

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2015

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

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Larrabee welcomed members to the committee and introductions were made. The chair explained that the goal is for the committee to reach consensus as a result of its discussions but that there may sometimes be a minority opinion. Vice Chair Knowlton will chair the meeting in the afternoon when Chair Larrabee leaves to attend a meeting about the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative. UCEP's chair is in frequent communication with the chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and the Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). BOARS is responsible for issues related to admission to a UC campus, whereas UCEP examines matters related to being admitted to a major. UCOPE looks at issues related to SAT scores and students' entry level writing skills.

The analyst pointed out the confidential nature of the committee's discussion and the agenda materials, and if in doubt members should ask Chair Larrabee if something can be shared with their local committees. At times, the members will be specifically asked to collect information from their campus to report at the next UCEP meeting.

II. Highlights from 2014-2015

Last year, UCEP spent time discussing international students. There is concern about international students needing to have identity verification in various situations such as for online exams or exams they take before they arrive at UC. While this issue is related to international students, Chair Hare noted that the primary issue is whether UC can ask community college students to provide verification when UC does not ask this of its own students. When this was discussed at ICAS last year, the members agreed that this should be left to the discretion of the instructors.

In January, there was an Undergraduate Completions Conference that touched on a number of topics, including UCLA's Challenge 45 which will be discussed later today. UCEP also spent time discussing the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) although the committee's focus upon online has decreased compared to previous year. Chair Larrabee described some of the more successful online courses at UC. There are a number of complicated details related to the cross-campus enrollment system being developed by UCOP to support online education. Last year, the committee also discussed transfer pathways work which is an effort to streamline the requirements across the UC campuses. Chair Larrabee explained the committee's charge.

III. Intersegmental Council of Academic Senate (ICAS)

This item was not discussed.

IV. Major Requirements/Challenge 45

- *Aimée Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, UCOP*
- *Dan Hare, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The committee was joined by Provost Dorr, Senate Chair Hare and Senate Vice Chair Chalfant for an initial discussion about the programmatic initiative related to major requirements. Chair Hare explained that UC's budget deal with the state includes programmatic initiatives. Many of the initiatives are the responsibility of the administration while there are some that will involve the Senate. The committee should focus on the specific language of the initiatives. For example, the Senate has been asked to consider if majors can be reduced to 45 units but there is no requirement that majors are limited to 45 units. The faculty need understand that UC's funding is based on a political process and it is important for them to be engaged. The Office of the President is very focused on ensuring that the work on the initiatives is on track. It is expected that UCEP members will help make sure that particular objectives are being achieved on time. UC's efforts are being closely monitored and there is a great deal at stake for the University.

Provost Dorr explained that it was agreed that UC will provide a written report at the end of each calendar year about what has been achieved. Certain administrators at OP will have quarterly meetings with representatives from the Governor's Office and the Department of Finance. UCOP's administration also has weekly oversight meetings. The committee will be sent a document with the approved agreements from UCOP's perspectives. Provost Dorr observed that individuals at UC have shown good will and are making an effort to do this work in good faith. The Senate leadership has been closely involved and participates in weekly meetings to discuss progress on the initiatives with the Provost.

The Governor's Office learned about Challenge 45 while visiting UCLA and UCSD is currently undergoing this process. From the perspective of the bending the cost curve and serving as many students as possible, having slim and trim major requirements is desirable. The Provost understands that faculty want the best program possible for students and for students to be well prepared for the future. This exercise is about looking at the major requirements and determining if there should be any changes. There is no requirement that there must be reductions but campuses are expected to give due diligence to the examination of their courses.

The focus is on upper division courses in the major that are required and limiting this to no more than one year of full time engagement by a student. It is the Provost's understanding that the campus Educational Policy committees will play an important role and, currently, not all faculty understand this. UCEP and its members will have a critical role with the local committees in terms of their understanding of what is happening and their engagement in what will be asked of them. The systemwide Educational Policy may comment on what the campuses are doing or provide guidance to the local committees. Provost Dorr indicated that the campuses

Discussion: Reportedly, the UCSC CEP was informed by the administration that the CEP would be involved in these efforts. It would be helpful to know what types of information departments should provide to the local committees. The quick turnaround time will be a challenge for many campuses. Provost Dorr indicated that there are many important details related to the major requirements that need to be decided. The consequences for not achieving what has been promised will include that UC loses funding. Lowering the requirements of upper division courses is a concern to some members. A question is whether students should be instructed to take some courses in their junior and senior years. UC could explain that accreditation requires a certain number of units or that UC students will not be considered well-trained by the University's peers if the students have not taken

The goal is that each of the 75% of the majors identified as the most popular looks at their program and makes a rational decision about if the program is up to date and as lean as it should be. The Provost indicated that a group could report that this work was done within the past several years and confirms the choices made. UC will not try to renegotiate the agreement made with the Governor's Office. The need for certain requirements for some majors is recognized but the requirements can still be assessed. Some campuses have just an annual process for looking at degree requirement changes and a question is whether this process can be done more frequently.

Provost Dorr indicated that UCD has decided to examine all of its majors. Chair Larrabee suggested that UCEP should try to help make this process benefit UC's educational mission as much as possible. The Provost's Office wants to be helpful and supportive of the campuses, not an obstacle. Provost Dorr is the project lead on the major requirements initiative and IRAP Manager Peterson is the project lead on three of the initiatives, including the three year degree pathways. The work on major requirements is to be completed by the end of the academic year in 2017 and this date is part of the negotiation. Other deadlines in the oversight plan were based on guesses based on what usually occurs during an average academic year. The various committees at each campus involved in decision-making about courses are being identified and the Provost is collecting campus-specific processes to see if the work to be done can be easily added to existing mechanisms. Local Educational Policy committees may want status reports on implementation of the programmatic initiatives on every meeting agenda.

V. Alternative Credits

- *Michael Treviño, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs, UCOP*
- *Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Director Treviño from Undergraduate Admissions joined UCEP for the discussion about alternative credits. Vice Chair Chalfant first provided an overview of the 2015 programmatic initiatives and noted that UCOP is intently focused on this work. The briefings prepared by UCOP's External Communications unit help with understanding exactly what is asked of UC. The committee probably will not need to focus on the use of Advanced Placement (AP) credit which is a BOARS matter. UCEP may want to spend time on credit by examination and the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), but it is likely that the major requirements initiative will dominate this particular committee's agenda.

UC has been asked to consider the use of CLEP, which is separate from the credit by exam matter. Vice Chair Chalfant suggested that UCEP should coordinate with BOARS on the CLEP discussion and briefly commented on the history of UC and the program. Since UC has not looked at CLEP since the 1980's it may be appropriate to review the exams again with respect to rigor, quality and appropriateness. A question is whether a policy related to CLEP should be different based on when a student takes the exam. From UC's perspective, the University has met the state's programmatic requirement related to CLEP with the President's request to the Senate for a review of the matter.

Vice Chair Chalfant indicated that with respect to credit by exam, the frequency of its use varies across the campuses. At BOARS it was noted that if a student asks for credit by exam and does not pass, an F appears on the student's transcript. UCEP may want to examine this practice. UCEP might also find that some constraints should be placed on when the students are allowed to take these exams.

Discussion: It is not clear if CLEP could be taken by a student who has already matriculated to UC. At the moment, it is possible that BOARS, Preparatory Education, and UCEP each need to consider this issue. UCEP might look specifically at the question of matriculated students and CLEP. The College Board runs CLEP. At the moment, a rigorous analysis of the thirty-three CLEP exams is not expected. The committee might decide that CLEP does not work for UC but the reasoning behind this conclusion should be made clear. A member asked if there is any data on how well students who receive credit by exam perform at UC. UCOP's Institutional Research unit may be asked to join a future UCEP meeting to review the available data. While credit by exam is not allowed at UCLA, reportedly it has been used at some UC campuses.

A member offered that the message from UCEP might be that we believe that graduation should be competency- and milestone-based and not time-based and that we would support students advancing as along as those requirements for advancement made by outside exam are rigorous enough to substitute for taking an actual course. This would apply to mostly basic courses. No medical knowledge multiple choice exam can ever replace a seminar discussion based course. It was recommended that UCEP take a careful look at this matter. AP exams have to be taken after a course and a student cannot go back and take the AP test again. It was noted that UC has strange policies related to students who take a year off. No test scores taken after their graduation from high

school can be considered and these students are considered by exception only at most UC campuses. Therefore the CLEP exams are one of the few ways, other than UC-specific placement tests, that can be used to get credit. This is a gap and perhaps the College Board should allow students to take the AP tests to demonstrate proficiency at any time.

Members were asked by Chair Larrabee to survey their campuses on credit by examination policies and determine how widely used it is. Members were asked to explain CLEP to their local committee members and find out about other credit by exam processes. Members are also asked to find out about policies related to how the identity of any student is validated, both for in-person and online exams. Chair Larrabee would like to request through ICAS information from the CSUs about the use of CLEP. Specifically, information about the CSU's experience with CLEP, any data on students who receive credit via CLEP and their performance in classes for which the CLEP exam substituted for a prerequisite, and whether the CLEP is taken before or after matriculation. The difference between credit by examination and credit for placement should be clarified. The information from the campuses will be discussed at the next UCEP meeting. Members should note if their findings are preliminary and for discussion purposes only especially if others at their campuses need to be consulted.

Action: Members will investigate their campus practices and report to the committee by October 21st.

VI. Systemwide Review of Proposed Modifications to SR 417 and SR 621

The committee has the opportunity to opine on the proposed modifications to SR 417 and SR 621.

Discussion: The committee does not have concerns about proposed changes to SR 417. However, members expressed concerns about students who might be penalized. If students take even just one college level course, they are considered to be transfer students, not freshmen. Students that do not follow the traditional pattern of study are penalized and a Senate committee should investigate this in the future. This information is not made obvious to parents, students or high school counselors. A member indicated that the last sentence in SR 417 should be revised to state: "High school graduates who have completed college-level work *post-graduation* at an accredited postsecondary institution (except in the summer following high school graduation), shall be applicants for advanced standing under the provisions of Chapter 4." The committee approved of the specific change proposed but would eventually like to address the issue related to students being penalized. It was noted that this regulation specifically disadvantages people in the military or other non-traditional students interested in taking classes. The committee suggested changing SR 621 to read: "Students who enter the University with ~~advanced placement credit from any standardized examination credit (such as from College Board, International Baccalaureate Organization, Advanced Level and/or any other standardized examination~~ that BOARS determines is acceptable for transfer credit) may exceed by the amount of this credit:..."

Action: The analyst will draft a memo outlining UCEP's feedback.

VII. Update on Senate Travel Procedures

- *Mona Hsieh, Office Manager, Academic Senate*

The Senate's Office Manager joined the committee to provide an overview of the current travel processes.

VIII. UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee

The UCSC representative volunteered to serve the one year term and the UCSB representative accepted the two year appointment to the UCEAP Governing Committee.

Action: The analyst will notify the UCEAP office.

IX. Executive Session ~ 2015 Programmatic Initiatives/May Revise

Minutes were not taken during Executive Session.

X. UCEP Goals and Priorities for 2015-2016

This item was not discussed.

XI. New Business

There was no New Business.

Meeting adjourned at: 3 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee