

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2016

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair, (UCLA), Edward Caswell-Chen, Vice Chair, (UCD), Stephan Miescher (UCSB), Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Tony Smith (UCI), James Rauch (UCSD), Laura Nelson (UCB) (telephone), Beth Lazizzera (UCLA) (telephone), Stephen Handel (Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP), Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Tongshan Chang (Content Manager, IRAP, UCOP), Iman Mills Gordon (Provost's Office, UCOP), Paul Montoya (CFO & Marketing Director, ILTI, UCOP), Ellen Osmundson (Project Coordinator, ILTI, UCOP), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Mona Hsieh (Office Manager, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Welcome and Announcements

Chair Knowlton and the other members welcomed the student representative to UCEP. The chair acknowledged the work that has been asked of the committee for the first two meetings of the year. The chair plans for the December meeting to be held by videoconference.

Academic Council discussed the UCEP memo on Credit by Examination in October and forwarded it to Provost Dorr. There are situations when this option has been used well but Council agreed that there is no reason to expand Credit by Examination. Council also agreed with UCEP's recommendation to standardize some of the requirements across the campuses and that some campuses might loosen restrictions. The next step is for UCEP members to ask their campus Education Policy committees to consider if there would be any changes based on UCEP's recommendations. Council agreed with UCEP's point that the decision to give Credit by Examination should be made by faculty. The Council of Vice Chancellors joined Council and one topic discussed was how to increase enrollment.

The Academic Planning Council (APC) discussed how to manage the increase in enrollment. To implement the state budget agreement from last year, UC must accept 2500 more students on top of the 5900 students accepted last year and UC will have to plan on overshooting this number to avoid being out of compliance. UC will receive \$18.5M if it meets the targets. The budget act requires UC to make a policy on limiting non-resident students and UCEP will likely opine on this policy. The APC is also considering the longer term trends and the changing demographics for California to identify how UC will address the changes. The proportion of graduate students to undergraduates has decreased in the last few years. UC has made good progress in achieving the 2:1 the ratio of resident freshman to transfers. There is a push to increase summer enrollment for various reasons. A few campuses piloted programs aimed at increasing summer enrollment. Many students do not take advantage of summer offerings. A report on the pilot programs will be prepared for the state since summer session was one of the initiatives in the Budget Framework. Summer courses may help solve some problems related to classroom crowding.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The October minutes were approved.

III. Budget Framework Initiative: Major Requirements Rationale Review

Chair Knowlton reviewed the history of the Major Requirements initiative. UCEP reviewed a set of the rationales to determine if the information provided was adequate or if additional details will be required.

Discussion: The committee members discussed issues related to a handful of the rationales from the campuses. Miss Mills Gordon will send UCEP any late submissions and send the feedback from today's discussion.

Action: Chair Knowlton will take two weeks to synthesize the comments and send them to Ms. Mills Gordon to forward to the campuses. In January, Chair Knowlton will send to the committee the new responses from campuses about the rationales reviewed today. The February meeting will include a discussion about the revised rationales and the rationales submitted on November 7th.

IV. Systemwide Review: Draft New Presidential Policy on International Activities

The goal of the policy is to cover all international activities occurring in the UC system including research and provide oversight. The policy is to make sure that individuals are aware of potential risks and have a plan in case of a problem.

Discussion: A member reviewed this item closely for his local committee and found that it primarily describes who is responsible for approving and reporting. The UCSB, UCSC, and UCI committees declined to opine. This policy is probably more relevant to UCORP. UCEP might say that the committee "commends the Office of the President's attention to these issues." However, it was clarified that the committee does not have to opine on this matter.

V. Systemwide Review: Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182~UCIE

Chair Knowlton described some of the changes proposed by the Committee on International Education. The bylaw change appears to broaden the scope of UCIE's work beyond just the EAP courses to general international collaborations and student programs that are not traditional EAP arrangements

Discussion: UCIE deals with more than EAP so broadening the bylaw is reasonable. Members reported that their local committees reviewed and agreed with the proposed changes. A member suggested that UCIE should interface with the Committee on Preparatory Education as UCOPE discusses issues related to the language and math needs of international students.

Action: The analyst will draft a brief memo outlining the committee's feedback.

VI. Best Practices for Hiring Instructors or Lecturers

At the close of the October meeting, UCEP discussed issues related to Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOEs). Chair Knowlton proposed that there are two topics. One issue is related to hiring Unit 18 lecturers to teach courses. In the past, UCLA's process for finding lecturers may not have been very rigorous but Chair Knowlton's department devised a set of guidelines and proposed method for reviewing lecturers. The chair would like to know if departments have developed guidelines or if their approaches are still haphazard.

Discussion: A member shared that ten years ago his department reformed its process as people started to complain about students who had been poorly trained by lecturers. The department hired an LSOE to be in charge of the process for hiring lecturers. This made a significant difference in the quality of the lecturers and the department made sure to reward individuals who were successful. For example, some departments fire lecturers just before they become vested but this particular department eventually gave

the qualified and successful lecturers move out of the Unit 18 class into more permanent positions. Some departments have offered lecturer positions to graduate students who have not been successful. The model where an LSOE is hired to carefully vet the lecturers and UCEP might make this recommendation.

UC needs to be honest with prospective parents about who will be teaching their college-bound student, especially since it may not be a researcher. Two campuses hire faculty from community college campuses. It may be fine to hire good LSOEs in moderation but it can become problematic if not managed closely. There may be specific disciplines where LSOEs or Unit 18 lecturers are a good fit. Given that Unit 18 lecturers will be hired, UCEP could suggest the best practices for the process. UCEP might state that “The director of undergraduate studies and the chair are responsible for ensuring the Unit 18 lecturers are competent and delivering as promised.” Members were encouraged to the issue of best practices for hiring lecturers with their local committees. A member expressed concern that departments might be asked to support research on pedagogy if departments need someone to teach and hire a lecturer. It was emphasized that the Unit 19 lecturers and the LSOEs are separate issue. Chair Knowlton indicated that this discussion will be continued at future UCEP meeting.

VII. Budget Framework Initiative: Advanced Placement (AP) Credit

Chair Knowlton asked members to provide feedback on the report she drafted. The goal is to finalize this report within the next few weeks.

Discussion: A member suggested that credit for IB should be noted in the report although Chair Knowlton does not think that this is the focus for politicians. The memo touches on the issue of access but there is not a related recommendation. UCEP might suggest that local education policy committees to take a close look at equity. The data for underserved students was shocking to some members and one member suggested that UCEP could make a stronger statement about equity and the availability of AP courses. UCEP will recommend that campuses should at least examine policies for AP units for enrollment priorities. There was agreement that the use of AP credit is primarily related to admissions. The data report provided by IRAP for today’s discussion will be submitted as an enclosure with the memo from UCEP. Members will send any edits they have to Chair Knowlton and the chair will aim to finalize the report in time to submit to Council at the end of this month.

VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President ~ IRAP

- *Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP*

At the last meeting there was a question about registration priorities are legislated. There are state mandated registration requirements related to three groups of students: veterans, formerly homeless, and current or foster care youth. Individuals are asked to verify their status. The committee’s feedback on the photos selected for the IRAP website will be solicited via email. Manager Peterson reported on recent changes to the campus Teaching and Learning Centers (referred to by various names). UCSC and UCR are launching such centers and Manager Peterson will facilitate this group with the sharing of best practices and foster collaboration. This will start with campus-wide more general centers and may eventually incorporate the more specialized centers at some campuses.

Discussion: Campuses have scholarship athletes and campus-wide honors, but these are campus by campus decisions. A member suggested that UCOP’s photo archive could be expanded if the campus student government associations were asked contribute photos of students. A member asked if this work with address ADA compliance and students requiring accommodations but the main focus is on faculty teaching and graduate student instruction. UCI’s teaching and learning center is bringing under one umbrella the different groups working on related issues like ADA compliance.

IX. Proposal for UCI School of Nursing

Members are asked to provide any final comments about UCI's proposal for a School of Nursing and suggest changes to the draft memo.

Discussion: Members did not have any additional feedback on the UCI proposal and agreed that the draft memo should be submitted.

Action: The UCEP memo will be submitted to Chair Chalfant.

X. Consultation with the Office of the President ~ ILTI Budget

- *Paul Montoya, CFO & Marketing Director, Innovative Learning Technology Initiative*
- *Ellen Osmundson, Project Coordinator, ILTI*

CFO Montoya is finance director for the initiative. The 2016-17 budget is still under discussion as it relates to issues associated with campus transfers, but CFO Montoya will review the last three years of the expenditures for online courses. A budget augmentation of \$10M, the first of three annual augmentations, was received in 2013-2014. Over 160 courses were funded through the end of 2016. Campuses have received funding for projects intended to improve online instruction. There were 197 offerings of the courses built so far by the end of last year, with about 24K total students over the three years and 13K students in the last year alone. Sixteen hundred students enrolled in cross campus courses through June.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, CFO Montoya clarified that 1600 unique students did not take a cross-campus course. CFO Montoya suggested that it may be too early to look at enrollment data and deem ILTI to be a failure. Coordinator Osmundson pointed out that there are policy issues that have been brought to UCEP which are significant barriers to cross campus enrollment. One question is whether there is a point in the future when UC might decide that cross campus enrollment is not working. As the course catalog becomes more robust the enrollment may increase. UCEP is invited to make recommendations about how to get the information about online courses out to students. It was noted that students need information about whether the online courses will apply to a major. UCSB students may not know that online courses are an option so more awareness about these opportunities is needed. Chair Knowlton advised Coordinator Osmundson that UCEP will attempt to respond to the policy questions the Coordinator has raised with the committee but there are overarching concerns about students being interested in these courses. Even with the impediments are removed, there may still be low enrollment. Perhaps a better focus for ILTI would be campus specific or hybrid courses where there is some face to face contact such as study groups and office hours. A member commented that what gets delivered through online courses has been improved by ILTI's effort and this should be recognized. Cross-campus enrollment numbers should not be the only metric that is evaluated.

XI. ILTI Questions for UCEP

Last May, too late in the year to obtain comprehensive and meaningful feedback from campuses, UCEP received a set of policy questions related to the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative's online courses. ILTI wants to expand the use of online courses and policies established without online courses in mind may be impediments. UCEP members are asked to take the questions to their campuses and Coordinator Osmundson will be invited to a future meeting. One possibility is that UCEP would draft a response to the questions in the context of the broader issues troubling the committee.

Discussion: It could be helpful for the campuses if UCEP articulated a systemwide definition for what is "online" or "hybrid." Another idea is that ILTI could develop best practices on the use of technology in courses. Another issue is that ILTI is operating under the assumption that there is a demand for cross-

campus enrollment and it is not yet clear if online courses have improved problems related to over-enrolled courses. A member suggested that UCEP should respond to the main questions and emphasize the value judgments the committee is very concerned about.

XII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Chalfant reported that BOARS is interested in reviewing data from UCB's recommendation letter pilot project. It is likely that something will come to UCEP about the recommendation letters in the future. The Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity is also looking at the issue of bias as it relates to recommendation letters. UC will have an "International Thinking" Day in March which will be a retreat focused on internationalization of UC's mission, campuses, research, teaching etc. Next week the Regents will meet and three more campuses will present their budgets. It is likely that the presentations will show that deficits are projected and a discussion about tuition may be coming up. An update on UCRP and the pension plan will be the focus and the Regents are concerned about the ability to borrow. The Regents will also discuss the non-residents policy in January.

Chair Chalfant reported that the Community Colleges would like to develop Associate Degrees for Transfer which are not dictated by the state but instead designed around UC's transfer pathways. Chemistry is an example of why the SB 1440 Associate Degrees for Transfer do not work because a degree cannot be fit into 60 semester units and train the students for chemistry. This discussion is in its early stages.

The President has asked if Chair Chalfant would be willing to sign on to a policy asking faculty to provide contact information for an emergency situation. Chair Chalfant recommended that the policy should be opt in but President Napolitano believes this should be mandatory when faculty are leading a trip with students. Chair Chalfant thinks the UCSA should take a position on this proposed policy. A vendor will be hired to control this data so there will be a need to monitor this aspect.

Discussion: Chair Knowlton suggested emphasizing that the diversity of students from around the world is critical to enriching UC campuses. A member reported that booking through UCLA Travel automatically captures itinerary information but most faculty are not using this system. One member does not see a role for the Office of the President and strongly feels that this contact information is already collected at the campus level so the need for duplication is not clear. A cost accounting of what is needed versus what is already in place would be helpful.

XIII. Student Led Courses

In October, members were asked to investigate current policies on student led courses. Chair Chalfant shared that a UCB student-led course on Palestine received a lot of press in September and President Napolitano and some Regents have asked about UC's policy for these types of courses. UCEP is asked to provide information about campus practices. The committee may discover best practices being used at the campuses or simply report that there are existing policies.

Discussion: At UCB the course is designed with the mentoring faculty member and the faculty member is supposed to attend a portion of the course. In some cases the dean of the department has to approve the syllabus. UCLA has student led courses which students apply to teach and these courses have close faculty oversight. In addition to teaching the course, the student has to take a course on pedagogy. These courses are very specialized and are touted as innovative. There is a committee that reviews the courses but it may not be the committee on curriculum. At UCSD students who want to lead a course go through

the same Undergraduate Council process as the faculty follow. The vice chancellor at UCSD reported that there are inquiries but students do not follow through once the workload becomes clear and there are no student led courses at this campus right now.

At UCR, the courses are vetted by the Committee on Courses and the CEP and are one credit courses. The students take a pedagogy course before teaching their courses and there is a good deal of oversight. UCR's website has a chart that looks at the other UC campuses programs. At UCD the Courses of Instruction established two new course numbers for what the campus calls "student facilitated courses." There are one or two unit courses, and one course is intended for lower division students while the other is for upper division students. The student must have a faculty mentor who designs the course with the student. The student has to take a training course which is also under the guidance of a mentor and while teaching the course the student must take another course with the faculty mentor to discuss how the class is going. The faculty mentor is expected to attend 50% of the classes that are taught. It is not clear how often this has been used at UCD since the program was instituted in May 2014. The idea is to make sure that the faculty mentor, who is the instructor of record, is actively involved in the design, delivery and evaluation of the course.

At UCI, student led courses are under an administrative unit somewhere on campus and not an academic unit. The CEP does not like these courses and is troubled by the idea of charging someone tuition who will then be teaching a class. At one point these classes proliferated on the campus and the CEP stopped a large number of them. These courses are rare at UCSB. Any student led courses had a faculty mentor and the course must go through the course approval process. At UCSC, a faculty mentor is involved and courses have to be reviewed. Last year, it was discovered that an approved course had morphed into a series of courses on sustainable living. The CEP became very concerned about what was advertised about the courses. The instructors were contacted and given proper training in mentoring, and the campus has written up policies.

UCM does not have anything extensive in this area but the supplemental instruction is similar to what has been described at other campuses. Students have prerequisite experience in pedagogy and there is a faculty member involved in the course. UCB has policies similar to the other campuses. There is a faculty sponsor, the course design is done with the sponsor, students are encouraged to take pedagogy and the sponsor is expected to oversee the syllabus and attend a small number of the classes and oversee it actively. The chair of the department has to approve the course. Deans in some colleges require the course content to be approved at the dean's level. The UCB course on Palestine reportedly met all of the requirements. Faculty can only sponsor one course a semester. Chair Chalfant noted that these courses are clearly being monitored and that the campuses are already sharing the same practices.

XIV. Pre-Approval of Education Abroad Program Courses

At a recent Committee on International Education meeting, representatives from the Education Abroad Program reported that students go abroad without knowing if the courses they will take will count at their home campus. This matter has come up at the Academic Planning Council too. This may be a question best handled at the local level but the question is if there is a way for one UC campus to take advantage of courses at one institution that have been counted by another UC campus. EAP representatives would like to discuss this matter with UCEP, but Chair Chalfant thought the first step should be identifying campus policies and any issues related to pre-approval of courses.

Chair Knowlton thinks there should be no objections to having a list of courses that have been routinely approved. There may be ways to facilitate this process so it does not have to be done every year from scratch. The Chair would like to find out if there is a list of pre-approved courses or if it is done de novo every summer.

Discussion: At UCSC, the CEP has agreed to pre-articulate some courses and there has been an effort to pre-approve courses as much as possible. Chair Knowlton indicated that every summer, students have the syllabus and come to her to pre-apply for approval. The student representative applied to EAP and reported that although there is a list of pre-approved courses but these courses are not necessarily being taught depending on the quarter or semester. In these cases students are instructed to save the syllabus and their course work to submit to their major when they return. It would help if syllabi were available before students left but a member pointed out that the instructors might change from year to year.

A member commented that it is not clear that this is a significant problem. Many UC students participate in study abroad and students are not complaining about not receiving credit for their courses. There are differences among the campuses about where the students are going which are driven by where faculty from that campus will be traveling or by word of mouth from other students at that campus. Vice Chair White remarked that EAP has turned into a quick cultural exchange rather than deep academic immersion, which is problematic. A laundry list of courses approved in the past is maintained by EAP but there is no guarantee that they will be approved by a UC student's campus for his/her major in any particular year. One UCEP representative to the EAP Governing Committee reported that students from most other universities study abroad in the summer whereas UC students stay for one or two semesters, and about 6% of UC students stay for one year which is higher than the national average.

XV. New Business

Members were invited to share New Business.

Discussion: One member indicated that there are issues related academic integrity and the California Community College's (CCC) online courses. One concern is the online course this campus is being asked to accept where it does not seem that there were any controls with respect to how the exams were offered. Chair Knowlton suggested that UCEP might want to recommend best practices for exams for online courses. The question about these courses could be raised at ICAS. In the winter, members may want to talk to their local committees about this matter and report back to UCEP.

XVI. Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:30 pm

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton