenue and publishing, and not enough on great, innovative instruction.
• There are a lot of generalities stated without specifics, benchmarks, or timetables for measuring effectiveness.

**Other Response Summary**
Feedback submitted by one responder expressed surprise that UCLA does not already have a center dedicated to teaching and learning. In addition, any conversation about educational innovation must take into consideration ADA compliance and meeting the needs of students with disabilities. The number of students with psychological and learning disabilities continues to increase on college campuses across the country and is redefining effective teaching.