UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2017

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair, (UCLA), Edward Caswell-Chen, Vice Chair, (UCD), Stephan Miescher (UCSB), Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC) (telephone), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Tony Smith (UCI) (telephone), Kimberly Topp (UCSF), James Rauch (UCSD), Laura Nelson (UCB) (telephone), Beth Lazazzera (UCLA) Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Announcements

UCEP will not meet on April 3rd since this is the ICAS Legislative Day but the committee will meet in May likely in Oakland. Academic Council met in February and Chair Knowlton discussed the UCEP letter on student-led courses. Council accepted the memo and discussed whether these courses should be strongly encouraged, but reached the conclusion that campuses should make this discussion. Faculty Welfare discussed extending domestic partner benefits to opposite sex partners and there are currently differences from the policy for same sex partners. The sense is that UC should not take away privileges that are currently available to unmarried partners.

UCFW also proposed increased funding for campus health care facilitators. Council received a report from the chair of BOARS on UCB's pilot project for letters of recommendation and a policy being developed. There is concern that disadvantaged students will be negatively impacted by this requirement. The pilot focuses on students in the middle of the pack but the hope is to use the letters to distinguish between the students at the highest level. Council also discussed policies involving endowed chairs who are not based on a campus and whether the Academic Senate should be reviewing these chairs, and there is a gray area about how oversight should be provided.

Academic Assembly met in February and voted on changes to the Academic Personnel Manual regarding sexual violence and sexual harassment. Wording was changed to clarify how the behaviors violate the faculty code of conduct and to clarify the three year rule which requires chancellors to take action within three years of learning about a complaint. The procedure for putting the faculty member on voluntary unpaid leave which in some situations needs to be balanced with allowing the individual to continue his or her work is another issue. The Assembly voted unanimously to accept these changes and the policy will go to the Regents. The major rationales were discussed. For some majors the rationales did not provide any detail or provide information about the comparisons to similar major in the system. Most of the rationales sent back were from UCSD.

Vice Chair Caswell-Chen attended the most recent meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). ICAS is planning the April 3rd Legislative Day and is discussing reforming General Education. Chair Knowlton commented that there are different philosophies across the system with respect to General Education and there is a discussion about harmonizing GE across the three segments. One goal of Legislative Day is to reach out to lawmakers. ICAS has managed the Open Educational Resource Council and there is interest in continuing this effort with UC's involvement. One question is whether Advanced Placement courses can satisfy the GE requirement. Chair Knowlton recommends that UCEP discuss what GE looks like at the campuses.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: The February minutes were approved.

III.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Chalfant described UC's release of details of 113 sexual misconduct cases in response to a Public Records Act request. The Chancellor has three years to initiate an investigation when complaints are received. At UCB one of the cases involved complaints that were not acted upon. There will be more education for individuals who are required to report. The work on this matter is not complete. The Title IX process is not about discipline but rather remediation to make sure the behavior does not continue. When the case does not lead to termination, one question is what happens when the individual returns to his/her job as there will be people with legitimate concerns. UCOP has a new systemwide Title IX Coordinator. It is likely that the Regents will discuss this matter at their next meeting.

President Napolitano may discuss UCEP's letter on student-led courses at the Regents' meeting. When asked by the President if there is any interest in eliminating these courses, Chair Chalfant commented that leading these courses can be an excellent experience for the students and that faculty think this is a worthwhile opportunity for students. The policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition is another topic on the next Regents' agenda and it is not clear how the Regents will vote on this matter. The Regents have to approve a policy on capping non-resident student enrollment. The Regents have never written a policy that defines some UC campuses as second tier and this is what will occur with a limit on non-resident students. Academic Council agreed that every campus should document how the California residents benefit from tuition paid by non-residents and posing the question will prompt questions about how campuses with low numbers of non-resident students will be supported. The Senate only recently learned that the Regents will discuss the administration's proposed systemwide cap on non-resident students.

The policy on Lecturers with Security of Employment will be released for systemwide review within a month or so. Another audit of UCOP will be completed soon. The framework for UC's growth and support is moving forward with descriptions of what the campuses will look like in 2040. The Senate has received a good response to the idea of an Associate Degree for transfers which will help UC achieve the 2:1 ratio of freshmen to transfer student admissions.

Discussion: A member asked if the state can dictate a cap on non-resident student enrollment since UC has constitutional autonomy. Chair Chalfant explained that technically the state does not have this authority. While UC has seen a surge in undergraduate growth, there has not been significant growth in the number of Ph.D. students and the growth lags behind UC's comparator institutions.

IV.   Academic Dishonesty

Chair Knowlton would like UCEP to identify issues related to academic dishonesty.

Discussion: At UCD, the Undergraduate Council has discussed academic dishonesty, an issue that has become more significant in the past three years. Academic Council agreed to revise the student code of conduct which was introduced to students last summer. Plagiarism is a major issue and efforts to catch when it occurs can be labor intensive. Faculty members have been threatened by students who have been being caught. Chair Knowlton indicated that there is an issue with maintaining academic integrity with online courses.

Another issue is what type of punishment should be in place when students are found to have cheated. Some instructors check identification and have photo rosters. The UCD task force hopes to complete its work by the end of spring quarter. The task force may look at how the Office of Student Judicial Affairs handles cases and it is also addressing the need to make students aware of issues related to academic dishonesty. UCEP will discuss the outcome of UCD's work at a later meeting. The point was made that some faculty are reluctant to report students because the process is so onerous. UCSB is taking steps to move beyond the anecdotal information to gather more concrete evidence.

V.   Defining Online Courses

Chair Knowlton would like UCEP to discuss possible definitions for "online," "hybrid" and "systemwide." Faculty have various ideas about what these terms mean so defining them may help with formulating policy in the future. Some courses are completely online, some have an online component, and others incorporate online exercises. There are also courses that are based on a campus where students have the opportunity to meet with the professor or with a study group on campus versus systemwide courses that do not offer students support at their home campus. Chair Knowlton asked how campuses have defined these terms.

Discussion: UCM's Registrar developed a framework for the different types of courses. This campus looked at the Sloan Foundation definition and thought about content in terms of what faculty define as hybrid versus online. Reviewing the supplemental questionnaires that many campuses have for course review may be helpful. UCM has thought about the definitions in terms of credit hours. If a course has less than 1/3 of the contact hours, it would be considered fully online. Contact hours may have been used by the campuses to distinguish between the different types of courses. Courses that require students to take an exam in person would be fully online courses because this would be less than 1/3 of the contact hours.

There is a concern about creating rigid definitions because of the different ways faculty in different disciplines use technology in their courses. At UCI, hybrid courses appeal to students because they will have a cohort with which to interact in a study group. Defining these terms will be helpful during discussions about courses under the umbrella of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). There is not a lot of cross campus enrollment in the online courses. Looking at the difference between systemwide online and campus-based online courses is important and can move the conversation with ILTI forward.

UCLA defines online courses as those with less than one hour per week where the faculty member is there for lectures or discussion, and office hours are not included. Less than one hour per week in person would be an online course and more than one hour in person would be a hybrid. A course can be called online even if the students are required to take the exam in person at a defined place. The point was made that online courses are not necessarily cheaper than traditional classes.

There are ongoing discussions at UCD about online courses and exams, and the campus may create a testing center. Student success issues may result in limiting the number of campus based online courses a student can take. Systemwide online courses are not tied to any UC campus. Popular systemwide courses are mostly taken by students at the host campus. Students want to have a cohort and to know they can meet with the instructors in their campuses and the campus based courses have been more successful as a result. Students have to do a lot more work to determine if a systemwide course will transfer to their home campus and are more likely to take the course at their home campus if it is offered.

VI.   Pre-Approval and Review of Systemwide Courses

Chair Knowlton explained that there are systemwide programs including UCEAP, UC Washington Center, UC Sacramento Center and the NRS Systemwide Field Course. A question came from UCD about the review of systemwide of the UC Washington Center (UCDC) since many aspects of this program are not specific to UCD. It is not clear if campuses are independently reviewing these programs or if the programs have not been reviewed at all.

Discussion: UCEAP has a mechanism whereby every ten years its programs are reviewed. UCIE is in charge of the review of the UCEAP courses and UCEAP invites faculty systemwide with knowledge of where the programs are located to participate in the review. This process could serve as a model for other systemwide programs which should not be reviewed by individual campuses. In 2009 UCD took over the UC Sacramento Center and will review this program. Who should review the UCDC is a question and a member suggested that UCEP should take the lead on the review of this program.

The systemwide guidelines UCEP created in 2014 indicate that the systemwide courses should be reviewed every seven years. Chair Chalfant proposed that if the name of a program is not explicitly associated with a campus, it should be reviewed by UCEP. In May UCEP will further discuss systemwide courses which will include devising a timeline for review and the committee will also discuss GE credits as related to systemwide courses including the suggestion that UC would harmonize GE with the CSUs and California Community Colleges. UCEAP would like its courses to be approved for GE credit to provide an incentive for students to participate. It may be that decisions about GE credit for UCEAP courses should be made by the campuses. The analyst noted that UCEP's chair is a member of the UCDC governing committee.

VII.   Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, Institutional Research and Academic Planning, UCOP*

Manager Peterson remarked that UC is waiting to see what the federal government will do in terms of WASC accreditation. The President of WASC has announced that she will retire at the end of the year.

VIII.   Innovative Technology Learning Initiative

The ILTI Coordinator posed a set of questions to UCEP in June 2016 which UCEP has not addressed. The questions focus on barriers that make enrolling in an online course difficult.

Discussion: One question is what assurances are there that students will be successful in online courses. Another question is what systemwide online courses are aiming to achieve. At least two campuses' CEPs have attempted to address these questions. Chair Chalfant commented that there may be some barriers that the faculty are willing to reconsider such as whether students can be allowed to take two online courses per year. A concern with cross-campus courses is whether the resources for these courses should be redirected to campus specific courses. Every course currently proposed for ILTI is a hybrid. Some of the money allocated to the EVCs remains unspent.

Chair Knowlton wants the committee members to discuss the questions with the divisional CEPs/Undergraduate Councils and report back in May. A concern at one campus is that more student contact hours are needed, not less. In today's resource limited environment faculty are concerned about competing for resources at their own campuses. UCEP should provide reasons for keeping any of the barriers and there are some campus specific issues that UCEP should not try to change.

IX.   Policy on Readmission of Students

Manager Peterson explained that the information available to students who may want to return to UC is confusing. The Undergraduate Deans developed a list of issues that might be discussed and clarified. The California State University system has a seven-year rule embedded in its catalog rights. The legislature may focus on the CSU rule. One campus explained that some majors have been kept on the books for decades in case a returning student asks for that major. UCEP is asked to come up with a generic statement about catalog rights although students will have to go to their campus to look for additional detail. There are students who interrupt their education for various reasons, are in good standing and want to return to UC as well as other students who left UC while not in good standing.

Each campus has readmission webpages and the Academic Planning Council suggested that having some centralized information. The systemwide admissions website has information for these students whereas campus information is available at the Registrars' websites. Chair Knowlton reported that she has dealt with readmission of students on a case by case basis and the campus does not have any time limits. The catalog rights for majors that have been continuous might be different from those for majors that are no longer offered. .

Discussion: UCSC recently discussed this matter and departments have a lot of latitude to handle this, whether by waiving or substituting requirements. The major may still exist but if the courses are no longer offered or the requirements have changed it would be almost impossible for students to exercise their catalog rights. There should be clarification that a student who is unsure about the catalog rights should work with a representative of the major and there is a possibility of finding substitutions for existing requirements.

If departments are willing to be flexible, a way to help the student attain the degree is viable. If someone returns after an extended period there is a question about whether the courses taken in the past are out of date with the state of the art for that major. A distinction between departmental and GE requirements could be useful. Students need advice about the appropriate place to go for assistance and Student Services might be the starting point. Chair Knowlton will craft potential language for the committee to consider. The number of students who may be interested in returning to UC is small but the goal is to create more consistent and complete information for them. Campuses also use terms like reinstatement or reentry.

X.   Report on the UC Education Abroad Program's Governing Committee

The Governing Committee met in November and February. The 2016-17 enrollment has dropped by 5.2% possibly as a result of the political situation abroad. New international health and safety trainings have been provided for UCEAP staff. The financial situation is in good shape considering the program no longer receives state funding. Following the presidential elections, the program advised DACA students to return to the U.S. before Inauguration Day in January, and the withdrawal fees were waived. UCEAP is considering acquiring a building in Goleta in order to realize some cost savings.

A large financial reserve of $16M is maintained in part because the program is self-insured and also for operations, and the amount of this is being scrutinized very carefully. The discussions include considering taking advantage of existing UC insurance. The program has high enrollment in the summer and the year-long enrollments have increased a bit. It is hoped that the enrollment will stabilize. Chair Chalfant questioned why UCEAP is not treated the same as any other academic program in terms of their insurance.

Discussion: A member asked about efforts to diversify the students who are participating in EAP. This a current focus and the program does offer scholarships aimed at underrepresented student groups. Chair Knowlton remarked that students in some majors feel restrained by the demands of the major. The emphasis on pre-approving the EAP courses may be driven by an effort to help students avoid missing a course in the sequence. EAP is also trying to improve the participation of students in STEM majors. If students receive help finding a lab when they are abroad, this may increase the number of students in STEM in the EAP. Some classes are designed strictly for UC students and others are immersion courses. There is another Governing Committee meeting in May and the representatives can raise any questions that UCEP might have.

XI.   Introduction to UC's Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE)
   - *Julie Lind, AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions*

Coordinator Lind provided a brief overview of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) and the Analytical Writing Placement Exam. The analyst explained that in the past UCEP participated in reviewing analyses of the AWPE, most notably in 2002. Chair Knowlton suggested that UCEP could decide that it should be involved in the early stages of UCOPE's effort to assess the validity of the AWPE, decide that this matter is clearly in UCOPE's purview and review the analysis after it is completed, or some members of UCEP might want to participate on a subcommittee and consult with UCOPE on this matter.

Discussion: The UCM representative commented that preparatory education has a lot to do with foundational experiences for students and articulates across the curriculum, so if it would be helpful to UCOPE for UCEP to interface with them, it would be valuable to be involved. Fifty percent of the students are completing ELWR through the AWPE and this varies across campuses. As the student population becomes more diverse and with the influx of international students, this is a timely moment to think about the AWPE at both the divisional and systemwide levels.

UCOPE is in the beginning stages of figuring out the data they will request. UCEP could review UCOPE's data request, the 2002 report, and the most recent analysis from 2012 in May. One question is how campuses are dealing with the remedial aspects of this in terms of workload and how it is being satisfied. There will be information the campuses that offer workload credit as opposed to academic credit, and Chair Knowlton thinks the issue of how credit is assigned for the courses that lead to satisfaction of the exam. Several members agreed that it would be valuable for UCEP to know what UCOPE is working on. Not all campuses have preparatory education and members of UCEP may not hear about UCOPE's efforts unless the information is brought to UCEP.

XII.   New Business

UCEP will not meet in April but the committee should anticipate meeting in person in May.

XIII.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:40 p.m.
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Barbara Knowlton