

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2017

Attending: Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, (UCD), David Paul (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Hugh Roberts (UCI), John Serences (UCSD), Ken Ueno (UCB), Robert Gould (UCLA), Greg Miller (UCD Alternate), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student Representative), Kimberly Peterson (Interim Chief of Staff, Provost's Office), Shane White (Chair, Academic Senate), Robert May (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Announcements and Updates

Chair Caswell-Chen welcomed members to the videoconference and invited feedback about convening via Zoom.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Robert May, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair White noted that the committee will receive a briefing from the Provost's Office on Assembly Bill 97. UC has to submit a plan to the state by December 1st in response to this Bill. The Senate would oppose cutting funding to online education in favor of programs that have little to do with the University's mission of teaching, research and service. Chair White commented that Agriculture and Natural Resources receives funding with little scrutiny. Provost Brown is aiming to involve his office more deeply in decision-making at the Office of the President (OP). Senate Bill 201 allows graduate student researchers to unionize, although UC asked Governor Brown to veto it. This Bill changes the dynamic from graduate student and teacher to employee and employer.

Chair White reported that cases of students accused of sexual violence and sexual harassment are being reviewed by state auditors. There is a question about whether some of the sanctions were overly punitive. Chair White described a loophole a student found in UC's suspension policy which allowed him to enroll at another UC campus. It was noted that withdrawing may be different from suspension, and suspension can be related to issues other than academics. UCEP will be asked to weigh in on this matter this year. Council has met with several Regents and Regent Park has been invited to an upcoming meeting.

IV. Consultation with the Provost's Office

- *Kimberly Peterson, Interim Chief of Staff, Provost's Office*

Chief Peterson joined UCEP to update the committee on OP's implementation of the recommendations made to UC by the state auditors. The Chief Operating Officer, Rachel Nava, has stated that the Academic Senate will be involved in the implementation. President Napolitano announced that Huron Consulting has been engaged to conduct an organizational review including a look at systemwide programs administered by OP and this assessment is due by the end of the year. AB 97 requires that UC enroll more freshmen from California and the Academic Council and Provost's Office are working together on decisions about what cuts might be made to make this possible. UCEP will eventually be

involved in activities related to program reviews and Chief Peterson will share some of the implementation plan for the audit recommendations with the committee. The first deadline related to review of systemwide programs is April 2018 and the final deadline is April 2020.

Discussion: Chair Caswell-Chen indicated that Immediate Past Senate Chair Chalfant stated that UCEP might have tasks related to program reviews before the committee's October meeting. Based on today's discussion, the committee will wait for information about next steps and timelines.

V. UC Washington D.C. Center

Chair Caswell-Chen invited members to share the highlights about the engagement of their campuses with the UC Washington D.C. Center. The Chair will summarize the information the representatives have gathered.

Discussion: UCB's liaison to UCDC did not express any strong reservations about the program but budget information was not available. UCD is well served by UCDC but recommends that the program should be reviewed at the systemwide level by UCEP. UCI has a robust relationship with UCDC and students in the program have provided enthusiastic feedback about it. The information from UCLA included historical background such as the idea that UCDC should be self-supporting. It was also noted that many of the faculty at the Center are adjuncts from the D.C. area and this may be a point that UCEP should examine. UCLA faculty members are on the Center's Academic Advisory Committee (AAC).

UCR has a two-part administration of the program: an administrative campus liaison and a faculty person and both individuals in these positions are new. There is regular communication with UCDC. Information is provided by students through surveys which indicate that the program is a success from their perspective. UCSD has multiple contacts to coordinate placement into UCDC and student satisfaction surveys are in place. Approximately 80 students per year attend the program. The program is administered by the campus Academic Internship Program and there is no established review process. The Center is successful from UCSB's perspective but there is a question about oversight of courses. The electives taught by the adjunct lecturers may not be reviewed individually. UCSC has a faculty representative and a staff person who work with UCDC. They sit on the AAC and are satisfied with their level of participation. It is not clear if the Center's courses are being reviewed by any Senate body.

Chair Caswell-Chen shared that UCDC's annual reports can be found at <https://www.ucdc.edu/who-we-are/governance/related-documents>. The AAC, UCEP or divisional committees might certify the annual reports as part of a review process. Members agreed it would be a good idea to encourage the Center to re-institute the annual reports as a means of oversight. The most recent report, for 2014-15, is still pending and this may be related to the change in UCDC's leadership several years ago. The chair will follow-up with Chief Peterson about these reports and UCEP might draft a request that the reports are reinstituted and submitted every year. The UCSB representative underscored that UCEP should follow up on concerns about the approval of electives.

UCLA's liaison to the Center, James Desveaux in the Department of Public Policy, reported that he is responsible for course approvals, in coordination with University Extension. The information from UCI indicates that the courses it sponsors go through the standard course approval process. It is not clear how UC faculty are involved with the electives taught by adjuncts so there should be follow-up on this point. The AAC may be involved with oversight of courses in some fashion. A faculty member at UCSD was implementing a program at UCDC but there was a challenge aligning the semester and quarter calendars, and this was a problem noted by UCSB faculty as well.

VI. Systemwide Review - Senate Regulation 424.A.3

Chair Caswell-Chen invited members to suggest changes to the draft memo with UCEP's feedback.

Discussion: There are doubts that a high school science course can fit into the grand, philosophical framework of scientific inquiry. The expanded definition could increase the number of high schools able to offer more than two science courses. UCLA and UCSC's divisional committees are strongly against having asynchronous labs. UCI's divisional committee endorsed the point that under-resourced schools might be unable to offer the courses and would potentially add a hurdle for the most vulnerable students. It was noted that there is no data about the number of schools currently offering three science courses. There was a question about this matter being related to Senate committees that deal with admissions but it was clarified that all Senate committees including UCEP have the opportunity to weigh in on this proposal as it undergoes systemwide review. The draft memo will be revised to reflect the comments made today.

Action: The chair and analyst will finalize the committee's memo.

VII. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

Last year, UCEP was asked to weigh in on possible impediments to cross campus enrollment into ILTI courses. UCEP's input was used to draft a memo to the campuses and Chair Caswell- Chen and Chair White discussed whether this memo should go forward. A concern is that students who enroll in cross campus online courses may not have the support they need to be successful. It is important that students have the opportunity to receive help when they need it. UCEP's memo proposed that students in their first quarter could petition, through an advisor, to enroll in online courses. The chair revised the draft memo and would like the members' feedback.

Discussion: Members agreed that the last paragraph in the memo should be deleted. It is important that a student in his or her first semester has a compelling reason to petition for an exception. A member suggested that the policies identified as barriers may not be the reasons for the limited number of students taking advantage of cross-campus enrollment. Online courses can be isolating for students but students on their home campus are able to meet with each other. ILTI's focus should be on offering online courses as a free resource to faculty at other campuses to integrate into traditional face to face courses. Chair Caswell-Chen noted that online courses may be useful when traditional courses needed for a major are impacted or when a campus offers a very unique course not available elsewhere. Chair White has indicated that it is important to the state that UC facilitate enrollment in online courses. The coordinator of ILTI will meet with UCEP on December 4th.

Action: The chair and analyst will finalize the committee's memo.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:15PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Ed Caswell-Chen