

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

## Videoconference Minutes

Monday, January 22, 2024

**Attending:** Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), A. Katie Harris, Vice Chair (UCD), Darlene Francis (UCB), Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD), Jose Antonio Rodriguez-Lopes (UCI), Catherine Sugar (UCLA), Christopher Viney (UCM), Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Madeleine Norris (UCSF), Ben Hardekopf (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), Megan Chung (Undergraduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy Development, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Carmen Corona (Director, Academic Planning and Policy, IRAP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

## I. Chair's Updates

Chair Cocco updated the proposed policy on awarding degrees posthumously following the committee's January 5<sup>th</sup> discussion and sent the changes to the chair of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). CCGA agreed with UCEP's proposed revisions and the memo will be transmitted with the proposed policy to Academic Council. Members were invited to suggest topics that should be explored by the Senate's artificial intelligence (AI) workgroup.

**Discussion:** The committee's ideas for the AI workgroup included: academic integrity; working with AI in the classroom; how to vet technology around AI (how to ensure the information is accurate); level of AI use: e.g., distinguishing text generators from grammar checkers etc (one provides ideas, the second checks your ideas as standard English); appropriate versus inappropriate collaboration between UC and tech companies (compare OpenAI and Arizona State); bias and stereotype enhancement: there are levels of bias in the input training data/sets, in the analytic algorithms themselves); information versus knowledge; ensuring students are actually learning, still going through the learning process, and able to apply their knowledge to higher level questions and/or case studies; and implications for testing (AI generated questions, AI grading).

## II. Consent Calendar

**Action:** The committee approved today's agenda.

## III. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)

- *Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning & Policy Development, IRAP*
- *Carmen Corona, Director, Academic Planning & Policy, IRAP*

Director Corona let the committee know about the January 29<sup>th</sup> workshop on undergraduate education and the congress on artificial intelligence scheduled for February 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>. IRAP is preparing items for the May Regents meeting including an update on the compact with the governor and a report on how UC is bridging the equity gap and increasing graduation rates through pedagogical innovations. IRAP is also monitoring a campus pilot looking at the first year experience through a degree navigator approach. Executive Advisor Greenspan shared that IRAP released the fall enrollment dashboard which members can use to see how their individual campus is doing with enrollment of California residents and non-residents. The dashboard can

be found here: <https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/about-us/information-center/fall-enrollment-glance>

Undergraduate California resident enrollment grew by a headcount of over 4k in one year which does not meet the goal to grow by 8k but is still a significant increase in access. The media reports frame the decrease in non-resident enrollment at UCB, UCLA, and UCSD as a good development. In terms of FTE, IRAP is estimating that UC will have grown about 6,400 FTE over the last two years including fall and summer courses and this is again short of the targets in the compact. An upcoming letter from the president will ask each campus to grow enough to reach the 8k California resident target next year. In the next few weeks, the Office of the President will release graduation and first year retention rate data.

IRAP received another batch of California Community College (CCC) baccalaureate degree proposals and feedback regarding the duplication of any UC programs is due this week. Executive Advisor Greenspan will send UCEP information about the Community College League (the lobbying arm of the CCCs) bill to create a pilot program for bachelor of science in nursing (BSN) at 15 community colleges. The California State University system opposes this bill because it offers most of the BSNs in the state.

**Discussion:** Since there is a major difference between AI developed in industry settings versus AI developed in academic settings, the February congress on AI should include speakers from Google or ChatGPT, for example, to share what is happening in the real world.

#### **IV. Minor Updates to the Compendium**

Today's agenda includes a link to a Google Doc with potential minor revisions to the Compendium. The analyst compiled this list based on members' comments last year regarding what should be updated and an enclosure in the agenda packet was prepared by IRAP. Chair Cocco explained the reasons for each of the suggested changes which includes the information UCEP would like campuses to provide in proposals for new schools and colleges.

**Discussion:** Executive Advisor Greenspan noted that the Compendium refers to specific things in CCGA's handbook. The Compendium could point to UCEP's systemwide course and program self-study template but the document itself would not be included in the Compendium.

**Action:** Members will send any additional suggestions to Chair Cocco by the 30<sup>th</sup> and the chair will forward the list to Chair Steintrager.

#### **V. UCSD School of Computing, Information, and Data Sciences Full Proposal**

- *Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD) and Ben Hardekopf (UCSB)*

UCEP's review of the pre-proposal identified several issues regarding UCSD's proposed School of Computing, Information and Data Sciences. UCSD is proposing combining two existing entities to fix an already impacted major and provide access to data science courses for students not in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics majors. The faculty will either be based at the School or have joint appointments, and the School is funded primarily through a combination of a healthy endowment and Master's program revenue in addition to the standard sources related to enrollment. The reviewer's draft memo indicates the questions about the pre-proposal that have not been clearly addressed in the full proposal including: how the School will handle non-majors taking their classes; the lack of clear transfer pathways; if there will be enough teaching assistants to meet the growth of the major; where the advisors will

come from; and what the sources of support outside the classroom will be; continued fund-raising is required to sustain the school. Although the proposal is well-thought out, there are several glaring omissions since the previous UCEP review was not addressed.

**Discussion:** Members agreed that joint appointments can generally be problematic in terms of how merit and promotion and knowing who is in charge, and UCEP should flag this as an issue that could impact the teaching quality. The committee expressed concerns about the proposers not explicitly addressing concerns raised about the pre-proposal, and talked about UCEP's role and authority in the approval process. Chair Cocco explained that UCEP's memo can empower UCSD's divisional Senate to point out elements of the program the systemwide Senate identified as needing improvement.

Some weaknesses the reviewers highlighted are more appropriately addressed at the local level and the reviewers are not opposed to the School. Members debated having a vote on the proposal versus sending a memo to the proposers asking for responses to the unanswered questions. The point was made that UCEP should assert its right to ask proposers for missing information and that the committee should not set a precedent of approving proposals that are not fully responsive to the Senate's concerns. It is important that UCEP provide quality assurance and slow down the process even if it seems the train has left the station by the time a proposal is sent to the committee. Chair Cocco observed that there could be a Senate policy requiring that full proposals address questions raised in the review of a campus's pre-proposal.

**Action:** A majority of the committee members voted in favor of sending a memo to be drafted by Chair Cocco to the proposers requesting answers to UCEP's questions.

#### **VI. Updated Statement on UC Quality**

- *Catherine Sugar (UCLA) and Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR)*

Chair Cocco wants the committee to finalize the statement on UC quality so it can be transmitted to Academic Council. The representatives would like to make sure that the concerns members have previously highlighted have been addressed.

**Discussion:** The committee talked about the potential audiences for the statement and debated additional changes. Chair Cocco will draft a cover memo to Chair Steintrager and the representatives will send an updated version to the listserv for a final review but no substantive changes will be made after today's discussion.

**Action:** The committee voted unanimously to approve the statement on UC quality.

#### **VII. UC Sacramento Center**

This item was not discussed.

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

There were no campus reports or member items.

#### **IX. New Business/Executive Session**

Members suggested changes to the draft statement on the APC workgroup on doctoral education report:

UCEP appreciates the time and effort that the APC workgroup on the Future of Doctoral Education made in drafting their recent report. There are challenges to the University in accommodating higher salaries for TAs. Although it may be tempting to cut the number of TA positions, UCEP emphasizes the importance of TA support to the quality of education at the UC. In some cases like labs, TAs are absolutely required for both pedagogical and safety reasons. In other cases, TAs provide essential feedback to students needed to ensure their development. This text will be further edited by email.

Videoconference adjourned at: 12:40 PM  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: Melanie Cocco