

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2018

Attending: Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, (UCD), Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair, (UCM), David Paul (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC) (telephone), Hugh Roberts (UCI), John Serences (UCSD), Mark Stacey (UCB), Robert Gould (UCLA) (videoconference), Jennifer Perkins (UCSF), Daniel Potter (UCD), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Shane White (Chair, Academic Senate) (videoconference), Robert May (Vice Chair, Academic Senate) (videoconference), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Announcement and Updates

Chair Caswell-Chen welcomed members to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. The committee will meet by videoconference in March. Members will be asked to consult with their divisional committees regarding certain issues that may result in recommendations from UCEP.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The December minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with Senate Leadership

- *Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Robert May, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The Committee on Faculty Welfare is leading the effort to address the faculty salary gap in a comprehensive way, and Chair White is cautiously optimistic that UCOP will address the lag behind the Comparison 8 institutions. Retiree health benefits are being discussed by a working group established by the president.

Last Thursday, ICAS held a Transfer Forum in Sacramento. Legislators are closely scrutinizing the transfer student issue and report hearing from constituents whose children have not been admitted to UC or to their UC campus of choice. UC has been meeting the required 2:1 freshman to transfer student ratio on a systemwide basis. However, last year the focus shifted specifically to UCR and UCSC which were not meeting the ratio, and the governor has withheld \$50M until UC has made good faith efforts to fix the transfer rate at these two campuses. UCR and UCSC are working on this issue. Some California Community Colleges (CCCs) are better set up than others to facilitate transfer, and the CCCs are work to improve communication with students, whereas UC's communication on transfer pathways is working reasonably well. Chair White indicated there is a need to continue actively working on improving the transfer student process and mentioned the Provost's Transfer Task Force.

Chair White discussed the January Regents meeting. The planned budget presentation did not happen and the vote on a tuition increase for California residents was postponed until March. Chair White described the Senate's ongoing efforts to play a more significant role in the president's decision-making. Past Senate Chair Dan Hare has been appointed as the president's senior faculty advisor.

President Napolitano hired Huron Consulting to evaluate the Office of the President. The President's Immediate Office has roughly twenty individuals and the vast majority of employees at UCOP are involved with services that support the campuses. Chair White and Vice Chair May are suggesting that

the President's Immediate Office, the Regents Office and the Academic Senate Office could perhaps more accurately be referred to as the "UC Governance Office" and that the other units in UCOP be referred to as "UC Systemwide." The Huron Report included high praise for many aspects of UCOP operations and oversight, and some options proposed in the Huron report that strengthen academic efforts are positive, and the consultants identified some accounting practices that could be improved.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

The committee has the opportunity to comment on the second review of the proposed revisions to the policies for the LSOE series.

1. Proposed Revised APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135, 235 -Second Round

Chair Caswell-Chen explained the history of the proposal related to policies for the Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOEs) series.

Discussion: UCD's Undergraduate Council is concerned about the title of Teaching Professor but appreciates that it is a working title. The meaning of "LSOE" is unclear to anyone outside of UC and it would help if the title included a reference to tenure. UCD also appreciates the addition of creative activity. However, there is a concern about removing innovation from the teaching component and the change to "professional and/or scholarly activity." A concern is that someone could be doing an excellent job of teaching without necessarily being "innovative." UCM's concerns are similar to those raised by UCD. The fact that "Teaching Professor" would be used as an acting title but not as a payroll title could have both pros and cons. Language about having "limits" rather than "thresholds" suggests that there could be problems with using the title, and referring to thresholds might invite academic planning around the use of the title and its purpose. At UCM, there is a history of using the LSOE title for exceptions rather than actual planning. The revised policy suggests that the Teaching Professors' teaching load would be heavier than it is for a ladder rank line, but the policy does not specify that the teaching load would be lighter than it is for Unit 18 lecturers. Teaching loads should be examined across the campuses to identify what the appropriate workload would be.

UCLA's Undergraduate Council will discuss the policy revision this Friday, but it was debated by a curriculum subcommittee last week. There was some concern that the title "Teaching Professor" implies that other faculty are not engaged in teaching, and expressed similar concerns on emphasizing innovation in advancement criteria. Chair Caswell-Chen agreed that the issue of outside perception about what professors do is a concern. Chair White commented that allowing the campuses to decide which title to use is a good outcome and that some campuses are already using the "Teaching Professor" title.

Action: The chair will draft a memo summarizing UCEP's feedback so that UCEP comments can be submitted by Feb. 21, 2018.

2. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128, Conflicts of Interest (Comments due March 14, 2018)

Chair Caswell-Chen invited members to share feedback about the proposed amendment to the Senate's Conflicts of Interest policy.

Discussion: Members agreed that the proposed amendment is reasonable. Vice Chair Zanzucchi asked if there is a central definition of conflicts of interest and Chair White reported that UC has approximately fifty different documents related to conflicts of interest. This amendment has been carefully crafted by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to focus on management of conflicts rather than on defining them. A

member suggested that concrete examples of conflicts of interest that have arisen in the past could be provided to faculty serving on Senate committees. It was also suggested that the policy language should prompt a faculty member who is unsure if they have a conflict to speak with their chair. Members agreed that the language should be revised as follows: Any member of a committee who thinks they **may** have a conflict of interest must inform the Chair (or the Vice-Chair) if there is a potential conflict of interest on the part of the Chair) thereof.

Action: The chair will draft the committee's memo.

V. Evaluation of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative(ILTI) Courses

An ILTI Calculus course offered at UCSC was evaluated by the campus' Institutional Research (IR) unit and UCEP's UCSC representative provided the committee with a report that included a discussion about the statistics. The UCSC representative explained that the introductory Calculus courses are offered online and approximately two-thirds of students are enrolled in them. The CEP started looking at these courses last year after hearing complaints from students, and the Dean of Physical Sciences asked IR to analyze how these online courses compare to the traditional face-to-face courses in terms of teaching effectiveness. The IR evaluation did not find a statistically significant difference in student performance in the online versus the face-to-face courses. The analyses were somewhat limited however, for example, the courses were not offered side-by-side during the same term, so in some regards the comparisons were limited and the results need be interpreted cautiously. IR also assessed student performance in courses taken subsequent to the online or face-to-face course offerings. The analysis did not find evidence that the online courses are worse than the traditional courses, but previous caveats remain.

Discussion: The students who took the courses in the fall would be considered on track in terms of having met the requirements while the students who took the online courses later were not on track, and the analysis does not address these differences. The report should be interpreted carefully, and how it will be used is a concern because the analysis was not as rigorous as would be desired. The UCSC representative met with the IR director to discuss sensible ways to conduct the analyses, and the CEP will create an evaluation protocol for online courses. The CEP has asked that students be given a choice about what kind of courses they take instead of forcing the majority into the online courses. The online offerings have helped the campus in addressing space issues and the need for increased access.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP), UCOP*

Director Greenspan explained the history of enrollment planning and the related budget allocations from the state. In two years more than approximately 11k students have been added to UC campuses. The state has been setting new targets that build on over-enrollment that is not fully funded. UC continues to inform legislators of concerns with the over-enrollment relative to budgeting. Campuses have been asked how much they want to grow and the legislators have indicated that they would try to find the funds for additional growth. It is difficult for campuses to hit the enrollment targets precisely. Academic Planning has attempted long-ranged enrollment planning but it has proven to be difficult. At present, the idea is for campuses to provide three year plans for growth.

A report from the Public Policy Institute of California projects there will be a 1.1M gap in Bachelor's degrees in the workforce by 2030. The legislature is interested in this projected gap and they also note that the high school population is growing. Data are being collected at the campuses about creative strategies for dealing with enrollment growth and this issue will be discussed by the chancellors in

August. IRAP Vice President Pamela Brown will be a witness at a legislative hearing this week and her testimony will point out the need for capital outlay.

Discussion: Chair Caswell-Chen commented that increasing the number of degrees while maintaining quality is a challenge. UC's communication strategy should emphasize the importance of the University to the state.

VII. UC Transfer Task Force and Issues for Transfer Students

- *Anne Zanzucchi, UCEP Vice Chair & Task Force Member*
- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)*

Vice Chair Zanzucchi briefly explained the Transfer Task Force, which involves representatives from BOARS and UCEP. The goal is to produce a report by May focused on increasing and regularizing the transfer of California students. The Task Force has three subcommittees: one on degrees, one on articulation, and one on advising and a UCEP representative is needed for the articulation subcommittee. The Transfer Pathways website provides comprehensive information to students. The Task Force is considering ways to increase yield rates, best practices, and provide admission guarantees given completion of a program with appropriate GPA. Associate of Science degrees in chemistry and physics are being considered as a means for students to complete these majors, and the associate degrees for transfer would have a guarantee of admission into a UC.

UCM does not have a significant number of transfer students. All of the campus programs for transfer students are grant-based and will be phasing out next year, so UCM is figuring out how to serve these students in the future. A concern is that transfer populations are an after-thought when it comes to academic planning. Vice Chair Zanzucchi would like to hear about the infrastructure supporting transfer students in place at other campuses.

Discussion: Students experience "transfer shock" when their GPAs drop after enrolling in UC. UCSB has a one quarter-long orientation course for transfer students but students only become aware of the course through word of mouth. Faculty need to think more about how their curriculum meets the needs of transfer students. UCSB opened a transfer student center that provides access to counselors and there is residential housing specifically for transfer students. UCSD has a similar residential setting which allows transfer students to form a community. At UCB, transfer students are a prominent consideration when curriculum is redesigned or updated although this does vary by department. Transfer shock is related to the change in campus environment (e.g., quarter system versus semesters, expectations) and can also occur when transfer students begin taking upper level courses. One department at UCB has thought about creating a transfer seminar that is similar to a freshman seminar. UCB's campus housing for transfer students is extremely challenging.

Housing is also an issue for transfer students at UCLA. At the department level at UCLA, there is an orientation specifically for transfer students but there are pre-requisites for some majors that are somewhat unique so the students may be behind by one or more courses. Upon arrival at a campus, transfer students may not connect with the communication networks that provide them with the informal "how-to" insights for a variety of things.

It has been noted that transfer students opt to stay at home and attend community college in order to save money, particularly when they plan to attend medical school. An issue at UCSC has been that transfer students cannot graduate in two years. Each department has been asked to provide information about what is needed or required, at minimum, for transfers to graduate in two years. Faculty have different opinions about whether transfer students are adequately prepared for Math or Writing.

The Transfer Task Force has received data about eligibility according to Vice Chair Zanzucchi but it would be useful to have data about how transfer students perform once at UC. IRAP does not have much data about campus programs but the UC Information dashboard has graduation rate data available. About one half of transfer students graduate in two years and this varies by discipline. Director Greenspan indicated that summer early-start programs would like to know if their support helps transfer students graduate at rates similar to other students. The director will find out if the dashboard could disaggregate at the level of discipline and disaggregate average debt levels by transfer students.

For the associate degrees in science, the Task Force has discussed that the admission guarantee would be into the campus of choice, but a concern is that such directed self-selection could impact the 2:1 ratio, and so current mandates. In this regard, guaranteed admission into an unspecified campus could make more sense. Current discussions include the idea that UC departments will be able to set thresholds for associate degree GPAs, and the required GPA could vary across campuses. Some flexibility as a way to redirect students is needed if the program of choice is impacted is needed.

VIII. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

In 2016, the ILTI Coordinator asked UCEP about nine perceived barriers to cross campus enrollment in online courses. Initially, UCEP members were asked to simply discuss the barriers with divisional committees.

UCEP members are now asked to review the information gathered last year with their campus CEP or UGC and obtain recommendations on the need for the “barriers” with specific understanding that this process may result in recommendations from UCEP to Academic Council.

The ILTI Coordinator is preparing a matrix which will clearly indicate if the barriers are related to systemwide or divisional policies, or if they are the result of campus practices. The goal is for UCEP to develop consensus about the nine barriers that will be documented in the committee’s official record. Campuses should clarify the reasons why any policies or practices should be continued.

Additionally, UCSB recently sent a memo to UCEP and UCOPE seeking clarification of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) and Senate Regulation 636. UCSB would like to know if students who have already matriculated from UCSB can satisfy the ELWR at a CCC. Students at UCD are also taking an online course in order to satisfy the ELWR. UCSB is questioning the fairness of giving credit to CCC students who transfer into UC for the ELWR-satisfying courses.

Discussion: The committee briefly discussed the fact that eliminating the barriers might not automatically lead to increased cross campus enrollment. Chair Caswell-Chen would like the committee to reach agreement about reasonable recommendations. Members will ask their divisional committees about the policies or practices related to the barriers and make a determination about what should stay in place or could be changed. Some barriers are related to processes rather than policies. A statement about the justification for the original policy or practice would be helpful, but this information may not be readily available.

Members compared the current language of SR 636 to the language to the revision in 2008, given that UCSB has encountered some confusion on this. The regulation includes a clause that the ELWR is to be completed in the student’s first year unless the campus designates a longer time period. If a student does not complete the ELWR in their first year they are no longer eligible to continue, and at UCM and other campuses there is a petition process. Perhaps UCSB could use a petition process to make an exception for the two students who have already matriculated from UC and would like credit for taking the ELWR-

satisfying course at a CCC. In other situations, UC students take various courses at CCCs for credit. Having different standards for transfer and freshmen students is not a reason to disregard the regulation. It is likely that there is precedent for alternative standards for transfer students and freshmen entry undergraduates. Several members believe the current language in the regulation clearly specifies that once enrolled at UC, students must satisfy the ELWR before earning transfer credit at another institution to satisfy any writing requirements. UCEP would like to weigh in on this matter but will review the rationale for the 2008 amendment before offering UCSB any guidance. In addition, UCOPE will opine on this matter when it meets in April.

Action: Members will take the information collected in May 2016 along with the forthcoming matrix back to their divisional CEPs or Undergraduate Councils to discuss possible recommendations.

IX. Review of UCEP White Papers

Vice Chair Zanzucchi explained that UCEP's white paper on undergraduate research and statement on UC quality were drafted about a decade ago. The papers aimed to articulate what a research university identity is to students and the general public. The committee is asked if updated systemwide statements on quality and undergraduate research would be useful for discussions related to education policy. Members may want to discuss the papers with their divisional committees.

Discussion: The paper on undergraduate research prompted one member to think about how to involve undergraduate students in his research. A best practices document or tips on how to enable participation in research would be helpful. An updated paper could be outward facing but include tips or practices. The paper on quality speaks to issues that UCEP discusses in relationship to online versus face to face education. The word "quality" is used but there is nothing that speaks specifically to what is distinct about UC with respect to quality. The papers do not explicitly address the value of interacting with students from diverse backgrounds and with faculty. The issue of how students are assessed could be addressed. Members were skeptical about the documents being aspirational, are probably not read or widely recognized, and are not directly implemented. Statements about core principles that could be realized and actively engaged on the campus level might be more valuable. Issues related to quality could be more specifically anchored in the undergraduate research context. UCEP declined to place a priority on revising the documents at this time.

X. Climate and Safety: Disruptions in the Classroom

There was an incident at UCSD in January which involved an individual, who was not a student, entering a classroom while holding up a badge that identified his membership in an alt-right group. The individual sat down in the classroom for a short time, possibly videotaping the lecture with this phone, and he then left. While the interloper did not actively disrupt the class, his actions caused varying levels of distress among the students in attendance. This incident was brought to UCEP's attention as a general reminder that faculty do have the right to remove (with the assistance of campus security) intruders in their classrooms, which are not public spaces.

Discussion: The individual at UCSD was not necessarily disruptive, so how faculty should respond in that type of situation remains unclear. It can also be very difficult for faculty to identify individuals who do not belong in their classrooms. It is recommended that faculty should know how to contact their campus security when there are concerns and that departments should have action plans for responding to these incidents. Members shared concerns about being videotaped without authorization in informal situations as well as the management of accommodations to meet specialized needs.

XI. New Business

Chair Caswell-Chen asked members to consider serving as the committee's vice chair next year.

Discussion: A member asked if service on UCEP is limited to one year. The analyst clarified that members can serve on the committee for four consecutive years and noted that the high turnover this year was unusual.

The Graduate Student representative reminded members to investigate the status of training for Teaching Assistants and to discuss the idea of a systemwide training for TAs with their divisions.

XII. Executive Session

The committee did not have an Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Ed Caswell-Chen