UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

2017-2018 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met nine times in Academic Year 2017-2018 (including five videoconferences) 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.

2017-2018 TRANSFER TASK FORCE

UCEP dedicated time during each meeting to focus on transfer students, an ongoing priority for both the Academic Senate and the Office of the President. Building on the work of the 2013 Presidential Transfer Action Team and the subsequent development of Transfer Pathways in 2015, President Napolitano established the Transfer Task Force to analyze admission options for prospective UC applicants, with the goals of strengthening pathways for prospective transfer students and better preparing students for entry to the UC. UCEP's vice chair represented the committee on the Transfer Task Force, keeping UCEP apprised of and eliciting feedback on its work from the central committee and its three subcommittees focused on Associate of Science degrees and transfer guarantees, transfer pathways, and advising/communications.

The committee discussed how the transition to a UC campus impacts students and the infrastructure supporting transfer students in place at each campus. Although campus-based support programs for transfer students are in place, how well they are working is not known, best practices should be shared more broadly, and it is essential that these programs receive permanent funding. It is imperative that faculty consider if their curriculum meets the needs of transfer students.

A draft of the report from the Transfer Task Force was reviewed by UCEP in May and, following endorsement of the final report by the Academic Council on June 27th, it was formally transmitted to the President. A memorandum of understanding between UC and the California Community Colleges, signed by President Napolitano in April, requests that the UC Academic Senate guarantee admission for students beginning community college in fall 2019 who complete one of the 21 Transfer Pathways with a specified GPA. As a result, implementation of the Transfer Task Force's five recommendations will need to move forward quickly and it is anticipated that UCEP will continue to be involved with the intricate work ahead.

In addition, UCEP identified a number of unanswered questions about the Transfer Pathways that should be considered as this important effort continues. These include how the pathways will be governed and reviewed and how affiliated degrees will be managed. How well the pathways are working should be evaluated, including the impact on persistence and retention. The pathways also need to be examined in terms of how their utilization contributes to student access and success. Lastly, how new pathways will be created for majors beyond the initial set needs to be determined.

INNOVATIVE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE (ILTI)

UCEP had a number of discussions about the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative throughout the year with an emphasis on possible impediments to cross campus enrollment into ILTI courses. In May

2016, ILTI asked UCEP about nine perceived barriers to cross-campus enrollment in online courses and committee members gathered input from their campuses over the course of 2016-2017. This year, the committee re-examined the barriers with the goals of determining if they stemmed from systemwide or divisional Senate regulations or divisional practices and if any such policies or practices should be modified in an effort to facilitate cross campus enrollment. In an effort to improve and expedite communication between ILTI and UCEP, this year UCEP and Senate leadership agreed that the ILTI Coordinator would be invited to serve as a formal consultant to UCEP.

By June, following consultation with the campus Committees on Educational Policy (CEPs), Undergraduate Councils (UGCs), and the Registrars, it became clear that the nine issues are divisional policies or practices with sound academic justifications. While there is also significant variability across the campuses in terms of how strictly the enrollment requirements are treated, one constant is that students' enrollment in ILTI courses must be approved by Academic Advisors and Registrars. In light of these factors, UCEP decided to recommend that all campuses should institute a flexible petition process that would cover any of the nine issues that might influence enrollment. This recommendation was supported by the ILTI Coordinator who reported that some campuses had already successfully implemented petition policies to handle issues related to enrollment in cross-campus online courses. In addition, the Coordinator agreed that ILTI will assist campuses with the development of their petition processes and will share information with the campuses about the best practices that facilitate effective online education. The recommendation was discussed and endorsed by Academic Council on June 27th and the memo was forwarded to the Registrars by way of the Provost's Office and to the divisional CEPs/UGCs.

UCEP is confident that the petition process will be the most straightforward and efficient solution and plans to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of a petition process. UCEP will follow up on requests that ILTI provide data on the frequency and magnitude of the issues limiting enrollment in cross campus online courses. The committee will continue to emphasize the value of having data on the utilization of online courses and the success of students who take ILTI courses to inform its discussions. Members also asserted that it is essential for CEPs/UGCs to be involved in any discussions with Registrars about changes to local policies or practices. Next year, UCEP will follow up on a request for a Committee member to be included on the ILTI Steering Committee to facilitate improved communication.

RELOCATION OF UCEAP FROM SYSTEMWIDE TO UCSB
In May, UCEP discussed the proposed move of the systemwide program UCEAP from UCOP to UCSB. The UCEP Chair worked with the chairs of UCIE and UCPB to prepare a joint memo to the Academic Council regarding the proposed changes to UCEAP.   The memo addressed the desire for appropriate consultation, and of particular concern, the lack of sufficient senate faculty member representation on the proposed Advisory Committee. Suggested modifications included an increase in senate representation on the Advisory Committee.   The memo was conveyed to the administration through the Academic Council. Only some aspects of the memo regarding Academic Senate representation on the Advisory Committee were accepted by the administration.

TRAINING FOR TEACHING ASSISTANTS/GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTORS
At the beginning of the year, UCEP's graduate student representative prompted the committee to explore the availability of training for Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) to help them develop as instructors and effectively teach undergraduates. The preliminary information members gathered revealed that the existing training offered by departments or campuses is extremely variable. There is variation across the campuses in terms of the training available and how well it is utilized, and even required training may not be offered consistently or meet the demand due to resource limitations. Members also found that TAs and GSIs may sometimes receive training while simultaneously teaching a

class. The information UCEP compiled was shared informally with the directors of campus Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) or Offices of Instructional Development (OIDs).

In July, the committee submitted a memo to Academic Council calling for renewed attention to the need for, and importance of, TA and GSI training. The memo was endorsed by Council on July 25th and will be shared with the CTLs/OIDs, which have separately decided to prioritize this issue. Next year, in consultation with the CTLs/OIDs, UCEP may closely examine the nature of the training that is available in an effort to determine its effectiveness and identify best practices and potential solutions for improving the offerings.

SENATE REGULATION 636.E
UCEP and the systemwide Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) received a memo from UCSB seeking clarification of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) and Senate Regulation 636.E. Although UCOPE is technically the committee responsible for supervising the ELWR, UCEP took up this issue because, at UCSB, Undergraduate Council handles matters related to preparatory education. UCSB questioned why, if a student has left UC then enrolls at a different institution and later wants to return to the same UC, a course taken at that other institution will not satisfy the ELWR and they will not receive transfer credit for the course – even if the course would normally count for a transfer student enrolling in UC. There is a question about the fairness of giving credit only to the students who transfer into UC for the ELWR-satisfying courses taken elsewhere.

To better understand the intent of SR 636.E and provide the expert guidance to UCSB, UCEP consulted with Evera Spears, Associate Director, Advocacy & Partnerships, Undergraduate Admissions in March. Associate Director Spears advised that the possible reasoning behind this Senate regulation may in part be related to UC faculty's concerns that students would attempt to circumvent the intent of the ELWR by substituting courses at other institutions that may not be sufficiently rigorous. After receiving this information, UCSB appealed to UCEP to reconsider this requirement for UC students who must leave temporarily for well-justified reasons. The chairs of UCEP and UCOPE agreed that the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) should be asked to review and provide an interpretation of SR 636.E and in June, the chair of UCSB's Undergraduate Council and the UCSB representative to UCOPE were asked to draft alternative language to SR 63.E, for UCRJ's consideration, which addresses UCSB's concerns. UCEP will continue to work with UCOPE and UCSB on a resolution to this matter in the year ahead.

Student Mental Health
In June, UCEP briefly discussed the important issue of student mental health after learning that at least one campus (UCLA) had reduced mental health services for students covered by the Student Health Insurance Plan. Although the committee was somewhat reassured to find that students are in fact allowed unlimited visits when mental health treatment is deemed "clinically necessary," concerns about the adequacy and availability of treatment persisted. UCEP agreed to send a brief memo to Council emphasizing the need for the University to prioritize additional funding for student mental health support services and to advocate for permanent state funding augmentations sufficient to meet increasing student demand for mental health services. This memo was endorsed by Council on July 25th then transmitted to President Napolitano. Council added a recommendation that UC would benefit from a coordinated initiative focused on faculty training in supporting student mental health on campus and this initiative would involve UCEP, the systemwide Committee on Faculty Welfare, and the Office of the President's Offices of Academic Personnel and Student Affairs which are informed by campus Disability Resource Centers.

POSTHUMOUS DEGREE POLICIES
In late February, Senate Chair White asked UCEP to assess the need for a systemwide policy for granting posthumous degrees. UCEP reviewed the existing campus policies which vary across campuses and even within a campus and noted that some policies are more lenient than others. Members agreed that it would be beneficial to have a standard policy for the system that affords campuses some latitude for flexibility, and discussed what a systemwide policy might look like. UCEP submitted for Council's consideration a draft model for a systemwide policy for awarding of posthumous degrees. After receiving Council's endorsement on July 25th, the draft policy was forwarded to the divisional Senate chairs and executive directors for review.

UCSF VARIANCE REQUESTS
UCEP considered two requests from UCSF for variances to Senate Regulations. UCSF requested a variance to Senate Regulation 750.B to change the language to include Health Sciences Clinical Faculty series. This request was deemed reasonable and approved by the committee in March and a memo documenting the decision was transmitted to Academic Council, also in March.

In May, the committee considered a request from UCSF for a variance to SR 780 to change to a pass/no pass grading system, which had recently been proposed by the UCSF School of Pharmacy. This request was also approved and Academic Council was notified of this decision in May.

Other Issues and Additional Business
In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCEP also issued views on the following:
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3
- Proposed Revisions to APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135, 235 - Second Round
- Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128, Conflicts of Interest
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Disclosure of Financial Interests and Management of COI in Private Sponsors of Research and Revised APM – 028
- UCR School of Business Administration Name Change
- UC San Diego Pre-Proposal for a School of Public Health
- UC San Diego Pre-Proposal for a 7th Undergraduate College
- Proposal for UCI School of Nursing

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 Ed Caswell-Chen represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly. Chair Caswell-Chen also participated on the Provost's monthly budget briefing teleconferences, the Academic Planning Council and represented UCEP on ICAS, and the UC Washington D.C. Center's Academic Advisory Council. Vice Chair Anne Zanzucchi represented UCEP on the Transfer Task Force and also participated in several Academic Council and ICAS meetings. Finally, UCEP was represented by Daniel Potter (UCD) on the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements
UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from Michael Brown, Provost and Executive Vice President, UCOP; Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning Institutional Research and Academic Planning; and Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator, UCOP.

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,

Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair (D)   Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair (M)
Ken Uneo (B)   Daniel Potter (D)
Hugh Roberts (I)   Rob Gould (LA)
Judith Rodenbeck (R) (fall/winter)   Paul Lyons (R) (spring)
John Serences (SD)   Jennifer Perkins (SF)
David Paul (UCSB)   Onuttom Narayan (SC)
Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student-SB)   Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student-I)

Shane White ((LA), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio)*
Robert May ((D), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio)*
Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst