

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Videoconference Minutes
Monday, December 2, 2019

Attending: John Serences, Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter, Vice Chair, (UCD), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Mary Lynch (UCSF), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Lene Levy-Storrs (UCLA), Ann Marie Martin (Graduate Student), Idalys Perez (Undergraduate Student), Ellen Osmundson (Coordinator, ILTI), Mary Ellen Kreher (Director, Course Development, ILTI), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair, Academic Senate), Mary Gauvain (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Updates

Chair Serences welcomed members to the videoconference and briefed the committee on the discussion about the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 544. UCEP will ask the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) for clarification of SR 902 and how good standing is defined. The Online Degree Task Force will meet in Oakland on December 9th and all models for online instruction, including hybrid and completely online models will be on the table for consideration.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The November minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The presidential search is moving forward and there is a commitment from the Chair of the Regents that the Academic Advisory Committee will have a role in screening candidates. The criteria for the candidate have been finalized and are posted on the Regents' website. The Regents met last week and the discussion about pensions will be postponed until July. No action was taken on cohort tuition but UCOP has notified the campuses to prepare for its implementation. Guidelines are being developed by the Working Group on Comprehensive Access for how UC medical centers can affiliate with non-UC health providers.

Vice Chair Gauvain reported that the Regents reviewed data from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey which shows a drop in student satisfaction. The Public Engagement Committee heard from a student formerly in foster care and a formerly incarcerated student. When the budget was discussed, a proposal was made to add funding for vulnerable students populations and the Regents approved allocating \$20M from the existing budget for this. Chair Bhavnani noted that UC receives a line item budget which limits the University's ability to shift funding as needed.

IV. Consultation with the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI*
- *Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director, Course Development, ILTI*

Based on feedback from UCEP, ILTI has started identifying the courses that have prerequisites and will contact the course proposers about courses at other UC campuses that meet the prerequisites. ILTI will have a list indicating the equivalent courses at the student's home campus that matches the prerequisites

at the host campus. Registrars indicated that this mirrors the process currently used for verifying prerequisites.

ILTI surveyed registrars and advisors about the reasons online courses are dropped and a taxonomy has been created to provide better data about the enrollment process and why students drop the online courses. When UCEP reviewed the enrollment data last year, the “other” category was large and the Cross Campus Enrollment System will force a text entry for “other,” requiring students to give a reason when they submit requests to drop a course to ILTI Student Support. The new taxonomy will enable ILTI to see how many students are never approved for a course.

Chair Serences, Vice Chair Potter and Coordinator Osmundson discussed the proposed revisions to SR 544 after the November meeting. The preamble proposed by ILTI includes value statements and implementation factors which Coordinator Osmundson now understands should be in a separate document. The requirement that students must be enrolled in 12 units at their home campus is connected to the requirement for good standing. UCEP will ask UCRJ to weigh in on SR 902 and the definition of good standing.

Discussion: Members discussed the negative reaction that some faculty might have to the value statements, especially proposed language about treating all courses the same regardless of the format. Although ILTI courses have been approved by the Committee on Courses or educational policy committee at each campus, some campuses have established more rigorous evaluations of online courses and it is problematic to propose that a course approved at one campus must be accepted by other campuses. The committee believes that the requirement for students to be enrolled in a certain number of units at their home campuses is in place for valid reasons, but that some flexibility would be appropriate. Coordinator Osmundson will send the committee a clean version of the regulations with the proposed changes agreed upon to date.

V. UCI School of Pharmacy Pre-Proposal

The UCSF representative reviewed the UCI pre-proposal for a School of Pharmacy and identified issues that should be more thoroughly addressed in the full proposal. UCI’s goal is for the new School to be approved by the Regents in July 2020. This relatively quick turnaround time may make it difficult for the School to hire new faculty. The full proposal should clearly articulate the courses that will be in the Pharmacy School.

Discussion: The UCI representative shared that the campus received a major grant that will enable it to launch the School of Pharmacy.

Action: The committee agreed that a full proposal should be submitted.

VI. Status of the Transfer Initiative ~ Pathways Plus

- *Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The chair of BOARS notified the chairs of physics and chemistry departments that the pathways for these majors will be reviewed soon. The 21 existing pathways are being examined with the goals of determining if transfer students can graduate in two years and identifying any additional “hidden” courses that will give students a better chance of graduating in two years. In cases where there are hidden courses, departments will be asked to figure out a timeline that will enable students to take these courses at UC and still graduate in two years. Vice Chair Gauvain is working on laying out the differential requirements in a clear way.

Discussion: Most of the pathway majors do not have hidden courses and the pathways reflect the requirements across all of the campuses for a particular major. The UCSC representative will share a chart that illustrates campus specific requirements for the physics pathway. It was noted that the timing of the upper division courses may be problematic for some transfer students.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning*

This item was not discussed.

VIII. Guidelines for Campus Closures

UCEP has discussed the issue of campus closures and there has been agreement that campuses should develop their own guidelines. The UCSC representative shared a summary of discussions at that campus about campus closures. UCSC has considered adding alternative days of instruction and making up missed class time using technological solutions. The representative indicated that there is not complete satisfaction with these two approaches and each campus will need to determine the threshold that needs to be reached.

Discussion: The policy for “reading week” is set by UCOP and it may be one of the best solutions to closures. Reading week has worked well at UCB, however, campuses on the quarter system are bound by the winter holidays and the spring quarter already extends into June. UCB’s reading week is in lieu of a week of courses and this has been successful. UCM has also discussed the idea of reading week and faculty are opposed to reducing the number of days of instruction. It would be useful to have quantitative data to support the effectiveness of a reading week to add weight to the reported opinions of UCB administrators. One member spoke to a group of students about alternative days of instruction and there was pushback. Students work on Saturdays and there would be contract issues if teaching assistants are required on weekends.

IX. New Business

The UCSC representative asked if there are limits to how much time students can participate in UCEAP and other systemwide programs other than the senior residency requirement. Chair Bhavnani was the London study center director for several years and believes the maximum is two years. Although there are articulation agreements for UCEAP courses, departments may have changed their approval processes since those agreements were made.

X. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 12:45 P.M.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: John Serences