



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Minutes of Videoconference
Monday, December 1, 2025

In attendance: Catherine Sugar, Chair (UCLA), Jason Duque, Vice Chair (UCSB), Darlene Francis (UCB), Yuming He (UCD alternate), Maia Young (UCI), Jeffrey Maloy (UCLA), Susan Varnot (UCM), Gene Brewer (UCR), Lily Hoang (UCSD), Nailyn Rasool (UCSF), Giuliana Perrone (UCSB), Tanner WouldGo (UCSC), Susannah Scott (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), 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), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda items and their priority were approved.

Action: UCEP's November 3rd videoconference minutes were approved.

II. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership *Susannah Scott, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Chair Scott reported that Academic Council endorsed the interim policy on the use of online program management companies as well as recommendations from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs on doctoral degree programs proposed by the California State University system. The Council meeting included a discussion about the President's Post-doctoral Fellowship program which President Milliken subsequently announced will be continued. The UCSD divisional Senate released a report on mathematics preparation that advocates for bringing back standardized tests for admissions and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) is preparing a statement underscoring that the Area C (Mathematics) admissions requirement has not changed.

Topics on the November Regents meeting agenda included the Department of Justice demand letter and the tuition stability plan. In remarks to the Regents, the UC Student Association president advocated for open educational resources and for more hybrid modality options for disabled students. The Task Force on UC Adaptations to Disruptions (UCAD) is incorporating feedback from the systemwide review into its report and this updated document will be provided to the new UCAD Plus Task Force. The Performance of Undergraduate Degrees (PUDP) Task Force is focusing on operationalizing the principles and concepts recommended by the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Degree Programs.

III. Chair's Announcements and Updates

Chair Sugar indicated that the PUDP and the UCAD Plus task forces are both developing metrics and this work will need to be aligned. A special Academic Assembly meeting was held on

November 20th to consider a resolution submitted by a group of faculty regarding UCB's release of personally identifiable information to the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights. The original resolution contained factual errors and Assembly voted to postpone acting on a revised resolution that was provided shortly before the meeting.

IV. UCD Proposal for Simple Name Change of the School of Veterinary Medicine

Chair Palazoglu requested that UCEP expedite the approval of a proposal from UCD to change the name of its School of Veterinary Medicine so the recommendation can be endorsed by Academic Council on December 17th. However, since the proposal has not been received members will be asked to vote on this matter by email. Analyst Abrams explained that, while simple name changes are typically uncomplicated, Chair Palazoglu has been asked to make sure that UCD's proposal documents that the donor has been vetted.

V. Changes to College Board's Advanced Placement Scoring

Chair Sugar explained how UC utilizes credit by exam and provided a high-level overview of changes the College Board made to how scores on Advanced Placement exams are set. BOARS has met with College Board representatives several times since 2024-2025 in an effort to gain a better understanding of the Evidence-Based Standard Setting (EBSS) process implemented in 2022. The chair of BOARS collaborated with Chair Sugar and the chair of the University Committee on Preparatory Education on a draft memo to the divisions raising awareness of the new scoring process. The memo includes several recommendations to the campuses including collecting data and monitoring the pass rates for exams scored using EBSS.

Discussion: Members expressed concerns about the College Board's lack of consultation with UC faculty before moving to the EBSS process. According to Chair Sugar, in the most recent meeting with BOARS, the College Board representatives said they are willing to work with individual campuses to provide detailed information. It will be important to have a comprehensive understanding of the EBSS methodology before making any significant decisions about the various ways AP scores are utilized. The Senate must also keep in mind that AP has value to students and parents. Committee members would like to see analyses of how predictive AP scores are of how competent students are once they are at UC and there are questions about how EBSS will impact different types of students. A member observed that the current political climate in the country may influence the content of AP courses such that the information might not be in line with what scholars expect students to know. At a future meeting, UCEP will discuss its 2024 position statement on credit by exam which emphasized the trust UC faculty have in the AP curriculum.

VI. Policies and Processes for Systemwide Course Articulations

Chair Sugar explained that the COVID-19 pandemic and the advent of better technology increased pressure to offer online classes. This in turn shown a spotlight on handling of courses accessible to students from multiple campuses and articulation issues more broadly. This includes both existing in-person programs such as the UC Center Sacramento and UC Washington Center as well as remote options such as UC Online-funded courses, summer session, and the new Global Language Network Initiative. Students receives unit credit for any class taken at another UC; however, their home campuses must approve credit for meeting general education, pre-major, or program requirements. The process for requesting more than unit credit is burdensome for

students who are reluctant to take courses if they do not know if credit will be granted. At the same time, divisions and departments have autonomy to determine what meets their requirements, so a manageable articulation process is needed. UCEP will collect data on how each division currently handles articulation decisions via a survey to relevant stakeholders. Committee members are asked for feedback on any questions that should be added to the survey.

Discussion: One concern is that encouraging students to take courses at other campuses raises questions about what constitutes a home campus and if this is a strategy to make faculty teach more online courses as a means of generating revenue. Chair Sugar stressed that there are broad policy questions that call for serious deliberation and gathering information helps to establish a foundation for future deliberations. The purposes of the survey are to uncover the pros and cons of improving systemwide articulation and granting more than unit credit and to identify ways to implement efficient processes. Systemwide articulation may not be appropriate for every class, but UCEP should figure out the boundaries and when systemwide articulation will be feasible.

Since the content, delivery, or pedagogy of a course changes over time, knowing how courses are reviewed or reconsidered will be important, otherwise the process of articulation will be problematic. Members suggested revisions to the survey including adding a questions about who can be helped and what can be gained by systemwide articulation. This effort might lead to the creation of a UC articulation database, like the ASSIST database for California Community Colleges. UC Online has a way for students to see if UC Online-funded courses can be taken for various types of credit. The committee provided input on the administrators who will probably need to weigh in on the survey.

VII. Systemwide Review Items

- 1) The Proposed Presidential Policy IMT-1300 Information Technology Accessibility. The deadline for comments is December 10, 2025.

Discussion: The policy is a response to a change in law that UC was aware of in early 2024 and it is problematic that the policy is being issued so close to when enforcement will begin. Training is an unfunded mandate for divisions and having each division develop its own training module will not be efficient, therefore UCOP should create a training for use at all campuses. Guidance documents should be prepared in coordination with relevant stakeholders. UCOP should also inform the faculty about the support that will be provided to help them manage the work of making course content accessible, and the policy should take into account that the effort to adapt content will vary depending on the nature or size of the class. Another suggestion is that the policy ought to acknowledge faculty concerns about making course content available widely in ways that are unprotected and the need to protect faculty intellectual property rights.

Action: Chair Sugar and Analyst Abrams will prepare a memo to Chair Palazoglu with UCEP's feedback.

- 2) The Proposed Presidential Policy on Education Loan Practices. The deadline for comments is January 21, 2026.

Discussion: Members agreed that this policy does not fall under UCEP's purview and that the committee will not opine.

VIII. Reports from UCEP Members to Their Divisional Undergraduate Council (UgC)/Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)

Chair Sugar would like to know if members are able to regularly report on UCEP activities to their divisional committees. The idea is that members share information about local educational issues and policy discussions to help create systemwide policy and also keep their UgCs/CEPs informed about the topics under consideration at the systemwide level. One question is whether time is regularly allocated on the UgC/CEP agendas for the UCEP representatives to provide updates. Chair Sugar would also like clarification regarding when the local committees need to receive a formal memo when UCEP is seeking preliminary divisional feedback.

Discussion: At UCB, all formal requests must be sent to the divisional Senate chair. Reports from UCEP representatives are standing items on UgC and CEP agendas. Members indicated formal requests should be sent to the divisional committee chair and analyst.

IX. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCM: The representative described the series of across-the-board cuts that will be made over the next three years. The cuts have already impacted Unit 18 lecturers including many with continuing appointments. The campus administration is issuing policies for which there is minimal support to enforce. The UGC and Graduate Council have been asked to write a policy on artificial intelligence by February.

X. New Business/Executive Session

No new business was introduced, and executive session was not held.

The meeting adjourned at: 12:55 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Catherine Sugar, Chair