UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, January 6, 2020

Attending: John Serences, Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter, Vice Chair, (UCD), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Paul Goldstein (UCSD), Mary Lynch (UCSF), Ted Bennett (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Ann Marie Martin (Graduate Student), Ellen Osmundson (Coordinator, ILTI), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair, Academic Senate), Mary Gauvain (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Updates

The Chair announced changes to the agenda. A preliminary report from the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) was discussed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) this past Friday and there is significant pressure from the Regents to stop using the SAT and ACT for UC admissions. ICAS is planning its annual Legislative Day for early March. Chair Serences reported that there is growing support to allow students to use preferred names on diplomas and other documents. UCEP may send Council a letter asking that preferred names be used on diplomas for 2020. Members are asked to find out about campus efforts to use preferred names. The committee will discuss the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 544 today, including concerns about the ambiguity of part D.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: The December meeting minutes were approved.

III.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
  - *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Senate*
  - *Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Bhavnani reported that the search for a new vice president for research is well underway. The Public Policy Institute for California (PPIC) issued a report in response to a request for more data from the Senate about Area D, which is part of the A-G requirements. Several years ago, the Assembly passed a three part proposal for Area D to revise its name, add related courses and to require three sciences to be eligible for UC. After this action by the Assembly, Provost Brown expressed concern that requiring three sciences would discourage some students from applying to UC and that some schools are unable to offer three sciences. The PPIC report provides data related to this issue and Chair Bhavnani noted that the Next Generation Science Standards, to be issued in the near future, will require students to take three sciences. The Assembly may reconsider its approval of this requirement.

On Friday, BOARS discussed and provided feedback on the STTF's draft report, but Chair Bhavnani cannot share its content at this point. The report is to be finalized in time for the January 29th Academic Council meeting. After it is approved by Council, it will be sent out for a 45 day systemwide review by the Senate and then sent to the president who will take it to the Regents in May. UCEP will have time to discuss it on March 2nd. Chair Bhavnani indicated that the Working Group on Comprehensive Access has completed its report and the president will eventually issue a statement on it. The policy on Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act is being reconsidered based on comments from the Native American Council and other groups.

IV.   Student Fees Beyond Tuition

A UCI faculty member developed an online tool needed for quizzes and tests which students had to pay for and he reportedly kept the money from its sales. In response, UCI created a task force which produced a set of recommendations about limiting fees students must pay for various instructional materials.

Faculty are encouraged to evaluate whether additional fees are justified. One question is whether students who take online courses are required to pay for proctoring.

Discussion: The UCI representative explained that faculty who author textbooks for their lectures were alarmed that the task force might recommend that faculty should not be allowed to profit from sales of the texts. However, the final report does not include this recommendation. UCI students pay for proctoring when they use an off campus site but not for proctoring on the campus. Bulk negotiation for learning management systems may be difficult because of different faculty needs. A member suggested that books should not be included in the definition of materials. One idea is to flag the need for an evaluation if students have to pay more than a certain dollar amount. The recommendation that a "no-cost equivalent should be made available" puts faculty at risk being sued.

The UCM representative indicated that he weighs the cost of textbooks for his students and found a low-cost option. Members agree, however, that the burden to limit the cost of instructional materials should not be on faculty. A suggestion is to establish a financial conflict of interest policy for costs over a certain threshold for a course. UCD's administration is negotiating costs of textbooks. Director Greenspan provided a link to system guidance on fees. The UCB representative commented that only one textbook is available for a particular course. Faculty might be asked to justify the use of costly materials and a campus committee could assess whether the textbook chosen is the best option. There is a question about infringing on a faculty member's academic freedom by weighing in on the textbooks selected. The committee is also concerned about discouraging the development of new and excellent teaching materials for undergraduates. The analyst will share information about open source textbooks.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning*

Campuses revised their enrollment targets for fall 2020 in order to achieve the growth required by the legislature and UCOP has asked them to increase the number of students by 60 to 90. Campuses wanted flexibility in how to add the FTE, such as by adjusting freshman transfer targets, and the president will soon announce the final enrollment targets. Rather than simply distributing $10M in state funding to the campuses, the provost issued an RFP for baccalaureate degree completion programs. A couple of chancellors are interested in a developing a systemwide degree completion proposal and $5M has been set aside for this. The RFP language is broad enough to allow for programs that will enable anyone to complete their degrees but the first priority is to serve people who have not completed their UC degrees and the second is to serve California residents. The RFP requires the program to be self-sustaining after the grant period. UCOP estimates there are about 50K people who left UC before completing their degrees. Other states have model degree completion programs. The legislation allows this funding to be used for professional degree certificates which might be done through Extension. Director Greenspan shared that the Regents will receive a presentation on graduate students, noting that the state does not provide funds to UC for graduate student enrollment.

Discussion: The RFP has been discussed at UCM but there is little momentum at that campus in part because faculty did not express interest in creating a new academic program.

VI. Consultation with Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)
- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI*

The revision of SR 544 aims to address several central issues. Since campus Committees on Courses of Instruction approve online courses, the courses should be able to offer more than unit credit and this point will be in the preamble. To give students increased access to needed courses, they should be considered in good standing until there is a reason to drop them. The type of credit received currently varies and UCEP has previously discussed that it would be challenging to standardize the credit awarded across the campuses. The Cross Campus Enrollment System provides information about equivalent courses, and using the course outline may help develop more information about course equivalence and credit

provided. The regulation currently stipulates that students are responsible for determining the type of credit they will receive.

Discussion: The good standing issue as it relates to payment of student fees is an administrative matter and Chair Serences noted that the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has been asked for a definition of good standing. Over time, the types of credit that have been awarded for online courses will be available in a database. At UCSC and UCSD students have to find out about the credit they will receive before taking a course. It seems problematic to encourage students to take the course before knowing the type of credit to be granted. The proposed revision to 544D seems vague and open-ended because it is not clear who is responsible for the work involved. Vice Chair Potter pointed out that SR 544 applies not just to ILTI courses but to all courses and that the current system works well. Coordinator Osmundson will provide UCEP with an explanation of what the goal for SR 544 D is for further discussion.

VII.   Systemwide Review: UC Washington D.C. Center

UCEP will discuss the report on the review of the Washington D.C. Center in February but the UCSD representative provided an overview. The Center's impact and potential is viewed positively but it has undergone growing pains related to its remoteness and specialized nature. The program was consolidated in 2010 and there has been ongoing consolidation of multiple programs into a single center, and some issues are related to centralization versus autonomy and redundancy. Most suggestions in the report are related to organization. A review in 2016 suggested changes in the reporting structure and these are ongoing. Several issues are related to the reporting relationship to UCOP and the time difference makes use of centralized facilities difficult. The financial support from UCOP is substantial. Issues related to geographical distance may have to be dealt with.

The Center still has elements of different campus programs. The program is not at a big enough scale to pay for itself or average out in terms of costs in part because the Center manages its building and tenants (a unique situation). The information technology functions are provided in-house and on-site, causing complications and stress for staff. The report does not suggest that there is a major need for additional resources although the staffing has not increased since 2016. Campus relationships with the Center vary and it was noted that UCLA has an administrator. Chair Serences reminded the reviewers to focus on any undergraduate education issues raised by the report such as if accessibility varies by campus.

VIII.   Update on Principles for Working with Students who are Incarcerated or Formerly Incarcerated

The UCD representative reported that an outline and overview of the issues related to working with students who are or have been incarcerated have been drafted. The representative is looking into how many of these students already have a high school degree or higher. One focus is on why working with this population might be beneficial for Californians such as savings of public funds, reducing recidivism and educating a diverse population. The representative is also investigating existing programs within UC and California Community College programs that may serve as a pipeline to four year degree programs.

Some of the challenges with this work include the preparation of students, screening for admissions, access, and transfers. The average stay in prison is 18 months and an issue for in prison programs is that punitive responses to an inmate's behavior will disrupt participation. Lockdowns will prevent students from attending courses. Policies on readmission, mid-quarter transfers, transfer of credits upon release and resolution of incompletes if access is cut off mid-term are other challenges. UCEP should discuss whether the course rigor and content of in prison programs should be the same as on campus offerings. Programs in the State of New York emphasize the importance of equivalence. Access to advising resources, career counseling, and the unique aspects of advising for this population require consideration. The representative will reach out to individuals within UC already working with this population for input

on the draft principles after UCEP's review. The principles will also eventually be shared with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and submitted to Council.

IX.   Teaching Evaluation Task Force

Chair Serences explained that a Task Force was established by the Senate last spring to look at teaching evaluations at UC. The analyst will give members access to the Box folder with several campus reports which should not be distributed until further notice and the members have received the report from the Centers on Teaching and Learning (CTL). Campuses use different types of questionnaires for student course evaluations. One recommendation is that a second form of evaluation should be provided. Student course evaluations have been found to be biased. The CTL and campus reports note the need for a cultural shift so the focus is on the student experience. There is agreement that the current system is problematic but viable alternatives are not clear. Members are asked to get feedback on the reports from the divisions.

Discussion: UCI requires faculty to include a statement on teaching which does not seem to make a difference in the personnel review and granting of tenure. UCI has also attempted to use peer reviews but reviewers have reportedly been unwilling to express negative opinions about their colleagues who may later be in a position to weigh in on a personnel action. UCR's Committee on Academic Personnel carefully considers the teaching evaluations and negative evaluations will impact tenure. At UCD, the peer reviews are usually positive. It was noted that the return rate of student evaluations is low. UCD's Undergraduate Council reviewed the Davis report and is concerned about individuals who are not faculty evaluating faculty, especially if it could lead to negative outcomes for personnel reviews.

At UCSF, a significant number of students in the larger core courses are inclined to provide negative feedback which is demoralizing to faculty, so there is an effort to find better ways to work with students. At UCM, the Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning provides faculty with an opportunity to get a second form of evaluation, and participating faculty have found it helpful. One effort to improve student evaluations involved training for students on how to prepare them. The Centers could help faculty find ways to complement aspects of evaluations that are not working well. The UCM faculty voluntarily invite the Center to evaluate their courses, involving students in the process that utilizes a rubric.

The UCI representative expressed concern about allocating resources to training students on how to do evaluations. Student evaluations are completed by those who are most motivated or who most dislike the faculty member. The analyst explained that Immediate Past Chair May asked committees to look at inappropriate comments on student course evaluations after hearing from female colleagues about offensive comments. The report is broad and Chair Serences suggested that the task force should probably focus on the bias issue. An idea considered at UCD is to look at how well students perform in subsequent courses. Assessment of this type could provide an alternative validation of the evaluations, especially for populations subject to bias. The assessment would look at basic questions or standards for mastery or retention of certain core themes or information across the courses.

X.   New Business

There was no New Business.

XI.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:10 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Serences