

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Videoconference Minutes
Monday, November 1, 2021

Attending: Mary Lynch, Chair (UCSF), Katheryn Russ, Vice Chair (UCD), Dana Carney (UCB), Katie Stirling-Harris (UCD), Melanie Cocco (UCI), Kathleen Bawn (UCLA), Holley Moyes (UCM), Bryan Wong (UCR), Daniel Dubin (UCSD), David Paul (UCSB), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Zola Hayes (Undergraduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Director, IRAP, UCOP), Ethan Savage (Analyst, IRAP), Pamela Brown (Vice President, IRAP), Tongshan Chang (Director, IRAP), Gage Dayton (Administrative Director, UCSC Natural Reserves), Kelly Ziliacus (Acting Program Coordinator, UC Natural Reserve System, UCOP), Ellen Osmundson (Director, UC Online, UCOP), Robert Horwitz (Chair, Academic Senate), Susan Cochran (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Robert Horwitz, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Susan Cochran, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The first report from the workgroup on mitigating the impacts of COVID-19 on faculty was recently transmitted by Provost Brown to the divisions. The workgroup put forward the concept of achievements relative to opportunity to recognize that the research efforts of faculty in particular fields and those with caregiving responsibilities were constrained by COVID-19 and that the pandemic required more attention to teaching and service by some in the effort to keep the university functioning. The report also recommends ways for campuses to help restart research and give teaching flexibility to faculty in certain situations. The workgroup started meeting again last week and will take up issues that had not been addressed in the first report, including how to socialize the recommendations and orient department chairs to deal with personnel files and COVID-19 impact statements in the next three to five years.

Chair Horwitz reported that Senate leadership has been helping climate activist faculty organize climate crisis committees on their campuses. Campus faculty groups provided status updates during a meeting last month, and the possibility of sending the Regents a memorial on climate will be considered during the next meeting. There is growing interest in combining research and projects across the campuses, and the Vice President for Innovation and Research at the Office of the President (UCOP) is developing a climate budget request which was shared with the UC Global Climate Leadership Council (GCLC) last month and will be presented to the Regents in November. The GCLC meeting featured presentations about climate justice and actions that address the crisis.

The Regents have asked the Senate to give greater recognition and credit to faculty for their patents and startup activities in the merit and promotion process. Chair Horwitz has asked the Academic Personnel and Research Policy committees to look into the matter and prepare a report by mid-January. Senate leadership has continued discussing the third-party “social learning” websites which facilitate student cheating and the theft of faculty intellectual property (IP) with UC Legal. UC Legal is not optimistic about the success of litigation or legislation strategies, and Chair Horwitz has asked UC Legal to look into an automated Digital Millennium Copyright Act takedown request process for the removal of faculty IP. UC may be able to join with other universities and accrediting agencies in this effort which could increase the chances of a positive outcome.

Chair Horwitz informed the committee about the Senate's work with the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates on student transfers from the California Community Colleges (CCCs) to UC and the recent passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 928. The process of transferring to UC is considered confusing and opaque although UC's undergraduate campuses meet the enrollment target of one transfer student to every two freshmen which was codified in the 2018 memorandum of understanding between the CCCs and UC. Data from UCOP shows that transfer students do well at UC. Their grade point average and years to degree are roughly comparable to those of freshman, and transfer students graduate on time. UC asserts that the success of the transfer students reflects that UC cares not just about its mission, but about student preparation before and after enrollment. However, critics view the focus on preparation as elitist and argue that UC does not admit enough underrepresented minority and first generation college students. It is noteworthy that most of the transfer students come from just eight or nine CCCs located in coastal, urban communities.

Over the years, the responsibility for working on transfer has largely fallen to Senate leadership but the leadership wants to make transfer part of the official responsibilities of UCEP, the Committee on Preparatory Education and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools or of a working group with members drawn from those committees. The Senate has an especially heavy lift now with the passage of AB 928, which was signed into law by Governor Newsom. AB 928 calls for a single General Education (GE) transfer pathway to the CSU and UC and requires the CCCs to place students on an Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) track in order to make the transfer process more transparent and easier for CCC students. The effort to address AB 928 will begin with exploring how to build upon the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum to create the GE pathway and finding way to align the ADTs with UC's Transfer Pathways.

Another problem is that certain CCCs do not send many transfer students to UC because they are under-resourced and often unable to offer the courses necessary to satisfy UC's requirements for major preparation. In addition to the need to make the ASSIST course transfer and articulation system user-friendly, Senate leadership thinks that UC Online (UCO) could collaborate with some CCCs to offer the kinds of major preparation courses that would make it easier for students to attain the necessary academic record and pursue their transfer aspirations.

Discussion: A member asked if UC Online courses can be taken by students who are not enrolled at UC. The analyst remarked that the UC Scout program develops and delivers A-G approved online classes and curriculum to non-UC students. In addition, UCO is now under Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs which also includes the Transfer Policy Analysis & Coordination unit, positioning UCO to be directly involved with transfer issues. UCEP's undergraduate student representative recommends surveying transfer students about their experiences, and suggested that the campuses should do more to help transfer students feel a sense of community.

Chair Lynch indicated that it would be helpful for the committee to have guidance from Senate leadership about the principles for online undergraduate degree programs. Questions include whether the principles should address: the type of student who may be a better fit for an online degree program; fully online versus hybrid programs; the different types of technological infrastructure and support will be needed by both for faculty and students; and if online education will cost the same as on campus education. Chair Horwitz pointed out that these questions were considered by the Senate's Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force, so the report from this task force, along with the experience with remote instruction during the pandemic, should inform UCEP's work on the principles. UCEP might also want to consult with the campus Centers for Teaching and Learning which have been focusing on remote courses. As a result of the pandemic,

UC has a better understanding of what can and cannot be taught online. A member commented that online courses should be developed by faculty, not by UC Online.

II. The 2022 UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES)

- *Pamela Brown, Vice President, Institutional Research and Academic Planning*
- *Tongshan Chang, Director, IRAP*

UCEP will learn about the plan for the 2022 UCUES from Vice President Brown and Director Chang and consider if any new questions about remote instruction should be added to the survey. The UCUES is administered every other year and Vice President Brown shared the dashboard with data from the 2020 survey which asked about remote instruction, the quality of remote instruction compared to in-person classes, and students' overall experience. One issue is that two groups of students will be surveyed in 2022: one group who were UC students during this period and another group who were still in high school or a CCC in 2020-2021. IRAP wants to be thoughtful about the types of questions related to learning loss or challenges that may have arisen during remote instruction and it will be helpful to have UCEP's ideas. IRAP will meet with the campus UCUES coordinators to finalize the survey instrument in the next month. The survey is open to all undergraduates and takes about 45 minutes to complete. The return rate is usually between 35 to 40%.

Discussion: Given how different students are because of the pandemic, how the survey results are analyzed will be critical. IRAP will be able to look specifically at students who transferred from a CCC, students who were in high school and students who were at UC last year. Since many of the questions have been asked over a number of years, it will be possible to see how responses vary from previous cohorts. The coordinators will be given the detailed results for their campuses so they can do their own analyses, and they will be able to identify students who responded to the 2020 survey. The results can be filtered by the CCC from which students transferred to UC. The campus coordinators will also be able to breakdown the survey responses by academic unit and this information can be used for academic program reviews. IRAP provides data to Student Affairs for presentations to the Regents on issues such as student basic needs and student engagement.

The analyst suggested it could be helpful to add questions about academic integrity to the survey. UCUES does include questions about student well-being and mental health but there are no questions about how the students have been impacted by the pandemic in particular. A member proposed adding questions about the experience in different types of courses during remote instruction, but one challenge will be that campuses may describe courses differently. Members will send proposed questions to the analyst by the end of this week.

III. UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field Course

- *Gage Dayton, Administrative Director, UCSC Natural Reserves*
- *Kelly Ziliacus, Acting UCNRS Program Coordinator, UCOP*

UCEP approved the systemwide NRS California Ecology and Conservation field course in 2015 and it will be the first systemwide course the committee reviews. Chair Lynch would like two members to take the lead on the review which should be completed this academic year, and the committee will discuss adopting UCD's procedures for reviewing special academic programs. The analyst explained that UCEP created the process for approving systemwide courses in 2011 and indicated that these courses should be reviewed every seven years, but the committee did not delineate how they would be reviewed. UCD's process appears to be very rigorous and UCEP may want to streamline it. In addition, there has never been an academic review of the UC Washington, D.C. Center (UCDC) and this will need to be tackled in the near future. In July 2020, UCEP leadership had

a call with the Senate leadership, Provost Brown, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson, and the Chair of the UCDC Academic Advisory Committee, and the participants agreed that UCEP would be responsible for the UCDC review.

Director Dayton and Coordinator Ziliacus joined the meeting to provide background information on the NRS California Ecology and Conservation (CEC) course. The CEC course is based on an established UCSC course and it was designed to be a systemwide course because many of the other campuses did not have an immersive field course. The first offering of the systemwide course was in fall 2015 and it is actually a set of four credit-bearing courses taken over a quarter or a semester. The courses are very hands-on and teach students how to do science, experimental design, statistics, conservation topics, and conservation biology. UCOP facilitates the application process and CEC is offered three times a year in fall, spring, and summer, although the spring and summer sessions in 2020 were cancelled due to COVID-19. The program started again in 2021 after a pandemic protocol was created and the offerings were increased to two times per quarter in response to high demand for in-person teaching. Since 2015 there have been 20 sessions with 775 applications from across the system and 360 students have been enrolled.

Director Dayton reported that, in the beginning, there were concerns about whether there would be buy-in from campuses, departments, and students but the CEC has been very successful and continues to grow. Another concern for the program was whether there would be representation from all of the undergraduate campuses. Through the application process the program evaluates the number of students applying from different campuses in an effort to be equitable. A large number of applicants are from UCSC, but representation across the other campuses is good. The program is also aware of the need to increase diversity in Science, Engineering, Technology and Math, and UCSC has published a series of papers about the impact of field courses on students, and economically disadvantaged students in particular. The greatest number of students in CEC identify as White, but students from various ethnic groups are also participating. However, CEC is lagging behind the UC-wide proportion of first-generation college, transfer, and international students. The program aims to provide opportunities for students who might not have had access to a field course or who might think that a field course is not available to them. CEC is paying attention to how it can increase support to students, and offers a number of scholarships made both through private donations given to the systemwide office and UCOP has provided some support to students over the last seven years.

The director addressed a set of questions provided by Chair Lynch in advance of the meeting. CEC is not technically part of a special academic program but it is a systemwide course open to all undergraduate students at UC. UCOP serves as an administrative home for CEC, handling registration, enrollment, financial aid, and grade reporting. There is a memorandum of understanding that specifies the administrative roles of UCOP and UCSC. At UCSC, the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) department serves as the department head and record of employment of the CEC faculty. The program has two lecturers with 12 month appointments who teach CEC three times a year and are supervised by the Executive Director and the chair of EEB department. CEC has a budget analyst and Director Dayton noted that the program has a fleet of vans.

CEC does not offer a degree, but students from semester campuses receive 15 units of course credit and students from quarter campuses receive 19 units. The NRS's systemwide advisory committee is comprised of faculty from the nine undergraduate campuses, and when CEC was created, each faculty director made sure their campus department would track CEC to their degrees. Students interested in CEC are given information about how the units map onto their specific degrees at each campus. CEC is not subject to review by another committee or division of the Academic Senate.

Discussion: Director Dayton clarified that CEC is comprised of three five-unit courses and one four-unit course. Since the course involves a field component, there is an extra course fee of \$3,800. Students are in the field for seven weeks straight and a portion of the fee pays for transportation, food, and accommodations. The fee is steep which is why the program tries to offset it through scholarships and donations, and students can apply for financial aid. The fee also supports program infrastructure and for purchasing vans.

To apply for CEC, students answer questions about previous field experience, experience in remote field conditions, interest in scientific research, the students' ability to work in an isolated environment for seven weeks, and why they want to take the course. The application also asks about other talents, academic honors, and knowledge of first aid and CPR. Students are required to provide the emails of two references, and there is a minimum grade point average requirement as well as a requirement that students have completed at least one biology course. The instructors score the applications based on a scale of one through seven. Three spots are held for each campus as a way to have equal representation and if there are not three qualified applicants from a campus, those spots are allocated to students from other campuses with high rankings. The program tends to prioritize admitting students who have not had previous field experience.

Director Dayton will forward the papers mentioned during the presentation to the analyst along with any additional information UCEP would like. The program has not done an in-depth internal assessment but the papers include data from CEC. CEC will also begin looking at where alumni end up after taking the course, and students are given a survey on the first and last day of class in an attempt to evaluate the impact of the experiential learning opportunities on several key metrics. It would be ideal to have UCEP's review completed this winter, but the director will defer to the committee with respect to the timeline.

IV. Consultation with UC Online

- *Ellen Osmundson, Director, [UC Online](#), UCOP*

In August, the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative changed its name to UC Online (UCO) and moved to the Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs unit in UCOP. Director Osmundson explained that UCO receives funding from the Legislature every year to support online education at UC, including digital and hybrid courses, and to support the campus infrastructure needed to enroll students from other campuses. In the past, UCO ran a competitive request for proposals where faculty in concert with their department chair and dean were provided funds for the development of courses. UCO's catalog now has over 500 courses that have been funded either by UCO or campus funds and available for cross campus enrollment.

UCO hosted conferences on online instruction in 2013 and 2016, and the most recent conference, "The Next Chapter of the Digital Transformation of UC" was on October 21st and 22nd. Over 450 students, faculty, staff and administrators registered for the conference and approximately 250 joined the virtual conference. President Drake and several chancellors shared their perspectives about the status of online and digital education, and graduate and undergraduate students described their experiences with online courses. There was also a session on accessibility and how to use digital platforms to support students with disabilities. UCO is still collecting surveys with feedback about the conference. The dedication and the outstanding work done by faculty, students, and staff during the pandemic was very clear.

Discussion: In terms of lessons learned, Director Osmundson has found that faculty who want to

develop fully online courses have benefited from involvement with instructional designers and from having time to carefully plan courses that can support student learning and engagement. Faculty have commented on the value of having funds for infrastructure as well as gaining a better understanding of how to create an inclusive learning environment and to increase access for students with disabilities. There is a concern that significant resources are put into UCO courses but it is not clear that there is an investment in long-term maintenance. Director Osmundson indicated that there are opportunities for faculty to adjust the structure of an online course especially since faculty receive data in real time about how student learning is progressing. UCO courses are flexible and include synchronous components.

The director reported that campus instructional designers meet on a regular basis and have developed a rubric for assessing courses, including diversity, equity, and inclusion elements. A member asked about data on how long courses are consistently offered. Director Osmundson indicated that, as part of the award process, faculty agree to open the course to cross campus enrollment a minimum of five terms for quarter campuses and three terms for semester campuses. The majority of UCO-funded courses are open for cross campus enrollment for several years and then they are offered at the campus level after that.

Chair Lynch asked where the director thinks UCO will be five years from now and what will have been accomplished. Director Osmundson hopes to have more frequent informal conferences, and workshops that bring people together for conversations about online instruction. The vision for online instruction should be campus-driven with a focus on equity, inclusion, and accessibility. The director is hopeful that funding for UCO will allow it to move into the realm of graduate courses. There is a definite need for consistent funding for digital infrastructure that extends beyond UCO courses, especially if UC faces something like the pandemic again. Director Osmundson was also asked about the status of the recommendation for a new governance structure in the report on restructuring UCO. The Provost may consult with Senate leadership about who will serve on the new governance committee and one idea is that members will serve two or three year terms.

At a future meeting, it would be helpful to discuss how UCO could be involved with priority issues such as developing courses that support prerequisites for CCC students who will be transferring to UC. UCEP would also be interested in seeing data on how many students have taken UCO courses, the characteristics of these students, and if there is any variation across the campuses in terms of how many students take online courses.

V. Announcements and Updates

Chair Lynch remarked that UC's Chief Financial Officer provided Academic Council with a positive report on California's robust economy and how it will benefit UC. Regent Estolano joined Council and appeared to be very interested in hearing from faculty and responded to a variety of questions. The Regent indicated that the Board recognizes that online instruction is not a panacea and that UC learned what should not be repeated as a result of the pandemic. The Smarter Balanced Study Work Group recommended against using the Smarter Balanced Assessment for admission to UC.

VI. Consent Calendar

Action: The October 4, 2021 minutes were approved with corrections.

VII. Consultation with Institutional Research and Academic Planning

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*

- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

Campuses are beginning to send their fall enrollment figures to UCOP and it looks like UC will grow by about 2700 students following a decline of approximately the same number in summer 2020. IRAP will ask the campuses to submit their 2023 targets, which is complicated by proposals for an ambitious growth plan from the Regents, the president and the Legislature. President Drake has set up a workgroup of chancellors to look at the 2030 options for enrollment growth by about 20k more students. Discussions about growth do not include plans for building a new campus so the aim is to find alternative ways to accommodate increased capacity which include sending more students to Education Abroad and increasing the use of summer session and online courses.

The Regents Academic and Student Affairs Committee would like more data that will show the impact of the pandemic as well as information about student success and engagement. The Academic Planning Council will establish a workgroup on the future of undergraduate education to look at the online hybrid experience, academic integrity, and other hot button issues.

VIII. UC San Diego's Proposal to Re-name the General Campus Academic Divisions to Establish Schools of Arts and Humanities, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences

- *Melanie Cocco, UCI*
- *Kathy Bawn, UCLA*

The UCLA and UCI representatives were the lead reviewers of UC San Diego's Proposal to re-name the General Campus Academic Divisions to Establish Schools of Arts and Humanities, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. The proposal is more complex than a simple name change and the use of "school" raises red flags, but UCSD is adopting the naming convention used by UCI. The reviewers did not identify any problems with the proposal and recommend that UCEP approval the change.

Action: UCEP unanimously approved the UCSD proposal.

IX. Plan for Reviewing the NRS California Ecology and Conservation Field Course

Chair Lynch asked if two UCEP members would volunteer to lead the review of the NRS CEC systemwide field course.

Discussion: The UCI representative volunteered to conduct this course review and Chair Lynch will line up a second reviewer before that work begins. Vice Chair Russ volunteered to propose changes to UCD's procedures for reviewing Special Academic Programs for UCEP's consideration in December. The review procedures will be transmitted to the NRS CEC representatives upon approval so they can begin preparing the information the committee requests as soon as possible.

X. Principles for Online Undergraduate Degree Programs

The chair asked if the UCSC representative would be willing to take the lead on developing the principles for online undergraduate degree programs, and requested that members who previously volunteered confirm that they will work on this project.

Discussion: The UCSC representative agreed to lead the group that will develop a set of principles for online degree programs. The UCB and UCM representatives also volunteered to work on the principles.

XI. Member Items/New Business

There was no New Business.

XII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:45 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Mary Lynch