

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 3, 2020

Attending: John Serences, Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter, Vice Chair, (UCD), Tony Keaveny (UCB) (telephone), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI) (videoconference), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Paul Goldstein (UCSD), Mary Lynch (UCSF), Ted Bennett (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC) (videoconference), Ann Marie Martin (Graduate Student) (videoconference), Ellen Osmundson (Program Director, ILTI) (videoconference), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Updates

The Senate Chair and Vice Chair are unable to join today's meeting and there are two new items on the agenda: the report from the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) and a question about the senior residency requirement. The STTF report will be sent out for systemwide Senate review soon with a March 23rd deadline for comments. UCEP will discuss the report on March 2nd. The presidential search continues to move forward and town halls at campuses have not been well attended.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The January minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

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

This consultation did not occur.

IV. Principles for Working with Students who are Incarcerated or Formerly Incarcerated

- *Katheryn Russ, UCD*

The UCD representative explained that there are about 30k incarcerated individuals with high school equivalency and a growing fraction of them have Associate of Arts (AA) degrees. The California State Prison-Los Angeles is the only prison offering in-person courses towards a four-year degree. Some individuals have up to seven AA degrees suggesting there is a demand for more programs. The enactment of Senate Bill 1391 in 2014 increased access to in-person community college classes in prisons and these programs are now offered in 34 of the 35 state prisons. A benefit of these programs include reducing recidivism by half and it is estimated that every dollar spent on adult education in prison reduces taxpayer costs by \$5. The programs are intensively rehabilitative and offering education to this population is consistent with UC's mission to offer education to all Californians. The governor has included funding in the 2020-2021 budget for the development of four-year degree programs through partnerships between the California Department of Corrections and the California Community College (CCC) system.

One challenge to offering four-year degree programs is student preparation and screening to determine who is ready for these programs is important. Access to textbooks, computers and library services is a problem. Another challenge is that inmates may be transferred within a prison or to different prisons for various reasons and the average stay in prison is anywhere from six to 30 months. Prisoners lose access to programs if they are placed in lockdown and they also must be in a specific place for headcounts during the day, limiting when courses can be taught. A set of preliminary recommendations has been drafted based on UCEP's November discussion about this topic.

Discussion: A group of UCI faculty are planning an in-prison program that will not utilize online courses. The infrastructure needed to offer an online program does not exist and prison administrators may not support online programs for security reasons. The committee discussed how parents of students not accepted into a UC might react to programs offered to individuals who are incarcerated even though they meet UC's eligibility criteria. The UCI program will be a pilot in a women's prison with external funding and start with a cohort of 30, expanding after there is evidence of a positive impact. Although UC may be criticized for working with incarcerated persons, it is important to remember that the CCC and California State University systems have been engaged in this work for many years and such programs exist in other states. These students are likely to qualify for financial aid because of their low income.

If UC implements four-year in-prison programs, the course offerings will have to be significantly greater than if programs are for students who already possess AA degrees. Existing programs focus on specific degrees but one question is if UC can admit students without giving them access to different majors. Two of the principles indicate that students who are incarcerated should be treated the same as any other students and that the courses should have the same level of rigor as courses at a campus. One question is if the in-prison programs should be designed with rigor equal to that of campus programs or if that would be setting the bar too high for this population. The courses definitely need to be transferable to a UC campus. It should be clear that courses will be offered when feasible to avoid overpromising.

Some of UCEP's questions about implementation will be worked through as the UCI program gets underway and the principles may evolve as this and other programs are established. There are a variety of support services UC provides to students on campus that will not be provided to students in prison, such as healthcare. One principle might acknowledge that this population may need mental health services to help cope with demanding education programs and prison administrations might be expected to meet this need. Another issue is that these programs should not divert resources from existing programs and requiring external funding could be a principle. A process will be needed to help students who are being released from prison transfer to a UC campus. How UC supports students who are incarcerated after matriculating to a UC is unclear. The UCI group is willing to meet with UCEP to discuss their program. The UCD representative will send an updated draft of the principles to the committee for feedback.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*

The Academic Planning Council recently considered developing principles to guide non-resident enrollment. The idea is to make a case for why non-residents are integral to undergraduate education. Another topic was whether UC should engage undergraduates in future challenges such as climate change in ways that could change pedagogy. The faculty salary scales task force may survey all UC faculty as it explores ways to get more faculty back on scale. The future of scholarly publishing was another topic. The campus enrollment targets for 2020-2021 have been confirmed by President Napolitano. Director Greenspan indicated that the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Degree and Certificate Completion Programs specifies that the funding must go to the Extension programs and that an academic department must award the degrees. The criteria for review and a scoring rubric are being developed. The proposals are due February 18th.

VI. Consultation with the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

- *Ellen Osmundson, Program Director, ILTI*

Chair Serences explained that UCEP and ILTI are in agreement about clauses "a" to "d" of Senate Regulation (SR) 544 but there are issues with clause "e". As proposed, the burden would be on departments to approve each ILTI course. It was noted that SR 544 applies to all courses. Director

Osmundson indicated that ILTI's technical team is working on expanding the reasons for students being dropped from courses to generate more detailed information. Of the 480 ILTI courses, 60 have prerequisites. Most of the 60 courses fall into a sequence which is allowing ILTI to easily check the prerequisites. The interface will include a pop-up indicating that a course has a prerequisite.

Discussion: A recommendation is to indicate that departments will review and approve the ILTI courses upon request. Although this may be the current practice, this clarification is useful. Students must ask departments to review courses taken through the Education Abroad Program (EAP). Director Osmundson agrees with adding "upon request" to clause "e". The committee is still waiting for the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction's interpretation of good standing which is in section A of the Regulation. One question is where the principles and implementation guidance ILTI has proposed will be documented. This information could be included in the cover memo to Academic Council and UCEP can ask the provost to send annual reminders to campuses about implementation.

VII. Systemwide Review: UC Washington D.C. Center

The UCSD representative indicated that the Huron Report is more detailed than the State Review report. The Future State proposal mentions two options, keeping UCDC at UCOP or moving it to a campus, although no specific information about the latter is provided. Goals include increasing enrollment in order to fill the Center's building with UC students instead of renting space to other tenants, restructuring student services, and securing additional funding. The report does not provide any demographic data on participants but one recommendation is to enhance diversity. Only two scholarships are available to about 1% of participants and campuses provide varying amounts of financial aid.

Campuses are unhappy with the quota system which requires them to predict the number of beds a campus will need and campuses pay for these beds even if they are unused. However, alternative approaches are not suggested. There are issues related to the timing for the core system and internships. Students from campuses on the quarter system are disadvantaged since they must compete with students at campuses that start earlier. Based on the success of the UC Sacramento model, having one campus host the Center is a possibility. Student services and registration would be enhanced if one campus manages the Center but a drawback is this may undermine the sense that it is a systemwide program.

One idea is to diversify the variety of majors offered. At least 50% of UCSD students who participate are political science majors, so UCDC should promote areas outside of government to increase enrollment. Another issue is how much the program costs students. Participation in UCDC costs at least \$2000 but the costs for students who commute to a UC campus from home or for students who must work are not part of the calculation. The internships seem to be unpaid, so the Center should identify opportunities for paid internships which might be allocated on the basis of need. It is unclear if students are placed in internships during the summer.

Discussion: Members have concerns and questions about Senate oversight of UCDC courses, so a list of courses, the instructors and approval dates will be requested. The report does not include the syllabi, student evaluations of instructors, or other materials typically included in program reviews. This is troubling especially because the UCDC Academic Advisory Committee's (AAC) meetings this year conflict with UCEP's, preventing a UCEP member from participating. Even though UCDC's emphasis is on internships, it is unclear if the AAC is actually reviewing and approving any courses. Hosting the Center at one campus could improve Senate oversight but UCEP might recommend that it resumes approving courses.

Action: The chair and analyst will work on a memo for the committee's review.

VIII. Campus Closure Policies – Reading Week

Chair Serences reported that UCSD is discussing the pros and cons of the quarter and semester calendars.

Discussion: UCSC is discussing moving from the semester to quarter system and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has provided the chancellor with a written explanation of the campus's unique problems that make this change unfeasible. UCR's CEP is against cutting back on the days of instruction to fit in a reading week. UCSC faculty would not support holding classes on Saturdays but a reading week might be supported. Guidance about what percentage of instruction can be lost before a course is no longer valid as a course would be helpful. The addition of a reading week at UCB did not lead to the loss of days of instruction. Adoption of a reading week will need to be considered by each campus.

Director Greenspan shared that the provost approves the calendar and it was agreed that all semester campuses should have the same start and end dates and all quarter campuses would have the same start and end dates. Every time a campus closes the provost has to approve exceptions for changing the number of days of instruction. Envisioning undergraduate education in the future might involve discussions about the calendar. UCM decided that the divisional Senate chair should be involved in decisions about closures. UCSC has an emergency committee comprised of the chancellor, the divisional Senate chair and vice chair, and the chairs of the CEP and Graduate Council. Director Greenspan will find out if an Institutional Research report on calendar conversion created for the chancellors can be shared with UCEP.

Action: Chair Serences will circulate a set of draft guidelines on campus closures to the committee.

IX. Teaching Evaluation Task Force

A systemwide Task Force comprised of the chairs of UCEP; the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs; the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity; the Committee on Academic Personnel; and the Committee on Faculty Welfare have discussed reports from the Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and from several campuses. Student course evaluations should focus on the student experience and other strategies to be considered are self-evaluation, peer reviews, or observation by CTL. It may be that campus cultures will need to change in order to adopt new approaches. Members are invited to share any feedback from their campuses about the reports.

Discussion: UCD's Center for Teaching Effectiveness proposed giving more responsibility to administrative units for training and guidelines for teaching evaluations and this is a concern to faculty. UCSB is also concerned about giving an administrative unit a final judgement on teaching. With peer review, the observer will not understand the full context of the course. People in campus CTLs are knowledgeable about teaching and could be a valuable resource. The questions on student evaluations could be improved. Campus committees on Academic Personnel should be educated about the known problems in student course evaluations including bias in the scores for women and faculty from underrepresented minority groups and inappropriate comments. Another strategy is to use assessment to provide a counterpoint to the bias in student evaluations by examining how students perform in the next course in the sequence.

X. Student Fees Beyond Tuition

A UCI faculty member required that students purchase an online tool for quizzes and tests which UCI saw as a conflict of interest because the faculty member benefited from the revenue. A UCI task force subsequently made a set of recommendations that UCEP has discussed. UCEP wants to be cautious about discouraging faculty from creating quality text books, and having clear conflict of interest protocols in place would be helpful.

Discussion: One idea is to identify all fees when students sign up for courses, which might help UC negotiate lower costs with vendors. Faculty could be asked to justify extra costs for such things as exam proctoring. A member indicated that students pay for an online homework program upon which faculty and Teaching Assistants rely. The key issue may be that students need to know about additional costs in advance. UCEP might recommend updating the 2009 guideline, "[Implementing Course Materials and Services Fees](#)."

XI. RFP for Degree and Certificate Completion Programs

Faculty are worried that the RFP for Degree and Certificate Completion Programs would give UC Extension the ability to offer degrees. A practical concern is making sure that Extension has the same requirements for instructors as academic departments so the rigor of courses is maintained.

Discussion: UCR's Extension will partner with departments on an existing Liberal Arts degree instead of creating a new program. Instructors for Extension courses that grant credit are approved by the corresponding department on campus. Extension may be well-positioned to work with returning students, some of whom may be non-traditional. UCM's Undergraduate Council has heard rumors that suggest Extension may develop a program but has nothing concrete has been shared. The UCSC Extension program may propose a broadly defined degree program.

The analyst mentioned that the systemwide Senate had a Committee on Extension which was eliminated in 1985 but could be reestablished. Senate leadership recently met with Provost Brown who stressed that the degree awarding unit would be a campus department. A ten member proposal review panel will include four Senate faculty, one of whom is a UCEP member. The UCSC member might be willing to participate on the panel depending on the number of meetings required. The number of potential students is unclear. Members are encouraged to share any plans they hear about.

XII. Preferred Names

The use of students' preferred names has been under discussion for the past year and Immediate Past Chair May reported to the Regents in the spring that the Senate would recommend the use of preferred names on diplomas for 2020. The analyst has been advised that Chair May and Student Affairs worked on a proposal but its status is unknown. Chair Serences is not aware of any faculty objections to use of preferred names but UCSC's CEP recommends that students need to be educated. Students should make an explicit request for the use of preferred names. A Regents Standing Order is being interpreted by some campuses as dictating that legal names must be used on diplomas, so this policy may need to be revised.

Discussion: It is recommended that students should only be provided with one diploma with their preferred name and restricted from later requesting a duplicate with different preferred names. Campuses should provide students with guidance on how to change their legal name.

XIII. New Business

Senior Residency Requirement:

SR 630 establishes the criteria for senior residency. Clause "a" indicates that to satisfy the requirement, 35 of the last 45 units must be completed at the student's home campus. Clause "d" states that students participating in a systemwide program such as EAP must earn the final 12 units after returning to the home campus. UCSC's Registrar stipulates that students in a systemwide program must satisfy clause "d" in addition to clause "a." UCEP members are asked how their campuses interpret clause "d."

Discussion: At UCI, residency is not interpreted as related to a student's physical presence at a specific geographic location but to the fact that a student is taking a UCI course, although this may be contrary to what people typically think of in terms of residency. The UCSC representative would like to understand why the senior residency requirement is necessary and what makes the last 45 units special. UCEP might want to propose revising SR 630 to state that a specific number of units need to be earned at the home campus but that they need not be the final units.

Credit for Summer Orientation:

In an effort to increase enrollment, UCSC's administration is proposing that the required summer orientation should be converted into a one or two unit course but the CEP does not support this idea. The question is whether other campuses award units for summer orientation.

Discussion: A required General Education course during the regular academic term at UCM has slowly been incorporating topics or activities that are usually part of orientation. At UCD, an expanded summer orientation integrates a new academic seminar activity but it is not currently credit bearing.

Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA):

UCM's administration has asked the divisional Senate to figure out how UC can assist DACA students who get deported complete their degrees.

Discussion: This is not being considered at other campuses but in 2018 UCOP did suggest that efforts to support DACA students would be identified. It may not be realistic to devise a systemwide policy that addresses the disparate situations of students who are deported.

XIV. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:30 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: John Serences