

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Videoconference Minutes

Monday, March 18, 2024

Attending: Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), A. Katie Harris, Vice Chair (UCD), Darlene Francis (UCB), Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD), Catherine Sugar (UCLA), Christopher Viney (UCM), Sara Lapan (UCR alternate), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Madeleine Norris (UCSF), Ben Hardekopf (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), Megan Chung (Undergraduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy Development, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Carmen Corona (Director, Academic Planning and Policy, IRAP), Ethan Savage (Academic Planning and Policy Analyst, IRAP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved today's agenda.

II. Chair's Updates

Academic Council had a special meeting last week and voted unanimously against the Regents proposed policy regarding political statements being posted on department websites. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) held its annual Legislative Day on March 6th and one of the governor's representatives criticized faculty throughout their visit. Senate leadership is waiting for the Regents' response to a memo requesting clarification about what their February 14th vote affirming campus autonomy means.

III. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)

- *Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning & Policy Development; Carmen Corona, Director, Academic Planning & Policy; & Ethan Savage, Academic Planning & Policy Analyst*

Analyst Savage announced that the next Regents meeting will include a report on student basic needs and a presentation on mathematics at UC. According to Executive Advisor Greenspan, the legislature wanted UC to grow by 7,800 students over the past two years. Enrollment data shows that UC has grown by about 6,400 students and the average number of units taken by students in the 2023 fall and winter terms has increased, suggesting that the legislature's target will be reached. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) is recommending that UC should return the money for those students if the target growth for the current year is not met. UC still wants to achieve the goal in the compact to grow by 4k in 2024-2025 in fall, winter, and spring, and by 600 in summer. The LAO is advising the legislature against promising UC that the budget will be restored due to the serious budget deficit. The executive advisor added that first year retention rates for students who enrolled in fall 2023 have rebounded after a decline in 2022-2023.

The Academic Planning Council's (APC) Workgroup on the Future of Doctoral Education and the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modality and UC Quality Undergraduate Education are holding numerous meetings. IRAP and Senate staff have started working on minor, technical changes to the Compendium, and the plan is to undertake substantive changes to the document next year if the provost agrees. The provost is planning a congress on the evolution and possibilities of remote instruction to be held May 1st at UCLA's Luskin Center. The keynote speaker will be Eric Grimson, chancellor for academic advancement at the Massachusetts

Institute for Technology. The one day event will have multiple sessions and an opportunity to participate via zoom, and Director Corona will share updates with the committee as more details become available.

Discussion: Chair Cocco would like the APC to take up the issue of students earning excessive credit during the summer.

IV. California Community Colleges (CCC) Baccalaureate Degrees & Duplication of UC Degrees

Vice Chair Harris explained that the CCCs are authorized to grant baccalaureate degrees and there is a risk that those degrees might duplicate degrees offered by UC and the California State University (CSU) system. Faculty from the CCCs and CSU worked with Vice Chair Harris and Senate Vice Chair Cheung on guidelines for evaluating the duplication of the proposed degrees and those guidelines were subsequently approved by ICAS. UC's internal process entails IRAP sending the proposals to the divisional vice provosts and deans for undergraduate education (VPDUEs) for review, but Senate faculty are not involved. The goal is for the divisional Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) or Undergraduate Council (UGC) to sign off on the administrators' review and UCEP would like this to be codified.

Discussion: Analyst Savage expressed concerns that this proposal adds a separate parallel process especially when the law permitting CCCs to offer these degrees imposes a tight timeline. Members commented on the importance of the UGC/CEPs involvement in the review of the proposals and agreed this does not have to be a significant workload. The CCCs initial proposals were largely unrelated to the types of undergraduate degrees offered by UC but there has been some talk about a proposal for a degree in business administration which is already offered by the CSU and UC systems, and the IRAP consultants predict that future proposals will infringe more on the four-year institutions' territory.

Among UCEP's concerns is that the CCCs will claim a proposed degree program is not duplicative based on very minor changes. As the CCCs offer increasing numbers of baccalaureate degree programs, that system will be less invested in making sure that students are able to successfully transfer to CSU or UC. Analyst Savage sends the proposals with a form to the VPDUEs and the administrators could be instructed to not return the form until the appropriate Senate committee has been consulted. Suggestions include sending the proposals to the UGC/CEP chairs and the VPDUEs at the same time to help meet the deadline or for the VPDUEs to discuss the proposals when they usually join the divisional committees.

Action: A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously supported to recommend that the appropriate Senate committee provide a memo commenting on the VPDUEs' recommendations about proposed CCC baccalaureate degree programs. Chair Cocco will draft a memo to Chair Steintrager with UCEP's suggestion and Academic Council will determine how to proceed.

V. Criteria for Senate Review of Certain UC Online Courses

- *Madeleine Norris (UCSF) & Ben Hardekopf (UCSB)*

Chair Cocco indicated that there has been an expectation that UCEP would review UC Online courses but this has not occurred. UCEP will need a set of criteria for reviewing these courses which have been approved by the home campus and, if the instructor agrees, open to students at other campuses who enroll through the cross-campus enrollment system. There are a variety of problems related to these systemwide UC Online courses and the chair proposes citing the

negative assessment by Deloitte Consulting in the rationale for the committee's review. The UCSB and UCSF representatives, who have started drafting the criteria, suggest collecting information on all UC Online courses and scoring them on metrics that will be identified. Courses scoring above a certain threshold will go through an in-depth review. Chair Cocco would like members' feedback on the kind of information that should be collected and shared a list of elements that make UC courses compliant with federal or accreditation regulations.

The UCSB representative recommends that, because there is a large number of UC Online courses, the process for scoring should be automated rather than something needing to be reviewed by someone. Courses receiving a certain score will then be examined more closely. The representative commented that it will be important to keep in mind that campuses use disparate types of student evaluations. Another factor to be aware of is that in some cases the courses will be reviewed by faculty who are not subject experts and might not know what the accepted level of rigor is for a course. Chair Cocco believes UCEP could enlist faculty across the system to conduct reviews when specific expertise is needed.

Discussion: Members offered suggestions about the information that should be reviewed and pointed to the need to track which courses that have been reviewed. UCEP might decide that courses offered just once will not be reviewed and the committee might want to determine how many courses it will review every year. If this becomes part of UCEP's regular work, a subcommittee could be established to handle it. If the review leads to a recommendation that the course should not be listed with UC Online, there should be a path for remediation and a timeline for when a course can be resubmitted. One thing to be decided is who UCEP will send its reports to, and it might be best to send a recommendation that a course should not be listed with UC Online to the instructor and their department chair. Another issue is that the review might find the problem to be with the instructor, not the course. Chair Cocco observed that UC Online does not have a mechanism to remove courses, making this review by UCEP essential. The committee will discuss the proposed criteria at the rest of this year's meetings.

VI. Systemwide Review Item: [Final Report of the University of California Systemwide Advisory Workgroup on Students with Disabilities](#)

- *Christopher Viney (UCM)*

UCEP has the opportunity to opine on the final report of UC's Systemwide Advisory Workgroup on Students with Disabilities. The committee met with the Workgroup's co-chairs last year as this report was being drafted. The UCM representative remarked that UCEP is specifically named in a recommendation related to SR 778, therefore the committee should review the report carefully. This is the first comprehensive report on how UC is serving students with disabilities and it makes the useful distinction between medical and social models of disability. The former is where the disabled person is given a set of coping instructions to deal with a system that might not be working well for them, whereas the latter says the system should be made friendly for everybody and this is the model upon which the report is constructed. The Workgroup seems to draw a hardline on the student with disabilities rather than extending support to a student with primary responsibility for caring for someone with disabilities.

The representative recapped the Workgroup's six recommendations, highlighting the recommendation about grading policies and procedures handled by divisional senates under SR 778. This report's findings could be used by the divisional senates as a basis for revising campus policies and for consideration of a uniform regulation applying to all campuses. Modifications of SR 778 proposed by the divisions must be reviewed by UCEP and ultimately approved by the Assembly. The report describes measuring student progress based on course

completion, retention, and graduation rates for all students which can affect degree completion. In an effort to improve retention rates, UCM is in the process of revising its policies on pass/no pass, how many courses can be taken, and academic probation.

Discussion: UCLA's Senate is studying problems associated with its policy on incompletes and has found that campus policies are inconsistent. The UCM representative suggested that the divisional UGC/CEPs should consider SR 778 and their campus grading policies to identify the changes that might be made. Campuses could request variances to the systemwide regulation and UCEP will want to learn if campuses are applying rules that are not in SR 778.

VII. UCD Request for Systemwide Review of UC Center Sacramento

- *Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD)*

UCD's Senate is recommending that UCEP take over the review of UC Center Sacramento (UCCS). The division's UGC Special Academic Programs subcommittee was reviewing UCCS and the materials submitted by the Center were insufficient. The UGC agreed to request that UCEP take over responsibility for reviewing UCCS since it is a systemwide program just like the UC Washington Center. According to Vice Chair Harris, the UGC originally recommended that UCEP should review UCCS several years ago but it did not move forward. The Center was in trouble in 2010, and UCD stepped in to provide significant support which is why that division has been reviewing it.

Action: A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved for UCEP to assume responsibility for reviewing UC Center Sacramento.

VIII. Member Items/Campus Reports

There were no Member Items or Campus Reports.

IX. New Business/Executive Session

There was no New Business or Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 12:50 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Melanie Cocco