

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2017

Attending: Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, (UCD), Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair (UCM), David Paul (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Hugh Roberts (UCI), John Serences (UCSD), Mark Stacey (UCB), Robert Gould (UCLA), Dan Potter (UCD), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student Representative), Ellen Osmundson, (Coordinator, ILTI), Robert Blake (Participating ILTI Faculty Member, UCD), Juliette Levy (Participating ILTI Faculty Member UCR), Tony Tromba (Participating ILTI Faculty Member, UCSC), Iman Mills-Gordon (Analyst, Provost's Office), Shane White (Chair, Academic Senate), Robert May (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Updates

Chair Caswell-Chen explained that the Academic Planning Council (APC) is a joint administrative-Senate body chaired by Provost Brown (<http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/content-analysis/academic-planning/academic-planning-council.html>). The first meeting on November 8th was primarily an opportunity for the new Provost and the members to get acquainted and the APC had a general discussion about the issues currently faced by the University. The annual accountability report to the Regents which is prepared by Institutional Research at UCOP was explained. Members are welcome to suggest items to Chair Caswell-Chen for APC meetings.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The November 6th minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Robert May, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair White provided an update on the state's audit of UC and suggested that members read the minutes from the recent special meeting of the Academic Council found here <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/committees/council/council-11-17-17-minutes.pdf>

Discussion: Chair Caswell-Chen thanked the Chair and Vice Chair for their handling of the situation regarding the various audits and following outcomes.

IV. UC Transfer Task Force

- *UCEP Vice Chair & Task Force Member Anne Zanzucchi*

The Transfer Task Force is newly established and the first meeting is this Thursday, December 7th. The Task Force's objectives include strengthening pathways for prospective transfer students and to better prepare students for entry to the UC. Three subcommittees will work on these objectives with different foci. One subcommittee will work on the associate of science degrees for community college students, another will consider the Transfer Pathways, and the third subcommittee will consider transfer advising, innovation, and communication to strengthen the work UC does with transfer students.

The Presidents 2013 Transfer Action Team, established as part of the Budget Framework Initiative, focused on streamlining processes for transfer students. Common lower division courses for the 21 of the

most popular majors among transfer applicants were identified and the articulation processes between these courses were streamlined. This work resulted in the Transfer Pathways Guide website demonstrated for UCEP in October. The Task Force is expected to submit a report to the President by the end of March and the matter will be on the agenda for the Regent's May meeting. The Task Force will focus on increasing transparency about UC requirements for transfer students, advising on new or existing policies to increase the number of transfers into UC and to improve their success rates, and determining if advising resources can be strengthened. Potential outcomes might include recommendations that produce a higher yield rate, consideration of guaranteed admissions in some areas of the 21 pathways, and considering the benefits and challenges of the pathways in terms of associate degrees for UC transfer.

Discussion: A member asked if the President is usurping the Senate's role by convening the Transfer Task Force. Chair White clarified that Provost Brown established this Task Force and that the Regents have delegated authority to the Senate and can rescind that authority. There is pressure from the Regents to do better with respect to transfer students which has led to intense scrutiny. Vice Chair Zanzucchi noted that there is a campus-specific aspect related to transfers. UCR and UCSC have been struggling to achieve the 2:1 ratio of freshmen to transfer students. Campus based support programs such as a quarter-long orientation for transfer students at UCSB have proven successful. Best practices should be shared more broadly. A member indicated that a statewide change that would allow faculty with degrees in statistics to teach this subject within math departments would be beneficial.

V. Student Welfare/Campus Climate

The committee is invited to discuss issues related to student welfare, safety, and campus climate.

Discussion: The graduate student representative asked if UC is doing anything to oppose the proposed federal tax bill. Chair Caswell-Chen reported that UC and other universities have sent people to Washington, D.C. to explain to federal lawmakers about how detrimental aspects of this bill would be. The bill to allow graduate students to unionize has passed and the graduate students have the right to decide on representation. At this point the UC is neutral regarding the unionization. The UCB representative commented that Berkeley is wrestling with how to balance the need for marginalized students or communities that feel threatened when certain events occur. Members also expressed concerns about student homelessness and food insecurity, and that systemwide solutions should be identified. UCEP could raise these issues with Academic Council and emphasize how they influence academics. The chair and analyst will summarize the comments made today and the committee may want to have more in-depth discussions about these issues in the future.

VI. Training for Teaching Assistants/Graduate Student Instructors

Chair Caswell-Chen asked members to comment on training for Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs).

Discussion: UCSB's Graduate Council has mandated training for TAs but it is not clear who is responsible for providing the training. At UCB, the training for TAs or Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) is being implemented by each department and the trainings are extremely variable. There are cases where specialization is required but this is not always the case. Students take the course on how to be a GSI while they are actually working as GSIs. Propagating the training at the department level may not be the best idea but the alternatives are not clear.

Reportedly, UCSC does not have GSI training and the representative is interested in learning about models being used at other campuses. Among GSIs there are two titles, Teaching Fellow and Associate. The APM states the expectations of Teaching Fellows whereas the Associate title is not defined so

campuses can create their own qualifications for this title. Members are asked to document how the Associate title is being used at their campuses and how the TA/GSI training is provided.

If GSIs are instructors of record for a course as opposed to being the TA, members should find out how these appointments are handled and what training is provided. Members get feedback about the effectiveness of the training and potential solutions for improving the training. One campus has no training or guidance in place for GSIs who want to be the instructor of record. It seems that training is highly variable across the divisions and even across departments within divisions. Chair Caswell-Chen proposed that UCEP gather information about what the TA/GSI training campuses are currently providing. Members agreed to look into this matter and the committee can bring the issue to the Academic Council and recommend that improvements are made by the campuses. One potential limitation will be the allocation of resources to improve the training provided.

VII. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI*
- *Robert Blake, Participating ILTI Faculty Member, UCD*
- *Juliette Levy, Participating ILTI Faculty Member UCR*
- *Tony Tromba, Participating ILTI Faculty Member, UCSC*

The ILTI Coordinator explained that ILTI started in 2013 and there are now over 240 undergraduate courses. Students are able to use their home campus credentials to access the ILTI portal and there is no extra fee for them to take an ILTI course. Professor Blake described his positive experiences with developing and teaching online courses in Spanish for first- and second-year students (approximately 30 students per course). Professor Levy commented that online instruction works for a variety of students and the technology allows for greater contact with students. Professor Tromba noted that traditional lectures do not work well for students with disabilities and believes that online instruction has revolutionized education. All the presenting faculty were enthusiastic proponents of online courses. Professor Tromba commented that it is often the case that individuals critical of online education have never taught an online course, and he mentioned that Institutional Research and Academic Planning conducted a study of online courses and this will be shared with UCEP.

Discussion: Members thanked the presenters for sharing their experiences. The particular courses described today have only a few students enrolled across campuses.

VIII. Executive Session

No minutes were taken during Executive Session.

IX. Major Requirements Budget Framework Initiative

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

Analyst Mills-Gordon explained the Major Requirements initiative for the benefit of new members. As of November 2016 all undergraduate campuses have completed the faculty review. Of those reviews, 67% of the majors met the general efficiency guidelines, over 1/3 of the majors changed and 18% of the majors remained unchanged. Each divisional Senate has reviewed the changed majors, 210 of the 211 changed majors have been approved by the Senate, and campuses are working on publishing the changes now. The Provost's Office is preparing a report to the Governor on the outcome of this initiative.

Discussion: The Provost's Office is determining next steps for the effort but it is clear that the work at the campuses will be ongoing. There is a question about the status of another initiative in the Budget Framework, the identification of three year degree pathways, and Director Greenspan will check on the status of this work and report back to UCEP at a later date.

X. Online vs Traditional Courses and Major-Specific Requirements

The UCSC representative asked if campuses use specific course numbers to distinguish between online courses from traditional courses and if any majors designate which version students can take.

Discussion: UCLA does not currently identify the online courses but the Undergraduate Council may consider changing this in the future. UCSB faculty would probably not support prohibiting students from taking the online version of a course because the online courses undergo rigorous approval and review processes. UCD does include an indicator suffix letter for online courses (often a "V" for "virtual"), and currently it does not appear that it is possible to limit such courses as counting toward a degree objective. There is a question about how extensively online courses are being used for foundational courses. Vice Chair Zanzucchi suggested that UCEP might take an inventory of the introductory math courses are available online.

XI. New Business

There was no New Business.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:05PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Ed Caswell-Chen