

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES
MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2016**

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Barbara Knowlton, Vice Chair, (UCLA), Jeffrey Stopple (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Thomas Stahovich (UCR), Simon Penny (UCI), Edward Caswell-Chen (UCD), Tara Javidi (UCSD), Dan Hare (Chair, Academic Senate), Jim Chalfant (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements

Chair Larrabee provided an update on the most recent Academic Planning Council meeting. Systemwide programs such as the UC EAP, UCDC, UC Sacramento and ILTI were discussed. Another topic was degree completions for non-matriculantes. The process for the five year planning perspectives has been streamlined but the Provost asked for feedback about its value. The challenges of local growth and the international activities policy were discussed.

Academic Council discussed the ongoing cybersecurity issue, the universal Course ID number system, the UCEP letter about the change to the UCIE bylaw, and the sexual harassment and violence prevention policy. Vice Chair Chalfant joined the videoconference to explain the cybersecurity issue at UC. Fidelis is a system that has been installed at the campuses to monitor web traffic at the campus border. UCOP has not done a good job communicating what steps were being taken to address cybersecurity and the lack of consultation is problematic. The threat detection involves looking for specific attempts to break in. Fidelis is looking for malware attached emails. The systemwide Committee on Academic Computing and Communication issued a statement which is posted on the Senate website and the chair and vice chair of UCACC will represent the Senate on the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee. This committee also includes Chief Information Officers and CyberRisk Responsible Executives. Three Senate members will be on the Advisory Board for this Governance Committee. Fidelis is the minimum amount of security that UCOP wants and this monitoring will continue at all campuses.

The five UC hospitals, which have to meet HIPPA standards, will be working with a system called FireEye. Campuses will be able to take advantage of additional features available in FireEye. The details of shared governance at the systemwide level to advise on the campus to campus threat detection effort are being discussed. UCEP members are encouraged to visit <http://security.ucop.edu/> and review the frequently asked questions section. Chair Larrabee suggested inviting someone from UCACC discuss this at UCEP's next meeting.

Vice Chair Knowlton reported on the most recent meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Councils. The main purpose of this meeting was to prepare for Legislation Day. However, the scheduled date falls within the period when the CSU professors may be planning to strike. UC faculty should be more aware of how the political process works as it relates to UC's funding. Members of the legislature are not interested in the argument about UC's excellence and legislation is often based on anecdotal information. It is important for UC's work on the transfer pathways and initiatives such as the C-ID system and the College Level Examination Program to be highlighted. Assembly Bill 1711 was introduced earlier this year and it proposes a cap on non-resident enrollment at 15.5percent systemwide.

Discussion: A member pointed out that the cybersecurity monitoring has centralized the data which would make it easier for hackers to access. The data is stored for only thirty days.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The February minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

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

Chair Hare reported that Council had a teleconference in February. New options for the retirement plan will be announced a week from today, one of which will be better than what is currently on the table. The Report from the Joint Committee on Faculty Discipline has been released for systemwide review and UCEP can opine. The process resulted in several different groups making recommendations, most of which were designed to make the responsibilities of certain people easier. Recommendations about how to improve the entire process are needed. Nominations for the Senate's Vice Chair are still being accepted. ICAS is in the process of trying to plan the Legislative Day.

IV. Budget Framework Initiative: Awarding of Advanced Placement Across the UC System

Chair Hare explained that this initiative is similar to the major requirements Budget Framework Initiative. UC is being asked to determine if there is variation in how campuses award AP credit and to explain the basis for the differences.

Discussion: A member asked for a way to look at the impacted majors across the campuses, perhaps by using the C-ID numbers. Some departments that are less generous in the awarding of AP credit may be influenced by seeing what other departments do. It was clarified that this study is independent from the work being done on C-ID numbers. A suggestion is to start with the most popular majors such as those identified in the transfer pathways. Departments have been looking at what it takes to transfer and the type of classes for which students receive AP credit. There is legislation that would require the CSUs to accept a score of three to receive AP credit.

Chair Hare indicated that C-ID numbers have not necessarily been assigned to the UC courses that would show which courses are equivalent at each campus. Vice Chair Chalfant clarified that the question is not how a certain course at one campus compares to a course at another campus. The initial focus might be on the transfer pathway courses which are the key lower division gateway courses. These courses have already been defined systemwide as being particularly important. It would be helpful to have a table that shows, by campus, which courses can be satisfied by AP or not. Chair Hare cautioned that UCEP should make the distinction between awarding GE credit versus credit within a major.

Departments could be asked for one sentence about what each course is. UCEP would ask for the information for the GEs and for the transfer pathways majors departments have already addressed. Within a campus, different majors could have very different expectations and policies about the AP courses or scores accepted. UC may want to think about the specific cases where a score of four is required. The local committees could be asked the AP score that is accepted, the justification for that score, who made that decision and the procedures for revising it. A member expressed concern about

departments being asked to harmonize their policies and Chair Hare clarified that the Senate has been asked to re-examine the policies regarding how AP credit is awarded, not to make changes or standardize any policies. The fact that no one remembers when or why the decisions about AP scores were made is central to the request from the State. If campuses provide logical explanations for why campuses or departments differ with respect to how they award scores, this will satisfy the request for analysis and allow the Senate to understand why the differences exist. Chair Hare suggested that this analysis is similar to the review of the College Level Examination Program but a key difference is that UC does not award CLEP credit.

The UCSC representative volunteered to look at biology life sciences pathway and prepare a template to share with the other members before the April meeting. Members agreed that the UCSC representative's proposed strategy is a good start and members will provide the UCSC representative with information to assist his work. Based upon the information found, UCEP may decide that this examination is not worth the effort. High school students take AP courses without knowing they will not receive much credit for it at UC. This first step will be generalized for other disciplines if the findings are helpful.

V. Systemwide Review: Proposed Guidelines for the Use of Waivers in Academic Hiring at UC

UCEP has the opportunity to opine on the proposed guidelines for the use of search waivers.

Discussion: A member asked about the reference to individuals in unpaid positions. Vice Chair Chalfant will ask for clarification about this language and a memo from UCEP will not be required.

VI. Systemwide Review: Report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate

UCEP has the opportunity to opine on the Report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate.

Discussion: There is a question about who is required to take the mandatory training and whether the two year training has been revised to address the findings in the report. There is a question about whether the law allows for certain faculty to be in a category that exempts them from mandatory reporting. Vice Chair Chalfant indicated that OGC is very much involved with the work being done on UC's policies on sexual violence, sexual assault and sexual harassment. The committee is concerned about whether the recommendations are aligned with the law and will raise this question with Chair Hare. Who establishes the criteria for designated employee is a related question.

VII. Member Items/Campus Reports

A member feels that faculty are being told that the pressure on decreasing time to degree requires that academic standards are lowered. The requirement that UC enroll additional five thousand students is an additional pressure. A member reported overhearing students complain loudly about how difficult it is to access courses. Vice Chair Chalfant commented that in the fall, the Senate may be pressured to focus again on major requirements if too many majors have not reduced the number of units. Information about the expected and unexpected consequences of the five thousand students will be compiled in the fall. The analyst shared that the Library Committee discussed student access to the library space. Chair Larrabee would like something to be said about UC being forced to take in more students and being

unable to educate them. In addition, the psychological needs of students, both undergraduate and graduates, should be addressed. This includes raising faculty awareness of and sensitivity to these needs. As more students are crowded onto the campuses, there may be an increase in the numbers of students with psychological issues.

Uniformity of GE across the campuses is another question related to the additional undergraduates. It is not clear if funding will be available to hire more teaching assistants.

VIII. New Business

There was no New Business.

Videoconference adjourned at: 12 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee