UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, February 5, 2024

Attending: Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), A. Katie Harris, Vice Chair (UCD), Darlene Francis (UCB), Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD), Jose Antonio Rodriguez-Lopes (UCI), Catherine Sugar (UCLA), Christopher Viney (UCM), Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Madeleine Norris (UCSF), Ben Hardekopf (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), Megan Chung (Undergraduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy Development, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Carmen Corona (Director, Academic Planning and Policy, IRAP), Ethan Savage (Academic Planning and Policy Analyst, IRAP), James Steintrager (Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Consultation with Senate Leadership
- *James Steintrager, Chair, Academic Council*
- *Steven Cheung, Vice Chair, Academic Council*

Chair Steintrager reported on the January Regents meeting which included a discussion of a proposed policy to employ undocumented students. The issue was studied for several months, and the Office of the President (UCOP) consulted with outside law firms. Should the policy be implemented, President Drake noted that there are risks to UC and to the undocumented students and their families. Undocumented students and other supporters of the policy in the audience vociferously protested when the Regents voted against the policy. The Board is interested in expanding opportunities for experiential learning for undocumented students and funding for this will need to be secured. The meeting was adjourned after this item so the item on Senate Regulation 630.E was postponed until a special meeting on February 14.

Another proposed policy before the Board was about political statements being posted on department websites and this was distributed last week for an expedited systemwide Senate review. A number of principles, like freedom of expression, might be difficult to reconcile as well as complications that need to be thought through. In 2022, the University Committee on Academic Freedom issued recommendations about political statements which Chair Steintrager believes are adequate. The Regents Academic and Student Affairs Committee received a presentation on UC Online that offered a rosy take on the program.

UCEP's updated statement on UC quality has been formally transmitted to Chair Steintrager and will be on Academic Council's February agenda. The statement was also sent to the co-chairs of the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Degree Programs. Chair Steintrager appreciates the statement's focus on environment and the articulation of the emergent qualities of UC quality. It is hoped that the Presidential Task Force helps UC understand what needs to be in place across the system in order for appropriate divisional Senate review of online and hybrid undergraduate degree programs to occur. The Task Force is supposed to address intercampus competition and might recommend that a campus needs to study the impact of its proposed online programs on the other campuses.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved today's agenda.
Action: The January 8 and January 22, 2024 minutes were approved.

III. Chair's Updates

Academic Council met last week and discussed ongoing labor issues. Council approved UCEP's memo on regional and institutional accreditation terminology. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates also met last week and there was a discussion about the fallout from the elimination of two humanities courses from the California General Education Transfer Curriculum to accommodate the addition of the ethnic studies course. Chair Cocco shared that the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities held its first meeting on Friday. The Task Force is dividing into four subgroups, each of which will meet independently to talk about specific issues. A number of members, including the administrators, were mystified by why the Task Force has to complete some of its work by this May. The Task Force has not been provided with much of the data members would like to study.

Vice Chair Harris explained the process for determining if a baccalaureate degree proposed by a California Community College (CCC) duplicates a UC degree. Currently, the proposals are sent by IRAP to the campus vice provosts for undergraduate education (VPDUE), but it is not clear at what point input from faculty is solicited. Chair Cocco suggested that the response from the VPDUEs could include a memo from the divisional Undergraduate Council/Committee on Educational Policy and that UCEP does not need to be involved.

IV. Review of UC Washington Center
- *David Cuthbert (UCSC) & Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD)*

The committee had a preliminary discussion about the academic review of the UC Washington Center (UCDC). The UCSC representative, the lead reviewer, indicated that the program's report includes: multiple course evaluations; a list of their faculty; a sample questionnaire; and a chart illustrating the makeup of their students and faculty. The program responded to UCEP's questions with very brief sentences or a single word with no elaboration. UCDC referred to a 2020 self-assessment and it is puzzling that the in-depth information in that document was not incorporated into the report to UCEP.

The availability of internships has been reduced significantly due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the rapid turnover of the campus coordinators in the last 2 years has been a challenge. The UCD representative agreed about the shortcomings in the response, adding that the evaluation data is not disaggregated by individual courses. Students have positive feedback about UCDC but the questions in the student evaluation are not geared for the assessment of an academic program. Both reviewers assert it will be difficult to review this program based on the materials UCDC has submitted. Chair Cocco will find out if the Natural Reserve System's report to UCEP on the systemwide California Ecology and Conservation field course can be shared with UCDC to provide a model. A thorough self-study is an opportunity for a program to make the case about its strengths.

Discussion: Executive Advisor Greenspan suggested that it might be helpful for Chair Cocco or the analyst to talk with the point person at UCOP for UCDC. Rather than sending a memo to UCDC asking for detailed information, the analyst proposed that UCEP leadership and the reviewers should meet with the executive director. Chair Cocco mentioned that the provost has made comments about plans for UCDC and the program's report to this committee might be helpful in that regard.

V. Review of UCDC's Design Your Life Course
- *Geoff Cook (UCSD) & Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR)*

The UCSD representative explained that the Design Your Life course, which is based on a book, includes 3 hours a week of face-to-face time over eight weeks in summer. A version of the course is taught at UCB. The learning objectives for the course look satisfactory, but there is a question of whether the course adds up to four quarter units because details about what is expected outside of class are not provided. The workload does not appear to be very demanding. While UCDC proposes giving students a grade for this course, the reviewers think that Pass/No Pass would be more appropriate.

Discussion: UCDC should be asked to justify why students should be permitted to repeat the course. A rubric illustrating the credit should have been included. While UCEP could ask for additional information to enable the committee to more accurately evaluate the course, the UCSD representative cautioned against dictating the pedagogy. Chair Cocco suggested sending a memo to UCDC indicating the conditions on which UCEP approves the course: only two units should be awarded; it can be taken for Pass/No Pass; and it should not be repeated. UCDC could redesign the curriculum and submit a proposal to UCEP for awarding more than two units. The reviewers will draft a memo for Chair Cocco to finalize and the committee will vote on the memo during its next meeting.

VI. Review of Advanced Placement (AP) Pre-Calculus Exam
- *Catherine Sugar (UCLA)*

The UCLA representative reviewed the AP Pre-Calculus exam to determine if UC should grant credit towards a degree for it. The course is approved for meeting A-G admissions requirements as an advanced high school math course. The question for UCEP is whether UC should give credit for the exam and if so, should credit be given for a score of 3, 4 or 5. The representative compared this course to UCLA's Math 1 course. Math 1 is offered because it is important for students to have this content but it is only for elective credit and does not meet the quantitative reasoning requirement. The committee should consider if it is appropriate to give UC credit for the AP Pre-Calculus exam with a high score. If this is UCEP's recommendation, the representative would like faculty who teach Math 1 to review this course to determine its rigor.

Discussion: Regardless of a student's score on a standardized test, they are required to take UCD's math placement exam. Most campuses also have a math placement exam, and requiring students who received credit by exam for the AP Pre-Calculus exam to take pre-calculus again at UC would confuse them. Campuses can decide to accept the AP Pre-Calculus exam for credit, but UCEP does not have to approve the exam for systemwide credit.

Action: A motion to recommend against offering systemwide credit was made and seconded, and the committee voted unanimously in support of the recommendation.

VII. UCEP Criteria for Reviewing UC Online Courses
- *Chair Cocco*

Chair Cocco asserted that past presentations on UC Online have not included a lot of essential information and in spite of meeting with the program's executive director, UCEP has not been provided with data. The chair would like to create a formal policy to establish that UCEP will review UC Online courses. To meet federal guidelines for financial aid, a full time student must take a minimum of 12 credits or have 36 hours of work each week. Correspondence courses

have online instruction but lack sufficient engagement, and there are limitations on the financial aid that can be provided to students in such courses. WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) requires that when 50% of the courses in an in-person degree program are moved online, the program must be reaccredited. WSCUC expects the courses to have regular and substantive interaction between students and instructors in the form of weekly synchronous or asynchronous engagement activities. The engagement activities should be initiated by the instructor, and students should be given a predictable and scheduled way to interact with faculty. The WSCUC substantive change manual indicates that the application for a distance education program has to describe how online courses will be reviewed and the faculty training program for online pedagogy. WSCUC also wants to see that a student's identity is verified and that exams are proctored, and Chair Cocco thinks few of UC's online courses meet these requirements.

The January presentation to the Regents on UC Online indicated that there are over six hundred courses. However, Chair Cocco reviewed the course list and found that the majority were only offered once. In some instances, the faculty member identified as teaching the course separated from UC years ago. The chair proposes that UCEP should review those UC Online courses with large enrollments, and described a course at UCI that was taken by over 7k students in one year. UCEP's review of UC Online courses should entail looking at: course completion; grade by student demographic group; whether the course shortened time to degree; course rigor; compliance with accreditation; and other data UCEP would like to see. Although UC Online courses are approved by the home campus, Chair Cocco thinks it would be important for UCEP to review a sampling of them. If a course is found to be problematic, UCEP would make a recommendation to Academic Council that it should not be offered systemwide. Chair Cocco would like the UCSB and UCSF representatives to have recommendations for the review criteria for UCEP's consideration in May.

Discussion: The committee would not be involved with approving UC Online courses, but would review a sampling of them after they have been offered for long enough to have the data UCEP would like to see. If a UC Online course is clearly not meeting the needs of the systemwide students, it should only be offered to students at the host campus. It is not clear if UC Online has a mechanism to remove a course when it is no longer being offered.

VIII.   New Business/Executive Session

There was no New Business or Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:10 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Melanie Cocco