UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 7, 2019

Attending: John Serences, Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter, Vice Chair, (UCD), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Lene Leve-Storms (UCLA) (videoconference), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR) (videoconference), Mary Lynch (UCSF), Ted Bennett (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC) (videoconference), Ann Marie Martin (Graduate Student Representative) (videoconference), Linda von Hoene (Assistant Dean for Professional, Development; Director of Graduate Student Instructor-Teaching and Resource Center, UCB), Kem Saichaie (Associate Director for Learning and Teaching, UCD), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Ellen Osmundson (Coordinator, ILTI), Mary Ellen Kreher (Director, Course Development, ILTI), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair, Academic Senate), Mary Gauvain (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Welcome and Introductions

Chair Serences welcomed everyone to the first UCEP meeting of the academic year and members introduced themselves. The chair reviewed the committee's charge and the day's agenda. The committee voted to add the graduate and undergraduate student representatives to the listserv.

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

Chair Bhavnani thanked the members for their service to the Senate. Chair Bhavnani plans to establish a systemwide task force, to be chaired by Chair Serences, to consider whether UC should offer online undergraduate degree programs and what these programs might look like. The Senate will monitor the Education Abroad Program's enrollment management this year. Vice Chair Gauvain reported that online degrees and lifelong education were two topics discussed during a recent Regents' retreat. During the last Regents meeting, it was suggested that the Regents, rather than the Senate, should decide on the use of standardized testing at UC and Chair Bhavnani described the Senate's Standardized Testing Task Force which is expected to provide preliminary recommendations in the near future.

Aspects of UCEP's proposed policy on awarding of degrees posthumously are being fine-tuned by the administration before it is presented to the Regents for approval. Chair Bhavnani will participate in the searches for a new president and a new chancellor for UCM. The state's plan to audit UC's admission process prompted an internal audit by the compliance unit at UCOP. Discussions about employee contributions to the retirement plan are underway and equity is a critical issue for the Senate. The Regents are scheduled to vote on this in November.

III.   Fully Online Undergraduate Degrees

Last year, UCI's Paul Merage School of Business proposed a fully online undergraduate degree in Business Administration which the systemwide Senate viewed as a first degree of its kind, thus requiring UCEP's approval. The proposal was not approved by UCEP and it raised practical and philosophical questions. It is unclear if a student in an online program will be allowed to change their major, attend a class on campus or participate in a research activity. Since the experiences of students in the online programs will be different from students in traditional campus programs, it is unclear if the degrees from the online programs will be equivalent. While UCI has invested in its online course offerings and

platform, whether the population the School of Business planned to serve would be successful in the online environment is a question. UCEP recommended that UCI expand its online courses to gather data and that the Senate have a systemwide discussion about fully online degrees.

Discussion: Members discussed various issues raised by the UCI proposal and there is agreement that an online degree is inevitable. The UCI representative reported that the School of Business has added 200 spaces with for transfer students and students who stopped out, and these students are given the option to take their courses online. Guidelines should be developed to share with departments that are considering proposing fully online programs to give them an idea of the issues that should be addressed. Another suggestion is to explore online degrees at other universities. Director Greenspan indicated that, since online degree programs are on this year's agenda for the Academic Planning Council (APC), information about the programs at universities similar to UC has been collected and can be shared with UCEP. Extension programs at UCM and UCI have considered online degrees. UC could focus on strategies to improve completion rates and faculty need technical support to offer high quality online courses.

The analyst encouraged members to ask their Committees on Educational Policy/Undergraduate Councils (CEPs/UGCs) to discuss the idea of online undergraduate degrees and to identify principles, values and guidelines for these programs. UCSD has guidelines for evaluating online courses but this would need to be scaled up for full programs. It was suggested that the issues raised by UCI's proposal become less problematic if student choice is the starting point and students accept the different features of the online programs. UCEP should review the Coordinating Committee of Graduate Affairs' (CCGA) guidelines for self-supporting graduate degree programs to gain a better understanding of the issues under the purview of faculty. One idea is to offer a "UC online degree" which would allow students to benefit from everything the campuses have to offer.

IV.   Consultation with Innovative Learning Technology Initiative
- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI*
- *Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director, Course Development, ILTI*

Coordinator Osmundson briefly reviewed the history of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative. ILTI worked with the Senate chair and vice chair and UCEP's leadership last year and over the summer to draft a proposed revision to Senate Regulation 544, which addresses simultaneous enrollment, to improve student access to courses and to clarify the credit granted for online courses. The draft from ILTI includes principles, changes to the actual regulation and factors related to implementation. Based on a review of the history of SR 544, ILTI recommends that it is important to keep the principles and implementation issues front and center to make sure the campus practices and protocols are addressed in the future.

Discussion: One question is whether the demand for cross campus enrollment justifies the cost of the cross campus enrollment system (CCES). Coordinator Osmundson acknowledged that there is still resistance to online courses or cross campus courses in some corners but progress has been made. There is disagreement about student demand for and faculty interest in cross campus courses. A member reminded the committee that nine perceived barriers to cross campus enrollment were investigated by UCEP over the last few years. Overall the regulations or practices were found to be sensible and in some instances the campuses were asked to be flexible. There is a concern that ILTI is now proposing to revise SR 544 before it has addressed structural issues raised by UCEP last year. The issues include prerequisites not being verified before students are enrolled and timely transmission of grades, which could both be fixed with improvements to the technology.

According to Director Kreher the ability for academic advisors at the home campuses to see the prerequisites for the online courses is being addressed, but members suggest that some issues related to this continue. Coordinator Osmundson explained that the purpose of the proposed revision of SR 544 is to

facilitate increased access to courses students need. The revisions are based on the premise that online courses are the same as face to face courses; that freshmen and transfer students should be allowed to enroll in cross campus online courses in their first term at UC; and, that the processes for enrollment should replicate how students enroll in on campus courses as closely as possible. The ability to take courses at other campuses may be a reasonable solution especially for impacted majors, although opinions vary. Of the 370 ILTI courses available for cross campus enrollment, only five are approved at every campus to offer more than unit credit (i.e. meeting General Education [GE], pre-major, or major requirements or being equivalent to a course at the home campus). The goal of the revised regulation is for cross campus courses to be automatically accepted by the campuses unless a campus provides justification for not accepting a course. Courses should be treated equally until it is found that they are not. Coordinator Osmundson clarified that cross campus students do not take seats in courses designated for the home campus but rather cross campus enrollments are in addition to home campus enrollments. The course instructor sets the home campus enrollment cap and then faculty and the department determine the number of cross campus students based on the availability of Teaching Assistants (TAs).

Information is needed about the growth of online courses at each campus and access to courses impacting time to degree. Members would like to see data on the number of students who have enrolled in cross campus courses. A member commented that the rationale for cross campus enrollment shifts on a regular basis. The analyst noted that, in addition to the provost, the Senate chair and vice chair serve on ILTI's steering committee, and thus perspectives may shift as a result of turnover. One member urged the coordination of online courses by campuses to better help students at other campuses. Disparate GE requirements would make treating courses the same at each campus difficult. There is agreement with some of the proposed revisions but ILTI should address the structural issues UCEP has reported. Requiring students to take a specific number of units at the home campus gives campuses the chance to intervene early when students are struggling academically. It may be preferable to implement a petition process rather than to change the systemwide regulations. The chair will distribute a red-lined version of the proposed SR 544 revisions to share with divisional CEPs/UGCs.

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

Academic Planning is calculating how many students have enrolled this year and campuses will look at their targets for 2020-2021. The state budget for UC included $49M to enroll approximately 4,900 California freshmen and transfer students over two years at the full marginal cost. About 3,500 FTE will be added this year so 1,400 students will need to be enrolled next year to meet the state's expectations. Campuses may be encouraged to admit additional students this year while funding is available, at the risk of having to return funds to the state. The state expects UC's enrollment to increase annually but, based on their enrollment plans, the campuses are at capacity. Strategies involving increased use of Education Abroad and summer session to accommodate more students are under discussion.

The Regents have asked for presentations on graduation rates which will include data on number of degrees and elimination of achievement gaps within campuses among various groups. Presentations may feature best practice programs found to reduce achievement gaps and completion rates for first generation or low income students and students from under-represented groups. This year, the APC will discuss what constitutes an undergraduate degree at UC and whether it can be offered fully online as well as principles for non-resident enrollment at the undergraduate level in particular.

VI.   Principles for Working with Incarcerated Students

Chair Serences reminded members of last year's discussion with the Underground Scholars UCB director about the needs of currently and formerly incarcerated students. The California Community Colleges

(CCC) and the California State University (CSU) system have numerous programs for incarcerated students whereas not many UC campuses are engaged in this work. The committee is asked to consider principles or arguments for working with this population, bearing in mind that the needs of currently and formerly incarcerated students are different. Formerly incarcerated students require assistance with transitioning to a campus and with basic needs such as housing suitable for individuals on parole.

Thought should be given to avoid contributing to stigma related to being formerly incarcerated and how the campuses can support success. UCEP should consider the types of degrees to offer and how to ensure that faculty receive credit for work in prison. Once the statement of principles is developed it will be shared with the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates.

Discussion: One question is what prompted the Senate to think about working with incarcerated students. The analyst explained that immediate Past Chair May asked UCEP to consider how Senate regulations should be revised to allow students who are incarcerated, in long-term hospitalization or prisoners in their home countries to enroll in a degree program. It was suggested that currently incarcerated students could take online courses but a major barrier to this is the lack of computers and internet connectivity within prisons. A group of faculty in UCI's Sociology Department are developing a program to work with incarcerated students and UCEP may receive a proposal from this group.

A member expressed concerns about resources being directed to serve students who are in prison, but another argued that everyone has a right to a college education and the system should be rehabilitative. The committee should consider economic arguments. Incarcerated students will have to meet UC's standard eligibility requirements. It will be necessary to have enough students at one location to function as a pedagogical unit. The committee could look at prison education models in other countries for ideas. CCGA will work on principles for graduate degree programs.

VII.   Transfer Initiative ~ Preparation and Support Programs
- *Kari Stewart, Executive Director, Education Pipeline Programs, Diversity and Engagement, UCOP*

Executive Director Stewart joined UCEP to discuss UC's preparation programs for transfer students who are about to matriculate to a four-year university. The programs include MESA, The Puente Project, and UC-UMOJA Partnership. Potential transfer students are increasingly making use of UC's Transfer Admissions Planner and students will eventually be able to use this for the Transfer Admissions Guarantee, now called Pathways+. About 77% of transfer students admitted to UC end up attending a UC. The Community College Transfer Prep program serves 15K students annually at 114 CCCs and will expand to the new online CCC. This program provides general guidance and support particularly for first generation, low income and under-represented students. Programs are based in various units on each undergraduate campus and may be offered during the summer. Some programs focus on particular types of majors and many involve faculty. There is no expectation that participants will attend a UC.

One challenge for the transfer preparation programs is a lack of data on the number of participants because CCC data has not been provided since 2011, but an MOU to rectify this will soon be in place soon. In addition, there is a need to research the programs' impact on transfer preparation practices, which is a potential opportunity to partner with faculty. Funding is needed to offer programs that assist with persistence once students are at a UC campus and some of the funds attached to the Pathways+ program will enable UCOP to develop such services.

Discussion: Members were unaware that the new transfer guarantee is called Pathways+ and the analyst will share a set of frequently asked questions. The focus at UCOP has been communication with CCC advisors about Pathways+ but suggestions are welcome about where outreach is needed. The analyst

reported that UCEP members will be asked to volunteer to participate on the Course Identification (C-ID) Advisory Committee and the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup which oversee the C-ID system project plan under the leadership of the CCC Academic Senate.

VIII.   Training for Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs)
- *Linda von Hoene, Assistant Dean for Professional Development; Director of Graduate Student Instructor-Teaching and Resource Center, UCB*
- *Kem Saichaie, Associate Director for Learning and Teaching Support, UCD*

Assistant Dean Von Hoene and Associate Director Saichaie joined the committee to follow-up on their June discussion about the report on training for TAs and GSIs from the campus Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTLs; also known as Office of Instructional Development). A CTL workgroup began discussing training for TAs and GSIs in 2018 and learned about UCEP's interest in this topic. The report was presented in June to the APC.

The report aims to provide a more nuanced picture of training provided to TAs/GSIs. Required preparation for teaching varies across the campuses and commonly includes orientation at the start of the semester and training in ethics or inclusive teaching. UCB uses an online course on ethics and professional standards and UCLA has a workshop series on foundations for teaching. There are numerous voluntary offerings available for graduate students including workshops, one on one consultation, classroom observation and a centralized course on college teaching, and nine campuses have teaching certificate programs.

The CTLs do not share UCEP's concern about variation in programming across the campuses, but it would be problematic if campuses were not preparing graduate students to be able to achieve certain instructor development outcomes as a result of teaching. The CTLs recommend a connection to the graduate council on each campus to help strengthen preparation and a study of how preparation is captured in departmental reviews. Instructor development outcomes should be used to guide programming. UCEP's suggestion to utilize a graduated approach to TA/GSI preparation is an important one and several campuses have good models in place. The CTLs believe it would be valuable to look at the link between preparation of future faculty at a research university and the teaching that happens at CCCs and CSUs. More resources will be required if campuses are asked to increase the training available.

The report has been shared with people at the campuses. The CTLs' systemwide TA/GSI development committee is starting to develop a set of common outcomes for instructor development in teaching with the understanding that there are different degrees to which these outcomes need to be learned in the teaching experience of graduate students.

Discussion: Training for undergraduates has not been considered by the CTL but the job title will determine if required training is needed. At UCB, undergraduate students are being used primarily in computer science, and it is noted that undergraduate students may not teach frequently. UCSC has a science education major designed to prepare students so they can pass a California subject test for science teachers. Assistant Dean Von Hoene has some concerns about how the teacher certificate programs vary in rigor. The CTLs would like graduate students to have more than end of semester teaching evaluations to document teaching excellence especially since the evaluations are fraught with bias. The CTLs will be looking at how teaching certificates are viewed by search committees. The CTL report can be shared with divisional CEPs/UGCs.

IX.   Appointments to Task Forces and Other Committees

This item was not discussed.

X.   Goals and Priorities for 2019-2020

Changing majors: A member expressed concerns about policies that prevent students from changing their major. Such policies are set at the campus or department level, and at UCSC the CEP approves the relevant policies. The member will discuss this matter with his divisional committee. UCM looks at mid-semester grades and students not doing well are required to attend workshops, and the campus also requires that students pass certain courses to enter a particular major but the effectiveness of these strategies would need to be evaluated.

Change from quarters to semesters: UCSC is exploring switching from quarters to semesters. Director Greenspan indicated that this issue was brought up during the Regents' retreat and there is some talk about aligning California higher education calendars. Historically the faculty at a campus vote on the proposed change.

Best practices during a campus lockdown: There was a lockdown at UCD last year and there do not appear to be any guidelines for faculty. The issues that would trigger a lockdown vary making it difficult to create standard guidance.

XI.   New Business

There was no New Business.

XII.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45 pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Serences