

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017

Attending: Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, (UCD), Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair, (UCM), David Paul (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Arvind Rajaraman (UCI), John Serences (UCSD), Ken Ueno (UCB), Robert Gould (UCLA) (videoconference), Jennifer Perkins (UCSF), Daniel Potter (UCD), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Monica Lin (Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools & Colleges, UCOP), Evera Spears (Associate Director, Advocacy and Partnerships, Admissions, UCOP), Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Shane White (Chair, Academic Senate), Robert May (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Mona Hsieh (Office Manager, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Introductions

Chair Caswell-Chen welcomed everyone to UCEP's first meeting of the Academic Year and members introduced themselves. The committee's charge was reviewed. Chair Caswell-Chen encouraged members to speak candidly and noted that committee discussions are confidential. The analyst explained who is on the committee listserv and noted that typically the January and July meetings are canceled but the dates should be held in case a videoconference is necessary. Members will be notified about a month in advance when a meeting will be held by videoconference.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Robert May, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair White summarized state audits of UC and the Office of the President (OP), and noted that aspects of the audit process will be ongoing throughout the year. OP funds systemwide academic programs that in some cases should not be cut. Chair White described AB 97, the State Budget Act, with the state currently expecting UC to find \$15M to fund 1,500 new California resident undergraduate students.

Chair White reported on issues related to retiree healthcare which will be on the Regents' November agenda. The retirement plan and retiree healthcare are part of the total remuneration. UC has covered much of retiree healthcare costs in the past, but the funding has been reduced in recent years. The president is interested in lowering healthcare expenses for both active employees and retirees, and there is a major concern about the longer-term liability of such costs. It is noted that estimates of such costs involve assumptions that are not necessarily defined to the satisfaction of all. The Senate will propose a joint administration-Senate task force involving all stakeholders to devise a plan that is sustainable.

The Master Plan calls for UC to take one transfer student for every two freshman and UC has met this goal on a systemwide basis. The Senate believes that the process for transferring to UC should be made easier for potential students. AB 1440 required the California State University (CSU) system to develop associate degrees for transfer, but the unit cap of 60 is not feasible for students in the sciences. The Senate has been working with the California Community Colleges (CCC) to develop associate degrees for Science in Chemistry or Physics to help students prepare for UC and the number of units will be better managed. It is not clear how many students might pursue these associate degrees or enroll in UC after receiving it. UC campuses will be able to require different grade point averages (GPA).

III. California State University General Education Task Force

- *Barbara Knowlton, Immediate Past Chair, UCEP*

UCEP's Immediate Past Chair Knowlton joined UCEP to describe the work of the CSU Task Force examining General Education at the CSU campuses with the goal of developing recommendations for that system. In addition to Chair Knowlton, the Task Force includes a representative from the CCC system. The discussions began with big picture issues such as the underlying philosophy of GE. Another aspect of the discussions is whether there should be a standard across the CSU campuses for what students learn or if the campuses should have more autonomy based on their particular emphases. How the CSUs communicate to students about the justification for GE requirements is also important. The outcome of these discussions might inform UC GE requirements.

California mandates that students fulfill an American Institutions requirement comprised of a course on American history and another on American government. At eight of the UCs, students fulfill this requirement while in high school. At the CSUs, students have the option of taking these two courses which are folded into the GE. Chair Knowlton would like the perspective of UCEP members about this requirement.

The Task Force is also discussing transfer students who take the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) to fulfill the lower division GE courses before transferring to a CSU or a UC. However, transfer students may not know into which system they will transfer, so it is important that both systems accept IGETC. If the CSUs make any major changes to lower division GE, UC would need to make a decision about changing IGETC. A question for UCEP is whether it is acceptable for transfer students to not have the same GE experience as freshmen.

Discussion: To fulfill the requirement in high schools, students must take either one year of U.S. history or one semester of U.S. History and one semester of U.S. Government with a grade of C or better (UCLA requires at least a B) and these could be an AP course, a score of 3 on the AP exam, or a college course taken by a high school student. The UCSB noted differences at this campus in terms of what is accepted, with the History department offering an exam every quarter to test out of this requirement (however, only one to five students take it each quarter), and UCSB has a long list of courses that satisfy the requirement, including courses in Anthropology and Art History.

Currently, the requirement is much more rigorous at CSU campuses than at UC. A concern is that changing this requirement could negatively impact the CSU faculty teaching these courses although it was noted that this factor should not drive the decision-making. UCEP members may want to discuss the American Institutes requirement with faculty at their campuses. Some CSU campuses may want local control over certain GE courses for specific reasons and understanding the reasons behind this can inform decisions about potentially reconfiguring Humanities and Social Science departments.

There are already some differences between UC and the CSUs in IGETC, and so UC might not necessarily need to make changes in response. Since GE is already implemented differently across the UCs, it is possible that on some campuses the transfer students effectively avail themselves of the GE experience. Ideas could include moving some units to upper division GE or encouraging transfer students to complete some GE requirements at UC. A member suggested looking at how closely transfer students in certain disciplines adhere to fulfilling IGETC, and the implications for the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology regarding GE for example. Without IGETC, it would take transfer students a minimum of three years to fulfill GE requirements at a UC campus. Different solutions for different groups could be created. For example, Santa Cruz requires transfer students to complete its Disciplinary Communication GE course at UCSC but all other GE requirements can be satisfied with IGETC.

IV. Update on Senate Travel Procedures

- *Mona Hsieh, Office Manager, Academic Senate*

The Senate's Office Manager provided an update on the travel and reimbursement procedures.

V. UC Education Abroad Program

Chair Caswell-Chen asked for two volunteers to serve on the UCEAP Governing Committee. There is a one-year term and a two-year term. In addition, in mid-October the chair will participate in a discussion about how to increase participation in EAP from 15% to 30% and would like members to share ideas for strategies.

Discussion: The UCR representative agreed to serve the one-year term on the Governing Committee. Members had several ideas related to increasing participation in EAP to 30%. Members mentioned that it is not clear that there is an unmet need or demand for EAP, and suggested that students should be asked for their opinions about EAP. Possible challenges to participation include: expense; lack of awareness; difficulties completing core curriculum for certain majors (especially in the STEM fields); the length of time required for study abroad (shorter increments should be available); and, language competency requirements. One unknown is the number of students participating in some form of education abroad programs offered at individual campuses that are outside of the UCEAP structure. Data on participation at each campus would be helpful. Other suggestions include allowing for participation in EAP over the summer and increasing the research opportunities available.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)*

Manager Peterson explained the data available in UC's annual Accountability Report and on the Information Center website. The manager will also provide the committee with the most recent results from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). IRAP is determining the research that can be done with data from UCUES now that it has been conducted for almost a decade. Systemwide results from the 2016 administration of the survey have been posted on the IRAP website. Members are also welcome to suggest information or data they would like to receive from IRAP this year.

Discussion: Members would like to see data that includes: student response to the UCLA initiative to provide mental health screenings; student feedback on on-line courses offered through the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative; and, the positive impact of diversity on student success. A member suggested that it would be valuable to look across campus at large groups of students but Manager Peterson explained that there are restrictions on how the UCUES data can be used at the systemwide level. The language suggested by UCEP last year regarding catalog rights for returning students who wish to complete their degrees has been integrated into the systemwide Admissions website and it is currently being discussed with the registrars.

The committee briefly discussed the importance of access to mental health services and improved awareness of the issues among students, staff, and faculty. A member would like to see data about how students brought to UC as a result of outreach efforts are supported, and someone from Diversity and Engagement at UCOP could meet with UCEP in the future to share data the unit has collected in this regard. Manager Peterson will share the report to the state on the three-year degree pathway Budget Framework Initiative. The UCB representative runs the five-year old Berkeley Connect initiative in his department and participating students have higher graduate rates and higher GPAs than other students. UCEP may want to review the data about this program.

VII. Upcoming Reviews of Systemwide Courses

Chair Caswell-Chen indicated that it seems appropriate for UCEP to review the UC Washington, D.C. Center. Members are asked to check with their campuses about any review processes or mechanisms for the Center and share what they learn at UCEP's next meeting.

Discussion: The UCD representative reported that the campus has no direct control over the Center's academic program. Information about the course approval process, recruitment and oversight of students, and the nature of the internships would be helpful. Chair Caswell-Chen remarked that the audit mentioned oversight of the budget for the Center, but this is something the Committee on Planning and Budget should consider. The committee is interested in data about the academic aspects of the Center. At the moment UCEP anticipates some direction from the Provost's Office in this regard.

VIII. Transfer Pathways

- *Monica Lin, Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools & Colleges*

Director Lin joined UCEP to discuss the Transfer Pathways. In 2014 the President's Transfer Action Team discussed how to streamline the transfer process and support community college students before they arrive at UC. One of the Team's recommendations was to look at academic preparation in conjunction with the admissions process. In 2015, faculty were brought together in disciplinary specific groups to identify what the core course work should be for twenty-one of UC's most popular majors. The foundational course expectations of these pathways were clarified as a result of these faculty convenings. The Transfer Articulation Team in Undergraduate Admissions at UCOP then took stock of the community colleges offering courses that aligned with these expectations and where there was alignment, a determination was made about whether the transfer of course credit applied to every UC campus.

This articulation work began in 2016 and is ongoing. This information is clearly relayed to students via UC's Transfer Pathways Guide website. At the site, students select their CCC, identify the pathway they want to follow and a list of that Community Colleges' courses that articulate to UC campuses is provided. While this information is available in the statewide ASSIST website, the Transfer Pathways Guide makes it easier for students to find exactly which courses would be needed to fulfill a particular pathway. A benefit of the pathways is that requirements for transfer students are more consistent across the UC campuses. Past efforts to streamline did not involve bringing together UC faculty to discuss the course expectations. President Napolitano is convening a new Transfer Task Force that will grapple with the question of the extent to which the pathways should mimic the associate degrees for transfer developed by the CSUs with the CCCs.

Discussion: A member asked for data about the gaps that remain since some UC campuses have not articulated to courses at the CCCs. Each UC campus must individually agree that a given CCC course is equivalent to a UC course and it is a challenge to line up the course expectations across the UC campuses. There are approximately 100k articulation opportunities that need to be completed in order to address the gaps and there were 12k gaps across the first 21 majors. The Articulation Team provided information about the gaps for course expectations for each major to the Campus Articulation Officers who then asked department chairs or undergraduate deans to review the course outlines. When campuses declined to articulate a course, the Articulation Team requested the rationale for the decision. A summary of the rationales was provided to the Senate leadership. One question is who has the ultimate authority to decide that a course articulates to UC, and it was noted that the Articulation Officers are not necessarily in a position to tell the departments that a decision not to articulate a course does not make sense.

Students in urban areas often have access to several different CCCs and they are able to more easily find a CC offering the courses needed to fulfill a pathway, but this is not always the case for students in rural areas. Director Lin agreed that this is a problem, and one idea is that online courses might be used to

fulfill the articulation of certain pathways. Admissions and the Senate are discussing establishing pathways for more majors. Over the past few years, Senate leaders have reached out to the campuses to ask for additional degree programs, typically more specialized majors, to agree to the core course expectations as defined in the pathways, which many have done.

How to make establishing pathways a more regular process needs to be determined especially since there will be changes in curriculum and articulation that require the work on pathways to be continuous. Admissions is already anticipating changes to established pathways. For example, UCB plans to review the pathways for Physics and there are eighty Physics pathways that could change as a result of the decisions that UCB makes. Developing systems that reflect the changes and setting a schedule for when a campus makes a change that impacts a pathway are future considerations. A member commented that the divisional educational policy/undergraduate council committees should have been more involved in the discussions about the articulation gaps and the creation of the transfer pathways. Director Lin indicated that a comprehensive report on the transfer pathways work will be prepared for the Academic Senate. Eliminating more of the gaps may increase the number of transfer students into UC.

IX. Systemwide Review-Senate Regulations 424.A.3

Chair Caswell-Chen explained the proposal from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools for Area “d”. The proposal calls for changing the required number of units from two to three for Area “d” and changing the name from Laboratory Science to Science. There are new standards for Science education in high schools which is part of the reason for this proposal.

Discussion: One concern expressed is that adding a third unit might not necessarily give students enough to satisfy the Computer Science requirement. Concerns regarding asynchronous lab activities were also expressed, with suggestion that face-to-face labs should be required. Another issue of concern is that some schools may not be able to offer the courses (or sufficient capacity), and that students who are already disadvantaged at under resourced schools will be negatively impacted. It was noted that the requirement could benefit students who do not intend to go to college. Director Lin shared that the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) are meant to raise the bar for students in high school so they are prepared for college. Arguably, the students who do not consider themselves “college material” would also be exposed to, and benefit from, these higher standards.

The state’s adoption of NGSS specifies at a minimum that schools would teach science in high school as a three-course series. However the state has not revised the high school graduation requirements to increase the number to three. It was noted that there are potential ramifications to this decision, as school districts consider this because they want to meet the higher standards and are wondering if UC will support the new standards, which might cause the state to begin reconsidering graduation requirements. There is some expectation, from various quarters, that UC, jointly with the CSU, would support three years of science in the way that BOARS has proposed for it to be defined. The a-g rubric sets expectations about how the CSU and UC will support some of the changes happening in K-12 education.

The California Science Teachers Association has come out in favor of increasing the number of science courses. Director Lin reported that 95% of students in the UC applicant pool already take four or more years of Science. For California students in 2016-2017, 96% of 10th graders, 95% of 11th graders and 91% of 12th graders were enrolled in Science. Chair Caswell-Chen asked if this data is broken down demographically and by school API so that the possible effects on students at under-resourced schools might be anticipated. Data on non-resident students might also be informative. Director Lin clarified that the NGSS are national standards which have been adopted by California. New standardized tests will be developed that align with these new standards. The proposed change would apply to incoming freshmen

in 2023. Chair Caswell Chen would be interested in seeing the Area “d” Work Group’s report for more background and Director Lin will follow up with the chair of BOARS.

Action: Members will discuss this proposal with their divisional committees. The committee will discuss this proposal again on November 6th.

X. Senate Regulation 778

The analyst explained that UCSF’s School of Pharmacy will submit a proposal to UCEP to change its grading policy to Pass/No Pass. This proposal should be submitted to UCEP for consideration in December.

XI. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCSB: The divisional committee is examining issues related to the student use of digital recording devices in the classroom and issues related to academic integrity. The committee’s findings will be shared with UCEP. Chair Caswell-Chen mentioned UCEP’s previous discussions concerning websites that allow sharing of course documents and materials without prior instructor permission. Apparently, the individual faculty member holds the copyright to his/her lectures, therefore the University is limited in assisting in having documents removed from such websites.

XII. Goals and Priorities for 2017-2018

Members are asked if there are issues or topics that should be on the committee’s agenda for this year. Chair Caswell-Chen indicated that the committee should discuss issues related to academic integrity.

Discussion: Cheating in online courses should be discussed. UCEP should consider department-specific training for Teaching Assistants because the standard training is unsatisfactory. Another issue is the possible need for improved guidelines for student-led courses. Problems with the Banner online registrations system will be discussed by UCR’s divisional committee. Another topic for UCEP is the current emphasis on freedom of speech and how that might influence how faculty teach, campus climate, and student safety. This is an important and sensitive issue, and someone from the Office of General Counsel could be invited to a future UCEP meeting to discuss this.

The UCB representative offered to find undergraduate students to serve on UCEP.

XIII. New Business

There was no New Business

XIV. Executive Session

Notes were not taken during Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:30 pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Edward Caswell-Chen