UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2018

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD), Katherine Snyder (UCB), Daniel Potter (UCD), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Adriana Galvan (UCLA) (telephone), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Deborah Johnson (UCSF), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC) (telephone), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, UCOP), Monica Lin (Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools and Colleges, UCOP), Jim Chalfant (Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office, UCOP) (videoconference), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Zanzucchi welcomed the members to the first meeting of the Academic Year and explained the relationship of UCEP to Academic Council and other Senate committees as well as Academic Planning Council which is a Provost's committee that includes Senate representation. The chair is a member of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) which includes representatives from the California State University and California Community College systems and will hold an annual Legislative Day in Sacramento.

Members may be asked to participate in subcommittees and to be lead reviewers of reports or proposals. The committee agreed to add the graduate student representative to the committee listserv. The analyst reminded members about the confidentiality of committee discussions and materials. It was noted that the members' appointment to UCEP ends on August 31st and members can serve for four consecutive years. The committee will be asked by the Senate chair or the administration to consider various topics and members can identify issues that should be discussed.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved today's agenda.

III. Training for Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Instructors

Last year, UCEP considered issues related to training for Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). The committee informally gathered information about the training available at the campuses, finding that training varies across the system and departments. There is no expectation that the training should be consistent but it should be coherent. The campus Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and Offices of Instructional Development (OID) met during spring 2018 to provide regular contact across divisions by CTL and OID leadership and identified training for TAs/GSIs as is a priority topic, establishing a workgroup to address this subject. The graduate student representative will participate on the workgroup and a faculty representative from UCEP is also invited to be a liaison to this workgroup. In addition, the Provost would like the Academic Planning Council to explore ways to improve training.

Discussion: There is an orientation for TAs and GSIs at the campus level but there may not be department or discipline specific training. Some departments have the resources that enable them to meet the demand for training while others may not. At UCI, there was a discussion about what is required to be the Instructor of Record and reportedly there is no definition or criterion for this title. UCEP may want to consider standards for Instructors of Record and come up with a definition, which might be done in collaboration with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs. Another suggestion is for the committee to devise a list of objectives for the

training so there is a unified set expectations. Typically, faculty have called attention to the need for training but addressing this issue from the perspective of graduate students is a good idea.

A member indicated that an assessment of the TAs and GSIs is an important piece that may be missing. The TAs and GSIs could be observed by a faculty member. The training in one member's department involves observation of the student by at least three peers in the first semester of teaching and the observation is developmental rather than evaluative.

Action: The UCB representative and the graduate student representative volunteered to participate on the CTL/OID workgroup.

IV.   Student Mental Health

There is a general effort at UCOP to meet the mental health needs of students. A report from President Napolitano to the Regents indicated that, since 2014, funding from student fees has been used to expand campus student health services resources with an emphasis on the needs of students who are first generation or under-represented minorities. UCEP discussed this subject in the spring when a question arose about access to services at UCLA. The committee received clarification that the visits are not limited when treatment is deemed clinically necessary. A memo was sent to Academic Council to highlight this issue and the committee may work with the Senate's Health Care Task Force and units at UCOP.

Discussion: The point was made that faculty should receive training to increase mental health awareness and to ensure they are familiar with the campus resources available to students. This should be included in the training for TAs and GSIs. Academic Advisors are often the primary point of contact for undergraduate students but not all advisors may understand that they should refer students to counseling services. It is not always clear who has responsibility for identifying that a student has a mental health issue and directing him or her to a campus clinic. Perhaps everyone needs to pay attention to the well-being of students but clarification of roles is essential.

V.   Systemwide Policy on Awarding of Posthumous Degree

The issue of awarding degrees posthumously was raised last year in relationship to the death of a UCLA student. The committee reviewed current campus policies and the UCI representative drafted a model policy, based on the existing policies, which was intended to provide guidance to campuses.

Discussion: One aim of UCEP's memo is to encourage campuses to be prepared if a student death occurs and to have a policy that does not add to a family's distress. One issue includes whether the family can initiate the request for this degree to be conferred. In the event that a student did not meet the threshold for the posthumous degree, there should be some type of recognition. The family of the UCLA student was not satisfied with the offer of a certificate and continues to discuss this matter with a dean at that student's school. There is a difference between a posthumous degree which requires approval by the Regents and a degree awarded posthumously and this contributed to the confusion at UCLA. The UCLA dean is working with the Senate on a policy that will allow this particular student to receive a degree under different criterion. UCM's Senate reviewed the model policy and plans to adopt it.

Action: Members will check on the status of discussions about the model policy at their campuses and report back in November.

VI.   Restructuring of Systemwide Programs

An audit of UCOP identified a number of systemwide programs that are in the Office of the President's budget which include presidential initiatives and systemwide academic programs. The audit led to an assessment of

UCOP by Huron Consulting. The Senate was asked to conduct an expedited review of the systemwide UC Mexico programs and members have commented on a memo drafted by Chair Zanzucchi. The UC Sacramento Center and UC Washington D.C. Center will also being evaluated and UCEP anticipates receiving a proposal for the restructuring of these programs. UCEP will eventually receive a proposal on restructuring the systemwide Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). The analyst participates in the ILTI Steering Committee meetings and the ILTI Coordinator will formally be appointed to serve as a UCEP consultant. Chair Zanzucchi asked the members to think about potential concerns related to the restructuring of systemwide programs and one issue might be faculty representation in the governance of these programs.

Discussion: It was noted that the undergraduate component of UC Mexico programs is limited while more campuses are becoming Hispanic Serving Institutions, a point which will be added to draft memo. The Senate has concerns about faculty oversight of systemwide programs that are based on a campus. Another concern is that moving systemwide academic programs to a campus decreases OP's focus on academic affairs and that at a campus the programs will be conceptualized as administrative units rather than educational programs. UC Sacramento Center is primarily an internship program and is run by UC Davis. A member wondered what the finances will look like when these programs are moved to a campus, and a concern is that a systemwide program will be a burden to a campus.

Action: The memo regarding the UC Mexico programs was finalized and will be submitted to Academic Council.

VII.   **Transfer Guarantee**
- *Monica Lin, Director, Director of Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools & Colleges, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*
- *Jim Chalfant, Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office, UCOP*

Chair Zanzucchi provided background information about the Transfer Task Force and explained UCEP's role in the current effort. In the year ahead, UCEP will work with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), Undergraduate Admissions, the Special Advisor, and possibly ICAS. The committee's focus will be on matriculation and student success as part of the initiative to encourage higher levels of preparation, equity, diversity, and strong communication. Materials shared by Director Lin may be shared by members. In the last two years, UC has enrolled more transfer students than it has in the University's 150 year history and, as a system has met the 2:1 requirement in the Master Plan for enrolling one transfer student to every two freshman. The more selective UC campuses have enrolled the greatest number of transfers and one third of transfer students are under-represented minorities (URMs).

The aim of President Napolitano's initiative is to continue to strengthen and expand California Community College transfer but it should be noted that efforts to streamline transfer existed long before this president joined UC. Director Lin explained the development of the Transfer Pathways for the twenty-one most popular majors at UC. Development of the Pathways involved unprecedented collaboration by faculty throughout the system and required significant work on articulation by Undergraduate Admissions with the campus Articulation Officers. The pathways provide a higher level of clarity and consistency to students as they prepare. The Physics and Chemistry pathways are evolving into a way for California Community Colleges (CCCs) to offer Associate of Science degrees that will come with a guarantee of admission to UC. The first Pathways were established in 2015 and Director Lin indicated that there are currently well over 10k articulation agreements.

Professor Chalfant shared an analysis of the utilization of the Transfer Articulation Guarantee agreement (TAG) offered by six UC campuses. CCC students initiate the TAG process soon after deciding to transfer to a UC. The TAGs largely do not include major requirements but have lower division General Education and overall GPA requirements. Students can only have one TAG which guarantees a space but are able to apply to other UC campuses. The analysis shows that more than half of the CCC students with a TAG enroll in a different UC campus, suggesting that many students see the TAG as a "safety school." TAGs are underutilized at many CCCs

while a small number of them send over 40% of students to UC by way of a TAG, an important consideration for future plans for outreach. There is no particular association between the student's major of choice and whether or not a student uses a TAG. A question is whether there is a correlation between high-sending CCC campuses and the use of TAGs. An analysis of the use of TAGs by ethnicity showed a significantly higher use of the agreements by White and Asian American students than by under-represented minority (URM) students. Just under 85% of African American applicants to UC do not use TAGs. An important issue explore why URM students have low utilization rates and whether students with higher Grade Point Averages (GPAs) did not use TAGs.

Chair May indicated that the Senate is responding to a Transfer Guarantee made by President Napolitano. The goal is to improve preparation for transfer students by offering incentives. The Senate has the authority to set the overall GPA and the GPA for a major, and students who satisfy a Transfer Pathway are guaranteed a space at a UC campus, although not necessarily the campus of choice. For capacity reasons, a key consideration is what percentage of transfer students should be enrolled as a result of the Transfer Guarantee and 50% is the current working assumption. Although it is a systemwide guarantee, the goal is to give transfer students the choice of which UC campus they would like to attend. The Transfer Guarantee will not change the ways UC admits transfer students which are by comprehensive holistic review or by a TAG. The 3.5 overall GPA results in that 50% and is a rough starting point being used to project how many students might enroll through the Guarantee and it is possible that the GPA will vary by major.

Two models have been discussed this summer and Chair May indicated that the Senate's proposal will undergo systemwide review and ultimately be approved by the Assembly. The "Four Pack" model requires that students who satisfy the GPA and completes a Pathway must apply to at least four UC campuses including one with a TAG. The requirements of the Pathways will exceed the requirements for a TAG. If a student is not admitted as a result of comprehensive review, he will be in a referral pool and a space at another campus will need to be found. The Four-Pack model uses the TAG as a safety school. The second model would require a student to use a TAG but allow students to apply at any additional campuses. The TAG model would eliminate the referral pool and campuses would need to reserve a certain number of spaces for students who qualify for the Transfer Guarantee. The courses required for a TAG are subsets of the Transfer Pathways.

The effort now is to determine which model should be utilized. Feedback about the models will be sought through focus groups with students and consultation with UC Admissions offices. Campuses will be asked to increase their articulation agreements to ensure that there are Pathways in place for students to follow. Chair May emphasized that there is a great deal of political pressure on UC, and the Senate to make the Transfer Guarantee work best for CCC students and for the University. Vice Chair Bhavnani underscored that the Guarantee needs to be in place by April 2019. The vice chair also noted that comprehensive review ensures that UC does not go only by numbers in the admission process. Another critical issue to keep in mind is that the transfer population is not as diverse as UC's freshman. Whatever approach UC follows should not negatively impact diversity and absolutely make the transfer process easier for students.

Discussion: Chair May commented that the high sending CCC's are likely to be better resourced schools that can offer better advising and whose advisors are aware of the TAGs. Chair Zanzucchi suggested examining the use of TAGs by first generation students or Pell Grant recipients but a question is whether this data is readily available. It is not clear if the GPA is the strongest predictor of the success of the transfer students, a point requiring additional discussion. UCEP will consider "summer melt" which is the loss of successful and desirable transfer students, particularly low income students, who are admitted to UC but do not enroll. Members spent time figuring out the differences between the two models.

At the freshman level, eligible students not admitted to any UC are put into a referral pool, fulfilling the guarantee that every eligible student will get a space at UC. In the past, the referral pool was only connected to UCM for the past ten years. It is not clear if there has been a study that provides information about students' experiences with the process of transferring. Members will review the materials provided in preparation for further discussion in

November and this information should be shared with the divisional committees at that point. Members should think about questions that might help with discussions at the campuses.

VIII.   Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

Chair Zanzucchi summarized UCEP's work, over the past two years, on questions related to access to ILTI's online courses and it was not clear if the nine so-called barriers resulted from practices or policies. In the spring, the committee proposed a petition process to Council that might generate better information about the enrollment or access issues students encounter. UCEP would like to have data to inform its discussions about enrollment in online courses. Chair May has asked UCEP to look at Senate Regulations on courses (Part III, Title III) and recommend if they should be revised or clarified in order to address online courses.

Discussion: It is not known if the petition process is under discussion at the campuses. The Provost's Office should communicate the proposal to the campuses but members should find out if there are questions for UCEP. ILTI should be taking the lead with developing the petition process and local education policy committees may discuss the process with advisors. The committee's proposal does not mean that students will not have any restrictions for enrollment. It was very difficult to find any evidence supporting that students were denied enrollment because of the nine barriers UCEP investigated. A member listed several structural problems that ILTI should fix before complaining at low enrollment. A memo from UCEP to ILTI requesting data will be prepared. This matter will be revisited next month.

Action: Members will find out if UCEP's proposed petition process is being discussed by the divisional committees.

IX.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership
* *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*
* *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair May announced the symposium honoring the 150th year of UC taking place on October 26th and 27th. All members of the Senate are invited and may register through the Senate website. Chair May would like UCEP to dedicate time to issues related to student conduct such as offensive comments on student course evaluations and cheating. Members are asked to generate ideas about how to clearly explain and reinforce the need for and importance of academic integrity. The Committee on Academic Personnel will also work on the issue of language used in course evaluations.

Last spring, President Napolitano asked the Senate to consider the use of standardized testing for admissions and Chair May would like BOARS, the Committee on Preparatory Eduction and UCEP to take up this study. BOARS will be the lead committee but UCEP should think about academic preparedness. This will be a year-long project and UCEP will be provided with data from Undergraduate Admissions. Chair May would also like UCEP to review Senate Regulations to ensure they reflect the use of online education. The Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs and the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction will also look at how to integrate online education into the regulations. Chair May has started identifying the regulations that should be reviewed.

Chair May mentioned highlights from last week's Regents' meeting including President Napolitano's announcement related to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The goal is for UC to have an effective policy related to the Act. The Regents and chancellors are interested in devising a process for long-range budgeting and the Committee on Planning and Budget will monitor this effort. A Blue and Gold endowment will be created, related to the Short Term Investment Pool and Total Return Investment Pool. The retirement plan is in good shape and has enjoyed healthy returns in the past few years.

The Huron Consulting report on UCOP has been reframed as a UCOP restructuring effort which includes a focus on programs at OP that have academic content. Last year, the Senate criticized the lack of consultation on the restructuring of some of the programs. The Senate has reviewed the proposal to restructure the UC Mexico programs and UC Education Abroad Program. Proposals for restructuring the UC Washington DC Center, UC Health, and Agriculture and Natural Resources will be given to the Senate in the near future. Chair May described how UCOP is funded and the lack of a method for OP to get funds from the campuses to support systemwide programs is problematic.

Council will discuss the negotiations currently underway with the UC librarians which includes their request for academic freedom. Chair May clarified that UC does not have policy establishing protections for represented and non-represented librarians. The principle of academic freedom applies to faculty and cannot simply be extended to librarians but it is Chair May's belief that librarians should have protections. Active service modified duties is the way faculty receive maternity leave and the policy has been corrected to allow for two semesters or three quarters of leave effective now. UC has had two definitions of domestic partners and this has been changed to clarify that there is one definition of domestic partner and health and welfare benefits also enable the partner to receive the survivor benefits. Chair May reported that the At Your Service website has serious cybersecurity problems and improvements are being made.

Discussion: A member asked if studies have been conducted of having more transparent student course evaluations. Offensive comments are disproportionately directed toward women and faculty of color. The point was made that the usefulness of the student evaluations is questionable.

X.   Academic Integrity and Cheating

UCEP has discussed academic integrity and cheating in the past and Chair May has asked the committee to consider these issues again. Academic integrity issues have a relationship to the proctoring of ILTI courses. Chair Zanzucchi would like the committee's discussion to be as concrete as possible as UCEP aims to identify practical solutions. At some campuses, academic integrity policy is located primarily in student affairs while at others it is part of academic affairs, so identifying where judicial affairs occur is a good starting point. Investigating any formal efforts at the campuses and what has been learned is another task for members.

Discussion: A UCD task force produced a report with recommendations to the campus judicial affairs about changes to the student code of academic conduct. UCD also changed a regulation that requires instructors notify students on the syllabus about the code of academic conduct.

Action: Members will investigate where academic integrity is situated at each campus and report back in November.

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

Director Greenspan shared links to the UC Information Center and other resources for data on UC. There are discussions underway about how UC can help meet the state's needs. Campuses have provided tentative four year plans describing how much more enrollment can be managed and how many degrees UC can generate. UC has responded with information about the number of degrees that could be generated contingent upon certain levels of funding from the state. There is an emphasis to graduate students faster and create space for new students. Recommendations on enrollment will be made to the president to submit to the Regents and ultimately shared with the new governor.

Discussion: A question is whether UC will consider adding a new campus and Director Greenspan indicated that the costs associated with bringing UCM have created concerns about adding an eleventh campus.

XII.   Last Degree of Its Kind

The UCD representative explained that several years ago a dean decided that the Textiles and Clothing department would be closed. The department offered two undergraduate majors and admission to those programs has been closed for the past two years. UCD's Senate expects to receive a proposal to discontinue one of the majors and move the second one to another department. The representative believes that Chair Zanzucchi should make the decision about whether UCEP eventually needs to weigh in on the UCD program. The Compendium language is somewhat confusing and the degree title issue is not relevant to the UCD department.

Discussion: The Compendium might include more examples that clarify the difference between discontinuance and disestablishment. When the UCD proposal is received by UCEP, the addition of examples will be addressed.

XIII.   Campus Reports and Goals and Priorities for 2018-2019

Merced: The campus is rolling out a revised general education program and is challenged by capacity issues. Student government has forwarded a proposal related to Review Week.

San Francisco: The doctoral nursing practice degree is launching a hybrid online program and UCSF is interested in the funding of programs. The tuition that is quarterly is a barrier to students having access to the doctoral program.

Santa Barbara: The division is working on a proposed revision to SR 636, the Entry Level Writing Requirement. Another issue is related to units that do not have pre-majors and how this will be expanded. It was noted that a benefit of pre-majors is that they can be a mechanism to keep students on track and keep improve four year graduation rates.

Santa Cruz: The campus is transitioning to a new software system with the goal of clarifying department structures. Who owns interdisciplinary programs needs to be addressed. The campus already has a significant number of petition processes. More resources are needed for undergraduate education overall.

San Diego: The local committee is discussing the number of impacted majors and how the enrollment of the students who are waiting will be managed is unclear.

Berkeley: The committee is responding to the campus strategic planning initiative as it relates to disability services, micro-bachelor degrees, underfinancing of administrative support services, and expansion of the role of undergraduates as TAs.

Riverside: The campus plans to study its GE requirements soon. A subcommittee on online education was created last year and will begin work this year.

Davis: The registrar has asked the Undergraduate Council to look at the new system for course pre-requisite registration. Other issues include student evaluation of courses which are heavily relied upon. Having other methods for evaluating teaching are needed.

Irvine: Continuing issues include online courses and the standards for evaluating the proposals for online courses. The campus uses COMPASS to get data about how students are performing and will allow faculty to look at the demographics of courses. The system is able to provide links to teaching styles, resources, and guidance for how to support students.

XIV.   New Business

The UCSC representative asked what campuses do with transfer students who enter UC with one major and want to change majors. UCR has criteria for changing majors that must be met in order for a student to transfer.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Anne Zanzucchi