

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

## MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2016

**Attending:** Barbara Knowlton, Chair, (UCLA), Edward Caswell-Chen, Vice Chair, (UCD), Stephan Miescher (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Tony Smith (UCI), James Rauch (UCSD), Laura Nelson (UCB) (telephone), Beth Lazazzera (UCLA) (telephone), Kimberly Topp (UCSF) (telephone), Monica Lin (Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP), Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Iman Mills-Gordon (Provost's Office, UCOP), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Mona Hsieh (Office Manager, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Knowlton welcomed the members to the first UCEP meeting of the Academic Year, noting there are several new as well as returning members. The agenda was reviewed and Chair Knowlton mentioned the goals for some of the discussions. The Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS) met last week and there was a lengthy discussion about Resolution ACR 158. This resolution is to harmonize all lower division course work across the California Community College (CCC), California State University (CSU) and UC systems. It is anticipated that this resolution will become a bill and there are a number of concerns. The chair described the universal Course ID project. The numbering of courses is not a significant problem at the UC campuses especially since there are not many transfers between UCs. Examining General Education and outlining the different ways campuses think about it may be a topic for future UCEP discussions.

Last week Council discussed a report from BOARS. BOARS will study whether non-resident students compare favorably to California students. Data presented in a recent audit indicated that non-resident students' GPAs are just slightly lower than those of California students. BOARS will examine if the compare favorably status exists by looking at all the criteria used to admit students, and international students will be compared to out of state students. The state and Regents are very focused on the statistics on applicants.

BOARS will also discuss a recommendation letter pilot project at UCB. The impact of letters of recommendation on underserved students is not clear and the President has suggested developing a workgroup. UCB has asked to continue its pilot for another year and will collect more specific data to determine if the letters provide value. It was noted that students using the common application for colleges are accustomed to providing letters of recommendation.

**Discussion:** A member pointed out that UCOP should provide resources to the campuses to read the recommendation letters if the UCB project expands. Chair Chalfant indicated that the availability of resources to manage the recommendation letters is a concern. Reportedly many of the Regents are upset about the recommendation letters. Reportedly the recommendation letters were not discussed last year by the UCB Education Policy committee. Chair Chalfant has asked BOARS and the campus admissions committees and UCAADE and the corresponding campus committees to review the UCB project.

**II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

- *Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Chair Chalfant encouraged committee members to listen to Immediate Past Chair Hare's remarks to the Regents from July and shared that there are two new audits of UC. The State budget requires that the Regents adopt a policy on non-resident students which means calculating a limit on the number of non-resident students. It is important for the Board of Regents to think carefully about decisions like this because of the possible consequences for the budget and the impact upon each campus. Campuses are providing budget presentations during the Regents meetings which may be in preparation for a discussion about tuition. The tuition freeze will end this year, so a moderate increase might be expected. UCM's 2020 project and the University budget were approved at this meeting. Chair Chalfant reported briefly on the Regents' committees on health services and investments.

The Regents were very interested in the transfer pathways. Chair Chalfant may meet with the President of the Community College Senate to discuss how CCC faculty could work with UC on transfer pathways. It is important that UC remain uninvolved with the SB 1440 process on Associate Degrees and especially that we do not give up control of our curriculum. Regents have asked whether there are complete pathways at all 113 CCCs. A number of the Community Colleges are not in the business of preparing students for transfer and this is not their mission. The success of the project should not be judged by whether all 113 CCCs have the pathways but, instead, by how well it limits unnecessary barriers that make it hard to transfer. The state allocated \$2M in one-time funds to UC to improve faculty diversity which UCOP will use to implement three project pilots, and two Senate representatives are on the project advisory group. The consequences of the 5k students UC has agreed to take, and the 2500 a year for the next two years, will be an issue UCEP should discuss this year. A percentage limit on non-resident students may result in campuses attempting to accommodate as many California residents as possible. UCEP may want to talk about the use of LSOEs as some departments are planning on increasing their numbers. There may be a concern related to passing a yet-to-be-defined threshold for how many people are hired outside the traditional ladder rank faculty system. Chair Knowlton suggested that UCEP may want to think about limiting the number of people hired in this title and the value of the pedagogical contribution of these individuals.

**Discussion:** Food trucks are being invited onto some campuses to help meet the increased demand for food from all the new students. A concern at one campus is that an LSOE will be hired with a research focus outside of the department's normal research. It is also believed that hiring LSOEs is a way to hire cheaper faculty. Overall LSOEs are valued members of departments that have them. One member commented that LSOEs are wonderful assets in his large department which had growing enrollment and the LSOEs have improved the entire undergraduate program. Only UCSD has adopted the title of Professor of Teaching to date. At UCD, the insertion of pedagogical research into the descriptions of the Professor of Teaching title was a concern to some faculty there.

### **III. Budget Framework Initiative: Major Requirements**

- *Iman Mills-Gordon, Contractor, Provost's Office*

Chair Chalfant would like to report to the state that the justifications prepared were read by a systemwide Senate committee and they seem valid. Chair Chalfant has volunteered to participate in the reading of justifications and today members of UCEP will be asked to read them and decide if valid reasons are presented. Committee members will not be responsible for notifying departments that the justification is insufficient or recommend which requirements could be eliminated. Ms. Mills-Gordon explained the Major Requirements Initiative and provided an update on the Initiative including a copy of the presentation to the Regents in September. Phase one is the faculty review and if approved, phase two begins. Phase three is when the new requirements are finalized and the changes have been recorded and disseminated as necessary.

The progress to date has been good and most of the faculty reviews have been completed. The Provost's Office is very grateful for the assistance of the campus point people and faculty. Four campuses completed their faculty reviews ahead of schedule. Most campuses have surpassed their targets and are on track to complete the work by November. Seventy percent of those submitted report being at or below the benchmark for review and one-third have reported making changes. As of phase two, 142 majors have been changed and 67 have made it through the campus based approval process.

To date there are 75 majors that are above the benchmarks for review and did not make a change in the review process. Ms. Gordon-Mills reviewed the rationales to determine if they are complete. Faculty were given criteria from the Provost's Office for a strong faculty review rationale and this will be shared with the committee. UCEP is asked to review the new responses submitted by departments and indicate if they are acceptable.

**Discussion:** At one campus the goal was not to cut the requirements but to ensure that the requirements were not extra. There might be resistance in response to a message that campuses should cut as much as possible. The language in the budget framework is from the state and is not necessarily the terminology UC would use. It makes sense for campus educational policy committees to look at the new plans to reduce the major requirements. At UCSC, the CEP looked at the rationales but this is the only campus that asked its CEP to weigh in early. As a result of UCEP's review, some of the rationales may be sent back to the campuses if they are not sufficient. Departments that did not reduce their requirements often have complaints about the lack of resources.

Ms. Gordon-Mills can provide the rationales to UCEP within a week and members will complete the reviews before the November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. UCEP will discuss any of the controversial rationales at the November meeting. Any reviews that still raise questions could then be sent to the campus education policy committees. It would be too time consuming to send the rationales to the CEPs before UCEP members review them. Each UCEP member will review a handful of proposals with a goal for them to be reviewed before the November meeting. A member asked for data on the departments that have already passed the campus review. It would be useful to see if any campus programs that have undergone the review are outliers. Members discussed how to best distribute the work. The campuses have been advised that there will be a deeper review and possibly more questions. The final deadline for the campuses is November 7<sup>th</sup> so there may be a few additional rationales to reviews submitted after today.

#### **IV. Update on Senate Travel Procedures**

- *Mona Hsieh, Office Manager, Academic Senate*

The Senate Office Manager provided an update on travel procedures for committee meetings.

#### **V. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- *Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)*

Manager Peterson highlighted some of the information available on the Institutional Research and Academic Planning website which includes the annual Accountability Report. The unit frequently adds new information.

**Discussion:** Members recommended adding the numbers of first generation college students and the numbers of veterans per district.

## **VI. Budget Framework Initiative: Credit by Examination**

Chair Knowlton prepared a draft report to stimulate the committee's discussion about the Credit by Examination topic. The goal is to reach consensus by the end of this discussion as the chair hopes to finalize the report as soon as possible. The inconsistencies that have been identified should be discussed by UCEP and the committee may want to propose best practices. One recommendation is that students would be given a pass/no pass instead of a grade when they utilize the Credit by Examination. However, instructors should have ultimate control over giving a letter grade or using pass/no pass. Chair Knowlton reported that Credit by Examination is a rarely used mechanism in general and a demand for this option does not seem to be in demand.

**Discussion:** The UCI policy allows students to utilize the Credit by Examination option but to not accept a low grade. Instructors, or deans at some campuses, have to indicate in advance if they give a letter grade or pass/no pass. A policy encouraging students to use Credit by Examination can help alleviate space issues in impacted majors. Between 50 and 75 students per year take Credit by Examination but there is no data about the students' subsequent performance. There was a discussion about not using Credit by Examination to meet requirements for a major. The committee should discuss pre-requisites versus core major requirements at the upper division. One idea is for UCEP to propose that the grade from the Exam will be on the student's transcript but a student could still take the course. UCEP could say that this option helps the best prepared students.

One member stressed concerns that encouraging students to utilize Credit by Examination will lead to abuse of the policy. Members agreed that campuses should be advised to set a limit on the number of credits a student can earn by Credit by Examination. Campuses that only offer pass/no pass may reconsider giving letter grades. UCEP will be communicating that campuses have the option to use Credit by Examination but it is not a requirement. The message will be that campuses should use this tool as appropriate but UCEP does not anticipate the widespread use of Credit by Examination. This topic will be on the November agenda.

**Action:** The Chair will incorporate feedback from today's discussion into the draft report. The draft will be submitted to the Academic Council and then shared with the campus education policy committees.

## **VII. Budget Framework Initiative: Advanced Placement Credit**

Chair Knowlton provided an overview of the issues with Advanced Placement credit. There are many similarities across the UC campuses and no campuses refuse to grant AP credit. Awarding of AP credit can be considered in terms of University requirements, major requirements, and GE requirements. Some campuses will accept a score of three for some of the University requirements. For major requirements, a score of four is accepted, fairly consistently across campuses and majors. A big difference across the campuses is whether AP credit can be awarded for GE requirements. UCD and UCLA do not accept AP scores for GE. The GE courses are said to have a particular pedagogical function. The issues for UCEP include why scores of four and not three for major requirements, and why are there differences in the GE policy.

**Discussion:** The limits are not set arbitrarily but to make sure students will be successful later and build on the courses that are the foundation. Different campuses have relied on their strengths to balance depth, breadth and integration requirements differently. Members agreed that there should be a limit on the number of AP credits a student can have. There was also agreement that more detailed data about the use of AP courses would be very helpful for discussions with the campus Education Policy committees. Departments should be encouraged to ask for information when AP examinations are changed so the

exams can be rigorously reviewed. The UCEP memo will note that being more liberal when granting credit for AP exams will enhance existing disparities for underserved students.

**Action:** Chair Knowlton will draft a report to circulate before the next committee meeting.

### **VIII. Transfer Pathways Report**

UCEP discussed transfer pathways last year and some committee members were involved in their campus' work on their specific majors. The first ten pathways are being reviewed and any gaps are being identified. Phase one of the pathways project involved Senate recommendations and phases two and three entail administrative reporting. A question is whether faculty input would be useful in these later phases.

**Discussion:** A member remarked that UC is handling transfer students successfully. Associate Director Lin reported that about 75% of the gaps have been filled. This year there will be a continued focus on identifying gaps and determine why they have not been closed. The pathways are supersets but Chair Knowlton said that it is not clear if UCEP would have to approve any future changes. Any campus which adds a course to a superset will create a problem for the other campuses. Associate Director Lin will be invited to a UCEP meeting next year to provide an update.

### **IX. Senate Regulation 630 and the systemwide UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) Field Course**

UCEP approved the NRS field course as a systemwide course last year. Chair Knowlton explained that seniors have a residency requirement as defined in SR 630 and exceptions to the requirement include students in systemwide courses like UCDC or EAP. The proposed revision to SR 630 broadens the regulation to include the NRS systemwide course as another exception.

**Discussion:** The committee agreed to recommend the revision of SR 630 and suggested edits to the draft memo. The specific programs should be listed in the second paragraph of the regulation so a systemwide course is defined. Chair Chalfant indicated that the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction should be asked for an opinion on whether UCEP has the authority to propose this revision and determine if a systemwide review is required. A memo will also be sent to Council indicating that the divisions can treat the NRS course as a systemwide course that meets the senior residency requirement. UCEP members agree with the proposal to change the regulation. If Council approves the request, it will be submitted to Assembly for approval. The question about the NRS course came from UCB so this division may need to request a variance to SR 630.

**Action:** The memo will be submitted Chair Chalfant with a request for an opinion from R&J.

### **X. Goals and Priorities for 2016-2017**

Members were invited to propose topics for UCEP to discuss this year.

**Discussion:** A member would like to discuss academic integrity and cheating. Now that online education has grown, there are issues with proctoring and authenticating student identity. A member suggested that there should be a focus on enriching the use of technology on campus rather than on technology for individual courses. Chair Chalfant suggested that UCEP should invite the budget person for the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative to receive a report on how the money is spent. A member reported that four courses in a calculus sequence were changed to online courses and the traditional courses are not being offered any longer. Looking at an individual course in depth is great but looking at the courses around it should be part of the process. UCEP should ask ILTI for data on the number of online courses.

The emphasis on creating self-supporting graduate degree programs raises questions about how faculty teaching in these programs are shifted away from undergraduate teaching and whether the undergraduate students are taught by instructors of quality. Chair Chalfant indicated that the CCGA handbook has a set of questions that are asked about each proposal and UCEP may want to review these questions along with the other Compendium committees. UCEP may want to develop best practices for hiring instructors or lecturers.

## **XI. New Business**

### *Student Led Courses*

Chair Chalfant raised the issue of student led courses with the committee. An example of one such course was a UCB student led course on Palestine and there were concerns about how it was approved. For students to receive credit for student led courses, the course must go through the normal course approval processes. There is a question about whether the policies related to student led courses are being followed. The committee members are asked to report back to the full committee in November on the practices for student led courses.

### *Proposal from UCI to Establish a School of Nursing*

The chair indicated that the UCI proposal is primarily a graduate degree program but there is an undergraduate component. According to Chair Chalfant, the campus would like to fast track the proposal approval because there is a generous gift. There seems to be a willingness to waive the pre-proposal stage to establish that there are available resources for the school. UCEP is free to not weigh in on this proposal

**Discussion:** UCI already has a nursing program and the plan is for a significant expansion of the graduate component including constructing a building. There will be not shifting of resources away from undergraduate programs and in time, this proposal will enable the undergraduate component grow in the future as well. The undergraduate program will have more faculty. The longer it takes to create this program, the more expensive it will be. UCI's CEP, Graduate Council, and Senate have all approved the proposal. UCEP does not need to weigh in unless undergraduate education issues are identified by the other committees reviewing the proposal. Chair Chalfant suggested that UCEP should look at CCGA's guidelines for proposal reviews.

## **XII. Executive Session**

No Executive Session was held.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:50

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton