UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, February 1, 2021

Attending: Daniel Potter, Chair (UCD), Mary Lynch, Vice Chair (UCSF), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Tony Smith (UCI), Megan McEvoy (UCLA), Matthew Hibbing (UCM), Juliann Allison (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Jose Gurrola (UCSF), Mary Brenner (UCSB), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Zoe Hayes (Undergraduate Student Representative), Ellen Osmundson (Director, ILTI), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Ethan Savage (Analyst, Academic Planning), Mary Gauvain (Chair, Academic Senate), Robert Horwitz (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**
   •   *Mary Gauvain, Chair, Academic Senate*
   •   *Robert Horwitz, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Gauvain reported that the recent Regents meeting included a discussion about the Feasibility Study and identifying alternatives to standardized testing for UC admissions. One possibility is the Smarter Balanced Assessment, which is used in high schools in California, and the next step will be to determine if it can be adapted to meet UC's needs. Academic Council is forming a task force to study the Entry Level Writing Requirement as well as a task force to look at the ethnic studies requirement in high school that has been introduced by the legislature. In early in January, the governor's preliminary budget was released and it includes a cut for UC along with several expectations, meaning UC is essentially being asked to do more with less. The budget includes a request that UC increase the number of online courses by 10% but what this means exactly is currently unclear. The preliminary budget also asks UC to think about a dual admission process for transfer students and the Senate is discussing what this means with the Provost's Office. The final budget will be released in May, so between now and then UC will be lobbying with the legislature and governor. President Drake is taking the Senate's concerns about the budget into consideration.

As the rollout of the COVID-19 vaccinations begins, UC is beginning to plan for a return to in-person instruction. However, what the plans are will be tied to the delivery and effectiveness of the vaccine. UC Health is involved in the vaccine delivery process, and Chair Gauvain and Vice Chair Horwitz are on a vaccine delivery committee. The human resources office at the Office of the President, which handles faculty benefits and pensions, is being reorganized and some high level positions that have been vacant for a while will be filled. UCEP has seen a letter from the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity for the administration that offers several recommendations intended to address faculty morale and the impact of the pandemic on advancement.

Discussion: Director Greenspan commented that, in addition to the lack of clarity about the preliminary budget calling for an increase in online course, it is troubling that the legislature is pronouncing that online is the preferred delivery mode. Regarding the COVID-19 vaccine and returning to campus, there are concerns about students with special health needs and older faculty who are at risk. Chair Gauvain proposed sending a letter to the administration that addresses the need to prioritize the safety of students, faculty and staff in the planning for reopening campuses. The return to campus is not likely to include any large lectures and UCSC is considering that all classes over a certain size must be taught remotely with in-person and remote sections. But the campus is trying to devise a flexible set of guidelines that will address concerns about the inequities for students in the remote sections.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP's December 7th videoconference minutes were approved.

III.   Results of the Systemwide Review of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force

Chair Gauvain suggested that UCEP consider a second round of surveys for students and faculty on remote instruction. Last year's survey provided valuable baseline data about the experience, and a follow-up survey might include questions related to online undergraduate degree programs. Vice Chair Horwitz remarked that it is problematic that some Regents believe that UC can accommodate increased enrollment utilizing online offerings. The results of last year's survey showed that students and faculty were unhappy with remote instruction, and it would be interesting to see if there is a change in attitude now that faculty have taught remotely for almost a year.

Discussion: A member pointed out that the development of remote courses last spring occurred within departments and was coordinated by program chairs, whereas the courses developed by the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) are not reviewed by the Academic Senate after the initial approval. Another issue with ILTI is that the contracts with individual faculty without coordination with deans, which means that revenues from the online courses do not flow to colleges and programs where the instructors are located. In contrast, online degrees would be grounded in programs and remain within the Senate's purview. The committee discussed how survey questions about online degrees would be framed, although students might not be enthusiastic about the idea of these degrees right now. Director Greenspan indicated that the Undergraduate Experience Survey is administered every other year, and it would be challenging to administer it this spring, but IRAP could work with campus IR units to put together a student survey. Chair Gauvain emphasized that getting student feedback in a timely manner is critical.

Faculty are concerned about the possibility of UCOP offering degrees and firmly believe that online degrees should only be offered by the campuses. The analyst asked Chair Gauvain if it is premature for UCEP to begin thinking about policies and procedures related to online degrees that might be added to the Compendium. Chair Potter indicated that current policies do not prohibit a program from putting all its courses online, thereby allowing students to take all the courses needed for a degree even though it was never proposed as a degree program. Chair Gauvain encouraged UCEP to think through the various policy issues. The committee further discussed the idea of a follow-up survey about remote instruction for students, but there is a question about extrapolating from data about the emergency use of remote instruction to inform decisions about undergraduate online degrees. A second survey of faculty could ask what they would do differently based on their remote instruction experience since last year. However, committee members have reservations about asking faculty to deal with a survey on top of everything they are already trying to manage.

IV.   Consultation with Institutional Research and Academic Planning
   * *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
   * *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

In November and January, IRAP presented an item on 21st Century skills and outcomes to the Regents. IRAP is currently working on a presentation for March on redesigning curriculum to address equity gaps. The unit has worked with the campus centers for Teaching and Learning to identify the programs that should be highlighted for the Regents, but UCEP members are invited to make suggestions as well. Enrollment planning is also underway, and with the exception of UCB, enrollment is not dropping at the campuses and should be flat for California residents. President Drake has approved the enrollment plans for 2021-2022. The University may need to accept fewer California students and transfer students compared to this year, although this is a tricky situation politically. Director Greenspan remarked that the

state projected declining enrollment which has not been the case, so IRAP has stopped utilizing the state's modeling. The expectation is that UC will continue to grow, in contrast to what is occurring nationally.

V.   Consultation with the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative
   - *Ellen Osmundson, Director, ILTI*

Director Osmundson reported that, for the past year, ILTI has worked on developing a feature in the cross campus enrollment system to categorize the reasons students drop courses. Before this, the drop reasons had an open text field that allowed students to indicate a reason but this made it difficult for ILTI to analyze the data and identify patterns and trends. With the new feature, students, registrars, and academic advisors have the same core set of drop reasons, and after a reason is selected, there is text field where more information can be provided. ILTI is launching this new feature and will host sessions for registrar and academic advisors to ensure they know how the system works. The tool includes a dashboard that allows users to look at records and run custom analyses.

One of the two new courses running this term is Introduction to Punjabi, offered by UCD. This course was developed after members of the Punjabi community reached out to UCD and asked for a course for students who grow up speaking Punjabi but do not know how to read or write it. This community contributed funds for the creation of the course, and one unique component is a mobile application that allows students to use their phone to practice writing by tracking the characters on the screen and submitting this for feedback. The other new course, offered by UCI, is Life 101 which focuses on managing emotional, psychological and physical health and well-being. Over 500 students are enrolled in Life 101 and some students recommend that it should be required for everyone. The course is currently required for all pharmacy students at UCI and the instructor has a mental health background. Students can attend a once weekly live session and, if they have concerns, they can reach out to the instructor for referrals to mental health services.

ILTI is preparing to launch spring quarter enrollment and over 80 courses will be open for cross campus enrollment, including old courses and several new ones in music, art and theater. Teaching resources are available on ILTI's website and ILTI may offer webinars on tools teachers are using related to inclusion, equity and diversity as well as tools that promote student involvement. Director Osmundson expressed concerns about the way the consultant who assessed ILTI for the restructuring report approached the endeavor. Huron only interviewed ten faculty members and missed the opportunity to gather feedback from registrars and others. In addition, there was no effort to explore how ILTI funding can be used more broadly to support innovation and instructional opportunities. The proposed new governance structure will expand the current Steering Committee to include more faculty and administrative representatives as well as individuals with instructional design expertise.

Discussion: Members expressed appreciation for ILTI's work on the taxonomy for organizing why students dropped courses.

VI.   Undergraduate Education and the Climate Crisis

At the beginning of the academic year, Senate leadership asked UCEP to think about how the climate crisis might be addressed through undergraduate education.

Discussion: UCI has a minor in sustainability and is taking steps towards being a certified green campus. It was noted that the Senate's use of videoconferences instead of requiring faculty travel to Oakland has reduced the Senate's carbon footprint. One member is concerned about the number of new buildings under construction, including lecture halls that will accommodate 1k students, and suggests that greater use of technology should be explored in an effort to ameliorate the need for adding new facilities. Another

recommendation is to build faculty and student housing close to campus to reduce long commutes and traffic. Workshops may be needed to help faculty figure out how to introduce education about climate change into existing courses in new, creative ways since not all faculty have the background and understanding of these issues. Faculty at UCR are thinking about developing modules about various issues related to the climate crisis that can be incorporated into a class.

VII.　Systemwide Senate Review: The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative Assessment Report & Recommendations for the Future

Chair Potter shared a draft response to the ILTI Assessment Report and Recommendations for the Future with the committee.

Discussion: A member asserted that the way ILTI does business needs to change immediately. ILTI's contracts with individual faculty mean that resources are not distributed to the program, and there is a concern that ILTI courses may not be subject to the usual oversight and review of the Senate after their initial approval in courses committees, which could have implications for accreditation. The Report does not include information about where the revenues for enrollments in ILTI courses are going, so it is not clear if the revenue goes back to the deans and departments where the faculty teaching the courses are located. Another issue is that ILTI only provides funding to develop the course, which means the program ends up subsidizing the course to keep it going. The Senate budget committees should be closely scrutinizing what happens with the revenue from these courses. Members remarked that ILTI is encouraging faculty to develop courses that are unrelated to the program and that some deans report having no information about where funding from ILTI goes.

ILTI should provide block grants to the campuses so that its primary administrative purpose is directing resources to the campuses instead of creating and managing content. Renaming the Initiative to "UC Online" suggests that ILTI wants to sound like a UC campus and create a competitor with the campuses, and UCEP needs to push back against this to prevent the possibility of ILTI expanding to offer degrees. If ILTI wants to continue to prioritize cross campus enrollment, a transparent budget model must be in place. The cross-campus enrollment process is a burden for advisors and registrars, and this work is not compensated. In addition, few students enroll in the cross-campus courses. There should be a funding model that is uniformly applicable to all campuses and all the programs on the campuses.

Action: Chair Potter will incorporate today's feedback into the memo and will send it to the committee for a final review.

VIII.　Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 610

Based on previous discussions, Chair Potter has drafted a revision of Senate Regulation 610, the systemwide regulation about residency. Members are asked to approve sending the proposed revisions to Academic Council.

Discussion: The analyst explained that Academic Council will decide if the proposed revision should be sent out for systemwide review.

Action: Members unanimously agreed to forward the proposed revisions to SR 610.

IX.　Plans for Fall 2021 and Beyond

Chair Potter would like UCEP to have an open-ended discussion about the transition to post-pandemic undergraduate education. Earlier in the meeting, Chair Gauvain encouraged UCEP to come up with a list of factors for consideration.

Discussion: Administrators have announced that students will return to campuses in the fall, but this does not seem realistic. Faculty and students both need to be reassured that things will return to normal. UCSC is planning to use a combination of remote and in-person instruction for classes over a certain size, which may be a disservice to remote students who are likely to receive less attention. Although vaccinations are on the way, there will be logistical obstacles that make coming back to campus difficult. County departments of public health will dictate when it is safe for students and faculty to return to campus, so statements from UCEP or the Senate may be of little use. Presenting a rosy view of when things will be back to normal could lead to students feeling that they have been misled. This topic will be on future UCEP agendas.

X.   New Business

The committee has received CCGA's draft Considerations for Review of Dual Degree Program Proposals and is asked to provide feedback by February 28th.

XI.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:05 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Daniel Potter