

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

## Videoconference Minutes

Monday, January 23, 2023

**Attending:** Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair (UCLA), Darlene Francis (UCB), Katie Harris (UCD), Manoj Kaplinghat (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Holley Moyes (UCM), Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR), Geoff Cook (UCSD), Dana Rohde (UCSF Alternate), Julie Bianchini (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), James Weichert (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCB), Sadaf Bandeali (Graduate Student Representative), Ellen Osmundson (Program Director, UC Online), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Ethan Savage (Analyst, Academic Planning), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Consultation with UC Online**

- *Ellen Osmundson, Program Director, UC Online*

Program Director Osmundson provided an overview of the evolution of UC Online since 2013. Full-time matriculated undergraduate and graduate UC students are allowed to take a UC Online course at another UC campus at no additional cost through the cross-campus enrollment system (CCES). The CCES serves as the registration system as well as UC Online's course catalog. A UC Online course must be open to students on the home campus before being opened for cross-campus enrollment. UC Online funds support for students taking a cross-campus course, including additional teaching assistants. The program is no longer using a rigorous reporting system to document the allocation of funds and no longer requires award recipients to submit six-month reports to the provost about their activities and expenditure of funds. Instead, the funds are sent to the executive vice chancellors who are responsible for making the expenditures. UC Online surveys students at the conclusion of every term about their experiences in the courses.

Deloitte submitted its report on the CCES to UC Online's Advisory Council and Vice Provost Gullatt for feedback and clarification and the report will be shared with UCEP once it is finalized. The analysis includes information about how many students complete the cross-campus courses. There is an ongoing discussion about the demographics of students who enrolled in UC Online courses, both at the home campus and in cross-campus courses. Moving forward, Institutional Research (IR) at UCOP will have students' demographic information.

**Discussion:** Since the campuses make decisions about how UC Online funds are spent, Director Osmundson does not know how many teaching assistants were hired but did indicate that 6k students took cross-campus UC Online courses in 2021-2022. UC Online courses can be synchronous, asynchronous and hyflex. One problem for Massive Open Online Courses was that many students who enrolled in courses did not complete them and Director Osmundson estimates that 90% of the students who enroll in UC Online courses complete them. The campuses are responsible for assessing efficacy and UC Online is careful to not overstep its role, but some campus IR units have studied efficacy and Director Osmundson offered to share the analyses with UCEP. It was noted that most campuses have moved away from using external proctoring services. The director does not have information about the number of students who have taken one or more than one UC Online course, and a member remarked that it would be interesting to see if students who took multiple courses had different performance outcomes.

Chair Cocco explained that State law allows California Community College (CCC) and California State University (CSU) students to take UC courses and asked students in these systems are taking UC Online courses. According to Director Osmundson, this happens through UC Extension courses and CCC and CSU are allowed to take one course per term for \$60 to \$75 depending on if it is a semester or quarter course and if there are seats available. However, because CCC and CSU students must wait until the enrollment period closes, they will be three weeks behind when they start the course and at a disadvantage. UC Online has argued that these students should be given access to courses, but they should be advised that they might be dropped if a course is over enrolled. It is better for students to wait until it is confirmed that there is a seat for them. Chair Cocco remarked that it would be beneficial if CCC and CSU students could take UC Online courses when the classes they need are not available at their campus.

## **II. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning**

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning*
- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning*

The Academic Planning Council's (APC) Future of Undergraduate Education workgroup will meet in person next week to work on their report. APC's workgroup on Faculty Mission, Priorities and Balance Post-pandemic is poised to start once the new provost is briefed. Senate leadership wants a workgroup on the graduate student funding model. The governor's budget which was released on January 10<sup>th</sup> will fully fund the compact with UC and includes additional funding to convert 900 non-resident students to California students.

**Discussion:** Director Greenspan indicated that the budget office will have information regarding whether the administration will provide the additional funding for graduate student researchers required as a result of the strike.

## **III. UCB's College of Computing, Data Science, and Society Proposal (CDSS)**

- *Geoff Cook (UCSD)*

Chair Cocco explained that most of the questions about the CDSS raised by the UCSD representative were asked by the Senate during the review of the pre-proposal and have not been addressed in the full proposal. The analyst notified the chair that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and the Committee on Planning and Budget are close to finishing their reviews, and Chair Cocco does not think it makes sense to stall the review process by sending UCB the same questions the proposers have already failed to answer. Chair Cocco asked all members to review the proposal which the committee will vote on during the February meeting. The UCSD representative remarked that there are many aspects of the proposal that could be re-tooled but there is clearly significant momentum at UCB for the CDSS to be established.

**Discussion:** Structural issues that could potentially impact undergraduate instruction are under UCEP's purview. The proposal does not respond to the concerns of stakeholders at UCB, and UCEP should offer strong feedback. The analyst noted that the Compendium spells out a process whereby the provost can work with the campus to resolve the systemwide Senate's objections to a proposal.

**Action:** Members will review the proposal and related materials in preparation for a vote in February.

## **IV. Guidelines for Proposal Reviews**

- *Darlene Francis (UCB) and Julie Bianchini (UCSB)*

Chair Cocco indicated that the Compendium includes instructions for writing proposals which should be referenced in UCEP's guidelines. Proposers should be asked to include the pre-proposal documents in the full proposal packet.

**Discussion:** Proposers should consult with staff and students early on. The assumption is that a proposal has gone through the divisional Senate. Members discussed if letters from deans should be explicitly requested. The committee suggested that it would be valuable to have letters in a proposal from the executive committees at each school.

#### **V. Questions for UCSC about the Creative Technologies Proposal**

- *Holley Moyes (UCM) and Julie Bianchini (UCSB)*

Chair Cocco stated that UCSC's Creative Technologies proposal is actually a pre-proposal since this is the first round of review by UCEP. UCSC will be asked to respond to UCEP's questions before the committee sends its feedback to Council. The analyst shared that immediate past Chair Horwitz suggested that UCSC should send the Senate a revised proposal for an online major. The UCM representative described the questions prepared for the proposers and Chair Cocco asked members to suggest additional questions.

**Discussion:** A member remarked that it is unusual to develop a major with all new classes. The proposers should be asked to describe what cohort building looks like and, if UCEP's proposed campus experience requirement is approved by Council, when students will be expected to be in residence. The syllabus is based on a generic template and more detail should be provided, and the allocation of student hours should also be clearer. Chair Cocco explained the information that the program needs to document in order to be accredited. The proposers should describe the overall strategy for assessment and examinations.

**Action:** Chair Cocco will add the information about the WSCUC review to the questions and send it to the UCM and UCSB representatives before they are forwarded to UCSC. The UCSC representative can inform the proposers about UCEP's discussions regarding online majors.

#### **VI. Scheduling UCEP's In-Person Meeting**

Chair Cocco selected April 3<sup>rd</sup> for the committee's in-person meeting so the committee can carefully flesh out the text for the guidelines for online majors and minors. The chair would like to invite someone from WSCUC to join UCEP in March to discuss federal regulations for online courses.

**Discussion:** The UCSD representative explained that April 3<sup>rd</sup> is the first day of the quarter at that campus and he is scheduled to teach, but he can join UCEP's meeting by videoconference. The other members indicated that they are will attend the April 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting in person at UCOP.

**Action:** The committee confirmed the plan to meet at UCOP on April 3<sup>rd</sup>.

#### **VII. Campus Reports/Member Items**

Following the wildcat strike at UCSC a few years ago, the CEP developed a rule that students will be given a Pass if a letter grade has not been entered within 30 days of the deadline for entering grades and instructors may alter the grade later. The decision was controversial but the committee felt it was necessary. Since the end of the most recent strike, UCSC's CEP found that 85% of grades have been entered whereas over 90% of grades have been entered at the other campuses. Faculty and teaching assistants have been asked to work on getting the grades entered because students were complaining about issues related to the lack of grades.

**VIII. New Business/Executive Session**

There was no New Business or Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:15 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Melanie Cocco