I. Member Items

Members were invited to bring questions or concerns under discussion at the divisional level to UCEP.

**UCSC:** The faculty on a UCSC Senate committee that reviews student petitions determined that the committee’s student representatives should not see the petitions because of the sensitive, personal information the petitions contain. The faculty then decided that students should not be appointed to this particular committee. These decisions angered students, who are pressuring faculty and threatening to complain to the Regents and the Office of the President. The UCSC representative would like to know if the other campuses have policies regarding the type of information shared with students.

**UCD:** As part of the effort to consolidate the campus budget, the administration is shutting down a Special Academic Program, a Physical Education Program. The Senate has found that there is no formalized process for consultation by the administration with the Senate specified anywhere. Chair Potter remarked that the other campuses may have different names for these programs that offer academic credit but are not attached to academic departments. UCEP should monitor what is happening with these programs across the system.

**Discussion:** Members reported unsettling interactions with students who are unhappy with decisions about such things as ending Pass/No Pass flexibility or not re-opening dorms. One recommendation is for the UCSC committee to work with the vice chancellor for student affairs or student success since these offices can liaison between the Senate, the administration and students. Vice chancellors may be in the best position to explain the faculty’s position about the petitions. UCEP’s undergraduate representative emphasized that students are stressed and feeling disenfranchised but acknowledged that students may sometimes go too far with their advocacy. Members agreed that campus administrators’ communication about COVID-19 related issues has been uniformly bad, which has been frustrating for both students and faculty.

An established set of guidelines for student involvement on committees would be helpful for the situation at UCSC. The guidelines should clarify the expectations for appropriate student participation. It is possible that the pandemic will lead to permanent, positive changes in how faculty partner with students. Faculty should make an effort to explain the workings of shared governance to students so they better understand who has authority over what. One idea is to remove any identifying information from the student petitions seen by the UCSC committee. Chair Potter suggested the committee gather information about how student petitions with sensitive information are reviewed and by whom at the other campuses.
The analyst noted the importance of carefully crafting committee bylaws to make sure the membership is appropriate.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
   • Robert Horwitz, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Vice Chair Horwitz reported that last week the Regents discussed transfer, including the Transfer Pathways and the use of Associate Degrees for Transfer. There is more to do to ease transfer into UC but UC has met the required 2:1 freshman to transfer ratio and campuses do not have the capacity to accommodate more students. President Drake discussed adapting a program from the Ohio State University that aims to reduce student loan debt. The Regents heard from Native American and Alaskan Native students advocating to increase their enrollment numbers and for more support. Disabled students reported to the Regents that campuses have not fully met the Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. The Regents approved UC’s budget as well as a proposal about protecting the UC retirement plan from any complications or changes posed by the curtailment plan.

President Drake has acknowledged the need to prevent curtailment from negatively effecting the Highest Average Plan Compensation program. Academic Council discussed the need to send a follow-up request to the Office of the President (UCOP) for more information about UC’s divestment from fossil fuel stocks. Council is recommending that UC stop using banks with significant fossil fuel profiles. In addition, Council received a report about the low morale among clinical faculty and discussed how the Senate’s can help address this as well as various issues related to clinical faculty who are not in the Senate.

Discussion: The UCSC representative mentioned the situation with student involvement on committees and access to sensitive information. Vice Chair Horwitz advised the representative to consult with UCSC’s general counsel since sharing student information could be a violation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The analyst suggested that UCSC reconsider the training provided to students on advocacy, shared governance, and the roles and responsibilities of committee members. At UCB, student representatives receive an orientation at the beginning of the academic year, and the chair and analyst for Berkeley’s Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) meet with the student representatives to explain the committee’s jurisdiction and responsibilities and how they hope students will participate. It was noted that students need to understand that Senate processes are often slow-moving and immediate action should not be expected. The analyst proposed that the systemwide Senate office should develop a more substantive information packet for student representatives about their roles and responsibilities as committee members.

III. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning
   • Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP
   • Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP

IRAP is preparing several presentations for the Regents including one on outcomes and equity, the future of instruction, designing equitable classrooms and technology enhanced learning at UC. In March, the presentation for the Regents will focus on redesigning curriculum to address equity gaps, particularly in large entry level courses. The undergraduate deans are discussing Pass/No Pass grading flexibility and the pressure they are getting from student organizations. IRAP has the final fall enrollment data and California resident enrollment has not declined as was anticipated, nor has non-resident enrollment.

IV. Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate & Equity Affairs
   • Yvette Gullatt, Vice President for Graduate & Undergraduate Affairs, Vice Provost for Equity, Diversity & Inclusion, & Chief Diversity Officer
   • Liz Halimah, Associate Vice Provost for Diversity & Engagement
Vice President Gullatt and Associate Vice Provost Halimah joined the committee to discuss anti-racism curriculum at UC campuses. Several years ago, the State gave UC funding to work with the California State University system on anti-bias training for staff, resulting in a six part online series on identifying implicit bias. Vice Provost Halimah reported that UCSC, UCD and UCLA have diversity, equity, and inclusivity training that is mandatory for new students. UCOP created a public facing website with information about campus efforts on anti-racism, including virtual town halls. One idea under consideration is to develop an online anti-racism course, modeled after the “Bending the Curve” climate crisis course, that will be optional for students. UCOP is considering offering an incentive grant to faculty experts to develop this course.

**Discussion:** UCOP will evaluate the effectiveness of online anti-racism courses in terms of changing behavior. The “Moving Beyond Bias” course has an evaluation component and the results of the analysis will be available in the spring. The optional anti-racism course being considered would be a lower division online course. UCSF has faculty, student and staff anti-racism activities that are expanding. The campus has anti-racism faculty champions who are expected to support anti-racism efforts and identify ways to decrease structural racism. The medical school has developed an anti-racism curriculum that will be extended to the professional schools. UCSF is also developing a course on structural inequities, and the efforts to improve practices with patients are being taken very seriously.

UCD had a series of colloquia coordinated by the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion about creating inclusive classrooms and inclusive ways for assessment. A community of practice at UCD focuses on student success for underrepresented and socioeconomically disadvantaged groups. An effort underway at UCB involves a series of three webinar workshops called “Grading for Equity” by Joe Feldman which has been effective and eye-opening for faculty. This began in the College of Engineering (https://engineering.berkeley.edu/about/equity-and-inclusion/empowering-engineers-for-positive-change/grading-for-equity/). UCSC’s Office of Student Success examined large classes in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math and mapped the equity gaps between Hispanic and non-Hispanic students based on average grades. UCLA had a variety of activities such as anti-racism workshops but decided against ongoing trainings due to concerns about their effectiveness. UCLA’s undergraduate and graduate councils have decided to revise the program review process to make diversity a required part of the reviews conducted every eight years with the hope that this strategy will have a longer term impact.

UCI revised its multiculturalism requirement to more specifically focus on racism and structural racism, and the campus will revisit the current General Education classes that fulfill this requirement to make sure they comply with the new nomenclature. UCI also has programs that include courses and workshops for administrators, faculty, students and staff. Irvine is trying to get more people involved in these activities by focusing not just on racism but also on the disabled and LGBT communities, groups who are among the most vulnerable members of the UCI community. UCSB has not had many activities related to anti-racism but Vice President Gullatt reported that a new vice chancellor for equity, diversity, and inclusion joined UCSB in September. UCR has an online guide to anti-racism resources that includes a list of all the faculty books and classes that might be relevant. A member asserted that traditional thinking about grading and the emphasis on grade point average (GPA) is part of the equity and anti-racism issue. Vice Provost Halimah will ensure the activities described today are included on UCOP’s anti-racism website.

V. **Systemwide Review: Report from the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force**

Chair Potter reported meeting with Chair Gauvain and Vice Chair Horwitz to discuss how UCEP can be involved after the feedback from the systemwide review on this report is received. The chair also expressed concerns that UCEP might reject all three of the recommendations from the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force, which could send the Senate back to the drawing board.
**Discussion:** One member is skeptical about UC’s ability to offer online degrees right now but does not want to prohibit them entirely. The ability to offer degrees to individuals who cannot afford to live in Santa Cruz or other areas with high costs of living is seen as an equity issue. The third option proposed by the Task Force would allow for a centralized offering that is comprised of the best courses across UC. There is a concern that the report lays the groundwork for the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) at UCOP to offer degrees and become a virtual UC campus. Ideally, campuses will propose online degree programs in fields where they excel. Members agreed that campuses should not be prevented from developing fully online degree programs.

UCD wants to ensure that students who decide to follow an online degree pathway are not disadvantaged and this will require concerted attention and investment. UC will need to publicize its attention to and investment in quality to make sure that prospective employers and graduate schools understand how well trained students in the online degree programs are. Campuses should take a comprehensive look at the demand for online degrees and the majors that will be of interest to students. Vice Chair Lynch commented that UCEP may eventually be involved with establishing structure and guidelines for undergraduate online degree programs. The committee discussed a draft memo in response to the report and suggested revisions. The memo will indicate UCEP’s support for campus efforts to develop online degree programs without specifying or limiting how campuses approach this and note that the committee needs to think about the principles and parameters for these programs.

**VI. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** UCEP’s November 2nd videoconference minutes were approved.

**VII. Updating Systemwide Regulations**

Chair Potter combined the discussion about updating regulations with the item on the outcome of the systemwide reviews of the proposed revisions to SR 544 and SR 630.

**Discussion:** Members have differing opinions about the need to make the definition of residency in SR 610 more explicit. The informal feedback on the regulations about grading indicate there is no desire to dictate whether a C or C- is a passing grade across the system and that campuses prefer to retain authority over this decision. The campuses that set a C for a passing grade are UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSF, UCSB, UCSC and those with a passing grade of C- are UCB, UCD, UCM, and UCSD. More information will be needed about the potential impact of eliminating the plus or minus before considering this change. The policies on Pass/No Pass have implications for good standing for financial aid but the specific federal polices related to this need to be identified. Students have disparate opinions about how Pass/No Pass should be handled and making decisions about taking a course for Pass/No Pass or a letter grade is stressful for students. Many faculty members do not think the pandemic is a reason to change their expectations of students or to relax grading. Regarding SR 780 on repeating a course, UCSC does not allow a course taken for a grade to be repeated for Pass/No Pass and vice versa. Since SR 544 and SR 630 are related to enrollment in cross campus courses and residency as it relates to online courses, UCEP will postpone further discussion on the proposed revisions of these two regulations until the systemwide review of the restructuring report of ILTI is completed.

**Action:** Chair Potter will draft a memo asking Council for a waiver of SR 782 for the period of the pandemic to formally give campuses the flexibility to determine the upper limit on courses taken on a Pass/No Pass basis.

**VIII. Intercampus Recognition of Transferable Minors**
Feedback from divisional CEPs and Undergraduate Councils suggests there is no interest in establishing a systemwide policy for the intercampus recognition of transferable majors.

**Discussion:** Campuses would prefer to entertain specific proposals on a case by case basis and the committee agreed that a systemwide policy is unnecessary.


Chair Potter explained that comments on the ILTI restructuring report are due on February 17th. Since it is not clear if UCEP will have a January meeting, members are encouraged to read the report and plan to share feedback by email. The goal will be to finalize UCEP’s comments in February.

**X. Guidance to Campuses for Flexibility in Grading**

The committee was asked to determine if there is a need for further guidance about continued flexibility in grading.

**Discussion:** Members agreed with the proposal to continue promoting flexibility due to the pandemic.

**Action:** Chair Potter will finalize a memo to Council on the need for continued flexibility in grading.

**XI. Systemwide Reviews of Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulations 544 & 630 & Next Steps**

This matter was discussed with Item VII earlier in the meeting.

**XII. New Business**

Chair Potter announced that UCOP will be closed for curtailment on January 4th, so UCEP will either meet on January 11th or have no January meeting. The decision will be made soon.

**XIII. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

**Videoconference adjourned at:** 2 p.m.
**Minutes prepared by:** Brenda Abrams
**Attest:** Dan Potter