

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY
2014-2015 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met six times in Academic Year 2014-2015 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.

Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Degree Programs

As a Compendium committee, UCEP participates in the review of certain proposed programs. However, UCEP is not involved with reviewing undergraduate/graduate hybrid degree programs that allow undergraduate students to complete undergraduate and graduate programs simultaneously. According to the Compendium, only CCGA needs to sign off on this type of program however UCEP found at least one existing hybrid degree program that did not undergo CCGA review. UCEP’s concerns include that there might be a systemwide push for more of these hybrid programs to provide students for self-funded graduate programs and that this model will be used because of the external pressure on UC related to time to degree, streamlining undergraduate education, and creating three year degrees.

Some type of oversight is needed going forward and UCEP agreed that it should be consulted about these programs. UCEP has an interest in degree programs that impact undergraduate programs. The committee sent a memo to Senate Chair Gilly in October 2014 recommending that the Compendium should be reconfigured to include UCEP in the review of these programs. The purpose of UCEP’s review would be to raise questions about unintended consequences of a campus decision on its undergraduate programs, not necessarily to veto a proposal. The committee also concluded that a systemwide residency requirement may be needed to prevent problems with hybrid programs, especially those with entities that are not affiliated with UC. A member suggested that some type of residency requirement is needed for joint programs. A general rule about the number of units taken out of residency might be a rule that UCEP proposes in the future.

International Students at UC

The enrollment of international students at UC has garnered an increasing amount of attention. The number of international students at each campus varies widely, and the percentage of undergraduate students alone may reach the double digits at some UC campuses. Decisions made related to funding streams and rebenching have compelled campuses to increase the enrollment of international students. Decisions such as these may have unintended consequences from an educational point of view.

From UCEP’s perspective questions include whether the large presence of international students has altered the experience of native students in lectures or session or impacted the native freshman or transfer student’s educational path or experience. The data that is available illustrates that the international students are not academically failing but there is no documentation about any impact on the students who are not foreign. The dramatic increase in the numbers of international students at most campuses began about three years ago and some data on their performance is available now. This data shows that some of the international students are struggling but many are doing just as well or better than anyone else.

UCEP would eventually like to see data that illustrates the annual increases in native California students beside the increase in international students. The committee would also like to examine data on the

current composition of the undergraduate student body and the steps campuses are taking to broaden its diversity. It was also suggested that data on the majors pursued by international students should be reviewed. If the majors selected by international students are impacted, native California students may be displaced.

January 2015 Undergraduate Completions Conference

UCOP's Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP) unit hosted a January conference on undergraduate completions. IRAP took a look at a variety of factors that might impact undergraduates. Campuses provided background information about their practices in advance of the conference. The overarching goal was for campuses to be able to identify current practices or strategies they should be using. It is hoped that each campus to be able to utilize the information that has been collected but there may be some activities that involve collaboration across the campuses.

It was suggested that IRAP examine the five and three year completion rates and that the data should be broken down by department. There is a need to distinguish between completion being delayed because students could not get into classes versus delays caused because students change their majors, for example. UCEP members agreed that the more nuanced the data is the better. IRAP is looking into systemwide licenses for databases that will help the system look at information about completion rates more readily. The provost has asked campuses to submit their plans and IRAP is planning its next steps which will include making the information shared at the conference available on the web. Next year, UCEP will monitor the work on undergraduate completions at the campuses and at UCOP.

Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

The ILTI Project Coordinator joined UCEP in February and May to provide updates and ask for feedback. The feeling among UCEP members is that ILTI continues to be a source of frustration but is beginning to do a better job of listening to the campuses that. Eventually, the eligibility requirement could be changed to allow more students to take the online courses and it would also be politically beneficial for UC to expand online education. Campuses may be able to change the requirements if they are deemed to be unnecessary but some of the requirements are there to protect what a campus values. ILTI has seen more success with smaller niche courses than GE courses being articulated across campuses. The committee offered suggestions about the types of courses that might be helpful for ILTI to support in the future. The committee continued to emphasize that the importance of student interaction with other students and faculty cannot be forgotten, and that there are ways in which people learn that online education does not address.

UCEP also discussed the issue of proctoring for online courses. Proctoring for online courses varies by campus and there are multiple challenges. For example, UCD currently requires, for all online courses, that students take an exam in person in a proctored setting. ILTI has been finding sites where students can go to be proctored in a face to face setting. Faculty and campuses have asked for ways to frame proctoring in a way that ensures academic integrity, allows instructor discretion and gives student needed flexibility. Next year, UCEP will consider issues related to the process, security and verification of people taking online exams for credit and discuss authenticating student work.

Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES)

The Cross-Campus Enrollment System is being developed is a key element of ILTI. The current system used to enroll students at a UC different campus is hobbled together and involves a lot of paperwork and different people. The CCES website was launched in November 2013 with information about course descriptions and credit. This year, functionality will be added that allows students to search for courses, an important goal for ILTI. UCEP had previously given feedback to UCOP indicating that the decisions about the system should be made by the registrars. Some members of UCEP felt that additional investments should be made towards course designers and faculty buy-outs instead of a system designed

based on unrealistic assumptions and predictions about its utilization by students, especially since most UC students are currently enrolled in online courses offered by their home campus.

UCEP sent a memo to the CCES work group that stated that no harm should be done to the efforts the campuses are making in developing online courses; the inventory of online courses is large at the campus level; online enrollment is functioning well at the campus level; and the campuses should be allowed to pursue their goals. The memo also noted that UCEP is pleased to have representation on the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications. It is critically important that UCEP continue to keep an eye open for unintended consequences decisions about ILTI related matters on undergraduate education.

The committee is concerned about whether there is a long-term market for cross-campus enrollment. UCEP's members agreed that online courses are more successful when they are in a residential environment. It was suggested that ILTI should provide funding for remote TAs and tutoring and that it would be a significant improvement if students enrolled in a cross campus course could be brought together at their home campus and connected to resources.

Transfer Pathways

This year, UCEP was involved with the Senate's efforts to develop a UC transfer curricula which would establish a set of courses for each major that students would complete to be prepared for admission and full consideration for admission unto UC. The varying requirements from campus to campus or from major to major mean students have to choose one UC campus or one major. One goal of this new pathway is to streamline and create more consistency across the UC campuses so that students can prepare for a smaller set of criterion and be ideally prepared to transfer into a UC and spend less time after matriculating at UC in attaining their degree. UC needs to clarify what it takes to come to the University and be more consistent. If not, UC will lose the best and the brightest students, especially those young adults who are the first in their family to attend college.

This is a systemwide problem because the current transfer pathways are so different, but it requires local solutions. UCEP members agreed that more data from each campus on what makes students successful would be very helpful. In particular, the Senate should look at data that will show how transfers and native students are being treated. Campuses should be asked if something is required for transfer students why it is not also required for native students. Faculty need data to help inform the requirements for transfer students.

Senate leadership requested the support of UCEP members to help ensure that the new pathways are implemented at their campuses. UCEP members should be advocates at their campuses so divisions understand that the effort to streamline the transfer process is aimed at increasing the quality of a UC education. UCEP (as well as the divisions) may need to monitor how changes now being made in admissions impact or influence the graduation requirements. Coordination across many committees is needed to manage various aspects related to streamlining transfer. UCEP may want to consider issues related to admission to a particular major while BOARS will focus on admission to a UC campus. The goal is to have meetings of eleven more majors in October.

State Budget Framework for UC

In June UCEP discussed the state's long term funding framework for UC with Provost Dorr and the Senate Leadership. One of the first steps is for UCOP to figure out what specifically applies to individual versus multiple campuses. There is an expectation that UC's work on transfer pathways for major preparation will be completed over the next two academic years which will be followed by a period of implementation work by the campus and UCOP administration.

There are a variety of activities in the framework that are fundamentally about getting a higher percentage of undergraduates to earn the BA and to do so in a shorter period of time. UCs graduation rates are outstanding so improving upon them will take extra effort. But it will be better for the students financially if they do it in a shorter time and it benefits the state by opening spaces for new students as UC educates them more rapidly. The President will ask the Senate to look at current policies for the kind of credit granted to students for AP courses taken in high school or by passing the College Board's College Level Examination Program. Some campuses already go above the minimum of unit credit by granting pre-major or GE credit. This data will be cataloged by UCOP and then the Senate will decide how to proceed.

Work on some activities really needs to begin by the summer at the latest and Senate involvement is clearly required in many areas. UCEP and the Senate in general should be prepared to be involved in a timely way. There is a question about how to collect the information that is needed about the current range of practices in a timely manner. Many of the practices to be examined are local practices and UCEP may be asked to help figure out how to facilitate this work. It is important that nothing is imposed upon the campuses and it was suggested that an informal approach such as sharing best practices might be most effective. There is agreement that the involvement of UCEP members willing to help would be a valuable asset to the efforts to implement the changes called for by the state. A good deal of coordination with the Senate and campuses will be required and who does what will need to be made explicit. UCEP members were invited to share ideas about communicating the message in the most appropriate and effective way.

Consultation with the Office of the Governor

In May, UCEP was joined by a representative from the office of Governor Brown, Jason MacCannell. Mr. MacCannell asked members for their feedback on topics that included: student learning outcomes, badging or micro-credentials, and the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative.

Review of Proposed Systemwide Courses, and Schools and Degree Programs

In contrast with the past two years, this year UCEP was asked to grant systemwide approval for only one course, a field course involving UC's Natural Reserve System. This course was approved by UCEP in May 2015.

As a Compendium committee, UCEP participated in the review of the following proposed Schools and submitted the committee's views and analyses to the Senate chair: UCLA's pre-proposal for reconstitution to establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and to redefine the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture.

Other Issues and Additional Business

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

- The revised ICAS Natural Sciences Competency Statement
- The guidelines for Accepting Equity in Exchange for Access

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy.

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. Chair Larrabee or Vice Chair Smith regularly attended ICAS meetings and Vice Chair Smith participated on the recruitment advisory committee for the next faculty director of the UC Center in Sacramento. UCEP's incoming-Vice Chair, Barbara Knowlton

also attended an ICAS meeting to represent UCEP. Finally, UCEP was represented by Seeta Chaganti (UCD) and Ann Plane (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)

Jonathan Wurtele (B)

Donald Curtis (SF)

Gabrielle Nevitt (D)

Ann Plane (SB)

Robby Boparai (Undergraduate student-SD)

Charles Anthony Smith, Vice Chair (I)

Jack Vevea (M)

John Tamkun (SC)

Geoffrey Cook (SD)

Barbara Knowlton (LA)

Thomas Stahovich (R)

Mary Gilly ((I), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

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

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst