

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 6, 2016

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Barbara Knowlton, Vice Chair, (UCLA), Jeffrey Stoppie (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Thomas Stahovich (UCR), Edward Caswell-Chen (UCD), Simon Penny (UCI), Tara Javidi (UCSD), Michael Burawoy (UCB), 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

The Academic Council discussed issues related to the Regents, the State Audit, and the positive review of UC Mexus. The Council will recommend that a member of the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications participate on the Cyber-risk Advisory Board. The Academic Planning Council spent time on self-supporting graduate programs, five year planning perspectives, and the international activities policy. The multi-year plan for enrollment, the role of summer session in meeting enrollment goals, and graduate enrollment growth and its effect on undergraduate enrollment growth were also discussed. The Provost's Monthly Budget call focused mainly on the State Auditor's report.

Vice Chair Knowlton called into the ICAS discussions about the transfer pathways and the Course Identification numbers (C-ID). UC exceeded its goal for the number of majors that would have a transfer pathway. It was difficult to create majors for engineering as well as for some campus specific life science majors but there are now pathways for the vast majority of the UC majors. Discrepancies with the C-ID numbers are being worked out at the Community Colleges.

Vice Chair Chalfant described the budget proposals from the State Assembly's budget committee and Senate. The Assembly would ask UC to enroll more than 30K students in six years but their plan would call for a reduction of non-residents by 1700 per year and the California students are not fully funded at the in-state rate. There has to be agreement on one budget by June 15th and Governor Brown can line item veto various provisions. At the most recent Regents meeting, UCB's financial situation was discussed in closed session. The plan for the next three Regents meetings, starting in July, is for three campuses to report on students' time to degree, diversity and the financial situation. President Napolitano invited the Regents to bring constructive ideas on how to deal with diversity to the next meeting.

Executive Director Baxter and Assistant Director Banaria joined the videoconference to acknowledge the work of the UCEP analyst and all of the Senate analysts with the committees.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: Chair Larrabee asked for members to send corrections to the minutes within the next 24 hours and the minutes will be considered approved at that point.

III. Report on the Committee on Preparatory Education's English for Multilingual Students (EMS) Advisory Group Meeting

- *Anne Zanzucchi, Merritt Writing Program Director, UCM*

The UCM representative reported on the meeting of UCOPE's EMS Advisory Group in May. Some agenda topics were related to issues discussed by UCEP including advanced placement. The Advisory

Group has become increasingly important because of the increase of international students at UC. In addition to campus reports, the Chair and Chief Reader for the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) provided a report that touched on multilingual students and placement. Several campuses have added oral communication courses and other courses that meet AWPE requirements on language and culture. The SAT writing sample was mentioned and there is a question about whether the score of 680 should be reconsidered by UCOPE but UCEP may want to connect on this issue. A 1990 white paper on the needs of EMS and international students may be revisited and updated with current information by the Advisory Group. This report may touch on issues related to education policy such as advanced placement.

Discussion: The issues on the Advisory Group's agenda are very pertinent to UCI and the representative would like to make sure that the information from the EMS Advisory Group is shared with the relevant people at that campus. There is a need for coordination between UCOPE's initiatives and the campus Education Policy committees and the UCI representative asked for a summary from the UCM representative including information about the Advisory Group's members. The approved minutes from the Advisory Group meeting will be shared by the analyst with UCEP.

IV. Budget Framework Initiative: Awarding of Advanced Placement (AP) Credit Across the UC System

The UCB representative provided a report that includes the information that the other UC campuses should prepare. Although UCEP may meet in July, the committee members may not be able to collect this information within the next month. UCEP should share best practices on how AP credit is awarded in a clear way and at the very least communicate this information with all the campuses. The UCB representative explained that he was able to locate someone at that campus, with administrative experience working at different colleges, who understood the problem of how AP credit is handled. This person pulled together the information as a set of principles. A key point is the distinction between using AP in a terminal sort of way and using it as a way of building on a major. In the latter case, for building the content of a major, AP is less likely to be used because it does not help with the specific requirements of a major. AP is more likely to be used when it is a terminal requirement.

Discussion: The justification that the UCB provided is what is sought from the other campuses. This information is probably not available publicly so members will have to find someone on campus with this knowledge. Chair Hare reported that the main object is not to collate what the campuses do, but to explain what the justifications are for managing AP credit differently. It is not necessary for all of the campuses to have the same policies. Chair Hare agreed that the UCB information is exactly what is needed to take back to the governor who is concerned with time to degree and finding ways for students to get credit. This justification provides that UC has reasonable policies which have been well thought out and that the same policies may not be in the best interest of each and every student. A member suggested providing information systemwide and distributing this to departments so they can articulate on why their departments are not as lenient as others in giving credit for AP exams. Some of these departments may consider becoming more flexible in the future.

Vice Chair Knowlton commented that the explanation provided by UCB is consistent with what happens at UCLA. The vice chair proposes that the committee discuss general units, university requirements, GE and major specific requirements in this order. UCEP has good information from each campus but not the same level of information that UCB has now provided in the general comments. Members might need to talk with people in the campus advising offices to gather specific information. At UCD, AP cannot count for any GE courses. The Davis catalog indicates explicitly what AP classes can be used for and this is similar to the information now available for UCB. It is important to note that students may have taken the AP course several years before matriculating to UC and what they can recall and utilize from that course may be very limited, so it may be harmful for students especially in some of the intense majors.

Chair Larrabee suggested that the campuses have a lot in common but the committee does not know this officially and that the level of information available for UCB and UCD is not available for the other campuses. Chair Hare would like each campus to provide a specific report like the one from UCB and UCEP could then make any generalized statements that are needed. After UCEP has all nine statements from the campuses, the commonalities can be summarized and the differences pointed out as they relate to specific needs. The report from UCEP needs to be submitted by December.

The UCI representative recommended developing a specific list of questions that would be taken to the campus committees. Chair Larrabee and Vice Chair Knowlton could work on the questions after the videoconference but Vice Chair Chalfant pointed out that specific questions about AP credit were included in UCEP's May agenda. Chair Hare would like UCEP to prepare a report to the Academic Council as an information item in the fall and after it is received this report will be posted on the Senate website. This would be the end product in terms of the budget framework initiative but to what extent individual campuses and departments wish to do their own follow up work later on is up for them to decide. The justifications provided by the campuses should not be second guessed by UCEP and it should be made clear that there is no push to standardize. There will be interest in why the campuses do not align.

Everyone has stated that the narrative on page three of the UCB report looks familiar but Chair Larrabee indicated that the next step is for members to provide official responses for each campus that will be published. The UCD representative indicated that he can easily begin drafting a response to the three questions and Chair Larrabee asked all members to try drafting responses for the October UCEP meeting. A member pointed out that there will be complicated and varied sets of reasons provided by the campuses about how they award AP credit and that justifying the variations will be complicated. Chair Hare responded that while this may be true, it is not a valid reason to not conduct this work. It will be very problematic if the conclusion is that the information is all historical and not contemporary. Chair Larrabee emphasized that page three of the UCB document is the model for what the other members should provide.

Action: Chair Larrabee asked members to have a draft response prepared for UCEP's fall meeting.

V. Budget Framework Initiative: Credit by Examination

The committee has collected information about Credit by Examination and a summary of this information needs to be prepared. Chair Hare suggested that UCEP should point out the commonalities that have been identified as well. This is connected to the budget framework objective of making sure that UC provides as much opportunity as possible for students to get credit for their prior experiences and not have to repeat classes on subjects that some of them may have mastered by alternative means.

Action: The chair and analyst will work on the report on Credit by Examination policies at the campuses.

VI. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

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

ILTI has not reached the level of cross campus enrollment it would like to achieve and there are barriers to cross campus enrollment at various campuses. At some campuses students must already have a full schedule before being allowed to take an online course or policies that prohibit students from taking an online course in their first quarter. Chair Larrabee indicated that ILTI has sought a UC rule that indicates when students can take cross campus courses. ILTI already has collected the various campus policies. The point was made that the extra five thousand students has changed the situation for UC and this may be a reason for UCEP to reconsider the questions posed by ILTI to help with bottlenecks.

Coordinator Osmundson received feedback from UCD on the eight policy questions she brought to UCEP in May. The Davis representative shared the questions with the Office of the Registrar, the Undergraduate Deans and the Education Policy committee. The Registrar's feedback suggests that there would not be impediments to enrolling students in cross campus courses. The residence question is not clear and UCD's committee on Rules and Jurisdiction was asked for clarification but the response provided was also unclear. Overall, for UCD the questions did not present big problems. The Registrar and UCD representative should take this information back to the Council of Undergraduate Deans. The campus provided some feedback on the website. Unrelated to the eight questions, the UCD faculty raised concerns about the pedagogy of some of the online courses. Coordinator Osmundson indicated that there is a ninth question that she would like UCEP to address.

Discussion: The UCD faculty are critical of the cross-campus enrollment plan. At a campus, there is already competition for resources and cross campus enrollment would lead to competition among the campuses. Vice Chair Chalfant pointed out the committee's somewhat contradictory positions related to the awarding of AP credit and allowing cross campus enrollment. There are concerns about pedagogy in the online courses. There is concern about students joining an online course where the support may not be available if they have problems. Transfer students have a difficult time adjusting to the quarter system and it is helpful to have a quarter to help with that adjustment.

Vice Chair Knowlton asked the coordinator for a copy of the slide that showed the campus variation. Coordinator Osmundson will share the matrix showing the differences with the committee and the information about the type of credit will be included. Even for staunch advocates of online courses there are questions such as arranging for adequate oversight to ensure that the person taking the test is who it should be. People did not disparage the courses per se but the point was made that the resources should be available so these courses could be offered in house. Coordinator Osmundson is particularly interested in how incorporating technology can impact the quality of teaching and how the information about student learning can be used to strengthen teaching and how students are learning. In some respects the online courses are more amenable to assessment. How much time students spend online studying a course is available to faculty and it has been found to improve how students perform in the course.

At UCLA, people are willing to embrace new technologies and to help with impacted courses. In contrast, there is concern about cross campus courses which limit support, such as access to office hours or other resources, that support student learning. There might be less resistance to online courses and a better use of resources if ILTI were to focus on courses that are specific to a campus. ITLI courses are being found to have the biggest impact on students at the home campuses. In the cross-campus environment, there is an opportunity for collaboration which is powerful. Rich conversations happen around cross campus courses and a question is whether this would be lost if cross campus enrollment was eliminated.

VII. New Business

Chair Larrabee announced that UCEP will not have an in-person meeting in July and the analyst suggested that members keep the date on their calendars just in case a videoconference is needed.

The analyst shared an article with the committee about a Wall Street Journal study about international students and cheating, and the UCI member asked whether UCEP should discuss it. The source of the data is not clear but it was noted that four UC campuses are listed on a graph with the article. The UCI member indicated that the committee should try to address this report before next fall. The UCI representative will send the listserv ideas about how UCEP can proceed and the analyst will bring the study to the attention of Senate leadership.

VIII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:55 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee