

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2015

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Barbara Knowlton, Vice Chair (UCLA), Jeffrey Stoppie (UCSB), Leslie Zimmerman (UCSF) (telephone), John Tamkun (UCSC), Michael Burawoy (UCB), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM) (telephone), Thomas Stahovich (UCR) (telephone), Simon Penny (UCI), Tara Javidi (UCSD), Edward Caswell-Chen (UCD), Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP), Michael Trevino (Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs), Tongshan Chang (Content Manger, IRAP), Dan Hare (Chair, Academic Senate), Jim Chalfant (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements and Updates

Chair Larrabee described several topics discussed at the recent Academic Council meeting including the review of the systemwide feedback on the proposed Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, the Course Identification system, the number of CSU students who transfer to UC, and enrollment planning. An update on the programmatic initiatives was provided. Chair Larrabee participated on the Provost's Monthly Budget Call which included a discussion about the 2016-2017 budget being prepared for the Regents. It has been suggested that something be done to humanize the face of undergraduate research to help the legislature and the Regents understand the contributions these individuals will make.

Discussion: Members agreed that a video of a student describing his or her experience with research, although expensive to make, could be valuable. The Vice Chair suggested that members could report back on the existing campus efforts to involve students in research. The number of undergraduate students who participate in research at UC has decreased. A review of the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey is a good first step. Another idea is to demonstrate how the research experience is related to the competencies students are expected to attain. Existing efforts might be coordinated across the campuses to have a bigger impact on the legislature. UC could produce a video that documents the participation of students in research.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The October minutes were approved with one correction.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate

- *Dan Hare, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Hare has learned that some community colleges and CSUs accept CLEP exam credit confirmation. UC faculty are concerned that preparation via CLEP exam, in the absence of data, is not up to UC standards and does not provide the same preparation. Just because the CSUs and CCCs accept CLEP credit does not mean that UC has to accept it. The students' performance in the next course in the sequence should be examined. Chair Hare is concerned that a cursory review may be problematic. The transfer pathways might have been a place to start the CLEP evaluation, but the pathways are for major preparation.

Discussion: If UC looks at CLEP in terms of students needing 180 units, it would be up to a campus to decide if that course articulates to a course that meets a GE requirement but any systemwide policy could address whether they count for other units. A member suggested that it could be worth looking at the exams on a case by case basis. Vice Chair Chalfant reported that UCSC Calculus Professor Frank Baurele is one of the writers of the CLEP exam for calculus. UC faculty may buy into the CLEP if there is a robust systemwide review. Whatever conclusion UC faculty reach should be well-informed and be shared by a wide group of faculty. This might be a money saving endeavor and the CLEP might become a pathway that benefits many UC students.

There was a request for data about the number of students who take the CLEP at the CCCs and CSUs and Student Affairs is trying to get this information. One member opined that AP courses are “taught to the test” at high schools and are not effectively teaching students. At UCD, one department does not accept AP exams for credit for courses, only for units and it would therefore be unlikely for this department to accept the CLEP. The Senate should identify common practices as well as where individual campuses might choose to change their procedures. If campuses choose to use AP credit differently, they need to be prepared to justify their decisions. UCEP will continue to exam this issue.

The Regents asked for a report from the Senate on how frequently credit by examination is utilized but the transcripts only provide the grade, not the mechanism. The Regents would prefer that the campus policies for credit by examination not vary so widely that they are detrimental to the students. It was suggested that UCEP look at how widely credit by examination is used and differences on credit by examination policies across the campuses, including how much the use is encouraged or discouraged. Chair Hare would find it helpful if UCEP could provide information about when students need to take credit by examination for a grade versus satisfactory/no credit, how uniform these policies are among the colleges at a campus, and the extent to which the policies differ across the campuses. This is related to time to degree and finding alternative pathways for students to make progress toward their degree. Therefore, UC needs to examine all three in order to have sound justifications if the campuses decide to differ in how these mechanisms are used.

Until BOARS studies the universal course identification matter, there is no work for UCEP related to C-ID. If the course identification process is problematic, UC could go back to the CCCs and ask for additional information to be added. It is not clear how to fix a situation where a transfer student is found to be unprepared even though he/she has taken a course that articulated. Chair Hare provided an update on the transfer pathways work. All of the meetings have occurred and several agreements are being put in place now.

The Senate Chair is on the Regents work group that is handling the Statement on Principles on Intolerance. It is likely that the Regents will find it difficult to write a policy that specifies one group without the policy being found to violate the 1st Amendment. A task force is working on total remuneration and UCRP, and Chair Hare thinks it will be difficult to preserve competitive remuneration for all groups of UC employees hired after July 2016.

One UCEP member commented that faculty at one campus are pushing back against the three-year degree pathways, in part due to the abrogation of the faculty rights to make decisions on these matters as well as the viability of these plans given certain existing campus structures. One issue is the way that summer session is articulated with respect to the running of the schools. The lack of the ability to guarantee comparability between a class offered in the teaching quarters and the same class offered in

summer session.

It could be possible for UC, along with the pathways, to articulate caveats as to why certain pathways would be difficult to use. Summer sessions that are self-supporting for example may be designed to make the teaching upper division courses as inexpensive as possible. The Governor needs to provide the same level of funding for summer session if he intends for it to be treated like the other academic quarters. Vice Chair Chalfant indicated that summer session is still under faculty control at the department level, and the faculty have to take responsibility for the major and who teaches in it.

IV. ICAS Natural Sciences Competency Statement

UCEP has the opportunity to comment on the ICAS statement on Natural Science Competencies. The committee reviewed a version of the statement last year.

Discussion: A member pointed out that one problem with the statement is the misuse of terms such as “populations” and “ecosystems.” Several members described the statement as very ambitious for high school students and there is concern about the precedent some of the language may set. The statement does not take into consideration the actual resources available to high school students.

Action: The committee will draft a memo outlining the committee's feedback.

V. Data on AP Exams

- *Tongshan Chang, Manager, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)*
- *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs*

Manager Tongshan prepared an analysis this summer on AP courses for UC's undergraduate admissions directors. There has been an increase in AP courses from 7.6 semester courses in 2006 to 9 semester courses in 2015. Non-California domestic students took the highest number of AP semester courses since 2008 to 2015.

The weighted GPA for students who took 18 or more AP courses is 21% higher than students with no AP courses. The data indicates that the more AP courses a student takes, the more likely they will be admitted to UC. Prior to 2010, about 50% of those who did not take any AP courses were admitted. The more AP courses students take, the higher their first year GPA and the higher their graduation GPA. According to the analysis, many students who took AP courses did not take any AP exams or have a score of 3 or above on any AP exam. The more AP courses students take, the more AP units they have and the more AP units students have, the more likely they are to graduate within four years. Controlling for AP units the number of AP courses does not significantly influence graduate rate.

Discussion: A member asked about looking at the unweighted GPA. The students taking 18 or more AP courses have a certain profile. Students are very aware of how the system works and some are gaming it. Students who take more AP courses may have more social capital. The students who take AP courses may not necessarily take AP exams. The API for the students' high schools and perhaps a proxy for zip code should be included in the model. Manager Tongshan analyzed three year graduation rates and found that the students who graduate in three years take far more AP courses than other students. Vice Chair Chalfant requested that the API be added to the analysis, perhaps in time for the BOARS meeting this Friday.

VI. UC InfoCenter

- *Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP*

The UC InfoCenter was created this past year and it provides data that is frequently requested. The url is www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter. Manager Peterson walked the committee through the InfoCenter website. High school and community college admissions directors utilize the site frequently. The data can be downloaded. UCEP members were invited to send Manager Peterson feedback about the website.

Discussion: Members remarked that the InfoCenter is very helpful. The committee discussed the increase in lecturers and how it impacts UC's educational mission.

VII. Campus Reports

Committee members provided written reports about Credit by examination and AP credit at each campus. CLEP is not used at any campus.

UCSB: Credit by exam is rarely used at Santa Barbara. The campus is already fairly generous about granting credit for AP. Validating student IDs is systematically done at this campus.

UCB: Credit by examination is a complex process involving multiple levels of bureaucracy. The campus has a process for granting AP credit.

UCD: Credit by examination has been left by the schools and departments to manage, so there is no data about the campus-wide utilization, but it is not utilized very often. AP credit is granted at this campus.

UCSC: Credit by petition (examination) is extremely rare. Some departments wonder if some test scores such AP credit could be used for prerequisite satisfaction.

UCI: AP is well-defined at this campus.

UCD: Credit by exam for individual courses is done on an ad hoc basis.

UCR: There is an official policy about credit by examination which includes five conditions for the students. It is not a well used mechanism.

UCM: Credit by examination is done on a case by case basis and there is a policy which includes reasons why students should not do it. The use of AP credit is well-defined

UCLA: Credit by exam is rare, it seems primarily restricted to honor students, multiple levels of approval are needed and there are a number of preconditions. There are reports that credit by exam is used at the graduate level. AP credit is used regularly for major requirements and units at UCLA.

UCEP went into Executive Session for some of the discussion.

Discussion:

It was suggested that a department could approve courses that would be eligible for credit by exam. Project courses would be excluded. It is important to minimize the resources that would be required if credit by examination was used significantly more.

UCEP can report that AP is being used for units but also at various departments for major credit. Checking student identification is standard practice across the campuses. One campus has pushed back against having exams online. Proctor U and Examity are two online proctoring services. Members agreed that in-person exams are the best way to deal with preventing cheating.

Chair Larrabee asked members to report on the major requirements work being undertaken at their campuses in December. Information about what has been done and the justification for the requirements will be gathered.

VIII. Executive Session~2015 Programmatic Initiatives

Minutes were not taken during Executive Session.

IX. New Business

A member would like to discuss Course Hero at a future UCEP meeting. Course materials are placed on the website without the instructors' permission. Another issue is faculty members who recycle exams even though creating new exams is burdensome. It was also suggested that UCEP should talk about campus climate. UCEP should review of summer session across the system, identifying practices and problems. With three year pathways there may be more pressure on summer session.

X. Executive Session

There was no additional Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:30

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee