

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2019

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter (UCD) (videoconference), Hugh Roberts (UCI) (videoconference), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Deborah Johnson (UCSF) (telephone), Adriana Galvan (UCLA), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC) (telephone), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Linda Cohen (Chair, UCI Divisional Senate) (telephone), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate) (telephone), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair May thanked the committee for its work on the policy for awarding degrees posthumously, reporting that Academic Council was pleased with UCEP's approach. UCEP's graduate student representative and chair will serve on the standardized testing task force which will have its first meeting this Friday. The charge to the task force will be broad and UC's decisions will have an impact nationally. The task force will provide a progress report by the end of this academic year but it is likely the work will carry over into next year. Any ideas UCEP members have for the task force should be shared with Chair Zanzucchi.

UCEP will receive UCI's proposal for a completely online Bachelor's degree in Business Administration. While an initial administrative UCI perspective considered the new program already approved because the courses were previously approved for and taught in the traditional setting, the Senate's position is that individual courses do not automatically constitute a program and that this is a novel program requires systemwide review, in addition to Senate-Administrative campus processes. In addition to the "first of its kind" review, UCEP is asked to think about the relevant Senate regulations, such as the residency requirement, which may need to be updated for multiple reasons.

As of December 31st, UC is out of contract with the publisher Elsevier, and the negotiations will continue for a few more weeks. During the most recent Council meeting, President Napolitano expressed strong support for the position UC has taken in the negotiations regarding open access. UC's librarians are dedicated to ensuring that faculty have access to Elsevier's journals.

Chair May reported that a UCSF lab conducting research on HIV involving modified fetal tissue was notified by the NIH that its grant would end in 90 days. The Academic Senate and President Napolitano have indicated their support for the UCSF researcher. It was noted that last year, Senator Booker sponsored a bill which would make it difficult to conduct primate research. These actions are part of politicizing academic research and also constitute clear threats to academic freedom; the situation will continue to be monitored. Academic Council passed a resolution to work on protections for non-faculty researchers and a small work group was established to create policy. As delineated in APM 010, academic freedom applies only to faculty.

Governor Newsom's proposed budget for 2019-2020 includes a 7% increase for UC which is a move in a positive direction. Last year, UC agreed to not raise tuition and politicians are opposing increases. The budget includes \$10M for enrollment growth but UC estimates that \$40M is needed. The budget does not include any funding for the Office of the President and this will make it difficult for UCOP to manage mandatory increases. Administrators from UCOP and the campuses will be advocating for changes to the budget in advance of the May revise. UCOP is developing a process for multi-year budgeting and this will enable families to plan ahead. A new emphasis for UCOP is how to more efficiently and effectively move students towards graduation. Capitol and human infrastructure are needed and cannot be handled with a small budget and an investment in ladder rank faculty is needed. Strategies to encourage students who dropped out of UC to re-enroll and ways to make greater use of Extension programs are being explored.

Discussion: A member reported that information about the Elsevier negotiations may not be reaching all faculty who might be directly impacted. With respect to students who drop out of UC, there is a concern that UC is not doing enough to help incoming freshman decide upon the right major or to help students change majors more easily. Requiring students to declare a major allows campuses to ensure an appropriate distribution of students across majors so one major is not overwhelmed while others have no students. Chair May encouraged UCEP to consider how to balance the need for an appropriate distribution of students with helping students understand the decisions they are making about their major. The committee should examine the available data on drop outs. How UC makes sure that the best environment for academic success is an important issue.

III. Chair's Updates

Chair Zanzucchi shared that the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates is planning Legislative Day on February 20th. The California Community College and California State University systems along with UC will discuss priorities shared by the segments with various legislators. UCEP's work on academic integrity policies was shared with Council and considering policies based on where they are located was considered helpful.

IV. Transfer Initiative

Chair Zanzucchi provided an overview of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools' (BOARS) proposal for the transfer guarantee. The 3.5 grade point average (GPA) is connected to preparedness for UC. A referral pool was discussed but this approach is no longer on the table. UCEP members are encouraged to discuss how to strengthen BOARS' proposal with their divisional committees. Another question is whether there could be unintended consequences of the proposed approach.

The UCSD representative serving on the Articulation Committee reported that some campuses have indicated that a GPA lower than 3.5 would be preferred. The representative recommended that a flow chart would be a helpful way to identify what might be missing from the proposed process. It is also noted that the number of pathways may change so the proposal should not refer to the 21 pathways. UC will need to look at the pathways major by major. Some majors have courses that are no longer required whereas other majors might be separated into two. This committee has been identifying the problems with the pathways and a goal is to ensure that going forward the process for the review of pathways is solidified. Senate Regulation 477 has been discussed and there is concern that it could force course articulation without faculty involvement or authority. Framing the articulation process by indicating that other faculty have already reviewed the course may generate more buy-in.

Discussion: At UCI, there are discussions about eliminating the TAGs and it is unclear how this would impact the current proposal which is built around the TAGs. The proposal from BOARS may prompt campuses to rethink the TAGs and make them more effective. One concern is that privileged students seem more likely to take advantage of TAGs than do students from more diverse backgrounds. Chair Zanzucchi indicated that the data on TAGs shows they are not taken advantage of by under-represented minority (URM) students. Provost Brown's office will develop a document that clarifies what the guarantee means. The information provided to students should clarify the different GPA requirements for the transfer pathway courses and for the TAGs. It is critical for UC to be clear with students about what is required especially since there is confusion among faculty about what the guarantee means and what agreements have been made.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

Director Greenspan mentioned that a presentation on multi-year budgeting was given to the Regents in January and work on this strategy continues. The student faculty ratio is being considered as a part of the long-range planning. The degree attainment target is based on the Public Policy Institute of California projection that one million degrees will be needed by 2030. Chancellors have provided estimates for the number of degrees they can generate. Adding different degrees is a small part of the conversation. The current proposal would generate about 200K more degrees by 2030. The Regents noted that some campuses did not have plans for addressing the attainment gap for URMs. Institutional Research has a new dashboard on how many students do not complete UC which may be of interest to UCEP. Chair Zanzucchi suggested that the committee will discuss the completion data in March.

Discussion: It was noted that adding an eleventh campus has not been a focus of the discussions about how to increase degree attainment.

VI. Campus Closure Policies

The committee gathered information about campus closure policies. Chair Zanzucchi asked if policy is better handled at the divisional level.

Discussion: During the recent wildfires in Southern California, UCLA students were instructed to not come to campus whereas faculty were initially told to be at campus but not given instructions about cancelling classes. A member indicated that students have paid tuition and have the expectation that they will get the entirety of their courses, so there may be an argument that the missed instruction needs to be delivered. Most of Santa Barbara was evacuated, impacting both students and faculty, and the situation in the region was not conducive to studying. It is not clear if extending the quarter or semester is a viable solution.

Having guidance for faculty in advance would be preferable to trying to address the problem after the interruption. The policies could be based on the duration of the closure. Having a standard or threshold for what constitutes delivery of a course might be helpful. Chair Zanzucchi suggested looking at this issue in the context of student experience and the degree to which students have contact with the course. UCEP might look for examples of model policies at other universities, such as policies for snow days. It would be beneficial to clarify who is responsible for making the decision about a closure.

VII. Campus Grading Policies

The Senate regulations indicate that each campus has the right to create its own grading system but the UCSC representative asked if there should be uniformity in the pass/fail boundary. At present some

campuses set a C- as a passing grade while others set a C as the lowest passing grade. Chair Zanzucchi proposed looking at the standard for graduate students as a point of comparison.

Discussion: Senate regulations stipulate that each campus can stipulate if the pass/no pass grade is a C or C- and if a satisfactory grade is a B or B-. Problems arise if a student passes a course at a campus with a C- and then wants credit to be granted for it at a campus where C is a passing grade. If students increasingly take courses at other campuses, there may be a need for consistency. The UCSC representative will draft a memo which will be sent to the Registrars clearly explaining the question and requesting their feedback on how the grading discrepancies are handled.

VIII. UCI Online School of Business Administration

- *Hugh Roberts, UCI Representative, UCEP*
- *Linda Cohen, Chair, UCI Senate*
- *Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

The UCI representative explained that a central issue is the bifurcation of UC into an online program with campus resource interfaces and GE coursework (as part of degree completion). A policy could be that the School cannot have overlapping applicant pools or that applicants have to prove that they are unable to be on the campus. Alternatively, this degree may be uniquely detached from campus structures and is standalone, which may be a new type of degree entirely. A potential focus is on determining the essence of a UC education and what does it mean to be in-residence, from an experiential as well as resource planning perspective. If UC starts offering online degrees, would it be considered acceptable and educational quality if the typical on-campus UC experience is not offered? Will it be reasonable and appropriate if the online experience does not match up with what is offered on a campus is another question. UCI's Senate Chair Cohen indicated that the campus would like guidance about the rights of students, such as whether they have rights to come to campus or change majors. Another question is what the fees for the online-only program will be.

Discussion: A member asked if the degree issued by the School of Business will be called an online degree. Being on campus offers students experiences that are important. To avoid diluting the meaning of a UC degree, it may be good to separate out a fully online degree by labeling it as such. Rather than the mode of delivery determining the degree, perhaps the question is whether the degree program reaches the same benchmarks as a traditional program. The opportunity to engage in research with faculty is something that distinguishes UC's undergraduate experience and it is not clear how students in the STEM fields would participate in research in an online program. Not every major could be done online.

Chair Cohen indicated that at this point the students in the online program would not have access to federal student aid. The undergraduate business degree at UCI is capped and many applicants with excellent credentials are not admitted. UCI believe this program will help the campus reach the 2:1 freshman to transfer student ratio and it should be noted that international students will not be admitted to the program. The proposed budget does not suggest that the online BA degree program will generate significant revenue. A member pointed out that online courses are resource intensive. Discussions with BOARS and divisional Senate chairs will be helpful.

IX. Academic Computing and Cross-Campus Courses

UCEP has discussed issues related to proctoring in online courses in the past. Issues that have been reported include that the ProctorU system may not start the exam at the announced time and students might not be permitted to start taking the exam after internet service has been disrupted. The goal is to identify if problems are being experienced by students throughout the system and to get a sense of the nature and extent of the problems. ProctorU is part of the service offered by the Innovative Learning

Technology Initiative (ILTI). The committee might refer this issue to the systemwide Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC). Members can share the memo included in the agenda packet with their colleagues.

Discussion: A member proposed inventorying the online courses that utilize the proctoring services. There is agreement that UCACC should be asked to investigate this matter. Some of the testing centers ILTI uses may not offer the appropriate setting for taking exams. A system where each campus offers proctored exam centers might be a good solution. It is not clear if ILTI has asked faculty teaching online courses about their experiences with the Learning Management System (LMS). The committee will look into the matter and then engage ILTI in discussions about the need to address the concerns of faculty.

X. ILTI Data on Cross Campus Enrollments

UCEP has received data from ILTI on cross campus enrollments and members were reminded that this data is confidential. The committee should think about the underlying data structures. Several years ago UCEP was asked by ILTI to consider a set of nine so-called barriers to enrollment in online in cross campus courses and this data is a key to more clearly understanding the obstacles.

Discussion: Several years ago UCEP was asked by ILTI to consider nine policies that may prevent a large number of students from enrolling in cross campus online courses. However, based on the data, it appears that only about 5% of students were not able to enroll in ILTI courses for policy reasons. A significant number of students dropped courses but the enrollment system does not require them to indicate a reason. ILTI should be encouraged to begin categorizing information. Chair Zanzucchi would like to provide an update to Academic Council about the obstacles to enrollment since the last discussion at Council was focused on the nine barriers. The LMS issues will be discussed in March. ILTI will be asked how Canvas was the platform selected for its courses.

XI. Inappropriate Comments in Student Course Evaluations

Chair May asked UCEP to consider inappropriate comments made by students in course evaluations. A concern is that inappropriate comments are primarily made about faculty who are women and URM. This topic is being engaged by UCAP as an academic personnel subject; UCEP is considering the educational quality focus.

Discussion: UCM's learning center created a video to be shown to students before they start writing the course evaluations to increase engagement and efficacy of reviews. Students may think that the evaluations are not read or that they do not make a difference. Members suggest that being proactive is important and emphasizing that course evaluations are part of the educational process. One idea is that the comments could be screened by Student Affairs but this could negatively impact the return rates. UCD will be looking at the evaluation of teaching in general. Not guaranteeing anonymity to the students would be problematic. One idea is that the course evaluation forms could have pre-set answers from which to select. The campus Committees on Academic Personnel read the comments when files are reviewed. A member proposed looking closely at the data to delve into why faculty are receiving inappropriate comments.

XII. Campus Reports/Members Items

UCR: A faculty member at the campus reported concerns about students posting course materials on websites (e.g. CourseHero), and it is up to the individual faculty member to ask the websites to take down the materials. The analyst has contacted the Office of General Counsel about this matter and is awaiting a response. This may also be a faculty workload issue of interest to the Committee on Faculty Welfare.

UCM: The experience of other campuses with “reading week” is of interest to the representative. UCB has reading week and it is well-utilized by students. No new information is introduced during the period. Approaches being discussed at UCM include having a three day period and not giving exams on Saturdays. This period can be valuable in that it offers an enriched environment for studying and access to faculty. UCM’s students have put forward a proposal for consideration by the Senate. Policy dictates that UCM and UCB must have the same academic calendar. The reading week replaces a week of classroom instruction.

XIII. New Business

The committee will convene by videoconference in March.

XIV. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:50 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Anne Zanzucchi