

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2015**

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Tony Smith, Vice Chair (UCI), Jonathan Wurtele (UCB), Jack Vevea (UCM), Thomas Stahovich (UCR) (telephone), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Don Curtis (UCSF) (telephone), Gabrielle Nevitt (UCD), Barbara Knowlton (UCLA), Simon Penny (Irvine), John Tamkun (UCSC), Ralph Aldredge (Chair, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools) (telephone), Mary Gilly (Chair, Academic Senate), Dan Hare (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Welcome and Announcements

Chair Larrabee gave a report from the February and March Academic Council meetings, where discussion included some details on the Committee of Two, a statement from the Committee on Academic Freedom that says that civility is fine as long as a call for civility does not infringe on academic freedom, the Presidential Open Access Policy, the streamlining on admission procedures for transfer students, and the implementation of the 3% raise for faculty. The March meeting finished with a vote for the incoming Senate Chair, which will likely be confirmed by the April Assembly meeting. The Chair also said that she is a member of the International Activities Workforce and hopes to share a statement from this group with UCEP in the near future.

The March Academic Planning Council began by clarifying its own charge. Next the short, general, and supportive copyright policy was discussed. Provost Dorr then discussed the resumption of the Five Year Planning Process and how well it has been received across the divisions. Finally, the provost discussed her view of the active service of President Napolitano with respect to the Committee of Two and other efforts in Sacramento.

The vice chair reported that ICAS will meet with the state legislature next Monday. ICAS continues to work on the issue of 100 courses with books for free, and this is turning out to be more difficult than anticipated. The committee has also discussed the harmonization efforts on the approach to GE credits and learning outcome issues. ICAS has requested a report from the California Open Educational Resources Council on its activities. The Council has spent about \$200k but has not responded to ICAS' requests for specific details on how the money has been used, or provided a report on what the assessment of the ten free books is to date with respect to faculty utilization.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Council voted for James Chalfant (UCD) to be the next vice chair of the Academic Senate. Regent Ortiz Oakley, the president of Long Beach City College, met with Council and is interested in transfer issues and would like to gain a better understanding of the UC system. It was a useful orientation to and for Council. The governor's staff asked to observe the April Council meeting, and although this is not a public meeting, the Senate will welcome a chance to communicate further with the governor's staff. The staff would like the opportunity to meet with a number of standing Senate committees and they have been

asked to forward their questions for the committees in advance.

In response to the request from Regent Kieffer, the Regents received a presentation on the meaning of a UC degree at the March meeting. It was titled the “Background on the Origin and Structure of Undergraduate Education” and presented by UCB’s Chancellor and Divisional Senate Chair. The presentation included a good deal of history but Regents veered toward questions related to admissions. Regent Kieffer made the statement that “the Regents need to be engaged in the academic side as much as the financial side, and now they are intertwined.” At least one Regent suggested that their discussions focus on the challenges faced by UC.

There was a presentation on veterans and the question of whether UC should give credit for military experience was asked. The CSUs do give nine credits to veterans. Chair Gilly shared that, in his state of the state address, the Texas governor remarked: “we also need to elevate the national research standing of our universities. Five of the top ten public universities in the country are in California, with none being from Texas. We will begin the process of ensuring that we elevate some of Texas’ elite colleges and universities into the top 10 nationally.”

IV. Streamlining Transfer ~ Introduction

- *Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Senate*

At a recent meeting, UCEP’s chair learned that 33% of the people who receive a bachelor’s degree in engineering in California began their studies at a community college. The current system for students attempting to transfer to UC is unwieldy. About 80% of the community colleges transfer thirty or fewer engineering students per year, many community college engineering departments have one faculty member, and crucial classes might be offered only once every two years. When students are preparing and attempt to use ASSIST, every UC and CSU has a different set of requirements so they must make a pick one institution. It is difficult to nearly impossible, in some disciplines, for students to prepare. At UCI for example, there are psychology departments in two different schools with completely different requirements.

It should be noted that some CSUs are more difficult to get into than many of the UC campuses. This can result in the more motivated students applying to schools like CalPoly that may be able to guarantee admission and less motivated students applying to UC. If faculty could agree on the content of the transfer model curriculum and the model curriculum for engineering, UC could offer these students a guarantee to review. This would improve UC’s attractiveness to students while also reducing faculty workload. The Course Identification system simplifies articulation by providing a subset of course descriptors that have been agreed upon by the different departments at UC. The divisions need to get the message that we are not trying to degrade the quality of a UC education by coming up with a gold standard, we are actually going to increase the quality of a UC education.

Chair Gilly noted that the AB 1440 degree, which guarantees admission to the CSUs, is the main avenue community college students now use to prepare for transfer. 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 pathways are so different, but it requires local solutions. Individual department are getting students who are prepared and doing well and transfer students graduate in 2.5 years and do as well or better than native freshman.

At the campus level, transfers look good so there is not much motivation to change. But from the systemwide perspective, there is serious motivation because we are looking at how to get students to apply and be ready for a UC education. Politically, if we do not get this right it is going to affect UC’s

budget. Ten of the most popular majors have been identified and individuals with knowledge and authority over the transfer pathways to those majors will be invited to meetings. Tomorrow a group of life sciences faculty will meet to discuss prerequisites and reportedly the requirements across the UC system for this discipline are already very closely aligned. Ideally at the end of the day the goal is for the attendees to agree that this is good preparation for transfer students to this major and will return to the campuses and ensure that this is implemented. For the life sciences, changing a single requirement at one campus would result in a recommendation for a transfer needs to take in order to start UC as a competitive junior and finish within two years.

Vice Chair Hare indicated that the Senate is likely to make three different recommendations on transfers. First, the minimum expectation for admission would require three to four years at UC after transfer. The second level is what is currently found in most articulation agreements: this is a highly selective major, take as many of the following as you can. Finally the highest level will indicate what is required to graduate after two years. This is exactly what all campuses expect their lower division students have done for them to graduate in four years as well. Chair Larrabee added that the chance that students can figure this out using ASSIST is nil. Each of the agreements was written independently by an articulation officer without talking to any other articulation officers at any of the other UC campuses. Chair Larrabee enthusiastically pointed out that this is definitely a topic that requires UCEP's very active involvement. Even where the existing requirements are closely aligned, it can be very difficult for students to figure this out. There will be similar meetings with faculty from nine other majors this year and eleven next year.

Discussion: Data is sorely needed so that faculty may be fully informed. A member commented that some UC faculty strongly believe that students should stay at the community colleges for four years and get things out of the way before coming to UC. Faculty frequently state that community college is cheaper and students should stay there as long as possible. 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. UCSC modeled the ten top transfer feeders to its majors, looked at all articulation agreements and devised a plan that has the fewest requirements of any UC campus, and people at UCSC are now very happy with how well the transfer students are doing.

The message to Senate leadership from the campuses is that they want recommended pathways, not requirements because they want flexibility when it comes to the transfer students they admit. ASSIST is an example of how information about the preparation pathways for transfer students is not well communicated and the campuses cannot fix this problem. On average, transfer students apply to four UC campuses. There is no focus on the Common ID system right now although this is a step in the process. The emphasis is on getting the campuses to be upfront about their expectations and what the students really need to be competitive when they transfer as juniors and to graduate in two years.

UCEP members were asked by Chair Gilly to identify an aspect of this situation that resonates with them. Chair Larrabee is concerned about social justice and access. The community colleges are also a source of diversity, although Chair Gilly indicated that the students who transfer into UC are less diverse. A member asked why UC is not getting students from all of the community colleges that are not feeder schools for UC. The experiences students have at UC compared to the CSUs should be considered. UCOP's Institutional Research unit should be asked about the availability of this type of data. It would be helpful to review data showing which UC campuses each individual transfer student applies to. Each campus might need an individual level version of ASSIST. TAG programs provide some of this individualization.

The question being asked of UC is why the campuses cannot do something similar to the CSUs which

have uniform agreements. Ideally, the legislature would like UC to adopt without change the CSU transfer curricula but UC cannot and will not do this, which is something President Napolitano has acknowledged. However a rational is needed. For some of the majors, if UC cannot find a few transfer curricula that will work across at least nine of the campuses, this will be noticed by the legislature. The CSUs' transfer model curricula is considered too light by UC. There are a number of courses where UC is expecting more rigor than is found at the CSUs. Even students who received As at the community college may get Cs their first year at UC, so there are issues with these students needing time to catch up.

V. Streamlining Transfer ~ Status of Current Activities

- *Ralph Aldredge, Chair, Board of Admissions and Relations with School*

Before 2012, to be considered for transfer students needed to complete certain quarters and a certain number of units, and there was just one pathway. In 2012, two new pathways were created in part in response to AB 1440 and a companion assembly bill that encouraged UC to recognize the Associate Degree for Transfer. At the transfer level there is no guarantee of admission to UC. Students who complete the Associate Degree for Transfer curriculum are guaranteed admission into the CSUs but the degree only guarantees a full comprehensive review at UC.

The other pathway introduced is based on a UC transfer curricula. This curricula 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. This is the basis of the current transfer streamlining effort: to develop a set of curricula student can take at a community college and be fully prepared for transfer into UC. The difficulty students encounter when attempting to transfer is meant to be mitigated. The varying requirements from campus to campus or from major to major mean students have to choose one UC campus or one major. The students end up restricting themselves from the other UCs. 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. The GPA range was established to provide a minimum and is not meant to imply a guarantee of admission for transfer students.

Discussion: The point was made that UC faculty are not familiar with the curriculum at community colleges. Faculty need data to help inform the requirements for transfer students. Some data is only available at the campus level. What happens after the meeting with the life sciences faculty with respect to getting changes implemented on the campuses if necessary is a key question. Chair Gilly reported that this exercise was conducted in 2010 and there was a lot of commonality discovered for some majors, but this effort did not result in any change at the campuses. UCEP (as well as the divisions) may need to monitor how changes now being made in admissions impact or influence the graduation requirements. Chair Larrabee suggested that UCEP could consider issues related to admission to a particular major and BOARS will focus on admission to a UC campus. Coordination across many committees is needed to manage various aspects related to streamlining transfer.

UCEP members are expected to go back to their campuses and follow up with certain people to determine what is needed to make sure the changes are implemented. Following the meeting tomorrow, Chair Gilly will share what is learned with UCEP and ask for members to follow up at their campuses. There will be resistance among faculty to some changes, who will ask about Senate process for example. Starting with the low hanging fruit and making changes incrementally, like with the life sciences where the campuses are already close, may reduce resistance. One suggestion is to focus on getting transfer students who are better prepared to enroll at UC which may help with the ongoing resistance by faculty.

Some faculty tend to believe that transfer students are not as prepared as natives and think of transfer admissions policies as a way to keep unprepared students out of UC and view these requirements as

barriers and want to build them high. Another contingent of faculty believe that transfer students are great and do what they can to facilitate transfer. The more data the better and it should also be noted that most faculty are simply not very familiar with community college courses. UCSC reviewed data that illustrated that transfer students had high contact hours, far more labs, far smaller classes, and far higher expectations at the community colleges, and this process helped UC faculty to understand what they are asking of transfer students.

Some of the most compelling data is available only at the campuses and there should be some effort to collect this data from UCLA and UCB to add to the data now available from just a limited number of other UC campuses. It is important that the agreements discussed today result in action at the campuses. The Senate wants to avoid a situation where the Regents decide how transfers should be handled. Mixed messages are given about the relevant priority of general education versus pre-major. UC can identify courses recommended before transfer and President Napolitano can speak to the Chancellor of the community college system about investing in specific types of coursework it does not currently offer.

VI. Streamlining Transfer ~ Next Steps for UCEP

Vice Chair Hare indicated that UCEP members should be advocates at their campuses. In May, members will be asked to report on their campus work on streamlining transfer admissions. Members will also make sure that the divisional Executive Committees are aware of the efforts now underway. The comprehensive review is the only thing that is guaranteed. The chair sent an email to the members about the streamlining activities which will be shared with the chairs of the local CEPs. At some campuses, transfer students are not allowed to transfer into another major.

VII. Natural Sciences Competency Statement

Chair Gilly indicated that UCEP should review the statement. The committee will send a memo to Council if there are major issues.

Discussion: A member has concerns about how the statement treats faculty like the priesthood. There are also unrealistic goals for high school students. Some members of UCEP were concerned that some portions of the program are demanding and inappropriate for the age group. There is overly broad language in the sustainability section

Action: The vice chair and UCB representative will draft a memo for the committee's review.

VIII. Report on the Systemwide Natural Reserve System Field Course

Chair Larrabee would like to ask the proposer to answer a few additional questions that are from UC Registrars. Administratively, this will help to make sure everyone is now on the same page. We recognize that some details may have to be handled later, including question 7.

Discussion: UCEP can ask if the fees were reviewed at the local campus and will be asked why the fees for this course are different from the original course. Question 8 should be entirely deleted. Question 9 will become we could like a break down of the course fee and how it relates to the original course. And is the course approved by UCSC. Chair Larrabee will inform the Registrar who raised the questions that UCEP is asking for responses.

IX. Accepting Equity in Exchange for Access

Members are invited to comment on the guidelines for accepting equity in exchange for access. Chair Larrabee has worked on collaborations with some non-UC colleagues who were not able to use some of

UC's resources and the new policy would address this. This is part of the President's Innovation initiative.

Discussion: UCEP could say that it is important that this program be initiated with a commitment that undergraduate education and students, in general, will not be impacted. It is important to make sure that the best faculty continue to interact with students.

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

X. Consultation with the Office of the President

This item was not discussed.

XI. College Textbook Affordability Act-AB 798

Members are invited to provide comments on a College Textbook Affordability Act.

Discussion: A member asked how about existing resources will be leveraged. The grant for the pilot program is not explained and there is no information about what the grant will pay for. It was noted that the bill assumes that students will accept using online textbooks. UCEP will not comment on this bill right now but the committee will monitor the discussions about this at ICAS.

XII. Member Items/Campus Report

UCD: The member asked if UCEP should discuss student cheating. This member found her course materials online at a pay website. One idea is that the University could file a class action lawsuit against the companies positing these materials. This issue crosses over to other standing committees. UCEP members are asked to find out from their campuses what concerns they have related to 21st century integrity violations.

XIII. New Business

No New Business was introduced.

XIV. Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:30 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee