UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Minutes of Videoconference
Monday, November 4, 2024

In attendance: Rachael Goodhue, Chair (UCD), Catherine Sugar, Vice Chair (UCLA), Gijeera Ranade (UCB), David Kyle (UCD), Russ Hovey (UCD Alternate), Allison Perlman (UCI), Cristobal Silva (UCLA Alternate), Jay Sharping (UCM), Sara Lapan (UCR), Jennifer Nájera (UCR Alternate), Carrie Wastal (UCSD), Angel Kuo (UCSF), Jason Duque (UCSB), Isabelle Escobar (Undergraduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Executive Advisor for Academic Planning and Policy Development, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Carmen Corona (Director, Academic Planning and Policy, (IRAP), Ethan Savage (Academic Planning and Policy Analyst, IRAP), Chris Furgiuele (Director, IRAP), Rolin Moe (Executive Director, UC Online), Steven W. Cheung (Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership
Steven W. Cheung, Chair, Academic Senate

UC's mortgage origination program ran out of funds, but the Office of the President (UCOP) is aiming to provide $100M to the program in January 2025. Letters from UC faculty at different campuses expressing concerns about the reorganization of UCD's Writing Program and about faculty oversight of courses were routed to Chair Cheung. Vice Chair Palazoglu was the chair of the UCD division when the reorganization was underway and was consulted during the process. Senate leadership has learned that campus administrators and relevant UCD Senate bodies have had a constructive dialogue on this issue and are in the process of drafting a document to reaffirm faculty rights over curriculum and instruction. The systemwide office communicated to the concerned faculty that this is a UCD division matter that appears to be moving toward a resolution consonant with Academic Senate authority.

The Academic Advisory Committee met with the Special Committee last week to review criteria for the selection of the next president and discuss prospective candidate assessment methodology. Chair Cheung attended the provost's recent congress on Hispanic Serving Institutions and learned that Latinx high school students are the fastest growing segment of that population. Advocates are asserting that the composition of UC faculty and students should mirror the Latinx population throughout the State, which is currently about 40%. The systemwide workgroups on the academic calendar, artificial intelligence (AI), and faculty conduct policies in the Academic Personnel Manual are each underway. Searches for a vice provost for academic affairs and programs at UCOP as well as for new chancellors for UCSB and UCR are moving forward.

The California State University (CSU) system will offer doctoral program degrees and staff at UCOP are working with the CSU Chancellor's Office to design a process for reviewing the proposed programs for duplication with UC's. Information from the Senate's faculty survey and from the upcoming total remuneration study will eventually be shared by Chair Cheung with the Regents. The workgroup on doctoral education is in the final stage of issuing its report which has been two

years in the making. Chair Cheung reported that UC is facing a 5-6% budget cut next year and the budget office at the Office of the President (UCOP) hopes the University will have a flat budget for 2025-2026.

Discussion: UCEP should invite Immediate Past Chair Steintrager to a meeting to discuss the workgroup on AI. Asked about the successor task force to the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Degree Programs, Chair Cheung indicated that ideally the second phase will commence in spring and be completed by the end of August but Provost Newman has other priorities that could waylay that plan. The goals of the successor task force include identifying a set of common assessments to be used by the nine undergraduate campuses, giving UC the ability to conduct sophisticated studies. This would necessitate developing a joint agreement on information sharing, which is a significant undertaking, and determining a data governance structure.

Another goal is an assessment of infrastructure needs to support training for faculty interested in developing online courses and for people with the expertise to design and produce these courses. The governor is interested in online education so it is possible that the State will provide some funding to support this effort. The Presidential Task Force did not conduct a market analysis to assess student demand for fully online undergraduate degree programs, but Chair Cheung suggests starting slowly with impacted majors to build capacity. Central oversight will be needed to ensure there are not duplicative degree programs. There is a concern that once pilot programs are initiated, it is difficult to discontinue them. Chair Cheung does not believe there are significant numbers of faculty eager to do implement online undergraduate degree programs and noted that Regental interest in these programs has waned.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda items and their priority were approved.
Action: The October 7, 2024 meeting minutes were approved.

III.   Chair's Announcements

Chair Goodhue welcomed the undergraduate student representative to the videoconference. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) discussed the State Auditor's report on transfer, the problems with the Free Application for Federal Student Aid, and credit for prior learning (CPL). The California Community College (CCC) system grants CPL for military experience and there are new entities that would like their exams to be used for credit. One issue is that the CSU grants credit for exams that UC does not and this can impact transfer students, but there is no obvious solution for this lack of alignment. Academic Council discussed the implications of the governor's veto of a bill that would have allowed UC to employ undocumented students. As a result of that action, UC is offering experiential learning opportunities that comes with financial assistance for this student population.

The first meeting of the Academic Planning Council's (APC) systemwide calendar workgroup, comprised of over 20 individuals, ended up solely focused on the four-part charge. There was tension around the questions of what would be gained by having a common calendar, what would be lost by retaining the current mixture of campus-determined calendars, and what the key features of an optimal academic calendar are. This workgroup may help figure out the data necessary for

clarifying what investments and supports will be essential to ensuring a successful transition to a common calendar. There are also lessons to be learned from other institutions though these might not be relevant. The cost estimates provided seem low and are based on an undervaluation of faculty time if they are to be compensated for revising their curriculum and redesigning every individual class from a quarter to a semester format, and queries about why this task force will not consider the financial implications were discounted. Task force members asked for the evidence supporting that students are missing out on internships and about utilizing summer session as a fourth quarter. Chair Goodhue expressed concerns about seeming reluctance to tackle difficult questions and about this effort moving too quickly.

Discussion: UCEP considered credit by exam last year when there was some pressure to evaluate new exams. Analyst Abrams explained that the CPL topic is related to the upcoming review of the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) standards and the CCCs want to explore if CPL can be applied to courses that satisfy Cal-GETC. Unlike the CSUs, UC does not accept the College Level Examination Program and differences like this mean CCC students have decide early on about whether they will transfer to UC or CSU. Following several debates last year, UCEP concluded that credit by exam will be awarded for the Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate exams because faculty are familiar with them and that exams offered by new entities will not be considered. Individual UC departments can decide if credit will be awarded for external exams.

Analyst Abrams mentioned that the systemwide Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools has serious reservations about changes the College Board has made to how AP exams are scored, so this may be a topic for a future UCEP meeting. The legislature and vocal advocacy groups are pressuring UC to streamline the transfer process, be more aligned with the CSU, and accept more transfer students. UC strives to have sound partnerships with the CCC and CSU and make a good faith efforts to introduce more flexibility for prospective transfer students. Faculty at UC are committed to CCC students being prepared for, and able to succeed in, their chosen major once they are at a UC campus.

Analyst Savage stated that a separate workgroup at UCOP made up of Budget Analysis and Planning and UC Legal will look at the cost of conversion while the APC workgroup will concentrate on student outcomes, but whether the Senate's University Committee on Planning and Budget will be involved with the former group is unknown. Another unknown is if faculty are advocating for the calendar conversion. The timing of this proposal is worrisome given budget crises at some campuses and serious faculty burnout. The workgroup is expected to complete its work in the spring and the recommendations will likely go out for systemwide review. The president and Regents will have final approval of any changes, and there would be a six-year conversion window. It was suggested that UCEP's focus should be on pedagogical issues related to the conversion.

IV.   Preparation for Consultation with UC Online and IRAP

Members received background information from UC Online's executive director, Rolin Moe, before the meeting. The committee has questions about the data sharing agreements between the program and the campuses. Chair Goodhue pointed out that UCEP's July 2022 and October 2024 memos about UC Online's data reflect a long-standing interest in knowing if students are successful in the courses funded by the program. UCEP's leadership met with Executive Director

Moe who explained that the attrition rate includes students who check UC Online's website for a course but does not actually register for it.

Discussion: The UCSB Undergraduate Council received a request to approve a course that says the course is being offered online as a part of a newly funded UC Online Systemwide Native American and Indigenous Studies minor. This is at odds with the UCSB committee's understanding of how UC Online operates, so Executive Director Moe will be asked about this matter.

V.   Consultation with UC Online and Institutional Research
Chris Furgiuele, Director, IRAP & Rolin Moe, Executive Director, UC Online

IRAP Director Furgiuele and UC Online Executive Director Moe were welcomed to the meeting and the UCSB representative asked about the proposed UC Online Systemwide Native American and Indigenous Studies minor. Executive Director Moe explained that UC Online is funding courses to support the Native American Studies minor and this project has been going on for several years now, with these courses first being funded in 2021-2022. UCD is leading this effort and the goal is for all courses within the Native American Studies minor to be available in online modalities. UC Online does not offer online minors or majors and degree programs are strictly the domain of the campuses. Chair Goodhue remarked that the materials received by UCSB did not appear to mention UCD, making the home of the minor unclear and raising questions about how it will be accredited. Executive Director Moe indicated that UC Online announces funding opportunities and departments and schools submit proposals. UC Online reviews the proposals to determine if the proposed course is consistent with the criteria set by the State for what can be funded. Another question is whether UCSB students will have access to all of the courses in the minor. The executive director promised to figure out the details of the UCD and UCSB programs and report back to UCEP.

Historically, the idea has been that UC Online would be a coalition of the willing with the program engaging directly with faculty, department chairs, and colleges to identify courses they see as beneficial. UC Online has a group of liaisons and an advisory council comprised of administrators and faculty members. UC Online determines whether courses should be funded or not based on what the campus wants to do and whether it aligns with the four pillars the State has tied to the provision of the monies. There is a desire to see the work UC Online is doing support time to degree, and Executive Director Moe proposes a greater partnership between UC Online and UCEP to ensure that the concerns raised today are resolved.

Before moving forward with an annual report, the program recognized the need to devise a strategic plan, now in the final stages of approval, that focuses on collaboration with the Academic Senate, campuses, and administrators. UC Online's role in piloting online undergraduate degree programs proposed by the Presidential Task Force will need to be determined as the program seeks to help meet particular systemwide needs. It will be important to articulate what UC Online provides to the system and how the State's money is spent, and Executive Director Moe acknowledged that UC has not seen the return on investment that would be expected. UC recently joined the State Authorization Network, a group of campuses working on issues related to interfacing with State and Federal governments.

There have been problems with UC Online's data and how it is discussed, but the program is starting to obtain better data. In 2022-2023, almost 3k students were approved to enroll and

completed the course, there were 4,537 drops, and 191 withdrawals. Drops are measured from the day that the course opens for enrollment until the drop period ends and this program is alone in measuring anything before the course actually begins. About 40% of students who sign up for courses at their home campus end up dropping them. There is information on the funding for courses offered only by the home campus but not for courses open for cross campus enrollment. UC Online reports this information because many different people are involved in, and significant costs are associated with, the registration and enrollment processes. The campuses have distinct approaches to late drops, referred to as withdrawals by the program, and new taxonomy and ways to calculating this data are needed to align what is reported by the systemwide office with what is happening on the campuses. Based on raw data, nearly 1,700 students enrolled in cross-campus courses this term, representing growth of 151% from last fall but this data needs to be verified. The program has full data sharing agreements with UCD, UCLA, UCR, UCSD, UCSB, and UCSC although there is room for improvement. UC Online does not receive grades from UCI, UCM is still building its capacity to send grades, and UCB has not signed the agreement.

Director Furgiuele explained that IRAP is responsible for collecting all student data from the campuses and maintaining the systemwide central database used to publish information on the UC Information Center. This data spans from admissions to enrollment to graduation degrees awarded, graduation rates, retention rates, and financial support. Although IRAP has been collecting data on course enrollment, completions, withdrawals, units attempted and passed, and grades for over five years, the office has not reached the point of compiling it into a public facing dashboard. IRAP and UC Online have been contemplating how to incorporate the online cross-campus enrollment data into something that could provide more transparency and visibility into enrollments across the UC Online-funded courses, other online courses, and in-person courses. Director Furgiuele summarized the information IRAP collects from the campuses on all forms of instruction by individual courses and sections which includes: student demographics; ethnicity; gender; Pell status; major; field of study; and if they enrolled as first year or transfer students. This data can be used to enrich the course enrollment data and it can be disaggregated by if courses are fully in-person, fully online courses not funded by UC Online and those funded by the program, and fully online courses available only to students at their home campus. The same definitions, terminology, frequency of data will be applied to all of the data.

IRAP has not decided what will be done with this data but Vice President Brown is interested in making use of it and Director Furgiuele and Executive Director Moe are talking about how to leverage this opportunity to provide more information to UCEP and other stakeholders. The tentative plan is to take a phased approach to developing a new dashboard that involves a prolonged, deliberative conversation with campus stakeholders to better understand the course grade data that is currently not published by the UC system or by any of UC's comparator institutions. If UC will pioneer the release of this data, it should be done responsibly and effectively. The first phase is understanding the footprint of the various kinds of instructional modalities across the system by subject matter and student demographic. The second phase will entail consulting with campus institutional research units, teaching and learning centers, as well as equity, diversity and inclusion experts and the Senate more broadly about the course grade and outcome information that could be published.

There will be operational questions that cannot be answered by the data and for privacy reasons the data will not show how students performed in a particular section of a course in a specific term. The dashboard will also not substitute for research or assessment to determine if online or in-

person courses are more effective but it will provide transparency and a bird's eye view of what is occurring across different instructional modalities in the system. This work has not begun but it will take a number of months given the consultation required, the fact that the data is not standardized, and because instructional modality definitions beyond what is fully in-person and fully online are not uniform. In addition, there will always be some data that is unavailable for a small number of courses.

Discussion: The proposed Native American and Indigenous Studies minor raises concerns about faculty at other campuses creating courses for a degree program at another campus. If it is a systemwide program it should be reviewed by UCEP. Asked how instructors of record for cross-campus courses provide grades for students at the other campuses, Executive Director Moe indicated that the instructor enters grades into their campus learning management system and an application programming interface transmits the information to UC Online's Salesforce instance, allowing the program to send the data to the other campuses with the exception of UCI which does not share grades and UCB which sends the program a manual report by mail.

Director Furgiuele remarked that the snapshots of data used by IRAP are collected from campuses at the beginning and end of each term when all grades have been assigned. However, for reasons that are not completely clear, there have been situations where the grades are not available. IRAP's system is not operational in a way that allows it to capture grades at varying times. Executive Director Moe reported that the strategic plan has been approved by the Vice Provost of Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs, is now under review by the Council of Vice Chancellors, and that Provost Newman has final approval. The assessment of the learning outcomes of UC Online courses rests at the instructor and campus levels but the executive director commented that the successor task will consider a foundation for and agreement upon what should be studied. Members thanked Executive Director Moe and Director Furgiuele for the helpful presentation.

VI.   Compendium Revisions

The UCSC representative has started working on proposed revisions to the Compendium and Chair Goodhue would like one or two members to review the document before it is considered by the full committee. The in depth discussion of this topics will be postponed until a later meeting.

Discussion: The UCD representative volunteered to review the document.

VII.   California Competes Policy Analysis: Reworking Academic Probation

Last year, a proposal from UCEP to replace "academic probation" with "academic notice" in systemwide Senate regulations was approved by the Academic Assembly. California Competes has prepared a brief that describes potential steps towards more substantive changes including establishing a task force. UCEP is simply asked to recommend if this brief should be considered by ICAS although how ICAS would proceed is unclear.

Discussion: Analyst Abrams clarified that UCEP's proposal to change "academic probation" to "academic notice" was prompted by the UC Undergraduate Academic Advising Council, not by California Competes. Members expressed support for suggesting that ICAS review the briefing.

VIII.   (Systemwide Review) Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 479

Vice Chair Sugar explained the proposal from the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues to revise SR 479 is out for systemwide review. The committee's comments are due by December 10th and today's discussion will inform the memo to be drafted by Vice Chair Sugar and the UCSC representative. The goal is to better prepare transfer students for when they enter UC and members are asked to comment on any downsides to the proposal.

Discussion: There is support for giving transfer students more flexibility and UCM's admissions and financial aid committee pointed out that this flexibility would likely reduce barriers for transfer students at that campus. The questions identified include: if the proposed change will impact time to graduation; if UC will have capacity in the general education (GE) courses that are deferred; whether students will have the breadth of preparation needed if they have not taken both physical science and biological science courses; and how the changes will be communicated to the CCCs.

IX.   Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)
Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning & Policy Development, IRAP; Carmen Corona, Director, Academic Planning & Policy, IRAP; & Ethan Savage, Academic Planning & Policy Analyst, IRAP

Analyst Savage received responses from the undergraduate campuses about the most recent batch of CCC baccalaureate degree program proposals and there were no duplicates. The CCCs submitted four new proposals and those have been forwarded to UCEP members for their records. Director Greenspan reported that IRAP will have the undergraduate enrollment census figures next week and proposals for 2025-2026 enrollment will be presented to the Council of Chancellors in December. It currently appears there will be higher enrollment than planned and hopefully the State will give UC credit for this next year. The State Auditor examined UC's use of online program managers (OPMs) and UC is required to develop guidelines and policies for these programs by June. An OPM workgroup will include two Senate faculty, several Extension and graduate deans, UC Online Executive Director Moe, and procurement staff.

X.   Homework for UCEP's December 2nd Meeting

On December 2nd, UCEP will have time for an in-depth discussion with Senate leadership about the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Education report and recommendations. Members are encouraged to review the report and submit questions by November 21st for Analyst Abrams to compile and send to Chair Cheung. The committee might also want to think ahead about what the charge for the successor task force and its timing.

XI.   Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCM: The annual administration-faculty Senate retreat was last week and there is effective collaborative problem solving. The main problem at this campus is that enrollment has been flat for the past three years and targets have been missed.

UCI: An external review of the School of Humanities has just been completed and the School of the Arts will go through an external review in the winter. A new budget model at the campus links the allocation of resources in part to student credit hours. This has generated a lot of anxiety in the School of Humanities because of a large number of writing and language courses that satisfy GE requirements have small enrollments.

XII.   New Business

The UCSD representative is the lead reviewer of UCR's request for a variance to SR 780 and the request seems reasonable. The proposed amendment says the grade delay designation will be changed to a grade or an incomplete when the registrar receives a written request from the instructor or program chair but there is no timeline for when this action would occur. Another question is when a grade delay will lapse into an F.

Discussion: The UCR representative explained that a grade delay is used in different ways on the campus including when an instructor misses the deadline for submitting grades, when suspected academic dishonesty is being investigated, or when a student is expected to pass a course but has to complete some work. The UCSD representative will send the questions in writing to the UCR representative and the goal is for UCEP to vote on this matter in December.

The meeting adjourned at: 5 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst
Attest: Rachael Goodhue, Chair