

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Videoconference Minutes

Monday, October 3, 2022

Attending: Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair (UCLA), Darlene Francis (UCB), Katie Sterling-Harris (UCD), Manoj Kaplinghat (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Holley Moyes (UCM), Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Thuan Le (UCSF), Julie Bianchini (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Ethan Savage (Analyst, Academic Planning), Susan Cochran (Chair, Academic Senate), Jim Steintrager (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Cocco welcomed everyone to the first UCEP videoconference for 2022-2023 and members introduced themselves. The committee's charge and key points from the member handbook were reviewed. Members will be asked to volunteer to work on special tasks or projects, and it will be important for members to offer advice based on their experience and expertise. Chair Cocco asks that everyone keep their cameras on during videoconferences. The committee can meet in-person at the Office of the President two times this year and Chair Cocco would like the members to vote on this.

UCEP's chair sits on a number of other committees and Chair Cocco shared the following highlights:

- Provost's Monthly Budget Call:
 - the state's revenues and enrollment at the California Community College (CCC) and California State University (CSU) systems are down, and UC students are signing up for fewer units
 - inflation is negatively impacting campus budgets
 - there is a misperception that online courses save money when it is in fact costly to offer quality online courses
- Academic Council:
 - a new state law required the CCC, CSU and UC systems to establish one set of general education (GE) requirements for CCC students transferring to either of the four-year institutions
 - President Drake reported that transfer students who come to UC are less diverse than freshmen although this varies both across and within campuses
- Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS):
 - the chair is on a subcommittee updating the ICAS bylaws
 - one topic under discussion is working with currently and formerly incarcerated students

Discussion: Members agree that there are benefits to in-person meetings but representatives in Southern California have to give up an entire day to travel to/from Oakland and there are also concerns about the carbon footprint. It would be preferred to have any in-person meetings after January. The analyst mentioned that the committee must have five hours of actual business to justify an in-person meeting. Members were also reminded that they should reserve 10 AM to 4 PM the first Monday of each month for UCEP meetings regardless of the format. Representatives should plan to book their flights thirty days in advance of an in-person meeting. Alternates must be approved by their divisional Senate office and the representative should notify the chair and analyst when an alternate will be substituting for them.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to table the decision about in-person meetings until December 5th.

II. Systemwide Review Items

➤ Second Systemwide Review of the Presidential Abusive Conduct Policy

UCEP has the opportunity to comment on the second review of the proposed Presidential Abusive Conduct policy. The changes from the first version are straightforward and Chair Cocco noted that the policy applies to student employees as well as to students who are not employees if they are complainants or reporters.

Discussion: UCEP was concerned that the first version of the policy did not provide sufficient protection for students but the revisions address questions raised by the committee last year. Clarification about how the policy deals with offensive postings on social media is needed. The committee is in agreement with the second set of proposed revisions.

Action: Chair Cocco will draft a memo with reporting UCEP's feedback.

➤ Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM 025 and APM 671

The committee can also opine on the second systemwide review of the proposed revisions to APMs 025 and 671. The policy pertains to how a faculty member's outside work is defined and adds new requirements for obtaining pre-approval. UCEP should identify any issues related to students.

Discussion: The committee does not have any significant comments on the second set of proposed revisions to APMs 025 and 671. Requiring a faculty member to obtain prior approval from the department chair before involving a student in outside professional activity, regardless of whether a faculty member is compensated or has a financial interest, is an improvement.

Action: Chair Cocco will draft a memo with reporting UCEP's feedback.

III. Update and Approve Distribution of the Annual Reminder about Academic Integrity and Intellectual Property

Last year, the committee prepared an annual reminder to send to the divisional Senates about academic integrity and the theft of intellectual property. It is important to add copyright language to course materials because third-party contract cheating websites claim they employ software that looks for this language so those materials will not be uploaded to the sites.

Discussion: There were no objections to forwarding the annual reminder to Council for distribution to the campuses.

Action: The reminder about academic integrity and intellectual property will be submitted to Council with a request that it be forwarded to the campuses.

IV. Program Proposals

Chair Cocco explained that volunteers are needed to review five program proposals. A primary reviewer will handle the majority of the work including writing a report and a secondary reviewer

will review the report to ensure that it addresses key points in the proposal. The UCD representative has volunteered to serve on the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues, which has monthly meetings, and will not be a primary reviewer of any proposals. UCEP representatives are also needed for the UC Washington, D.C. Center (“UCDC”) Academic Advisory Council and for the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) Advisory Committee. Volunteers are needed to draft the principles for online majors and minors which will be needed before the UCSC proposal for an online major in Creative Technologies can be reviewed. Finally, volunteers are needed to adapt the guidelines for proposal reviews used by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs for UCEP’s review of proposals for undergraduate programs.

Action: The following assignments were made:

- The UCM representative agreed to serve on UCDC’s Academic Advisory Committee
- The analyst will get more information about the time commitment for the UCEAP Advisory Committee
- UCB’s College of Computing, Data Science, and Society proposal: primary reviewer UCSD representative/secondary reviewer UCLA representative
- UCB’s Master of Advanced Study in Engineering proposal: primary reviewer UCSC representative/secondary reviewer UCSB representative
- UCI School of Population and Public Health proposal: primary reviewer UCSF representative/secondary reviewer UCB representative
- UCSD School of Computing, Information and Data Science: primary reviewer UCLA representative/secondary reviewer UCSD representative
- UCSC Online Major in Creative Technologies proposal: primary reviewer UCSB representative/secondary reviewer UCM representative (this review will not officially begin until the principles for online majors and minors are finalized)
- Principles for online majors and minors: the UCI and UCR representatives will prepare a draft to be reviewed in November
- Guidelines for program proposal reviews: the UCSB and UCB representatives will prepare a draft to be reviewed in November

V. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- Academic Planning Council started a workgroup on the future of undergraduate education at UC which will produce a report in spring 2023. There are three subgroups: faculty and undergraduate education, undergraduate teaching and learning, and undergraduate research. Analyst Savage will keep UCEP updated on their work.
- The State Legislature funded the enrollment of 8,500 new undergraduates between now and the end of 2023-2024.
- Based on enrollment this summer, limited enrollment growth is projected over the course of the next academic year. Last summer, the FTE declined by about 1,600 and summer session will resume in-person courses with fewer online or remote offerings.
- There will probably be discussions with leadership at UCOP and the Chancellors about whether there could be more remote/online and summer courses, which will vary by campuses.
- Governor Newsom’s budget compact with UC includes a guarantee to increase the budget every year over the next five years but this is dependent on enrollment growth.
- The funding increase does not include an adjustment for inflation, but Director Greenspan noted that Governor Newsom supports UC’s cohort-based tuition plan.

- UC has ambitious goals for eliminating equity gaps and improving graduation rates but there will be pandemic learning loss effects that have not been factored into the budget.
- President Drake presented UCOP's 2030 Capacity Plan to the Regents and the president's goal is to add the equivalent of another campus by 2030 through online instruction, acquisition of other institutions, and increasing participation in education abroad or internships.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- [Susan Cochran](#), *Chair, Academic Senate*
- [Jim Steintrager](#), *Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Cocco welcomed Chair Cochran and Vice Chair Steintrager to the UCEP meeting, and Chair Cochran provided the following updates:

- The new Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs, Douglas Haynes, has been appointed by the Regents. The outcome of the search for a new provost has not yet been announced but it is anticipated that President Drake will seek Regental approval for the final candidate later this month. These key administrators will need to be educated about the Academic Senate's role in shared governance.
- The Regents Academic and Student Affairs Committee discussed facilitating admission of freshmen and transfer students. Due to the pandemic and the drop in enrollment at the CCCs, some campuses are not reaching the ratio of one transfer student for every two freshmen as required by the 2018 Memorandum of Understanding between UC and the CCCs. The committee also received a presentation about UCI Lifted, a prison education initiative.
- President Drake's goals include: 1) expanding opportunity and access, and Senate leadership has encouraged the president to also talk about achieving excellence; 2) leading on climate change and the president has lobbied the governor and legislature for funds to support UC's engagement with climate resilience; 3) strengthening an inclusive and safe community which involves diversifying the student body, faculty and administrative leaders of the campuses as well as improving campus safety; and 4) promoting health across California, including its most vulnerable communities and UC Health is engaged in efforts to expand health care delivery to communities that are beyond the reach of UC health facilities.
- The ICAS (comprised of the Senate faculty leadership of the CCCs, CSUs and UC) has proposed the new California General Education Transfer Curriculum as required by California Assembly Bill 928. If the three faculty Senates do not approve the proposal, the administrators of the segments will be responsible for designing the new singular pathway for transferring from the CCCs to the CSU and UC systems.
- Academic Council discussed the results of the systemwide Senate's 2022 faculty survey about their experiences last year when instruction was a mix of in-person and remote. About 2700 faculty shared their perspectives about what happened on campus. The survey results shall be presented to the Regents in November.
- There are currently six items out for systemwide Senate review including the report from the Entry Level Writing Requirement Task Force and UCEP's proposed new residency requirement, Senate Regulation 630.E.
- Council is looking to UCEP to identify the essential elements of online majors and minors if they are to be approved. If Senate Regulation 630.E is approved, online degrees will be off the table.

Discussion: There is a concern that the proposed one-year residency requirement sends the message that one year on campus is sufficient. Chair Cochran noted that members of Council shared this sentiment but there is no agreement on how much time on campus is the right amount. If the Senate proposed a more stringent regulation, there would likely be calls for greater flexibility for

students. Chair Cochran explained that, in an effort last year to determine whether or not online degrees make sense within the UC residential university system, the Senate examined how other universities have gone about offering these degrees. At other institutions, students apply for either the in-person or online program and cannot switch between the two, and Chair Cochran pointed out that programs at UC are developed by departments. In addition, last year's Senate chair made the important distinction between online minors, majors and degrees.

Apart from curricular considerations, there are financial issues related to implementation of online degrees which are outside of the Senate's authority and decisions for the administration to grapple with. UCEP should focus on the pedagogy in terms of what faculty want to achieve and what is trying to be achieved with respect to student learning outcomes. While it is true that there are bad in-person and online classes, faculty who responded to the 2022 survey reported that in-person courses allow for better engagement with students. Council is looking for UCEP's guidance about the essential elements of online major and minors and for recommendations about whether online degrees should be offered, what these degrees would look like, and what the learning outcomes should be. Another question is whether a department or major will select electives or required courses on the basis of modality or if these will be selected on the basis of pedagogy.

Chair Cochran remarked that the Regents and other people believe that higher education should be accessible but quality is a key factor the Senate must think about. From the perspective of campus administrators, online courses are a way to increase enrollment and generate more funding. It has not been determined whether a degree in an online major will be labeled as an online degree and it is also not known how employers will view graduates of an online UC degree program, but UCEP should discuss these issues. A member posited that the committee is being asked to figure out how online education could be pedagogically superior but another countered that data shows that some students (e.g. 1st Generation students) do not learn well in the online environment and that online instruction is unlikely to be pedagogically equal for some students.

VII. White Paper: "Understanding Online Undergraduate Degree Programs: Definitions, Status, Process, and Questions at the UC"

Last year, Vice Chair Russ took the lead on developing the white paper, "Understanding Online Undergraduate Degree Programs: Definitions, Status, Process, and Questions at the UC" which contains valuable research and other information. However, it was an oversight that UCEP did not take the step of endorsing the white paper and submitting it to Council so it could be formally distributed to the divisional Senates. Although the paper was not produced by this year's UCEP, Chair Cocco would like the committee to vote to forward the document to Council in order to make it publicly available.

Discussion: Members want to make it very clear that the white paper is not seen as an endorsement of online degree programs, and it was noted that a sentence in the report indicates that UCEP is not recommending whether UC should offer fully online degree programs. The cover letter should be updated to indicate that the white paper is not the work of the current committee. By stating that online degree programs are not currently under consideration, Senate faculty can be free to think online courses, minors and majors without having to worry about online degrees.

Action: A motion was made and seconded and members voted unanimously to transmit the white paper to Council with an updated cover letter from Chair Cocco.

VIII. Finalize Principles for Online Minors and Majors

UCEP members were invited to make suggestions about what should be included in the principles for online minors and majors. Chair Cocco offered that one principle should be that students should be able to live on campus if they wish.

Discussion: Even with an online major, students may need to take classes for electives or GE requirements in-person. One question that has arisen at UCLA is whether a proposal for an online major needs to argue that it is better than the in-person version on academic grounds. Another question is if proposals should provide a justification related to access. The white paper contains several key points that could serve as the basis for principles. The guidelines should state that proposers will need to formally explain how faculty teaching in an online major will be supported because learning to teach in the online environment is difficult. UCEP should look at how the fully online master's degree programs are reviewed. Members also asked if every campus has a specific process for approving online courses and if the processes should be uniform. The principles could also mention that faculty own the content of their online courses. Another suggestion is to require that online courses in an online major should meet certain requirements.

Action: The UCI and UCR representatives will work on the principles.

IX. Campus Reports, Member Items and Priorities/Activities for 2022-2023

Chair Cocco explained that members can bring issues or concerns to the committee for discussion.

Discussion: A member reported that a Senate subcommittee at their campus has proposed changing the GE requirements in a way that would enable students to satisfy these requirements with classes from only one department. Decisions about GE requirements are left to the campuses and Chair Cocco would be reluctant for UCEP to start dictating what campuses can or cannot do in this arena. The member will share the proposal with the chair and Director Greenspan suggested this might be a subject that the Academic Planning Council's workgroup on the future of undergraduate education considers.

X. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2:25 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Melanie Cocco