UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, June 7, 2021

Attending: Daniel Potter, Chair (UCD), Mary Lynch, Vice Chair (UCSF), Dana Carney (UCB), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Tony Smith (UCI), Megan McEvoy (UCLA), Matthew Hibbing (UCM), Juliann Allison (UCR), Geoff Cook (UCSD), Jose Gurrola (UCSF), Mary Brenner (UCSB), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Ethan Savage (Analyst, Academic Planning), Ellen Osmundson (Director, ILTI), Robert Horwitz (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Updates

Chair Potter announced that the committee will probably not meet on Monday, July 12th but this will be confirmed. Academic Council approved UCEP's proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 610 on residency and the revisions will be considered by the Academic Assembly this week. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) met last week and discussed Assembly Bill 928, the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021, which the committee opposes. AB-928 calls for the establishment of an intersegmental committee to oversee implementation of the Associate Degrees for Transfer, which is a role that ICAS could serve.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP's May 3rd videoconference minutes were approved.

III.   Principles for Online Undergraduate Degree Programs

Chair Potter reminded members that a confidential document from a UCSC task force on online programs has been shared with UCEP, and it was noted that some of the questions raised by the task force were discussed by the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force (OUDTF). The chair asked the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) for an opinion about whether the Compendium actually requires that UCEP review a degree program that is the first of its kind, and UCRJ found that the wording of the Compendium does not clearly imply that changing the mode of delivery of an existing program requires systemwide review.

UCRJ was also asked if UCEP could introduce a requirement that it reviews all proposals for new online undergraduate degree programs for a certain number of years. In response, UCRJ indicated that Senate Bylaw 170 would need to be amended to give UCEP the authority to do this and that the Compendium should also be revised to include this new requirement. Next year, UCEP may want to take up the question of requiring the review of all proposals for online degree programs over a number of years. The committee should also attempt to devise a set of guiding principles for online degree programs, which can be informed by both the recommendations from the OUDTF and the experience with remote instruction due to the COVID-19 pandemic. UCEP may also want to address the fact that nothing prohibits a student from earning a degree solely by taking only online courses, even if an online degree program is not approved as such.

The UCSC representative explained that a task force was divided into five subcommittees that were charged with answering questions regarding issues such as pedagogy or student experience. Many task force members were initially skeptical about online instruction, but they were eventually

convinced that UCSC could successfully implement online degree programs for undergraduates if sufficient financial support is provided by the administration. A key focus for UCSC is making sure that students are offered mental health services, career guidance, and networking and research opportunities. The campus revamped its policy for approving online courses and it continues to be more difficult to get these courses approved compared to in-person courses. UC's online degree programs should be first class degrees that are beyond reproach, and UCEP should be watchdogs in this regard. UCSC's proposal for a fully online undergraduate degree in Creative Technologies may be sent to the committee this fall.

Discussion: UCRJ's response is based on an Academic Planning Council (APC) report from 1997-98 when the APC agreed to eliminate the systemwide review and approval processes for under-graduate degree programs. At that time, the APC probably did not think about the various issues and implications related to online education, whereas the Senate has viewed online education as a distinctly different mode of instruction in the past decade. The point was made that campuses have different policies for approving online courses and in-person courses, which reflects the higher level of scrutiny placed on the former. Online degree programs should provide support for students equal to what is available on campus, especially mental health services. Members expressed support for UCEP's long-term involvement with reviewing and approving online degree programs.

A member suggested that UCEP could systematize this process by identifying the types of online degrees that would be appropriate and asking departments to offer them rather than waiting for proposals to come from the campuses. However, it was argued that UCEP might not have the foresight and knowledge to judge which disciplines are best suited for online degrees. UCRJ's feedback suggests it is important for departments to initiate and for campuses to support proposals for online degrees, and that online degrees should be formally defined and delineated. The divisional Educational Policy Committees/Undergraduate Councils (EPs/UGCs) might be in the best position to keep track of the departments considering developing online degree programs.

Creating principles for online degree programs is consistent with the committee's previous work on principles for working with students who are incarcerated or formerly incarcerated. UCEP should ensure that students in online degree programs are properly supported and that the quality of the programs is maintained. Some administrators are very enthusiastic about online programs for undergraduates, but faculty have concerns that Arizona State University may be considered a model. A member cautioned that students in online degree programs may not fully understand the experiences they have missed, such as conducting research in a lab. Two central principles could be the importance of disciplinary rigor and the essential need to provide support services.

Based on today's discussion, members agree that UCEP should review and approve online degree programs for several years and work towards adding this requirement to the Compendium and the committee's bylaw. The first step, however, should be defining what constitutes a fully online degree program. The second priority is developing the principles or guidelines so that departments know what information should be included in a proposal. In addition to the principles for working with incarcerated students, the committee should draw from the OUDTF's recommendations. Vice Chair Lynch suggests that a small group of members work on the principles over the summer and that the implementation of the principles should be closely monitored. In addition, it is important to maintain regular communication with divisional EPs/UGCs to make sure UCEP has up to date information from the campuses. One member posited that UCEP should not dictate what the divisions do because some campuses have a specific position about online instruction and stated that UCEP is perceived as advocating for what the Regents and administrators at UCOP want. Senate Vice Chair Horwitz argued that it is essential for the Senate to coordinate and have a systemwide

perspective on policies for online education because of the significant pressure from legislators and Regents who believe it as the way to increase accessibility and reduce campus expenditures without a complete understanding of the complex issues. Vice Chair Lynch will contact members about working on the principles over the next few months.

IV.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Robert Horwitz, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Chair Horwitz will co-chair the recently established Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts Workgroup with former Senate Chair and current UCD Provost, Mary Croughan. The Workgroup will look at how to address research that suffered as a result of the time faculty dedicated to service and teaching during the pandemic. In May, the Regents discussed the idea of cohort tuition, which would standardize tuition over a student's two or four years at UC, and the Board will make a decision about implementing this model in the near future. The Regents also discussed UC's innovation and entrepreneurship policy and the Board wants to change the tenure and promotion criteria to recognize faculty who pursue monetizing their discoveries and creating start-up companies. Senate leadership pointed out that the academic personnel process is under the Senate's purview, so the Regents indicated that a committee with Senate representatives will be established to discuss this idea.

The Senate surveyed faculty about their experiences during the pandemic and with remote instruction. Over 4k faculty responded to the survey which included questions about the impact of the pandemic on their research, and this data will be valuable for countering misguided suggestions from the Legislature or Regents. Senate leadership have met with UC Legal about the third-party social learning websites that facilitate student violations of academic integrity and the infringement of faculty intellectual property rights.

Discussion: A member asked if Academic Council is discussing the new Ethnic Studies requirement and a more general requirement related to social justice. Vice Chair Horwitz indicated that two systemwide Senate groups, under the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, have begun looking at these requirements and this effort will involve determining what the substance of an Ethnic Studies requirement at UC should be. Vice Chair Horwitz and Chair Gauvain attend weekly meetings of UCOP's vaccine mandate group and the Senate strongly supports a mandate. One challenge is that California has a very liberal religious exemption, and the Senate has asked if the exemption can be narrowed, but this is not likely to happen. How the mandate, masking or social distancing protocols will be enforced has not been resolved, and it was unclear if vaccination can be required since the COVID-19 vaccines are currently provisionally approved.

V.   Academic Integrity
- *Tricia Bertram-Gallant, Director, Academic Integrity Office, UCSD*

UC San Diego is the only campus with a dedicated Academic Integrity Office and Director Bertram-Gallant has been with the Office since 2006. Remote instruction made it easier for students to cheat this year but cheating has occurred for a very long time and third-party social learning companies are an outgrowth of existing demand. The director indicated that what is new is the cultural acceptance of cheating. The new normal says school is not about learning or developing skills and abilities, but about producing assignments that will earn students the grades needed to attain a degree. Director Bertram-Gallant suggests that there is a role for the Academic Senate to play both systemwide and at the campus level and outlined three potential structural, procedural, and communication strategies.

The Senate could advocate for dedicated academic integrity resources on each campus. Student Conduct offices will report that they do not have enough support and resources to prevent or respond to academic integrity violations. At most campuses, academic integrity is subsumed under Student Conduct offices, and these offices generally need to prioritize violations that cause immediate physical or monetary damage because resources are so limited. Repeated cheating is damaging to the both the individual students as well as to the quality and value of UC degrees. It is difficult to provide students with an equitable education if some of them are cheating in class and this is not addressed properly.

Director Bertram-Gallant pointed out that faculty do not receive credit in the hiring, tenure and promotion processes for attending to academic integrity even though Academic Personnel Manual policy indicates that faculty must report violations to the Academic Integrity Office. Decisions about promotion and tenure do not take into account that a faculty member redesigned their course to enhance academic integrity and inclusion for example, and the effort required to report numerous students for violations is typically not acknowledged in the evaluation of teaching.

The third strategy pertains to the need for counter-messaging to students about appropriate behavior. The third-party companies are constantly sending messages to students by text and social media platforms to induce them to engage in dishonest behavior while also minimizing the unethical nature of academic integrity violations. Students need to be similarly inundated with messages promoting academic integrity. At present, individual faculty members are responsible for explaining academic integrity to their students, which is important, but the burden should not be on them. There are ways UC can leverage learning management systems like Canvas and other technology to increase messaging to students in an effort to offset the outside messages in a timely and consistent way.

Discussion: A member commented that some of the third-party social learning companies seem to be worse than others, and Director Bertram-Gallant indicated that some companies cooperate more than others with UC's investigations into academic integrity violations. However, this is a huge moneymaking industry that is winning when it comes to changing students' hearts and minds about what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Vice Chair Lynch expressed concerns about students in clinical settings reporting that they do not personally need to have certain knowledge since it is readily available online. This point is related to the fact that faculty have not been given the training and time to do course and assessment redesigns. Students do not have the knowledge needed to determine if information they read online is legitimate or illegitimate, and they will not have the analytical and critical thinking skills or fundamental information literacy necessary to make that distinction. Thinking that what is being taught in the classroom is not relevant to the real world or to an eventual job is connected to the need for faculty to update their pedagogy and assessments in light of how today's technology has changed education.

Director Bertram-Gallant explained that the UCSD Senate complained about the lack of attention to academic integrity violations, the long investigation process, and the lack of follow up. The divisional Senate negotiated with the campus administration to create one position and the Office continued to grow since the demand and need were evident. There are solutions to academic dishonesty but staff must be in place to implement them, and having a dedicated office may have increased the willingness of faculty to report violations. The Student Conduct offices operate differently at each campus. At UCSD, the Office offers preventative education to faculty focused on course design and assessments, handles the reported violations, and educates students. The UCSD representative to UCEP commented that having a dedicated office staffed with professionals who are scholars in the field of academic integrity makes reporting violations much less daunting.

## VI.	Annual Reminder about Academic Integrity & Intellectual Property

The committee has received a draft of the annual reminder to faculty about intellectual property and academic integrity especially as these relate to third-party social learning websites. The reminder includes a link to various resources for faculty.

Discussion: The analyst explained that the reminder will be sent to Council at the beginning of each academic year to distribute to the campuses, and the aim is to minimize the need to make any changes to the document. Members suggested a few minor changes to the draft which UC Legal will be asked to review.

Action: The committee approved the annual reminder.

## VII.	Flexibility in Grading for Fall 2021

Chair Potter has prepared a memo to the campuses about continued flexibility in grading for the 2021-2022 academic year.

Discussion: The faculty at one campus are not in favor of extending flexibility whereas student are calling for increased flexibility in the coming year because students have fallen behind. UCSB and UCI are each taking looking at grading policies, and UCI has extended the Pass/No Pass option to week ten instead of week six, but students will need to request the option. UCEP may want to issue a memo recommending that the divisions examine their grading policies in the context of equity especially given how the pandemic highlighted the issues related to equity. The Vice Provosts and Deans for Undergraduate Education are concerned about the antiquated grading structure.

Action: The committee approved the memo on flexibility in grading for 2021-2022.

## VIII.	Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning
- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

IRAP is preparing an item for the Regents' Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting in July called "*Instruction and Research at the University of California post-COVID-19 – Resilience, Flexibility, and the New Normal.*" Director Greenspan reported that UCOP is negotiating with the State Senate and Assembly over the budget proposal aimed at reducing the proportion of non-resident students at UCB, UCLA and UCSD. The Legislature believes non-resident students create less access for California students, despite of arguments that the resources from non-resident students allow UC to serve more Californians. The State is asking how much UC can grow over the next four to five years, so IRAP has compiled the campus multiyear and rolling plans. Some growth at the undergraduate level is proposed but numerous variables make it hard to predict how many freshmen and transfer students will come to campus. IRAP is also trying to determine how over enrollment occurred at UCD, UCI, and UCSD this year. Many non-resident students did not enroll last year and it is unknown if this will reoccur in 2021-2022. Non-resident students may decide to not attend UC when they learn that instruction will be in-person.

## IX.	Consultation with Innovative Learning Technology Initiative
- *Ellen Osmundson, Director, ILTI*

Director Osmundson has reviewed the feedback from the systemwide review of UCEP's proposed revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 544 in an effort to determine if a new set of revisions might be recommended. The director asked academic advisors for input on how to make sure that cross campus enrollment supports access to courses. The advisors reported that when cross campus enrollment began, the process was easy to manage for a handful of students, but their administrative role has increased significantly. It is not clear to the advisors why their input about students taking cross campus courses is required. Since the courses have been approved by the home campus and the registrars have confirmed things like the student's good standing and payment of fees, the decision about taking these online courses could be left to the students. Advisors do not have the same level of involvement in approving the courses students take at their home campus, and one idea is that advisors might be contacted only when there are special circumstances requiring their approval.

Another issue the academic advisors described is their involvement with reviewing courses for granting more than unit credit. At some campuses, the articulation officers are responsible for looking at the credit awarded for courses while at other campuses the responsibility lies with individual departments. It is not clear to the academic advisors why they have an administrative role in determining the type of credit to be awarded. Rather than review a new set of changes to SR 544 with UCEP, the director would like UCEP thoughts about the questions raised by the academic advisors about their role in approving cross campus courses and the type of credit granted.

Discussion: It is not entirely clear how approving enrollment in cross campus courses leads to a significant increase in the academic advisors' workload especially since the advisors manage the additional work required when there is an uptick in the course approvals needed for students studying abroad. Director Osmundson stated that the only campus that does not include academic advisors in the cross-campus enrollment process is UCSD because of the structure of its seven colleges. The point was made that advisors have an important role in helping a student understand which cross campus courses will or will not help them satisfy requirements for their major. There are questions about why the credit for cross campus UC courses is not managed the same way as articulation of California Community College courses, and Chair Potter suggested it would be helpful if Director Osmundson could investigate how elements of the articulation process could be adopted, including who is responsible for the various activities. It will be important to distinguish between how upper versus lower division courses are treated.

X.   New Business

The committee expressed their gratitude for Chair Potter's wise and steady leadership during this extraordinary academic year. Chair Potter, in turn, recognized the contributions the members in spite of the challenging conditions.

XI.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:50 p.m.
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Dan Potter