

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2018

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD), Katherine Snyder (UCB), Daniel Potter (UCD), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Deborah Johnson (UCSF), Micah Perks (UCSC Alternate), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Kimia Akbari (Undergraduate Student Representative), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Paul Montoya (CFO and Marketing Director, ILTI), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Monica Lin (Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools & Colleges, Undergraduate Admissions), Jim Chalfant (Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*

BOARS has been working on the plan for the Transfer Guarantee which is a complicated project. The Transfer Pathways were established to set guidelines for student preparation but are now being discussed in terms of eligibility requirement. A goal, then, is to incentivize major preparation to strengthen academic readiness; however, it is anticipated that the profile of transfer students is not likely to change significantly under the guarantee. It is hoped that BOARS decides on a model this month given the April 2019 deadline for the roll out.

Chair May explained the standardized testing task force to be established in response to the president's request that the Senate study the use of these exams for UC admissions. Since the task force has not yet started its work, it is unlikely that this effort will be finished by the end of this academic year. The chair has asked CCGA and UCAP to assess the self-supporting graduate degree programs in terms of their successfulness and impact on campus resource organization. At Council last week, CFO Brostrom presented the 2019-2020 budget request which included a proposal for multi-year budget planning. The Senate leadership recommended changing the presentation to highlight the things UC does that are most relevant to the public. The budget request for next year is aggressive and includes proposed salary increases for faculty.

Discussion: Chair Zanzucchi indicated that the question of campus closures in response to the recent wild fires was discussed by some members over email and Chair May would welcome UCEP's input on this matter.

II. Transfer Guarantee

- *Monica Lin, Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools & Colleges, UCOP*
- *Jim Chalfant, Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office, UCOP*

The UCSD representative reported on the first meeting of the Articulation Work Group. The pathways for the 21 majors were reviewed and with most of the majors, the articulation is almost 100%. Yet large gaps remain in for some majors which means it would be difficult for California Community College (CCC) students to follow those pathways. Decisions about these majors will need to be made. Director Lin would like this Work Groups to devise a clear roadmap that will enable the campuses to move forward based on action items that the articulation team can help implement. Beyond that, there may be activities that entail collaborative efforts with the CCCs focusing on aligning curriculum with the pathways.

Director Lin would like to have procedures and an associated systemwide schedule for periodic review of the 21 Transfer Pathways articulation agreements. There does need to be a mechanism for changing a pathway if there is a change in what is emphasized in a major. The current pathways have not yet been reviewed since implementation, and the current discussion about the Transfer Guarantee includes questions about changing the pathways. More flexibility may be needed when decisions are made about whether a pathway fits a particular major. Several majors that did not participate in defining the pathways were able to affiliate with existing pathways, which expanded the coverage. Some of the majors that were not easily aligned to become a pathway might be brought together again. Director Lin strongly recommends that an in-depth look at articulation is necessary to regularize and stabilize process.

Advisor Chalfant is co-chairing the Articulation Work Group with Senate Vice Chair Bhavnani and includes representatives from BOARS, the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity as well as UCEP. One idea the Work Group may consider is whether CCC students might be directed to an Innovative Learning and Technology Initiative (ILTI) course that fills an articulation gap. Another issue is related to SR 477 which states that if four or more campuses agree that a course articulates, it should be considered articulated for the entire system. This policy has not yet been implemented, and so a procedure for both communicating and petitioning to reverse those action may be needed.

Advisor Chalfant reported that BOARS has focused on adding to the 21 majors or creating guarantees for all majors. Attention needs to be given to majors outside of STEM and smaller majors that are trying to build their enrollment. Six of the campuses offer guarantees in essentially all majors and this could be featured more prominently in the communication about the guarantee to the system. It also should be clear that UCB, UCLA and UCSD will participate in the guarantee and CCC students should be actively encouraged to apply at multiple campuses.

Advisor Chalfant analyzed data on the use of TAGs by first generation students. Just over 50% of applicants self-identify as first generation students. First generation students were not significantly less likely than other students to have a TAG. The committee may want to consider if the 3.5 grade point average is the appropriate minimum.

Discussion: A member reported hearing complaints that the TAGs are no longer serving their original function of increasing access for under-represented minority students. Due to enrollment and resource capacity limitations, UCI has recently decided to eliminate the TAG for Computer Science. Advisor Chalfant suggested that TAGs could be made more difficult to complete in comparison to the proposed model for the systemwide guarantee under discussion. Campuses might need to raise the bar for TAGs if there are capacity concerns and faculty need to be more involved with decisions about these agreements. It would be helpful for faculty to understand how the TAGs function and that they enhance transfer guarantees.

The pool of qualified CCC students is very diverse but the pool who transfers to UC are less diverse and Asian American and White students use TAGs more often than other groups. This issue requires further study, possibly in partnership with BOARS. The phrase “first generation” is often used as a catchall for low income students and diversity could be defined more broadly to include non-traditional and veteran students. Director Lin reported that Associate Degrees for Transfer are not accepted by the most competitive California State University campuses across all of the majors. Chair Zanzucchi wondered if there could be a local focus on priority admissions for the types of transfer students campuses would like to enroll.

III. Updates – Anne Zanzucchi

Chair Zanzucchi joined CCGA for a discussion about training for Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). Council endorsed a June memo from UCEP on this matter and Provost Brown would like the Academic Planning Council (APC) to discuss this. CCGA members expressed concerns about workload, the lack of a common framework for mentoring TAs and GSIs, and the specific type of training related to being the instructor of record. The APC, a group of administrative and Senate leadership, met recently and the Chair and provost co-led the conversation about training. The Council for Graduate Deans will work with the Centers for Teaching and Learning to investigate the training needs. In the spring, UCEP might see documents from the Centers' work group related to this effort.

Chair Zanzucchi joined a meeting of the UC Washington Center's Academic Advisory Group which continues to focus on the Huron Report and the potential restructuring of the Center. UCEP's UCD representative participated in a recent meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS). The group discussed the plan for the Legislative Day on February 20th including the legislators and others with whom ICAS will meet. Later in the academic year, ICAS will receive presentations on the subject of standardized testing from representatives of the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium, the SAT and ACT as well as from experts on bias in standardized testing. Other topics included creating a definition of diversity and the tension between streamlining curriculum across the segments versus the importance of flexibility.

During the Provost's Monthly Budget Call and last week's Academic Council meeting, multi-year budgeting was discussed. An emphasis has been on growth enrollment as a justification for finances. There is now a shift to look at time to degree and degrees that are being produced, which relates to quality. It is important to keep in mind that every campus is distinctive in terms of the degrees produced and time to degree.

IV. Consent Calendar

Action: The November 5th UCEP minutes were approved.

V. Innovative Learning and Technology Initiative

- *Paul Montoya, Chief Financial Officer and Marketing Director, ILTI, UCOP*

Director Montoya explained that UC was given at budget allocation of \$10M starting in 2013 to create ILTI and the Initiative has now received \$60M. The funds are allocated between costs that are central and over time and costs at the campuses. The funds transferred to the campuses are for building courses, special funds requested by the campuses and the cross campus enrollment system (CCES). The forecast for the 2019-2020 budget call will begin now and for some things, ILTI forecasts every month. It is not always clear how much funding will be needed for course development. Instructional funds were transferred for a couple of years and funds to support the CCES were also distributed to the campuses. Recently the response to the RFPs has been high so ILTI moved courses that were approved from funding last year to this year. The Steering Committee approves the funds that go to the campuses.

UCEP members provided several questions to Director Montoya before the videoconference. Over the first few years of the program, ILTI transferred 65% of the funds to the campuses. In 2018-19, this amount dropped to 49% and the overhead has leveled out in recent year. The program is vertically integrated which means the program is instantiated centrally and ILTI provide funds to the campuses for local implementation. ILTI runs the technical operations for the platforms and provides funding for change orders. ILTI maintains the website which is the primary communication tool and is responsible for

the outreach to advisors, technical teams at campuses and outreach to students. The Initiative provides student support through a contract with UCM and uses Salesforce to help students to enroll or access the Learning Management System (LMS). ILTI operates as a small company that provides multiple services which has caused the cost structure to increase.

The goal is to reach a plateau that will enable enrollments to be scaled over time. Director Montoya is thinking about how to build projection models from a bottom up approach and to realize all of the costs of what ILTI provides in order to determine what can be done in terms of cost per enrollment. OP's budget office recently asked about the cost associated with development of ILTI courses, the costs with the entire operation and the costs of campus based activities. ILTI would like to have a model to project costs for OP. More experience with enrollment and costs related to the CCES are needed in order to look forward.

UCEP also asked why the CCES cost so much. The CCES was developed internally rather than through an RFP before Director Montoya joined ILTI. Funds were provided to the campuses to cover the costs for the development of aspects of the CCES. The CCES is only one component of what needs to be examined in terms of how it scales. It is too early to determine if the cost of the CCES is too high per student in comparison to campus-specific systems. The features and functionality of different systems needs to be understood before valid comparisons can be made. ILTI plans to follow up on UCEP's suggestion from November that the CCES should have the capacity to check on the prerequisites of courses. An inventory of the different LMS and platforms used by the campuses and information about the systems they need before ILTI starts exploring new platforms.

Discussion: Chair Zanzucchi noted that some information about ILTI is becoming clearer including that the operating cost structure is stabilizing. A better understanding of the demand for ILTI courses overall and cross campus enrollment is necessary. Director Montoya proposes that we need to study and understand the enrollment patterns. One approach is to map enrollment to the cost of ownership and the impact that is coming from enrollments. ILTI could begin evaluating the investment relative to enrollment. Chair Zanzucchi suggests that in the future UCEP might discuss the mission of ILTI and what UC is trying to achieve with online education. According to Director Montoya, the provost is interested in this question and this is a question that the system needs to address in some way.

Chair Zanzucchi asked the committee if UCEP should raise issues about the budget to UCPB or if additional conversations with ILTI should occur. A member noted that UCEP needs a much better understanding of the demand for ILTI courses and a discussion about the Initiative's purpose. A member noted that the \$10M was given to UC specifically for ILTI and there are constraints. It is not clear if the original four objectives are still the goals for ILTI. It may be too late to question the cost of the cross campus enrollment system. Members agreed that UCEP should consider more fundamental questions about the purpose of ILTI before focusing on details about how the resources are being used. Revisiting the bigger questions is timely as UCOP starts to engage in multi-year budgeting. UCEP will prepare a memo to ILIT reiterating details from recent discussions.

Action: A separate memo to ILTI requesting data on cross campus enrollment will be submitted.

VI. Academic Integrity

Members were asked to update or clarify the information previously reported about academic integrity policies and programs.

Discussion: At UCR, The Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs are within the office of the Dean of Students who reports to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. The Committee on Education Policy is involved at the Senate level. At UCM, the policy is within the Office of Student Life. The policy

and process are clear. The last major discussion about academic integrity was in 2012 and there are no immediate concerns now. Concerns about the policy can be brought to the Vice Provost Dean of Undergraduate Education or to Undergraduate Council. At UCB, the Center for Student Conduct is within Student Affairs. Resources are available to faculty on the use of Turn it-in.com. It is not clear where graduate student conduct cases are handled and they are in the Center but whether they should be in the graduate division is under discussion. UCEP may want to flag the graduate student policy for CCGA.

Determining where the policies for student conduct live and whether the location effective helps focus the attention on strategies and identify potential gaps. A member mentioned issues related to websites like Course Hero to which students upload exams. In the past, the Office of General Campus indicated that faculty have to deal with it on an ad hoc basis but a systemwide policy would be a much better solution. A member described concerns about the proctoring of ILTI courses including that the Proctor U system drops students and will not validate the work when the student is back online. More information about the proctoring of online courses is needed and UCEP may want to create a standard across the campuses.

Chair May asked UCEP to look at student course evaluations and Chair Zanzucchi proposed that UCEP will have a follow-up discussion about this.

VII. Medical and Surgical Abortions on Campuses through the Student Health Centers and SHIP

The Committee on Faculty Welfare's Health Care Task Force reached out to UCEP and CCGA to find out if there is any awareness of issues related to access to medical and surgical abortions.

Discussion: The UCM is not aware of serious problems related to this matter. The Vice Provost for Student Affairs reported that administrators meet to discuss access to medical access and policies are reviewed three times a year. The nearest surgical abortion center is in Fresno and services are covered by students' insurance. This geographical challenge is not unique to students. This is not a subject that has come to the attention of the UCSD, UCI, UCB, UCD and UCR education policy committees which does not mean there are no problems.

Action: Chair Zanzucchi will provide UCEP's feedback to the HCTF.

VIII. Student Employment

Vice Chair Serences attended an undergraduate finances committee meeting and issues related to student employment were raised. The Blue and Gold Program has been modified and there is an effort to re-brand existing resources. Strategies to help students take advantage of the available financial support. This quarter Vice Chair Serences has had five students request for exam rescheduling because of off-campus work commitments that cannot be changed and were essential to the function of the job. These students were all transfer students. Director Greenspan provided some data from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey on student employment. Chair Zanzucchi would like UCEP to allocate time to this topic in at a later meeting and members are invited to suggest additional data that should be collected.

IX. Awarding of Degrees Posthumously

Chair Zanzucchi asked if members have any feedback about specific aspects of the model framework UCEP proposed last year. This has been handled at the campus level but the current effort is to create a systemwide policy.

Discussion: UCSC discussed the model framework and adjusted its campus policy, which is now posted on the campus website. UCEP will rework the model framework into a policy to propose to Council which, if endorsed, will be sent out for systemwide review.

Action: The UCI representative agreed to revise the proposed policy.

X. New Business

The UCI representative reported that UCI's School of Business Administration is planning to establish an online BA degree for transfer students. Individual online courses were being approved to be offered in the summer but after a number of these were approved the School decided to offer a fully online degree. The argument is that this program is the same as the current undergraduate BA program in business administration, and therefore Senate review and approval is not required. The divisional Senate became aware of this project and the School is now preparing a proposal to send to the Senate. The School had not thought through a number of questions such as the campus resources to be made available to students, the fee structure students will be charged, and the support the students will need from the campus vs the department.

Broader questions are related to where these students stand as UC students in a general with respect to access to other courses offered on a campus, if they change majors or whether they will have access to student housing. A fundamental question is about the meaning of a UC education. Once enrolled in an online degree and with no other connection to the campus, these students will have a very different experience. A comprehensive discussion around these issues is critical. There are positive reasons to establish an online program but it needs to be done with a great deal of care. The School wants to start admitting students next fall.

Chair Zanzucchi noted that there are campus specific issues but several components that raise questions on a systemwide level. This degree is the first of its kind which might invite a systemwide review. As a next step, Chair May will be invited to discuss this matter in January and UCI's plan should be brought to the attention of Academic Council.

Discussion: A policy is needed to stipulate that a review is needed when the mode of delivery is changed significantly. The School is not in the catalog and students have not started enrolling yet. The School proposes contacting the students who were not admitted to the traditional program which is extremely popular. This is a two year program only for transfer students. UCSC's Senate will discuss a policy requiring that a certain percentage of seats are made available to students on campus. A member pointed out that it is more expensive to teach students online.

XI. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:10pm

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Anne Zanzucchi