

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Videoconference Minutes

Monday, March 2, 2020

Attending: John Serences, Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter, Vice Chair, (UCD), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Lene Leve-Storms (UCLA), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Paul Goldstein (UCSD), Mary Lynch (UCSF), Ted Bennett (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Ann Marie Martin (Graduate Student), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Ethan Savage (Analyst, Academic Planning), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Updates

Chair Serences reported that Teaching Assistants (TAs) who were on strike at UCSC have been fired. The campus closure discussion will include the Covid-19 situation. Regent Estolano met with Council, sharing her thoughts on climate change and the Standardized Testing Task Force report among other issues.

Discussion: The UCSC representative reported that some TAs withheld grades in the fall and others stopped showing up to teach. Some students are commenting online about suing UC.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The February minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning*

Director Greenspan introduced Ethan Savage, a new IRAP analyst who will focus on undergraduate education issues. The Senate asked the provost to extend the deadline for the Request for Proposals for Degree and Certificate Completion programs but it was too late to do so. UCOP received proposals from UCSF and all but two undergraduate campuses (UCB or UCSC did not respond). Three Senate representatives will be on the seven person proposal review panel. The Regents will have a presentation on the degree achievement gap and IRAP is discussing successful programs with undergraduate deans. Another presentation to the Regents will be on 21st Century workforce skills, with a focus on how curricular requirements will need to change.

Discussion: The UCSC representative confirmed that he is willing to serve on review panel.

IV. Consultation with Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

This consultation did not occur.

V. Use of Lived Names on Diplomas

The [Proposed Presidential Policy](#) on Gender Recognition and Lived Name, to be discussed in April, does not resolve UCEP's question about using lived or preferred names on diplomas. Members are asked for feedback on a draft memo that highlights potential unanticipated consequences of using lived names, with recommendations to educate students about what is required and offer help with changing their legal names. Regents' Standing order 110.c.3 may need to be reviewed and different interpretations of what is allowed may be a problem.

Discussion: It is not clear how UC knows a student's legal name or if proof is required.

VI. Student Fees Beyond Tuition

Existing course material and fee policies address concerns raised by UCEP. The committee will send a memo reminding faculty about current policy and encouraging enforcement. One recommendation is that campuses have an oversight committee to monitor conflicts of interest and related issues.

Discussion: UCSF's professional schools may not be informing students in advance of all extra costs. For example, the Dental School requires students buy their own tools which cost from \$500 to \$40,000. It would be a burden to require the oversight committee's review of homework systems because they are bundled with textbooks. The language about textbook bundles should be precise. Faculty should pushback against publishers about how they market their materials and also think carefully about the textbooks they use and the efficacy of additional materials. UCEP is mindful of academic freedom concerns related to textbook selection. Chair Serences will revise the draft memo for discussion in April.

VII. Senior Residency Requirement

Chair Serences explained the ambiguity in [Senate Regulation 630](#), the Senior Residency requirement. One interpretation is that students may satisfy clause A but not clause D. Requiring that students complete a certain number of units at the home campus in their final year may be intended to ensure that upper division work is completed at the home campus. Perhaps students should be encouraged to take a certain number of upper division courses at the home campuses without specifying when. UCEP will propose a revision that simplifies the regulation and focuses on the course work rather than senior residency.

Discussion: Revising the regulation to give students more flexibility, especially with impacted courses, would be helpful. The current language is outdated and puts unnecessary pressure on students to plan ahead and the number of units specified seems arbitrary. UCI does not connect residency to geographic location and a student taking a course taught by UCI faculty is considered to meet the requirement. One question is whether the cross campus courses are deemed to meet residency. UCEP's memo should explain how the committee interprets residency. The systemwide review of the proposed revisions might generate feedback about the need to specify a number of units in the final year.

VIII. Systemwide Review Items

UCEP has the opportunity to comment on two systemwide review items.

1) Report and Recommendations of the Academic Council Standardized Testing Task Force and an additional statement from some Task Force members. The deadline for comments is March 23, 2020.

Discussion: Concerns about the report include that the proposed timeline may not be defensible and there is a risk the Regents will end the Senate's delegated authority over admissions. The SAT and ACT do have predictive power, even if the tests are flawed. A member commented that looking only at the tests is simplistic and limited access to A-G courses and advising are root causes that should be addressed. Scores on these standardized tests may be used to identify students needing extra support once they get to a UC. UCEP will not comment on the recommendations but will reaffirm values like diversity, readiness for college, and data driven decisions.

Action: The Chair and analyst will draft a brief memo based on the committee's discussion.

2) Proposal from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools to eliminate the SAT Essay/ACT Writing Test requirement for undergraduate admission. The deadline for comments is March 23, 2020.

Discussion: Reportedly, the Essay/Writing sections are not actually used for admission, so eliminating them is reasonable. However, they can be used for placement in Writing programs and the SAT and ACT are less expensive than other options used for this purpose.

Action: The committee decided to not opine.

IX. Campus Closures

Chair Serences sent the committee a draft memo based on earlier discussions. Each campus has unique issues making a systemwide policy difficult to develop, so many decisions will be left to the campuses. The main issue is how to make up for lost instructional days. UCEP might ask local committees to consider how many missed days are too many.

Discussion: It may be helpful to review policies on incompletes and on what happens if a faculty member is ill. To deal with COVID-19, faculty may need to be encouraged to offer online courses or exams. Using technology to make up for lost days makes sense in the current situation. Current policies may not address how long term obstructions to instruction are managed. Faculty need support to utilize different delivery modalities to deal with situations as they arise. It is not clear if campuses have the ability to expand licenses for services like ProctorU. Campus administration should be encouraged to provide faculty with tools to work effectively from home. There are concerns about students from other countries who will not be able to report to campus in the fall.

The committee discussed issues specifically related to Covid-19. Guidelines from administrators to faculty have not been clear and, in some cases, it seems the burden is on faculty to figure out how to deal with the crisis. The UCD representative reported that colleagues in her department are developing a document with strategies faculty could consider. A central question is whether the necessary infrastructure is in place to support heavy use of technology for remote instruction. Faculty are being instructed to make their course materials available so others can teach their classes, prompting questions about intellectual property rights. Divisional Education Policy and Undergraduate Councils should discuss: 1) what constitutes a missed class and if this varies by discipline and 2) a threshold and/or definition of missed class and lost instruction.

Action: Chair Serences will update the memo and circulate it for feedback.

X. Campus Reports/Member Items

There were no Campus Reports.

XI. New Business

The committee agreed to only meet by videoconference until more is known about COVID-19.

XII. Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2:05 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: John Serences