UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, November 7, 2022

Attending: Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair (UCLA), Darlene Francis (UCB), Katie Harris (UCD), Manoj Kaplinghat (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Holley Moyes (UCM), Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Thuan Le (UCSF), Julie Bianchini (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), James Weichert (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCB), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Susan Cochran (Chair, Academic Senate), Jim Steintrager (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
   - *Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Senate*
   - *Jim Steintrager, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

   o   Chair Cochran and Vice Chair Steintrager will attend the Regents' retreat this week to hear about the Board's plans for this year.
   o   In November, Chair Cochran will present the results of the Senate's systemwide spring Faculty and Instructor Survey to the Regents' Academic and Student Affairs Committee.
   o   During Academic Council's October meeting, comments from the systemwide reviews of the proposed Abusive Conduct policy and the Conflict of Commitment policy were discussed and there were visits with Regent Leib and President Drake. Regent Leib asked if the elimination of the SAT/ACT as a requirement for admission has changed the composition of the student body which led to a discussion about how students can be better supported.
   o   The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates recently held its first meeting of the year, and the three segments are working on securing approval of its proposed new California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) in response to Assembly Bill (AB) 928.
   o   AB 928 also called for the establishment of the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADTs) Intersegmental Implementation Committee which is tasked with simplifying the process of transferring from the California Community Colleges (CCCs) to the California State University and UC systems, and changes may include creating more ADTs and a structure for the six additional units for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math degrees.
   o   The UAW has called for a strike starting November 14th if labor matters for tutors, readers, graduate student instructors and teaching assistants (TAs) are not settled. Chancellors' offices have issued guidance for faculty and Chair Cochran has advised the divisional Senate chairs to reach out to their administrations. Since faculty are considered supervisors, it is critical they understand how to avoid being accused of unfair labor practices. One labor issue is related to the submission of grades which will put undergraduate students in the middle of this situation.

Discussion: A member expressed concern that transfer students who pursue ADTs are not attaining the level of preparation required for their major and take courses that are not relevant when they transfer to the major. It was suggested that students would take advantage of a viable and straightforward transfer pathway and Chair Cochran clarified that UC offers clear pathways to the 20 most common majors which some CCCs make sure their students follow so they transfer successfully. Yet, there are many CCCs that do not have the resources to guide students and there are also students who end up taking courses at multiple CCCs which complicates their records. Chair Cochran posited that reducing student choice may be the only way to streamline transfer.

At UCSB, an email from the Faculty Association stated that faculty can strike in sympathy with their graduate students but guidance from the Academic Senate would be appreciated. The systemwide Senate is not planning to issue guidance to faculty, but Senate leadership will discuss this idea with UC Legal. Chair Cochran pointed out that faculty are not in a union and therefore do not strike, but faculty do have latitude in terms of respecting the right of other employees to strike. This is complicated, however, by the fact that faculty have a responsibility to assign grades. Chair Cocco recommended that faculty should be instructed that asking their TAs to provide grades now is reasonable and it was noted that faculty should have access to grades through the campus learning management systems.

II. Systemwide Review Items

➢ **Proposed Senate Regulation 479**

UCEP has the opportunity to comment on the proposed new systemwide Senate Regulation 479 to establish Cal-GETC and Chair Cocco asked a member to volunteer to draft the committee's response.

Discussion: Members shared the following comments about the proposal:
o UCSD's colleges have different general education (GE) requirements and acceptance of Cal-GETC may be inconsistent which raises questions about its usefulness if entities opt out
o There is a concern about administrators of the three segments taking control of designing the new singular GE pathway required by AB 928 if Cal-GETC is not approved by the senates
o Cal-GETC provides a broad GE base that the specific major requirements can build upon and transfer students can be confident that they will be able to focus on their major once at UC
o UCM has at least three upper division GE requirements that cannot be met by Cal-GETC except for partial credit and campus graduation requirements may have to be modified
o Students who enroll at a UC as freshman have different GE requirements from transfer students which is inequitable but the point was made that some freshmen have already fulfilled certain GE requirements before enrolling at UC
o SR 479 indicates that SR 414 allows a college or school to not accept Cal-GETC so one question is whether an entire campus could refuse to accept Cal-GETC
o Chair Cocco looked at the GE requirements at the nine undergraduate campuses and found that they differ significantly and that there are requirements specific to a major, school or a college
o UCI uses the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum for freshmen so these students have the same GE breadth requirements as transfer students
o There are no systemwide Senate regulations or bylaws governing GE at UC and each campus is able to create its own GE experience

Action: The UCD representative agreed to draft UCEP's response to proposed new SR 479 and share it with the rest of the committee by this Thursday.

➢ **Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) Task Force Report and Recommendations**

The committee can opine on the ELWR Task Force report and recommendations. Comments are also due on November 14th and Chair Cocco asked for a volunteer to prepare UCEP's response.

Discussion: The committee discussed issues with the Task Force's recommendations:
o The relationship of the proposed ELWR Oversight Committee (EOC) to the Committee on Preparatory Education is unclear and there could be conflicts of interest

- o The proposed membership of the EOC excludes the many faculty who deal with writing but are not in the writing programs
- o Unit 18 lecturers have reported feeling excluded from the Task Force's process
- o Senate faculty are spread extremely thin so they may not be able to serve on the EOC, and there are also concerns about the heavy workload writing program instructors are already trying to manage
- o The focus on responding to "material typically found in first-year writing courses" narrows the expectations that ELWR is not about preparing students for writing in general
- o The term "literacy" should be better defined and there is a debate about what "literacy" and "adequate" mean
- o Reportedly, one writing program's diversity, equity and inclusion committee has taken the position that making students learn formal English is a racist act and faculty may have disparate opinions about the position of formal English at UC
- o There is a question about how students who apply to multiple campuses will navigate the different ways each campus is addressing the ELWR requirement
- o It is concerning that the report focused on writing as an instrument of equity when writing is important to everyone

Action: The UCB representative volunteered to draft UCEP's response to the ELWR Task Force report and send it to the rest of the committee by Thursday.

III.   **California Community College Transfer Issues**
- *Katie Harris, UCEP representative to ACSCOTI*

The member from UCD is representing UCEP on the Academic Council's Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI), one of the committees focused on issues related to transferring from the CCCs to the UC system. Earlier in the meeting, Chair Cochran talked about UC's emphasis on preparation for a major, but there are aspects of transfer relevant to UCEP including student progress and successful degree completion once students land at UC. ACSCOTI was joined by Professor Jeffrey Williams, vice chair of undergraduate studies in Managerial Economics at UCD, who has analyzed data on transfer students in certain majors at Davis. The analysis showed that students who used the transfer admission guarantee and thought they were prepared are failing at dramatic rates before they even begin taking courses in their major, which means they are not being served well once they get to campus.

Something else that Chair Cochran mentioned, which members touched on during the discussion about SR 479, is the tension between fulfilling GE requirements and major preparation. There are limits on how many GE requirements transfer students can complete after enrolling at UC and this can affect time to degree. The governor's five-year compact with UC includes improving time to degree for transfer students. One difficulty is that students crowd into the 20 transfer pathways because they are popular but these are impacted majors across the system. Given that approximately 50% of transfer students are first generation compared to less than 40% of freshman, the pathways themselves may be exacerbating existing inequities along with slowing down transfer students' progress.

Discussion: Chair Cocco remarked that a transfer student who has met a major's specific requirements but is not admitted to that program will not have satisfied the GE requirements needed to get into another program. Having very specific requirements for different programs can result in students returning to the CCCs to take different courses and they might never be accepted into a major at UC.

IV.   Draft Guidelines for Proposal Reviews
- *Darlene Francis (UCB) and Julie Bianchini (UCSB)*

Chair Cocco thanked the UCB and UCSB representatives for drafting guidelines for proposal reviews. The goal is for the guidelines to be approved by UCEP later this year, and the guidelines will be shared with the divisions so proposers will know what the committee is looking for.

Discussion: One suggestion is to add a question about the admissions process for transfer students. There is some confusion about the relationship between a school and a department as well as whether a major or a degree program is contained in a broader entity. Proposers could be asked to spell out the differences between colleges, schools and degrees. Another issue is whether a new school will be financially sustainable in the long-run, but it was noted that the proposals are usually also reviewed by the Committee on Planning and Budget. Chair Cocco will upload the document to Google Docs so members can add comments.

V.   Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning
- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*

- o Academic Planning is in the process of developing enrollment plans for next year and is figuring out what happened this academic year.
- o About 1600 more California undergraduate residents enrolled at UC in contrast to the trend of declining enrollment at other institutions. This may be due to the reduction of non-residents which was funded by the Legislature.
- o The summer FTE decreased as it did in 2021.
- o New transfer student enrollments are approximately 1500 below the target and UCSC and UCR had difficulty reaching their targets.
- o The pandemic resulted in significant declines in enrollment into the CCCs, and the CSUs have declining enrollment of transfer and continuing students.
- o The Legislature wants UC's enrollment plan for 2023-2024 and the state provided funding for 6k-7k more students in the next two years. However, growth is flat this year and there is no way UC can grow by 6k-7k next year. UCOP will propose spreading out the enrollment increases required by the Governor's compact with UC over the next four or five years but the Legislature will have to accept this plan for UC to avoid returning funding to the state.
- o The Academic Planning Council (APC) has a work group on the future of undergraduate education which includes UCEP's vice chair and other Senate faculty. The subgroup working on principles has discussed the need for faculty to have time to deliver quality undergraduate education, how to ensure that there will be TAs since some campuses are reducing the number of PhD students, and the role of teaching faculty.
- o The new provost, Katherine Newman, will start in January.
- o The Regents have a planning group looking at UC in 2050 and during their retreat they are likely to review the 2030 capacity plan.
- o During next week's regular Regents meeting, one agenda topic will be the influence of research on academic planning which will touch on the changes to disciplines happening at the CCCs, CSUs, and UCs.

VI.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP's October 3, 2022 videoconference minutes were approved.

VII.   UCSC Creative Technologies Undergraduate Online Major Proposal: First Impressions of Strengths and Weakness
- *Julie Bianchini (UCSB) and Holley Moyes (UCM)*

Chair Cocco asked the UCSB and UCM representatives to share their first impressions of UCSC's proposal for an online Creative Technologies major. The formal review of the proposal will not be conducted until UCEP's principles for online minors and majors are finalized and endorsed by Council. The UCSC proposal is for a major for transfer students who have completed two years at another institution. The major is hosted by the Arts division and administered by an interdepartmental group of Arts faculty. UCSC wants to admit their first cohort in fall 2024 with 25 students and they will grow to a cohort 100 students each year, for a total of 200 in the major at any one time. Students would be required to complete 13 courses in the major including 10 in Creative Technologies and three in Art, and the 90 credits will be rounded out with five elective courses offered by UCSC or UC Online.

The strengths of the major include:
- The proposal was reviewed and approved by numerous Senate committees at UCSC
- Having the major online is native to the pedagogical research and community building aims of the major
- There is existing infrastructure to support students online, such as academic and career advising
- There is a growing demand for Digital Arts majors and many Digital Arts major graduates work in remote or hybrid settings after graduation, so this course would be a step on the way to a productive career
- A faculty development piece will train the faculty participating in the major on how to work productively on online

The reviewers have the following questions and concerns that relate to potential weaknesses:
- The terms "major" and "degree" are used interchangeably and it is unclear if the transcript would say "online major"
- Since students will have completed their first two years of college elsewhere ii is possible that the Creative Technologies program will become a de facto online degree
- The Arts division is asking for a significant resources for the program and it is not clear if the budget is appropriate for 200 students
- All students in the major would be in one college which is not how UCSC normally operates and there is a question about how a cohort will be created for students who are solely online
- There is no information about how much course work will be asynchronous or synchronous
- A stated aim of the program is to address issues of equity and diversity but students will be required to purchase a technology package at the start of the year and there is no explanation about what students who live far away from campus will do if the technology fails
- There is no information about how students will have access to the equipment needed for the course on 3D printing and fabrication
- Many of the courses are currently online but the proposal does not include any data or student evaluations to show how successful they are
- The proposal does not explain if TAs will work with the students asynchronously or synchronously
- How large or small classes will be is not indicated and there is no mention of how many TAs will be assigned to a class
- The three departments that will be involved with the major are not clearly identified

Discussion: It is important to have clarification about asynchronous courses because being in-person will be essential for some students in certain types of courses. There are students who need the flexibility of or simply prefer asynchronous courses provided that there are office hours. The proposal should explicitly state the fraction of classes that are asynchronous with no possibility of synchronous interaction, synchronous, or both. A member noted that there is insufficient detail in the syllabi to assess the quality of the proposed online major. The proposers could have presented information on current online courses such as student engagement and success, and details about how online instruction will be conducted in a way that ensures a high level of engagement and learning. Federal regulations require online instruction to involve engagement activities. The syllabus should include a page that lists and describes each of the engagement activities and this would be needed in the event of an audit.

Another issue is that UC is not accredited to teach students residing in other states even though this did happen because of the pandemic. The policy for online majors and minors should indicate that all participating students need to demonstrate that they have a California address. It is also not clear if the Arts division has engaged instructional designers who are a key to elevating the production quality of asynchronous content. UCEP will revisit UCSC's proposal after the principles for online majors and minors have been developed. Chair Cocco asked the UCSB and UCM representatives to put together a list of questions about the proposal to send to the proposers in February, and the UCSC representative will let the proposers know that UCEP will have questions about the syllabi and the number of synchronous and asynchronous courses.

VIII.   Draft Principles for Online Majors and Minors
   - *Manoj Kaplinghat (UCI) and Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR)*

Chair Cocco indicated that the goal is to finalize the principles document so it can be presented to Academic Council in January or February. The UCI and UCR representatives have drafted a set of principles which begins with defining an online major as a major wherein 50% or more of the course units required for the major, except for university, school or college requirements, are expected to be completed through online courses. Chair Cocco clarified that for accreditation purposes a program with 50% or more of its degree requirements is considered an online degree, but UCEP can decide on the percentage of online courses that would constitute an online major. Students could be advised that if they take the online courses for a major there will be an "online" designation on their transcripts, but the committee should discuss this idea. The principles were drafted with the idea that online majors should not be any different from in-person majors.

Discussion: While the "online" designation on the degree may not matter to students, for accreditation purposes it may be best to require an additional review process if there is a pathway that allows 50% or more of the courses to be online. The 50% threshold language, which comes from the WASC Senior College and University Commission, may not be sufficiently clear to students. UCEP could allow for some online courses in a major but not require a full review until there are 100% and this could be in the principles. Some structure should be in place to ensure that majors that are normally in-person cannot be fulfilled by taking 50% of the courses online. Chair Cocco suggested pulling some language from the committee's white paper on online undergraduate degrees that will put various factors that need to be considered into context, such as the eligibility of certain types of courses for federal aid.

The UCR and UCI representatives will draft a preface that highlights what is important about an in-person education and contrast this with the online experience because students may not understand the value of in-person class instruction. Data could be used to distinguish between

online and in-person classes. The principles document could include information describing what a good online course is and making it clear that there is a difference between online teaching and the remote instruction relied upon during the pandemic. UCEP might want to set a high bar by asserting that the first few experimental online majors at UC should have a low student to faculty ratio and significant interaction among students. UC will need to have substantial evidence that online instruction is good to get a sense of what is required for success and quality. The UCR and UCI representatives will edit the principles document based on the feedback received today and members are invited to share additional feedback. The committee will review the draft again in December.

IX.   Status of Program Proposal Reviews

The reviewers of four proposals were asked to report on the status of their work.

Discussion: The lead reviewers provided the following updates:
1. UCB College of Computing, Data Science, and Society: the review of this proposal will be completed in time for the January 9th meeting
2. UCB Master of Advanced Study in Engineering: the review of this proposal is complete and the reviewers' report will be discussed on December 5th
3. UCI School of Population and Public Health: the review of this proposal is complete and the reviewers' report will be discussed on December 5th
4. UCSD School of Computing, Information and Data Science: the review of this proposal will be completed in time for the January 9th meeting

X.   Chair's Updates

The December 5th videoconference will run from 10 AM to 2 PM. Chair Cocco would like to propose that UCEP meet for approximately two hours on the first and third Monday of the month instead of a longer meeting on the first Monday each month. The chair will send a poll to the members to identify the best timeframe for the meetings.

XI.   New Business/Executive Session

There was no New Business or Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 3:48 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Melanie Cocco