

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, MAY 4, 2015**

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Jonathan Wurtele (UCB), Jack Vevea (UCM), Thomas Stahovich (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD) (telephone), Don Curtis (UCSF) (telephone), Phill Conrad (UCSB), Gabrielle Nevitt (UCD), Barbara Knowlton (UCLA), Simon Penny (Irvine), John Tamkun (UCSC), Mary Gilly (Chair, Academic Senate), Dan Hare (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Aimee Dorr (Provost and Executive Vice President), Pamela Brown (Vice President, Institutional Research and Academic Planning), Steven Handel (Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions), Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements

Chair Larrabee reported on the Academic Council's last meeting and the Provost's monthly Budget Call. Academic Council included a visit from representatives from Governor Brown's office, one of whom will join UCEP today. Council also discussed the revision to Senate bylaw 182, the draft of the new sexual harassment prevention policy, the UC policy on Copyright and fair use, and the opportunity for more UC faculty to publish in the online journal the *Conversation*. The Provost's Budget Call discussed UC Care and the Faculty Remuneration Study.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate

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

The ICAS legislative day involved meetings with several aides and one UCEP member participated. SB 15 unanimously passed out of the legislature. It is clear that legislators want to give more to UC but there would be strings attached. SB 15 would provide additional funding to UC (and CSUs) to buy out tuition increases if UC increases California undergraduate student enrollment by five thousand additional students each year for five years beginning this fall. The legislators are very focused on the wait list for admissions which UC campuses are using more. Another condition is increasing non-resident tuition which would result in fewer non-resident students coming to UC.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the Governor

- *Jason MacCannell, Governor's Office*
- *Pamela Brown, Vice President, Institutional Research and Academic Planning, UCOP*

Chair Larrabee welcomed Mr. MacCannell to the UCEP meeting and members introduced themselves. Vice President Brown from IRAP also joined UCEP for this discussion. Mr. MacCannell asked a number of questions.

Question: The first question is about student learning outcomes and whether work on this is done by individual faculty or by departments, or if it is done systematically across disciplines or campuses.

Discussion: Generally in education right now, there a focus on outcomes and accreditation agencies expect institutions to have outcomes. UC has to demonstrate that learning outcomes for students are being evaluated and that continuous efforts to improve the process are being made. The state is working on the implementation of Common Core and Mr. MacCannell is interested in learning if UC is moving in a similar direction. There was a discussion about assessment and learning objectives and it was suggested that Mr. MacCannell learn more about

WASC accreditation. It was noted that UCB has an undergraduate student learning initiative. Several members also described the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) requirements. ABET requires that students are tracked after leaving the program and this information is used to assess the program, not just the individual students.

Question: Mr. MacCannell asked if members are aware of badging or micro-credentials being used at UC as signals of student learning. The military utilizes badging and an increasing number of micro-credentials being used in technology.

Discussion: Certificates or credentials can be important professionally but these do not have credit associated with them and they are not part of the bachelor's degree process. University Extension offers courses to help students prepare for credential programs. With over 200k students, it would be very difficult for UC to manage certifications for a short series of courses with the existing staff and student affairs offices. It would be extremely expensive and would require hiring a large number of staff to keep track of students' progress. The cost benefit ratio of this should be explored because the cost of administering these programs would be substantially higher than expected.

Question: The impression that Mr. MacCannell's team has formed of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) is that it provides a way for faculty who want to bring their courses online to get resources to support this, which is good. But the question is whether there will be a move to identifying courses that are bottlenecks or with high failure rates, and having an RFP that is more targeted and asks for specific online solutions for particular educational problems.

Discussion: Vice Chair Hare responded that the last RFP did target high impact classes. The ILTI resources have been used to support courses that are not just purely online but courses that utilize a range of technologies. Faculty vary in terms of their belief in the value for their particular discipline whether a fully online solution would work.

Mr. MacCannell will review the last RFP and the awards that were made. Mr. MacCannell explained that the question was about whether data is being reviewed or if waiting list data or other sources of information is used to identify courses that are turning into stumbling blocks, whether resource based or content based stumbling block and then figuring out how to plug these resources into those problems directly rather than faculty just doing what they would like. The focus, according to Mr. MacCannell, is on ILTI because his understanding is that when the deal was made for that \$10M piece of the base budget increase it would be for an initiative like this. When asked about the administration's goals for online education, Mr. MacCannell explained that the Governor loves technology; that he views UC as a producer and transmitter of knowledge; and broadly when he looks at the 21st century and the business of knowledge, he thinks about technology.

As a leader, Governor Brown has always looked ahead to the next thing. From a public policy perspective, the idea of fitting more students into a classroom without having to build and staff more classrooms is attractive. However, Mr. MacCannell stated that it is up to faculty to tell the administration what works and does not work and how far policy makers can go. A member agreed that looking at online education as one of the tools is the right perspective, but there is still an important role for the kind of community that exists when students work together and there is research that supports the benefits of learning in a group. The point was made that, especially in the arts, there are pedagogical exchanges that are very difficult to transfer to online environments. For example, it is very difficult to understand how to teach dance online and an issue is that the right tools are not available to faculty.

Question: Regarding alternative credit, Vice President Brown was asked if there is an overall figure for its use that will show trends over time.

Discussion: It is a challenge at the systemwide level to track differences with how students are completing required units. Information on course enrollments may show how credit is being given. UC has not had a reason

to track this information so it is likely to be impossible to address the trend question. Mr. MacCannell asked about the information in the AB 94 report that indicated that Senate faculty are teaching a minority of 49% of student credit hours. Vice President Brown clarified that this is some of the information used to calculate the cost of instruction and that the 49% relates to undergraduate student credit hours, upper division is about 58% and graduate and professional is about 79%. There are different types of instructors and over time, fewer ladder rank faculty have been hired by the campuses which in part contributes to the number of student credit hours being taught by ladder rank faculty.

Vice President Brown has provided information to Mr. MacCannell on the entire faculty workload in addition to instruction which shows that faculty are teaching more student credit hours per faculty over time. Looking at the 49% in isolation does not provide a complete explanation of the work faculty are doing. Mr. MacCannell indicated that this question is related to the structure of education at UC and asked if UC would prefer to have more undergraduate instruction provided by Senate faculty or if the current mix is optimal. The augmentation of non-Senate faculty can be viewed as a strength and reflects UC's ability to attract experts who can address specific information to students. Members pointed out that the value of non-Senate faculty can vary based on the discipline and that there are both pedagogic and economic reasons to make use of non-Senate faculty. There is wide variation around the 49% and there should be no reason to assume that there is an optimal number from UCEP's standpoint. The individuals selected as Unit 18 lecturers possess outside professional practices and expertise. The utilization of Unit 18 lecturers differs from campus. The increased reliance over the years on temporary teachers to try to deal with the lack of faculty is a concern for UCEP. Different types of instructors are involved to help faculty meet the demands of UC's educational mission.

Mr. MacCannell thanked the committee for meeting with him.

V. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken during Executive Session.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator*

Currently, 72 courses are opened for cross campus enrollment. Since online cross campus enrollment system was implemented over 8k students have completed cross campus online courses. This includes students taking the course at their home campus and cross campus students. About 10% of the students are cross campus. Fifty of the courses were brand new and did not exist before ILTI. Two RFPs were issued this year. In window one, 17 fully online courses were funded and an 18th course may be funded and in window two, six fully online courses were provisionally funded. Three courses funded in window one are related to the President's global food initiative.

The goal was to have 150 courses that are developed and open for cross campus enrollment in three years and ILTI is on track to do this in 2016. Data on Spring enrollments for eighteen courses was reviewed. ILTI conducts an eligibility check through the home campus and students are notified within 24 to 48 hours that they have been approved to take a course. A new feature has been added to the enrollment system to track the reason a student is denied permission to take a course. Many of the issues are not having 12 units, not being in good academic standing, or that academic advisors recommend against the online courses. As the hub moves forward, a number of additional features will be added. The project coordinator reported that ILTI will begin emailing a certificate of completion and transcript to the students instead of mailing these documents.

Coordinator Osmundson reported that proctoring for online courses varies by campus and there are multiple challenges. 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. Finally, Coordinator Osmundson shared that a fourth RFP will be

issued in the summer and will be open until December.

Discussion: The low number of students who have enrolled in cross campus courses was discussed. Possible reasons for the low cross campus enrollment include the type of credit provided, advisor approval, students who drop because the course requires more work than they anticipated, or that students are simply unaware that the online courses exist. If students received credit for toward their degree and if advisors were more fully informed, there would be a major increase in cross campus enrollment. The point was made that students are unfamiliar with what it means to take an online course so more information needs to be made available to them. ILTI is attempting to help advisors and faculty develop a better understanding of the online experience.

The UCSC calculus course provides the students at that campus with an infrastructure and community that is not duplicated for students at other UC campuses. The chair emphasized that UCSC's online courses are successful because they are online class in a residential environment. The cross campus enrollment effort will not be successful until ILTI provides for remote TAs and tutoring because students are not expected to survive with the online courses alone. 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.

It is very possible for students to cheat on ProctorU so one member would prefer that students take the exams in person. It was suggested that ILTI could invest in regional testing centers but Coordinator Osmundson reported that some proctoring centers charge up to \$150 for one person to take an exam. Reportedly, articulation officers and some faculty at UC are concerned that there is no overall policy at the community colleges for online courses where there was no in person or proctored exam. If UC does not have its own policy, the University is not in a good position require one at the community colleges. UCEP should think about the process, security and verification of people taking online exams for credit and the committee should have a discussion about authenticating student work. Faculty need to have flexibility and students need to understand what they need to do.

Action: Members will share the slide on proctoring with their local committees and gather feedback and suggestions.

VII. Member Items/Campus Reports

Davis: The campus honor code is thirty years old and the member asked if other campuses have modernized their codes. Some are general enough that they would not require updating. At least one campus does not have an honor code and other campuses may not update their honor codes. Members were asked to share their honor codes.

Santa Cruz: The members were asked about campus policies related to deadlines for declaring a major and how much time students have to figure this out before it becomes problematic. The major declaration deadlines and criteria for admission to majors vary widely from campus to campus. UCSC is trying to get departments to screen students for admission to majors early. From a systemwide perspective, how the educational programs and admissions policies inform one another should be examined. At what point and with how much rigor are students required to have a major at each of the campuses and how much time do they have to figure it out before they are in serious trouble. Campuses that do not have this issue, such as UCR, might share techniques with those that do. A related issue is restricting access because of resource issues.

Action: Members are to report on the "major declaration" or "major qualification" and whether it is competitive or evidence based ability to complete the major. This is for all majors, including impacted majors.

VIII. Streamlining Transfers

- *Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Aimee Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, UCOP*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*

The Senate continues to work on identifying appropriate pathways, but for this effort to be effective, campus Admissions personnel have to be on board and understand what faculty are asking of them. The campuses need to have the resources to up date the information on their websites. Chair Gilly and Vice Chair Hare will speak with the chancellors this week about the support needed from the campuses. The meetings with life sciences, physical and social sciences faculty were described. Not every campus was represented at each meeting. After the agreements, Chair Gilly emailed the chairs of the departments two or three weeks ago but has not received any responses. Chair Gilly has received feedback indicating that no actual policy changes are needed at the campuses to implement the strategies devised for streamlining transfer. However it is still very critical to make sure that the campuses and the divisional counterparts to UCEP and BOARS are informed and on board. The pathways are designed to allow students to complete the major in just two additional years, broad enough to accommodate campus variation, and small enough to allow students to fulfill some of their breadth requirements at the community college. There is not a mandate to the campuses to change campus specific expectations, curricula or admissions practices.

Provost Dorr indicated that faculty have primary responsibility for making the changes happen at the campus but there is an administrative component that is handled by admissions offices which AVP Handel and Student Affairs coordinates. The President is interested in this effort, so it will be important to make sure that the results are presented in a way that will be useful from a political perspective. It is important for UC to be able to represent what faculty have decided about recommended preparation in a way that is very easy for students, parents, and advisors to understand. What is available now is not that easy to understand and the ASSIST website, while complete, can be overwhelming and is very hard to navigate. The presentation needs to have the systemwide recommendations and how they relate to CSU template and the ADT for community colleges. Because of AB 1440, the CSUs have created templates for most of their majors that have been adopted by most of the CSUs and all of the community colleges are creating new associate degrees that meet these templates.

There will be a discussion about creating a UC website that makes UC's expectations clear and makes it clear how these expectations relate to the Associate Degrees for transfer. This work needs to be done by UCOP. The provost does not believe that each campus should be responsible for representing their information. Therefore, if there is one agreement about preparation for a major there should be one place that has this information to which the campuses refer. UC has to be careful to say that this is about preparation for the major. Each campus should not make a different representation about what preparation is supposed to look like. Chair Gilly underscored that the recommendations are not requirements and what is being done is to provide students with clear advice about how to prepare. Students can still apply for transfer without the recommended preparation. The campuses can make their own decisions about who will be reviewed. Chair Gilly asked members to follow up with people at their campuses to finalize the recommendations.

Discussion: Chair Larrabee reported that some engineers from different UC campuses are discussing the importance of making UC's requirements for transfer clear. Stating that there is a clear standard for preparation for UC is not the same as saying that if that preparation is completed the students will be admitted to all UCs, and this difference needs to be obvious. Some individuals at the campuses are under the mistaken impression that this is a completely administrative effort. It is important that the individual allowed to speak on behalf of a program is the person who is contacted otherwise random faculty are being contacted. The UCSC representative contacted several individuals at that campus following the meeting of life sciences faculty and received commitments that the streamlined requirements are acceptable for their majors.

According to Provost Dorr, the president has been concerned about getting this work done and has spoken to the chancellors about the streamlining effort. It will be discussed again at the next Council of Chancellors meeting.

The work done by the faculty at these meetings is important but there are still challenges ahead. The UCB representative agreed to follow up with the relevant people at his campus. UC cannot say that there is buy-in across the campuses if the campuses are not completely on board. UCEP members should share the information with their local CEPs and follow up with individuals who have not responded. In addition, UCEP members can help dispel rumors that this effort has been imposed by UCOP. Members should also check with the BOARS representatives at their campuses about the individuals who need to be informed. Vice Chair Hare indicated that the goal is to have meetings of eleven more majors next October. Faculty participants in the meetings to date have stated that they appreciate having a role in shaping who the transfer students will be. There are benefits to the campuses themselves. A member expressed concern about the variability across the system for when transfer students have to declare their major. Members suggested comparing data on transfer students and native freshman. Chair Gilly will send message to UCEP members explaining how they are being asked to assist at their campuses.

IX. Report on the Systemwide Natural Reserve System Field Course

UCEP received answers to the committee's final set of questions. Chair Larrabee recommended granting final systemwide approval to this course.

Discussion: Members agreed that the course should be approved.

Action: The course proposer will be notified that the course has UCEP's approval.

X. New Business

Academic Planning Manager Peterson will forward a link to information about the community colleges feeder schools. At the national level there is a conversation about changing accreditation and one idea is to de-link accreditation to financial aid. The message is that the accreditors should be focused on high-risk institutions. One member stated that the WASC accreditors do not understand that UC is very different from the University of Phoenix. It was also noted that accreditation is important for students trying to get into medical schools and it is also tied to financial aid. If UCEP meets in June, it might be worthwhile to have a longer discussion about WASC.

Meeting adjourned at: 3 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee