

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MONDAY, MAY 2, 2016**

**Attending:** Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Barbara Knowlton, Vice Chair, (UCLA), Jeffrey Stopple (UCSB) (telephone), John Tamkun (UCSC), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Michael Burawoy (UCB), Thomas Stahovich (UCR) (telephone), Kimberly Topp (UCSF Alternate), Edward Caswell-Chen (UCD), Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Ellen Osmundson (Coordinator, ILTI, UCOP), Dan Hare (Chair, Academic Senate), Jim Chalfant (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

**I. Announcements and Updates**

Academic Council discussed the State Auditor's Report at length and President Napolitano's response to the Joint Committee Report on faculty discipline. Cybersecurity and the campus discretionary salary plans were also topics on the Council agenda. The Academic Planning Council focused on the systemwide instructional programs. The UC Education Abroad Program is in the black. The International Activities policy has been discussed and it will be released for systemwide review in the fall. Academic Planning Council discussed degree completion for non-matriculantes, primarily UC students, and the question of whether they have catalog rights. At the most recent Assembly meeting, a new Senate vice chair was elected.

The Provost's Monthly Budget Call focused on the State Auditor's Report as well as how the campuses handled the Discretionary Salary Plans. ICAS did not have the Legislative Day in April and the next meeting will be in June.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The March minutes were approved.

**III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

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

Chair Hare discussed interacting with the College Board agency and how they led to our being unable to evaluate the CLEP exams. Chair Hare described some of the reactions to the State Auditor's Report. Vice Chair Chalfant remarked that discussions about the budget will continue next year with a focus on documenting the anticipated and unanticipated consequences. In his remarks to the Regents in January, Chair Hare described the impact that overcrowding is having on quality and the Regents are beginning to understand the problem. Chair Hare suggested that UCEP should craft a working definition of "quality." Chair Hare described issues related to the Joint Administrative Senate Committee report on faculty discipline.

**IV. Budget Framework Initiative: Awarding of Advanced Placement Credit**

Based on the committee's March discussion about AP credit, the UCSC representative looked at the new Biology transfer pathway and the AP courses that would fulfill UCSC's lower division requirements.. The pathway tells community college students interested in a specific major what they should take in order to be considered at all UC campuses. The representative proposed that high school students might look at the pathways to determine the AP courses they should take to complete as many lower division major

preparation requirements as possible. The representative attempted to compare the UCSC information with other UC campuses but the information on the UCOP website pertains to university credit rather than course credit. In order to look at consistency across the campuses, the campuses would have to make the information more transparent.

In light of the Senate's decision not to reevaluate the CLEP examinations there are a couple of reasons why it is particularly important for UCEP to assess the awarding of AP credit across the UC campuses. UC has the AP exams and has agreed to give credit. Chair Hare reported that there is a bill in the Legislature to impose uniform awarding of AP credit on the community colleges. This would be problematic for the students who may get credit in one system and not get credit in another system when they transfer. In addition, it is more important to document and understand if there is any variation in the utilization of Credit by Examination and whether any such variation can be justified or not.

The campuses have varied approaches to AP. Vice Chair Chalfant indicated that it would be appropriate for UCEP to state that UC campuses are different and not communicating, and this is not acceptable and here is what UCEP would like to see. If UCEP believes that this is wrong, the committee needs to make this statement. Harmonizing is not mandatory as campuses are allowed to make different choices, but UCEP should be asking questions when the differences are big. If AP credit satisfies a prerequisite, this is a positive and the best possible use of AP. The Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) do not need to be consulted by UCEP about this matter.

**Discussion:** Credit by Examination is rarely used at UCLA and in most cases it would be used by Master's students. There were six cases in two years at UCB.

High school students do not necessarily take AP courses to get ahead on the college requirements. Students may not be well served by receiving too much AP credit for passing things early and not taking courses at the university level. This is one argument for not giving credit for a score of 3. Vice Chair Knowlton is skeptical about the idea that awarding more AP credit will decrease time to degree. In general, campuses may be liberal in giving credit for the credits needed to graduate whereas the course credits vary from campus to campus and within a campus, some majors will accept it as course credits and others will not. Some high school students are very savvy and determine not only which high school courses will boost their GPA but identify community college courses to take during the summer to raise it even more. It was noted that AP for admission and AP for credit are completely separate.

Vice Chair Chalfant asked if there should there be a maximum number of AP credits that a student should be allowed to have on admission to UC or that should count towards their degree. Most UC faculty probably do not think that AP courses are the same as taking these courses at UC. Students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are disadvantaged by a lack of access to AP courses. There is a strong correlation between the number of AP courses taken and successful completion of UC. Access to AP courses is a proxy for income and good schools. Students will be missing out on the experiences that UC courses offer if they are given more credit through AP or Credit by Examination.

Vice Chair Knowlton pointed out that the BOARS' issue about access is separate from the question of whether time to degree and throughput will be enhanced by having a more liberal policy. Students could be given credit for AP courses at the GE level, but UCEP could caution that a potential danger in giving more Credit by Examination or credit for AP courses is that students miss a key element of what UC courses are designed to do. WASC wants UC to look at core competencies that go beyond just the content of the classes. WASC wants college educators to think about competencies like critical thinking and oral communication and this could be emphasized in UCEP's rationale for pushing back against giving a lot of AP credit.

UCEP could also state that the information found on the UCOP and campus websites would make it difficult for high school counselors or students to determine the type of credit granted. Specific courses may be listed but there is no way for students to figure out what that course actually is. The UCSC representative indicated that, based on the information on the websites, UCD makes it hard to satisfy any lower division courses in the biology transfer pathway whereas UCSD seems to have many courses that can be satisfied by AP credit. Depending on the UC campus, students may start at an advanced level or in upper division courses or get no credit for the AP courses taken. UCEP could document in a memo that it is impossible or difficult to determine from the UCOP and/or campus websites how AP credit is treated. Admissions could be asked to improve the information on the various websites to help students use AP credit better.

The GE is a reason that a campus has a particular view about what students are supposed to do and random AP credits may not be sufficient. If members of UCEP have opinions about the awarding of AP credit, these should be documented. This could include reporting that the committee feels that there should be a limit on the number of AP credits students can bring or that members are concerned about the efficacy of AP courses when applied to some UC degrees at some campuses. A freshman who enters UC with enough AP credit to actually be considered a sophomore will be able to enroll in classes from which other freshmen are restricted and this is a problem. The bottleneck is the upper division courses in the majors that students have to wait to get into and there is no funding to support more offerings of these courses. Therefore, having a more liberal policy on AP credit will not improve time to degree. UCEP has the opportunity to enrich the discussion about AP beyond what has been stated by various Regents and legislators which is that AP courses are college courses offered at the high school level. This simplistic view is dominant in the public domain. UCEP's members could start by weighing in about whether this is a valid description or if there is more to AP credit.

**UCM:** The campus coined the term "super freshmen" to describe a population of students who appear to be transfer students but they are technically native freshman. They come to UCM with a mix of Community College credit, UC credit, and AP credit. UCM has a lower division campus GE course required of all students that must be completed by 60 units. There were enough petitions to prompt the campus to ask who the students are, how common the situation is, and what should be done about the petitions. There was a study of the super freshmen that looked at two thousand students who entered with credit. About 75% have 1 to 14 credits of this mixture, primarily AP credit; about 25% have up to 30 credits which are primarily AP credit and not many college credits; and about 3% of this pool have up to 60% have AP credits and 40% have Community College credits.

It was surprising for UCM to learn that the predominant incoming credit was AP credit. It was fairly simple for the campus to pull this data and other campuses may want to consider conducting this analysis. The majority of the students at UCM are first generation college students who probably have a very low completion rate of AP credit, so it may be valuable to see this from the perspective of different UC campuses. UCM knows from the petitions that these students do not have a much of a cohort with other students so there is a qualitative component. The campus has not looked at persistence and retention, but given the motivation, wealth and resources one needs to be in this position it might be interesting to see how this population compares to the rest of the population which is a highly disadvantaged one.

**UCB:** No generalization can be made about AP credits. The same AP course will mean different things in different departments. There does not seem to be much coordination between departments. As a system, UCB could not come to a decision about which credit to grant where.

**UCD:** The course catalog has an extensive list of the courses for which AP credit is awarded. The campus has as defined set of what students can receive unit credit from for their AP exams and whether it can

count for specific courses. AP credit is utilized routinely and students rarely have questions about this. To make sure students have access to their classrooms, it was deemed undesirable for students with AP unit credit to leap frog over students without AP credits who are chronologically sophomores or juniors. AP credits no longer count for the students' standing relative to their priority to get into courses.

**UCLA:** The campus gives consideration of AP credit for University, college and department requirements. For University requirements, they are counted liberally towards graduation. There are a few different college requirements for which AP credit counts. The GE college requirements vary by college within the campus. For the most part, AP credit does not count for the GEs. The GEs are intended to be interdisciplinary types of classes and the AP courses do not provide the same types of experiences.

The departmental requirements also vary. When they are taken, the student needs to get a score of four and a three does not count. While three is a passing score, the argument is that students are disadvantaged because they would be placed at the next level but would not have the same experience. In Psychology, credit can be given for a score of four or five, but for a score of three students can get units and it does not count which means students still have to take Introductory Psychology. The same is true for Economics where a score of four or five count for Macro- or Micro-Economics but a three will not count. The vast majority of students come in with AP credit but the bottleneck at UCLA is at the upper division courses. The comment was made that it is unclear why students are given units if there is not a specific course for which the exam substitutes. UCLA tells students that they do not have to take the units towards graduation.

**UCSC:** The campus has a table about what students can earn for the AP courses but the table may be difficult for students to actually find. The table lists the course equivalencies but one problem is that unless the student is at the campus, this information is hard to understand. The campus overhauled the GE requirements about six years ago and every exam was reviewed by the CEP to determine if it would satisfy the GE requirements. A high percentage of these requirements can be satisfied by AP exams.

**UCR:** There is wide variation for what the AP exams count for. In some cases they count for units and in some cases they satisfy course requirements. In each college, different credit can be given for a given AP exam. AP units are counted toward the students' academic standing so students with more AP credit can potentially get higher enrollment priority compared to their peers.

Chair Larrabee suggested UCEP could write about how the policies vary across the campuses which would be interesting to consider. At UCM the most deliberation on AP scores has occurred during program reviews when this goes through Undergraduate Council. Having a structured conversation for a campus makes sense and may help connect the dots. Instead of looking at AP scores discretely for a discipline, considering from a campus perspective, or policy standpoint, what the variation may mean in terms of student experience could be a better approach. Chair Larrabee suggested looking at AP scores in relationship to the transfer pathways. Vice Chair Knowlton suggested that there may be more similarity about what departments count for lower division courses whereas the GE requirements have grown out of discussions at each campus so there may be less convergence there.

For students looking at the transfer pathways, UC has identified the superset of courses that would make students competitive anywhere. What would an AP score have to be in order for all campuses to count it? UCEP's chair asked if it would be satisfactory for the campuses to document the AP policies for the transfer pathways. After campuses review these policies, Chair Hare countered that there is still no explanation for why variation exists. When people outside of UC ask why there is variation, UC does not have much of an answer and stating that the variation comes down to individual faculty is not a sufficient response. This would only change the question to why the faculty across the campuses differ in their approach. It would be very helpful to have data from the campuses.

A member would be willing to ask colleagues at a different campus why the faculty will give a full year credit for AP credit whereas his campus will not. Data about the performance of students who come to UC with AP credit would be valuable. Finding the areas of agreement about how AP credit is counted would be a good start and then the campuses that are outliers could be asked if they would be willing to be flexible. One example is Chemistry where five UC campuses grant credit for AP math. The common ground could be defined and the divergence could be explained by what is covered in the course or campus specific requirements. Examples for some of the larger majors could be provided but this work may go beyond what the committee can do alone. In the future the committee may want to develop white papers that focus on issues like AP credit and access to UC.

**Action:** Chair Larrabee proposes that a first step is to create a document that summarizes all of the policies. In addition, UCEP will compile the questions that are being raised.

## **V. Budget Framework Initiative: Credit by Examination**

Chair Larrabee asked members to submit in writing their campus policies on Credit by Examination. Chair Hare indicated that UCEP should document the policies and asked the committee to provide explanations for why Credit by Examination is not used more frequently. Students may not be aware of the option, some campuses may have policies that make it difficult, and there is a workload issue for faculty having to write an exam are a few of the reasons.

**Discussion:** If students opt to take Credit by Exam and fail it, the failing grade is what will be on their transcript so this may be a reason Credit by Exam is used so rarely. UCLA seems to make it very difficult for students to take Credit by Exam although requiring a 3.5 GPA protects the students with lower GPAs. The fact that Credit by Exam is not utilized may reflect the fact that not be many students who come to UC have the knowledge required to pass the exam. With placement exams, UC already gives students a lot of credit for math. There could be similar opportunities to do this for students for coding or programming. It is not realistic to say that any professor should write exams. UCEP might discuss how UC already gives credit for placement.

Students may be put at risk if they actually do not possess the knowledge required to pass the test and students should be made aware of the risks. Chair Hare would like a short document that states that the Senate re-examined Credit by Examination policies and cite the consequences for students along with the other reasons mentioned today. UCEP may want to look at the literature on directed self-placement and what students do when they are aware of the rigor of a course. If one conclusion is that students are simply not aware of Credit by Examination the memo should state this. The memo could state that schools should do a better job of disseminating the policies and that there is very little demand for Credit by Examination. It is important that UC is able to show that the Senate made a good faith effort to examine the issues as the president asked.

## **VI. Catalog Rights**

Manager Peterson shared that IRAP quickly reviewed course catalogs to find statements about catalog rights. The question is whether it should be easier for UC students to come back and complete their degrees. One campus has indicated that courses are kept on the books in case students come back many years later. The Academic Planning Council discussed having an initiative to reach out to students who did not complete their UC degrees.

**Discussion:** Departments have broad discretion to help students complete their degrees. The language could be changed to be clearer. It could be as easy as saying that the campus will work with students who

want to come back and complete their degree. There is concern about the legal ramifications of stating that students have a right and maybe this language could be changed a bit. UCR cites a divisional Senate regulation that defines catalog rights which is unique and Provost Dorr asked if other Senates have similar regulations. The policy at UCSC says that students who have been out for more than two years have to use the new catalog. UCLA allows the catalog they were under or the new catalog even if it is after twenty years. Campuses seem to rely on an ad hoc approach.

This policy does not seem to be broken and these situations have not come up often. The UCSC representative indicated that this topic should be discussed with the divisional committee. Chair Hare would like a statement from UCEP that indicates that campuses have local mechanisms to accommodate these students but the policies should more clearly communicate what students need to do especially if they find that they have fallen out of catalog right time frames. If it is feasible to complete the original degree requirements or major and the field has not changed significantly, the request to return will be accepted. But there will be no guarantees if it is not feasible. In most cases, a returning student will have to speak with an advisor and work out an individual plan. Chair Larrabee asked members to discuss this issue with their local committees and if there is a statement they could add to their policies about students returning after a hiatus.

## **VII. Consultation with the Office of the President**

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

The Department of Education issued a letter to accreditors last week and the focus is on creating standard reporting to the Department from accreditors. It does not seem that WASC accreditation will change much in response to this letter. The letter indicates that if an institution has multiple years of positive accreditation, the accreditors can focus less on it. WASC does not think it needs to change anything but Manager Peterson will keep UCEP posted.

Manager Peterson asked if there are ways to show the value of a college degree, particularly a UC degree, to the general public in more than just economic terms. What is unique to a research institution as compared to a liberal arts college is one possible perspective. This is a longer-term project for IRAP.

**Discussion:** A member asked how to approach situations where the campus feels that some of the core competencies do not apply for certain disciplines. Manager Peterson indicated that this is a question that campuses are struggling with. UCM is looking at what it means to be a research institution in the Central Valley and UCLA is looking at the capstone majors. Since not every student will have the opportunity to conduct research with a faculty member, what are the other ways that students benefit from being at a research institution is one question. The fact that students are being taught by faculty who conduct research and this is what comes to the classroom should be highlighted. At a UC campus, there is an environment where people are asking questions and this really is unique.

## **VIII. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)**

- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, Innovative Learning Technology Initiative*

ILTI just closed its second RFP and there is representation from all campuses. It is hoped that all of the courses proposed can move forward. This would bring ILTI close to its goal of 150 courses including both hybrid and fully online courses. Only six of the courses offered now are hybrid and after the first year, the ILTI Steering Committee made the decision to fund online courses exclusively. Campuses can propose to offer a course as a hybrid course the first time and subsequently as a fully online course. The cross enrollment website is featuring and has links to the online courses offered by UC campuses over the summer. Interested students are directed to the campus websites.

Depending on the home campus and where the course is being offered, different options are available to students for where they can take exams. Students can take exams online through ProctorU. If everything for a course is online except for the exam, the course is considered fully online. UCD requires that students take all exams in person and ITLI provides support for and directs students to proctored exam centers where they take the exam in person. UCM will find a location for a face to face setting where students can take the exam in a proctored setting. Students have used Kaplan or proctoring services made available through community colleges.

Campuses are in the process of building their portion of the cross-campus enrollment system which will provide all enrollment information. This goal of the system is to further automate the enrollment system so that it happens as quickly and seamlessly as possible. Coordinator Osmundson reported that policies on simultaneous enrollment have been used by ILTI for the governing document about how decisions regarding student enrollment at other UC campuses is handled. Many of these policies have been in place a long time and apply to face to face courses but there are differences and variances in certain places. The Coordinator noted that it may be a good time to discuss whether the ideas that govern simultaneous enrollment still make sense or if there is an opportunity to revise and rethink some of the policies. The electronic system will be able to handle the variances with appropriate coding and noting if there is a change.

Another policy that Coordinator Osmundson would like to discuss is the requirement on some campuses that seniors be in residence and take all courses at the home campuses. This limits their ability to get the courses they may need that might be available online. Currently, except for UCSC and UCD, campuses require that students have completed a minimum of twelve units before taking an online course. One reason for this is related to financial aid. If students drop below the twelve unit requirement they will not be eligible for financial aid. If a student does drop below the twelve units, the student and registrar are notified immediately. The eligibility for enrollment is sent to the advisor or faculty member and the process can be delayed significantly. If the online course is part of the twelve units, this delay could easily jeopardize the financial aid. The automated enrollment and approval procedure in the hub happens simultaneously so aid would not be threatened.

The hub assumes that all students are full time unless students petition for and are given approval for a part-time status. Some campuses do allow part-time students to take courses at other campuses. The idea behind the twelve unit minimum and having all students be considered full time are two issues that UCEP is asked to consider. Transfer students could benefit if allowed to take an online course during summer session.

Another question is about being in good academic standing. This is for the term immediately prior the term in which a student wants to enroll. Students at campuses where the grades are not available have to wait longer to find out if they will be able to enroll in an online course. The add/drop period is another issue. Students have two weeks after the start of the instruction period to decide if they will add or drop a course. As the hub becomes more integrated, it will be possible for the request to be in a course and the approval to happen in a very short period of time. Extending the period for the add/drop period could be helpful.

There is a restriction that students are only able to take one online course from another UC campus during a given term. This applies to students who are in good standing. The thinking behind this was that it would be disruptive for students to travel to another campus for two courses. This problem is eliminated with online courses and this is another area where more flexibility would be helpful for students.

The final issue is related to course credit. UCEP has been asked in the past to consider the course review process. ILTI is asking what type of credit a campus or department is willing to grant for a course, for GE

or pre-major credit. Of the 120 or so ILTI courses, all have at least one instance, in addition to the home campus, of providing more than unit credit approval. In some instances, there are courses that have been approved by four UC campuses. Per Senate Regulation 544, it is possible that the other campuses could provide more than unit credit. This is another place where students can know the type of credit they will receive and this would be a significant bonus. GE and pre-major credit at UCSD has increased significantly after the articulation officer sent the information about the online courses to all six colleges. It would serve students well if UCEP looked at the course approval process to help students get the courses they need in order to graduate on time. Every term, at least half of the students are denied eligibility for reasons related to these policies. Many advisors recommend that students not take online courses.

**Discussion:** A member asked if the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements apply to UC's online courses and Manager Peterson reported that SARA does not in effect in California because the state has not successfully passed the requisite state legislation. At UCSC and UCD, students are able to count the online course toward the twelve units. It is still valuable for freshmen to experience the sense of community at their home campus but it may be time to reconsider the policy on simultaneous enrollment policies especially in light of issues with classroom space. At UCSC the individual contacted a pool of students who were one or two courses away from being able to graduate and encouraged them to take the online courses. UCEP could make a policy that would allow students to take more courses online. The committee discussed who should be asked what type of credit should be granted for an online course. Some campuses may not have fully considered what type of credit should be granted.

Coordinator Osmundson would like UCEP members to take the list of eight policy questions to their campuses and to meet with the committee again in June.

## **IX. The California State Auditor Report**

Chair Hare indicated that the fall out of the audit report will become clearer after seeing what happens with proposed legislation. There is a good deal of uncertainty.

**Discussion:** A member asked if there is any chance of UC campuses privatizing. This is unlikely at the campus level, but the self-supporting professional degree programs are a move in that direction. UC does not have a good model for how non-resident tuition is used. Socializing the non-resident tuition and using those funds to support quality is one idea but this would be very harmful to some campuses. Funding for the additional 5k students came from reducing the financial aid to non-resident students.

SCA-1 is back in a different form. This legislation will try to shorten the term of the Regents to four years which will turn it into a more political body than it is now. Problems with quality need to be highlighted. The Senate will need to state what is happening with quality since this information will not come from the administration. One suggestion is to gather information about the number of students who are unable to study the major they wanted. Another idea is to report the number of majors that have increased their restrictions.

## **X. Campus Reports/Member Items**

There were no Campus Reports.

## **XI. New Business**

There was no New Business.



## **XII. Executive Session**

The committee did not have an Executive Session.

**Meeting adjourned at:** 3:30 PM

**Minutes prepared by:** Brenda Abrams

**Attest:** Tracy Larrabee