

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

## MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2018

**Attending:** Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD) (videoconference), Katherine Snyder (UCB), Daniel Potter (UCD), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Adriana Galvan (UCLA) (videoconference), Jay Sharping (UCM) (videoconference), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Deborah Johnson (UCSF), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Kimia Akbari (Undergraduate Student Representative) (videoconference), Yvette Gullatt (Vice Provost and Chief Outreach Officer, Diversity and Engagement, UCOP), Ellen Osmundson (Coordinator, ILTI, UCOP) (videoconference), Mary-Ellen Kreher (Director, Course Design and Development, ILTI), Paul Montoya (CFO and Marketing Director, ILTI), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Jim Chalfant (Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office, UCOP) (videoconference), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates met on October 23<sup>rd</sup> and was briefed by Chair May on the Transfer Guarantee. Academic Council met on October 25<sup>th</sup> and was joined by Regent George Kieffer (Chair of the Board) who has a long-standing interest in undergraduate education and the meaning of a degree. Currently, a special committee to the Regents is focused on “basic needs” to inform multi-year budget planning and as a focus with the legislature. With Provost Brown, there are ongoing discussions related to the “area d” Laboratory Science requirement, and President Napolitano’s updates included undocumented student legal advancements and ongoing needs. Council also discussed issues related to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, contract negotiations with the represented librarians seeking academic freedom, and the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program. The president has set aside \$7M for building diversity in the faculty. On October 31<sup>st</sup>, a conference on faculty salary equity was held at UCOP and part of discussion was how systemwide analysis of salary shows comparable salary across faculty cohorts; however, it is also clear that further analysis would be worthwhile and that campus-wide studies do not adequately capture differences between disciplines. Chair May attended a conference “Advancing the Mathematics of Opportunity,” sponsored by Just Equations<sup>1</sup>, which was attended by numerous policy makers who were critical of UC and the authority of faculty over curricular requirements, and who claimed that current UC math requirements are fundamentally discriminatory.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The October 23<sup>rd</sup> minutes were approved.

**III. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative**

- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI*
- *Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director, Course Design and Development, ILTI*
- *Paul Montoya, CFO and Marketing Director, ILTI*

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://justequations.org/>

Coordinator Osmundson provided an overview of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) which was established in 2013 and is overseen by the provost and Senate leadership. Goals include to use technology to help increase access to courses needed for graduation, to support teaching, and to the help with time to degree. Currently, there are over 300 fully online and hybrid undergraduate courses funded by ILTI system-wide. ILTI created a searchable database of the online courses and a system that allows students to enroll in courses offered by other UC campuses. A course credit evaluation process was set up to determine if more than unit credit can be awarded for courses taken at another UC campus. Courses are funded through a request for proposal process and letters of support are provided by department chairs and deans. Each course is approved at the instructor's campus and a decision about opening the course for cross campus enrollment is made by the instructor. For a course taken at another campus, the tuition remains at the student's home campus and the department offering the course is eligible to receive cross campus instructional funds.

Director Kreher walked the committee through the Cross Campus Enrollment System (CCES) which provides detailed information for students about the courses available across the system including the type of credit granted. In real time, the CCES pulls in academic calendars and course catalogs from campus systems and collects students' identification and eligibility information from the student information systems (SISs). Director Kreher explained that the academic advisors determine if a student has fulfilled the prerequisites for a course. Students are provisionally approved to enroll in a course. Students verify that they are in good academic standing, are enrolled in the minimum number of units at their campus, meet the prerequisites, and will meet requirements of their home campus for taking a cross campus course.

The registrar at the home campus is asked to approve or deny enrollment and will determine if an academic advisor needs to be involved with approving the enrollment (advisors are not part of this process at some campuses). Advisors' decisions override the registrars' and students are notified by email if their enrollment has been approved or denied. The system allows but does not require advisors to add a note and the CCES will be modified to require a reason.

Some campuses have automated processes to accept the enrollments from the CCES whereas other campuses enter the information manually. At the end of the course, the CCES requests all grades for the students and the campuses not using the CCES send transcripts to the students' home campus. The CCES is being used by seven of the undergraduate campuses, will go live with UCM in December and UCI at a later date. UCSF does not have a catalog but does allow students to enroll in courses offered by other campuses.

**Discussion:** Since students typically take only one cross campus course the decision was made to not send the tuition to the host campus but as cross campus enrollments increase, a new funding model will be explored. Students can petition for a course to count for more than unit credit (i.e. GE, major preparation, or elective) but currently the process is initiated after the course has been completed. Director Kreher indicated that ILTI will meet with registrars and academic advisors to discuss including a feature in the CCES that enables students to file a petition as recommended by UCEP at the end of last year.

Currently, advisors must review the prerequisites but adding a feature to the CCES that articulates these courses could be considered. Establishing the equivalency of courses in advance will save time for students. A registrar might deny enrollment if a student has not paid fees, for example, and it is not clear how quickly denials unrelated to academic issues are resolved. Students must contact the registrar, ILTI's student support unit at UCM or their advisor to drop a course. ILTI has a good amount of data on the denials and even it is not clean, UCEP would like to see it.

Faculty teaching the ILTI course determine how many seats are available and report this to the registrar. The capacity can range from five students in courses such as writing to nine hundred in others. Seats available for cross campus enrollment are in addition to the seats for students at the home campus. Each campus has a different registration window so ILTI opens its enrollment in the middle of those periods to accommodate the differences. About 38% of students who attempt to enroll end up taking the courses. Many students enroll in a cross campus online course as a back-up when waiting for approval to take the course at their home campus. More information is needed to understand exactly how the approval process impacts enrollment. A member asked about the availability of Teaching Assistants (TAs) and ILTI will investigate the TA resources that could support a course. Based on how many cross campus students enroll, ILTI provides funds to support the TA resources. Coordinator Osmundson explained that the department determines the ratio of students to TAs and this standard is used for all courses.

Students find ILTI courses through social media, in campuses newspapers, and through a newsletter to advisors but promoting the courses is a work in progress. Director Montoya has looked at the relationship between traffic on the ILTI website and enrollment but no clear patterns have been identified. ILTI surveys students but the return rate is only about 10%. Graduate students, TAs and faculty are also surveyed about the student experience. Approximately 5k surveys have been submitted so far. ILTI shares information from the survey with the faculty who taught the courses. One question is how ILTI handles introductory science courses with labs and ILTI is researching best practices on this issue. It was suggested that the lab component could be done concurrently at the student's home campus with TA support. It is viable to split the lab component from the lecture. UCSC provides information about the equivalent labs at the other campuses.

An instructional design and faculty support group helps campuses with training for faculty, TAs and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) about how to teach online courses. ILTI prepared two brief documents with tips on how to teach online and tips for students for online learning. Coordinator Osmundson shared that a number of campuses would like to create professional development programs for TAs and GSIs and ILTI will provide some funding for these efforts. The privacy a student data is a serious concern and ILTI works with UC's Information Technology Leadership Council on such issues.

Decisions about platforms and applications are made by the campuses and every campus licenses its own learning management system (LMS). A member reported that Open edX is better suited than the Canvas LMS to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math courses. The use of Open edX is being discussed but ILTI and the campuses will need more resources to support an additional platform. Another issue is that it can take weeks for students to receive their grades. It was noted that manual intervention is required in the current process and, while this is less than ideal, it is because each campus has different versions of SISs. The technology and automation being utilized is new to some of the registrars and information technology offices.

#### **IV. Academic Integrity**

Members were asked to investigate activities and policies related to academic integrity in traditional classrooms and online environments. Where it is located may have an impact on implementation.

**Discussion:** At UCSC, the policy is in the Division of Undergraduate Education and supervised by the vice provost and dean of undergraduate education. The policy was overhauled with input from the provosts of the colleges, campus counsel, the education policy committee, and the vice provost but there are recent reports that implementation has been problematic. Some faculty are not following the steps in the process by providing complete information and failing to speak to students first, and students need clearer guidelines about what is acceptable and what is considered to be cheating. Academic integrity may be connected to a discipline. At UCB, Student Affairs' Center for Student Conduct handles the academic

integrity cases and the Center for Teaching and Learning offers resources. A statement about plagiarism is supposed to be included on the syllabus but this policy is inconsistently followed.

UCI moved the academic integrity policy from Academic Affairs to Student Affairs a few years ago and the representative is waiting for information about what led to the change. The system is now more transparent to students and faculty and the campus has a system for automated reporting. It seems that some specific faculty and schools frequently report cases which raises a concern about the standardization of the definition of misconduct. Cases are initially handled within Student Affairs and the student appeals are sent to a Senate faculty review board, which does not receive a lot of cases. Cases sent back by the first advisor are reviewed a second time by the faculty review board. Consistency is important for students but it may be that standardizing academic integrity could be difficult.

UCSD's Academic Affairs office handles the cases and any proposed changes to the academic integrity policy are considered by the education policy committee. Changes to the procedures may be recommended this year. The LMS includes information about academic integrity. Faculty can file a case online which is reviewed first at the college and forwarded for broader review if necessary, and the handling of cases is efficient. UCR has an Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, each college has an academic integrity committee. At UCSB, the Office of Judicial Affairs is located in Student Affairs. A student code of conduct outlines requirements for students and procedures for faculty are in Senate Regulation 90. A case is first reviewed by an assistant dean who will convene a conduct committee with faculty.

UCLA's dean of students handles the cases of misconduct. After a faculty member makes a report, a student receives a deferral record while the misconduct is investigated. UCD recently changed the regulations following a workgroup's examination of cheating last year. The policy is housed in the Office of Student Support and Judicial Affairs which is under Student Affairs. A regulation was changed to state that it is the responsibility of the instructor to report misconduct. A link to the student code of academic conduct should be on every syllabus and a student can receive a failing grade on the course, not just on the assignment. Students have the right to a hearing with a board comprised of two student members and one faculty member who will make recommendations to the director of Judicial Affairs. It is not clear if any specific incidents led UCD to establish the workgroup. Each school at UCSF has its own policy and procedures and faculty report incidents to an assistant dean. Integrity of research is under the executive vice chancellor. Chair May would like UCEP to compile best practices to disseminate to the campuses.

## **V. UCEP Chair Updates**

Chair Zanzucchi will send the committee a link to the recording of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education's October 23<sup>rd</sup> hearing on UC faculty diversity. Provost Brown has placed UCEP's recommendation about training for TAs and GSIs on the agenda for an upcoming Academic Planning Council meeting.

## **VI. Standardized Tests for UC Admissions**

In December, the committee will be updated on the workgroup that will study the use of standardized tests for UC admissions.

## **VII. Campus Reports/Member Items**

UCD: The campus is considering whether transfer students can change majors in their first quarter and it is not clear how the Transfer Guarantee and the Pathways may relate. The regulations only state that a student needs to be in good academic standing. UCSC had a large number of students who transferred

into Math (a non-screening major) who indicated they wanted to move to the Biology department. Following objections by the dean of undergraduate education, the policy was revised so that screening majors can allow students to transfer with consent of the department. Screening majors review whether the lower division courses have been completed.

### **VIII. Medical and Surgical Abortions on Campuses through the Student Health Centers and the Student Health Insurance Program (SHIP)**

The Committee on Faculty Welfare's Health Care Task Force has asked if UCEP members are aware of problems for students attempting to access abortion services through campus health clinics.

**Discussion:** Members requested more information about the HCTF's questions so this matter will include email follow-up and initial discussion in December.

### **IX. Transfer Subcommittees**

Chair Zanzucchi announced that the UCSD representative will participate on the Transfer Guarantee subcommittee, the UCSC representative will serve on a special working group focusing on the ASSIST website, and the UCLA representative will participate on the Articulation subcommittee. California State University and UC are required to admit any California Community College (CCC) students who attain an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT). CCC students who sign onto a Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) agreement are guaranteed a spot at a UC campus in their designated major. A significant number of students who use TAGs opt to enroll in a different, possibly more selective UC campus.

The Transfer Pathways are a set of lower division courses which prepare students to enroll in one of UC's 21 most popular majors. While the Pathways do not offer a guarantee, UC faculty decided that transfer students will be more successful if they have completed these courses at their CCC. UC is doing well with respect to admitting transfer students but the system could do better especially for CCCs that historically do not send many students to the University. UC must be able to identify where and how it can provide the most comprehensive support for transfer students.

There are several models under consideration for the Transfer Guarantee. One is completion of a TAG agreement and the other is the "four pack" model which requires that students apply to four campuses. An alternative proposal has been put forward by UCSC. Questions include what the grade point average (GPA) for transfers should be and a 3.5 GPA has been the starting point for the current discussions.

**Discussion:** Examining individual low sending CCCs and the success of their students at UC is not the approach the Senate has taken, but what students from low sending CCCs will need upon enrolling in a UC is an important question. For some CCCs, transfer is not an emphasis. The point was made that summer session, Extension and other resources have not been fully utilized to help transfer students. In contrast to the Pathways, faculty did not provide input into the TAGs and may be unaware of their existence.

### **X. Transfer Guarantee**

- *Yvette Gullatt, Vice Provost and Chief Outreach Officer, Diversity and Engagement, UCOP*
- *Jim Chalfant, Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office, UCOP*

Vice Provost Gullatt oversees UC campuses' transfer preparation programs with the CCCs. Before UCEP convened this year, Chair Zanzucchi and Vice Provost Gullatt discussed issues related to "summer melt" including the notion of transfer readiness and the student experience beyond academics. Advisor Chalfant explained that UCSC's proposal raises questions about the unanticipated consequences of extending the

TAG agreement model to non-Transfer Pathways majors. BOARS supports this approach and the MOU does not prohibit it. UCEP may decide that a student may begin by entering a TAG agreement and apply to other UC campuses as they wish. Students are already encouraged to apply to multiple UC campuses. The MOU calls for the TAG agreements to be reviewed but it is not necessarily clear which Senate committee should undertake this effort. The data analyzed suggests that the degree of preparation is a very essential factor which makes how potential transfer students are advised important.

It must be remembered that the CCCs have the least prepared students who, in transferring to UC, are attempting to do something quite complex. The more complex the Transfer Guarantee process is, the less likely it is that the transfer pool will be more diverse. It is important for faculty to understand that diversity goes beyond under-represented minority groups and includes transfer students who are first generation, working parents, veterans, or were incarcerated. More communication is needed with students about what they will encounter in upper division courses. Vice Provost Gullatt questions if, instead of pathways for the 21 most popular majors, focusing on less popular majors will lead to improving diversity outcomes. The Senate is encouraged to think about who has to navigate the pathways with an eye on equity and social justice.

During a recent Communications subcommittee meeting it was noted that it is more challenging to communicate with transfer students than with freshman. Transfer students need to receive a clear message that they belong at UC's campuses. We need to understand the practical issues CCC students consider when deciding between a CSU versus a UC. Every campus has a transfer preparation office that offers advising and hands on support. For the past few years, President Napolitano has written a letter sent to every CCC student which encourages them to get a TAG with a UC.

Campuses that need to meet the 2:1 ratio of freshman to transfers have utilized multiple strategies to improve their outreach and communication. In the spring, UC has a conference for CCC transfer counselors to report on any changes and how to effectively help their students. More work could be done with the low-sending CCCs. Transfer students may need more guidance than freshman with respect to connecting to the campus resources available to them. The advising offered should be consistent and support services need to be designed for the diverse backgrounds of transfer students.

**Discussion:** It was clarified that if a student has a 3.5 GPA in a Pathway major, any of the six campus offering TAGs will provide the guaranteed spot. There are no TAGs that are more demanding than the Pathway guarantee would be. TAG campuses could add a statement to their policy that if a student qualifies for a systemwide guarantee they are more than qualified for the campus guarantee. The TAG model sends a much clearer message about the guarantee. UCOP could promote and organize outreach by UC faculty to CCC students that highlights research and scholarship to help students better understand what differentiates the UCs from the CSUs.

A member asked about the history of the Transfer Admission Guarantees. As a result of pressure from Legislature in the 1980s to increase transfers, TAGs and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum were implemented. The three campuses that do not have TAGs may find ways to be more flexible in order to admit more transfer students into less popular majors. Campuses could lower the required GPA in order to boost the number of transfer students and the fact that students who do not have a 3.5 GPA are desirable to UC needs to be emphasized. There have been objections to connecting the Pathway Guarantee to the TAG. In the near future, the TAGs should be reviewed and updated as needed.

#### **XI. Consultation with the Office of the President**

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

The Regents will receive a presentation on multi-year planning. The focus will be shifted to degree attainment to improve time to degree and as a way to increase throughput and enroll more students. The Regents' budget is tentatively based on 2500 FTE growth in undergraduate students and 1k graduate students. To achieve this growth, the entering freshman class next year would need to be smaller but this will be a challenge with the Legislature which always wants UC to get bigger. The data on high school graduation rates that will be available in April will indicate the demand for freshman admission.

The focus on degree attainment is leading to discussions about identifying the pressure points. CSU received several million to improve their graduation rates, and UC is talking about potential strategies for using any funds it receives. Information from the campuses about the enrollment pressure points is being collected to give UCOP a better understanding of the problems impacting quality. Rather than focusing on the student to faculty ratio as an indicator of academic quality, the Regents have been encouraged by Provost Brown to look at things such as WASC accreditation or campus academic program reviews. Chair Zanzucchi asked Director Greenspan if information about the student success funding could be shared with UCEP.

**Discussion:** UCM is starting enrollment planning discussions and any best practices related to impacted majors would be helpful. The goal would be to identify a strategy that can eventually be used across the campus. Director Greenspan can connect UCM to people responsible for enrollment management at other campuses and noted that campuses have developed innovative ways to address this.

## **XII. Awarding of Degrees Posthumously**

Chair Zanzucchi explained the committee's work last year on a model policy for the awarding of degrees posthumously. Chair May has asked UCEP to revise the framework for a model policy into a proposed systemwide policy to be considered by Academic Council and sent out for systemwide review. The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs has been asked to consider a policy for graduate students.

**Discussion:** In the event that a student transfers from one UC to another and dies after being at the second campus for a shorter amount of time, it is not clear which campus should award the degree.

## **XIII. New Business**

There was no New Business.

## **XIV. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:40 PM  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: Anne Zanzucchi