

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY
2015-2016 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met seven times in Academic Year 2015-2016 (including twice by videoconference) to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 170](#) and in the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the “[Compendium](#)”). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows.

State Budget Framework Initiatives

UCEP was notified in June 2015 about the [budget framework initiatives](#) announced by Governor Brown as part of his May Revision to the 2016-2017 budget for the University. Over the course of this past year, the committee considered the issue of alternative credit, primarily through the use of Credit by Examination, the awarding of Advanced Placement (AP) credit, and the potential use of the College Board’s College Level Examination Program (CLEP).

Credit by Examination

UCEP began discussing credit by examination at the October 2015 meeting and determined the first steps in the committee’s investigation. UCEP representatives gathered information from home campuses about current policies and discussed the similarities and differences between campuses. UCEP representatives also were asked to consult with their local campus CEPs and other relevant administrators to get a sense of how frequently the credit by examination process is used and what barriers that may exist to students using this option. Information about campus policies was summarized and discussed in the spring of 2016. Issues addressed included reasons why the credit-by-examination option is used so infrequently, workload issues for faculty, and the advantages and disadvantages in terms of student learning outcomes of possibly promoting this option more.

Members received a list of specific policy inconsistencies by campus and were asked to opine on whether UCEP should remove these inconsistencies and come up with a general policy. Members were also asked if they felt any of the restrictions on credit by examination should be removed, or justify why not, and to give an opinion on whether students should be encouraged to take this option. Further discussions on the campuses about these questions are under way with the expectation that UCEP will prepare a report and submit a report to the Academic Council in the fall of 2016.

Advanced Placement Credit

Following the June briefing, in October UCEP began a more in-depth discussion about the awarding of AP credit at UC. Representatives gathered information from home campuses about current policies and discussed with academic advising staff. This information was organized in terms of application to university requirements, departmental (major) requirements, and General Education (GE) requirements. There was a great degree of consistency across campuses in terms of the use of AP exams for university and departmental requirements, with less consistency across campuses (and indeed across schools within campuses) for awarding GE credit. Some exceptions to the use of AP credit occur because at some campuses lower division course sequences are organized in a way that no single course corresponds to the relevant AP course. For most departmental requirements, a score of 4 is needed for credit.

Two main issues regarding reexamining AP credit will be on the agenda for the fall of 2016. UCEP will discuss whether the general policy of requiring a 4 or above on AP exams for major credit is justified, particularly in foundational courses. UCEP also will examine the differences in awarding AP credit for GE courses among campuses and how awarding AP credit, or not, aligns with the pedagogical goals and philosophies of the GE programs at the difference campuses. Following these discussions, UCEP will prepare a report for the Academic Council. In addition to the report to Council, committee members expressed an interest in developing white papers on how students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are disadvantaged by a lack of access to AP courses.

College Level Examination Program

In October, UCEP members were asked to consider the use of CLEP, which had not been evaluated by UC since the 1980s. UCEP studied the use of CLEP examinations by other universities and learned that they are rarely used by any of UC's comparators. Nevertheless, UCEP examined the list of examinations offered and developed a plan to establish subject-area working groups, comprised of faculty from each of the nine general campuses to review a subset of examinations in the areas of: Financial Accounting, College Composition, Spanish Language, American Government, Principles of Microeconomics, Calculus, and Chemistry. After these working groups were established, we learned that the Education Testing Service (ETS) would not allow UC faculty to review the examinations without a representative from the ETS or the College Board being present when the exams were reviewed. This was to ensure that the exams would not leave the room. Because that precluded the UC faculty members from comparing the CLEP exams with examinations with specific courses for which CLEP scores might be used for credit, or to consult with colleagues, UC declined to review the examinations under such restrictive conditions.

Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

ILTI's Project Coordinator Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator joined several UCEP meetings this year to report on the status of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative and to ask UCEP assorted policy questions. The committee was informed that by the end of 2016, 150 courses will be funded by ILTI including STEM, Social Sciences, and Arts & Humanities. Approximately 13,500 students completed online courses at their home campuses from winter/spring 2014 to fall 2015. ILTI created a new website in November for enrollment in online courses across the UC campuses and thirty courses are being offered for cross campus enrollment this winter. With the new launch of this website, a goal was to provide a more interactive experience to allow students a better understanding of what the course will be like.

Input was sought from UCEP on simultaneous enrollment policies, course credit, SB 477 and the question of whether online courses should count for General Education preparation or for the major. Another issue is related to the twelve unit minimum and the requirement that students taking online courses must be full time. The committee was also asked to consider extending the add/drop period. The members were asked to bring these questions to their campus committees for discussion.

Other Issues and Additional Business

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCEP also issued views on the following:

- Systemwide Review of Proposed Modifications to SR 417 and SR 621
- The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Statement on Natural Science Competencies
- Draft New Presidential Policy on International Activities
- University Committee on International Education's Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182
- Proposed Guidelines for the Use of Waivers in Academic Hiring at UC
- Report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, ICAS, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy/Undergraduate Councils.

UCEP Representation

UCEP Chair Tracy Larrabee represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly. Chair Larrabee also participated on the Provost's monthly budget briefing teleconferences and the Academic Planning Council. Vice Chair, Barbara Knowlton regularly attended ICAS meetings. Finally, UCEP was represented by John Tamkun (UCSC) and Jeffrey Stopple (UCSB) on the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from Aimee Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, UCOP; Pamela Brown, Vice President for Institutional Research and Academic Planning, (IRAP); Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP; Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP; Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator, UCOP; and Steve Handel, Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions.

In addition, UCEP consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair, who updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracy Larrabee, Chair (SC)

Simon Penny (I)

Michael Burawoy (B)

Leslie Zimmerman (SF)

Edward Caswell-Chen (D)

Jeffrey Stopple (SB)

Elioth Gomez (Undergraduate Student-B)

Barbara Knowlton, Vice Chair (LA)

Anne Zanzucchi (M)

John Tamkun (SC)

Tara Javidi (SD)

James Gober (LA)

Thomas Stahovich (R)

Dan Hare ((R), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Jim Chalfant ((D), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst