UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
<div align="center">

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES
MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 2019
</div>

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter (UCD), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Deborah Johnson (UCSF), Adriana Galvan (UCLA), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Kimia Akbari (Undergraduate Student Representative), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Consent Calendar

Action: The December 3rd meeting minutes were approved.
Action: Today's agenda was approved.
Action: The draft memo to the Health Care Task Force about student access to abortion services was approved.

II.   Chair's Updates and Announcements

The Academic Planning Council (APC) recently discussed shared principals related to salary which are not addressed in the Academic Personnel Manual. Another topic was self-supporting graduate degree programs (SSGDP) and UCEP should consider the academic planning implications of the increasing numbers of these kinds of programs. While the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) are involved with reviewing the SSGDP proposals, a new review process may be needed due to the increasing number of proposals. The APC's discussion about multiyear budgeting touched on the need for more attention to matriculation and retention outcomes and shifting away from growing out of budget shortages to a focus on basic needs.

Academic Council and Academic Assembly recently met and issues included the growth in new enrollments across UC and how it is connected to student progress and students' basic needs. One question is how multiyear budgeting will work when there is an economic downturn. The Council's standardized testing task force will be chaired by Henry Sanchez, the immediate past chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). UCOP's CFO provided an overview of the budget and an initiative focused on faculty housing efforts, which are connected to faculty recruitment and retention.

The chair of BOARS reported that his committee passed a plan for the transfer guarantee which will require that California Community College (CCCs) students complete a Transfer Admission Guarantee agreement (TAG), completion of a Transfer Pathway with a minimum 3.5 grade point average in the Pathway and overall. Issues include how to handle impacted degrees, the need to emphasize major preparation, and how to encourage the use of TAGs by students from a wide variety of backgrounds. Chair Zanzucchi noted that the Regents have established a Special Committee on Basic Needs (including the Senate Vice Chair Bhavnani) which will focus on persistence and matriculation issues.

Discussion: A member commented that the financial accounting for the SSGDPs does not seem to be transparent. Regarding the transfer guarantee, one member is concerned about the state's expectations that students who transfer to UC unprepared will be graduated within two years. The Regents Special Committee on Basic Needs will have to take into account the funding available to and the unique issues

impacting each campus. It is not completely clear how the Special Committee will get data about the student needs.

III.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair May indicated that the standardized testing task force will include the chair of UCEP, the UCSD representative to UCEP and UCEP's graduate student representative along with the chairs of and representatives from BOARS and the Committee on Preparatory Education; and people with backgrounds in standardized assessments. The group will be supported by Student Affairs, Academic Personnel, and IRAP at UCOP. The task force's charge will be broad and the final report is likely to be issued next year. The task force will not look at the Graduate Record Exam but CCGA will look at the role of this exam in admissions in the system.

The University's represented librarians have asked for academic freedom to be included in their contract. Council has agreed that non-academic appointees should have protections and Provost Brown has established a task force to be co-chaired by Chair May and UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal to develop policy that delineates the proper professional standards for non-faculty. Chair May noted that UC's negotiations with Elsevier are ongoing and it is still not clear if the publisher will accept UC's position. The University Librarians are working to ensure access to Elsevier journals. The Federal government is starting to restrict, and possibly cancel, funding for research that involves fetal tissue and the Committee on Research Policy will send Academic Council a strong resolution in support of UCSF researchers whose grants have been threatened.

Chair May has asked the Committee on Academic Personnel to look at SSGDPs and whether faculty in these programs are appropriately evaluated for the work they do in them. CCGA is looking at the SSGDPs overall and UCPB examines the funding for SSGDPs. UCEP has option to discuss the impact of SSGDPs on undergraduate education and communicate any concerns to CCGA and Chair May.

The California State Auditor (CSA) is investigating UC's handling of cases of sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) and will review the resolutions of cases from last year. The CSA wants hearings to commence within 60 days and for recommendations to be sent to the chancellor in 30 days. The Committee on Privilege and Tenure has proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336 that would apply to all hearings, not just those involving SVSH. The Senate is awaiting proposals of the restructuring of several academic programs based at UCOP. The proposal for restructuring Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) will be a focus for UCEP. Policies for fully online majors will be needed in the near future and how to ensure that campuses receive credit for cross campus enrollment needs attention.

IV.   Academic Integrity – Next Steps

UCEP members have gathered information pertaining to campus level considerations of policies for academic integrity and student misconduct as well as feedback about recent changes to policy and where policy is located. At some campuses, these policies are situated within Academic Affairs and at others the policies are in Student Affairs. The information describes challenges related to implementing the policies. A goal is to identify best practices for policy and implementation.

Discussion: Chair May believes students need to understand that academic integrity is not just about behavior but it is fundamental to the academic program. The information for students should help them understand how to follow professional standards. Academic issues could be referred to a faculty committee which includes Senate faculty. Some campuses have a statement about academic integrity for

students to sign. Faculty need regular reminders about the procedures to follow both proactively (information on syllabi) and when misconduct is suspected. However, it is also important for faculty to have the flexibility to decide for themselves how an incident should be handled and use the incident as a learning opportunity. For example, a faculty member may opt to give a student additional assignments.

UCD's policy is that faculty are expected to report a student when misconduct is suspected. If faculty do not report an incident, it will be difficult to determine cases of repeated offenses. At UCSC, the policy essentially mandates that faculty report incidents. It was noted that what constitutes cheating in certain disciplines may vary, so adjustments to policies might be needed. A member asked how cheating on a course taken at another campus is handled and this should be clarified. Chair Zanzucchi indicated that it does not seem that a systemwide policy for academic integrity is needed but that campuses and faculty should share best practices. The information gathered by UCEP will be shared with Council.

V.   Transfer Initiative

The requirements BOARS has decided upon for the Transfer Guarantee were noted earlier. Chair Zanzucchi summarized the December 17th meeting of the Transfer Guarantee work group. This group is considering how the systemwide guarantee is defined. Campuses will need guidance to review TAGs and it is likely that UCEP will partner with BOARS on how to engage faculty on these agreements. This committee also discussed the fee structure and timelines and other implementation details. The TAGs are underutilized by students who are from under-represented groups so strategies on making them more effective for broader group of students will be needed.

The Transfer Communications group met on December 19th and is focusing on communication for advising to students and how to market ideas for what has been recommended. The communication about what the guarantee means needs to be clear and specific. Attention will need to be paid to the issues for CCC feeder schools to those UC campuses that have struggled the most with the 2:1 agreement. An effort needs to be made to show that UC welcomes first generation students and UC faculty who transferred from a CCC might have a role in this. The Transfer Communications group is planning to have student focus groups to help identify language to help shape internal/external communications.

The Articulation group reviewed data on the articulation gaps. The agreements for some majors are almost complete. The group asked for more information about a few of the top 21 majors with a low number of articulation agreements. One idea is to identify majors that might be eliminated from the top 21. This group also talked about the need to change the language used when discussing articulation. What kind of preparation is sufficient to transfer to UC should be considered. A mechanism will be needed to ensure that articulation agreements are living documents. Departments should have discussions about expectations and potential changes to the agreements. Faculty participation is recognized as professional development for CCC faculty and service for UC faculty, but some type of incentive would be helpful. Local campus efforts with specific feeder schools may be a good approach.

Discussion: Strategies are needed to address challenges for CCCs that are remotely located and have a limited number of articulation agreements. Online courses might bridge the gap for some smaller majors. It is important to find out what students feel about the guarantee through focus groups. UCEP might write up a memo that captures issues related to low-sending CCCs.

VI.   Awarding of Degrees Posthumously

The draft policy was discussed at Council and Chair Zanzucchi has consulted with CCGA about the criteria to be used for granting degrees posthumously to graduate students.

Discussion: Rather than allowing any number of individuals to ask for a degree to be awarded, it may be better to list specific people. However, not all students have family so leaving it open-ended may be a better approach. The divisional Educational Policy committee should be the body that considers appeals. It is not clear if a student who has not declared a major but has met the other criteria could be awarded a degree. The goal is to err on the side of generosity. The proposed policy will be submitted to Academic Council and, if approved, it will be sent out for systemwide review.

VII. UCI's Proposed Online Bachelor of Arts Degree in Business Administration

The UCI representative reported that the divisional Committee on Educational Policy will discuss the plan for the online degree in Business Administration in the coming week. The deliberations should move beyond asking if this fully online degree is a good idea so broader issues are considered, such as the nature of a UC education and what it requires and these issues are not addressed in the proposal. However, the position of the proposers is that the courses for this degree have already been approved by the campus. Questions include: whether students in the online program will be charged the standard fees for campus infrastructure they will not utilize; whether the students can take a double major in a different departments; and if these students will be banned taking from electives that are not offered online.

It would be helpful for systemwide leadership to urge UCI to take more time to consider all of the issues. Chair May recommends that UCI's proposal will need to undergo systemwide review. There is the narrow question of the program itself but there are multiple underlying issues that should be considered. The UCI divisional CEP will transmit the proposal to Chair May who will forward it to UCEP and other relevant systemwide committees.

VIII. Grading Policy

The UCSC representative raised the question about consistent grading policies across the campuses. For a slight majority of campuses, a C- is a passing grade and for a small minority a C is passing grade. It is unclear, for example, if a UCSC student takes a UCD course for pass/no pass, whether a C at UCD is equivalent to a C- at UCSC. As more students take advantage of cross campus courses, a systemwide policy may be needed. The policy for UCM's writing program is that a C- allows the student to pass the course but that grade would not satisfy the systemwide writing requirement. This can be confusing to students when grade cannot be assigned although it was earned and it may be the type of campus-specific issues that needs to be worked out by the campus.

Discussion: Satisfaction of major preparation may need to be more rigorous. Grading policies have to be approved by Assembly but consistency may not have been a consideration. What constitutes a satisfactory grade in the C range needs to be clarified and a distinction between grades for the major versus for General Education requirements might be made. UCEP will review the current grading policies to clarify where the focus should be.

IX. ILTI Data on Cross Campus Enrollments

The committee has asked ILTI to share data on cross campus enrollments. UCEP should consider the student experience with online courses and with the enrollment process. It is not clear that students are prevented from enrolling as a result of systemwide or campus policy. ILTI has six thousand entries from the cross-campus enrollment system. UCEP could suggest ways to record the information categorically. A goal is to help ILTI by advising on what would be helpful so that the data collection is systematic.

Discussion: UCEP members may want to engage the academic advisors at their campuses after UCEP members come up with a list of categories.

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

The Regents adopted a proposed budget to send to the new governor and the amount of the request will be subject to negotiations. An item at the upcoming Regents meeting will include discussion about multi-year budgeting. Campuses are being asked how the plan to reach their goals. The growth in continuing students will be about 3k FTE. This growth is for continuing students. Applications for California students are down this year but this is not official. The three systemwide Mexico programs will be moved to UCR.

XI.   **New Business**

Chair Zanzucchi indicated that the committee will continue planning related to ILTI. Concerns include that the cross campus enrollment system students are not getting grades for the prerequisites courses and problems related to proctoring and Learning Management Systems. It will be important to determine if these issues are highly localized or relevant on a systemwide basis.

The issue of campus closures has been briefly discussed by UCEP and a task force is putting together guidelines for emergencies but these will only address pragmatic issues. For UCEP, the issue is about the impact of closures on academic time in the classroom.

UCEP will meet in person in February.

Discussion: UCD has a group looking at campus closure policies. Members are asked to check find out what campuses are doing now, especially those campuses that recently dealt with a climate-related closure are doing now.

XII.   **Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:45 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Anne Zanzucchi