



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Minutes of Videoconference
Monday, March 3, 2025

In attendance: Rachael Goodhue, Chair (UCD), Catherine Sugar, Vice Chair (UCLA), Gireeja Ranade (UCB), David Kyle (UCD), Russ Hovey (UCD Alternate), Allison Perlman (UCI), Jeffrey Maloy (UCLA), Jay Sharping (UCM), Sara Lapan (UCR), Jennifer Nájera (UCR Alternate), Carrie Wastal (UCSD), Angel Kuo (UCSF), Jason Duque (UCSB), Tanner WouldGo (UCSC), Isabelle Escobar (Undergraduate Student Representative), Katherine Newman (Provost, UCOP), Todd Greenspan (Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy Development, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Carmen Corona (Director, Academic Planning & Policy, IRAP), Ethan Savage, (Academic Planning & Policy Analyst, IRAP), Steven W. Cheung (Chair, Academic Senate), Ahmet Palazoglu (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Steven W. Cheung, Chair, and Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Chair Cheung reported that the Regents are interested in faculty discipline policies and processes, and there will be a presentation by a joint Senate Administration workgroup to the Board in May. This workgroup is assessing the organization of Privilege and Tenure hearings and ways to address the timeliness of hearings and consistency of practice across the system. The workgroup is also considering options to shorten the investigation phase of misconduct cases which is under administration control and typically lengthy. The Regents have required the workgroup to meet monthly with Regents Lieb, Anguiano, and Sarris. UC is slated to absorb a \$200M reduction to its core budget for the 2025-2026 fiscal year and the State is anticipated to prioritize funding relief to Southern California from the recent fires over other budget needs. The budget director at UCOP is exploring different strategies to soften the core budget reduction and it is hoped that UC's budget after May revise will be neutral. The federal government continues to issue executive orders at a rapid pace. One of the most challenging financial situations for the campuses is the capping of the NIH indirect recovery rate to a 15% maximum.

The Senate is planning a joint task force on adaptation to disruptions to be co-chaired by Chair Cheung and Provost Newman and comprised of chairs of standing Senate committees and divisions along with various administrators. Topics the task force will contemplate include: funding gaps and mitigation measures; research support and sustainability; instructional capacity and intercampus collaboration; DEI programs; UC community safety; and healthcare delivery. Medicaid and Medicare may be targeted for cuts, so the task force will engage with UC Health in light of its large portfolio across the system.

A special meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate in February was held to discuss the president's information security plan, variance between when adjustments are made to staff and faculty salary compensation, and the rise of health plan premiums. Chair Cheung reported that the common academic calendar project has engendered strong discomfort among some faculty who

feel that the question about converting to semesters is settled which is not the case. The workgroup's report, just distributed for systemwide review, includes an in-depth study on calendar conversion with financial estimates for adopting a common calendar. There is not a recommendation about whether the calendar should be semester, quarter, or trimester. Another special Assembly meeting on March 25th will focus on the common calendar issue and there will be a vote to make the date of the salary range adjustments for certain administrators the same as it is for the regular faculty.

The ballot for a confidence vote on President Drake at UCD specified a number of grievances, including budget challenges on that campus, the early depletion of the mortgage origination program, and the salary increase to Chancellor May. The outcome of the simple majority vote was positive, meaning that there was a no confidence vote on President Drake based on about 20% of eligible voters who participated. UCSF's memorials are moving forward and this process should be completed in mid-March. The academic advisory committee finished its review of about 250 prospects to replace President Drake and proposed 30 for further engagement by the search firm. The search firm is now doing a deeper review of those prospects, and the Regents who serve on the Special Committee are expected to do one on one outreach.

The search for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Programs is in the final stage and Provost Newman has indicated a start date at the end of next month. The top five candidates in the UCSB chancellor search were recently interviewed, and President Drake and the Regents are reviewing the list. President Drake has committed to seating the new UCSB chancellor before his June retirement. The search for the UCR chancellor is moving along and the nomination review subcommittee is combing through curricula vitae. It is also expected that the new UCR chancellor will be appointed by June.

II. Consultation with Provost Newman

Chair Goodhue welcomed Provost Newman to the videoconference and the committee posed a number of questions for consideration. Topics had been shared in advance with the provost.

Question: Why does there appear to be a rush to implement fully online undergraduate degree programs?

Discussion: Provost Newman indicated that there is no rush or pressure to implement fully online undergraduate degree programs but campuses that are interested in offering them should have the ability to pursue their intellectual and pedagogical goals. The provost predicts that most programs will be hybrid arrangements with online and in-person components. Following the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Education's work on quality standards last year, another group will develop a set of metrics so there will be a way to measure fidelity to those standards. Provost Newman asserted that the residency requirement would have made it impossible to offer fully online programs, leading to a decision by the Regents that there should be no such barrier. The provost noted that UCSC has a Creative Technologies program that is well-suited to the online modality and asserted that the residency requirement would have made it impossible for that campus to launch it.

Question: Faculty are concerned that a decision regarding the common calendar has already been made. Can the provost share anything to alleviate this concern?

Discussion: The provost explained that workgroups study issues and then reports are sent out for systemwide review to ensure sufficient feedback is collected and that there is thoughtful engagement with faculty. But when workgroups start their deliberations, faculty often jump to the worst-case scenario. It is difficult to counteract this while holding true to the practices of deep study. When it became apparent that faculty were increasingly worried about the common calendar study, an effort was made to solicit more input. Provost Newman would like there to be fulsome consideration of the issues at the campus level because of the importance of this topic, and hopes that faculty can see how thoughtfully the common calendar workgroup deliberated on a range of issues. The provost noted that the political and resource landscapes were very different when the workgroup was convened, and it is unlikely that a decision about pursuing a common calendar will be made in the near future. Changing the calendar would take three to five years and require significant compensation to faculty and some staff.

Question: How is Provost Newman prioritizing the many initiatives underway given various challenges UC is currently facing?

Discussion: Provost Newman leans heavily on the executive vice chancellors and sees the Senate as a critical partner in prioritizing initiatives and making decisions. The provost worries about what will be required to ensure that UC continues to be accessible. There is a \$2.7B deficit in the Pell Grant system and it is not clear how this system will be shored up. Another issue is how current UC students can be supported, and some peer institutions have announced plans to enroll fewer graduate students. UC campuses that are reliant on funding from the NIH or the National Science Foundation are facing serious cash flow problems. Priorities will probably differ from campus to campus especially as their reliance on federal funding varies.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda items and their priority were approved.

Action: The February 3, 2025 meeting minutes were approved.

IV. Chair's Announcements and Updates

Committee members shared their thoughts on the discussion with the provost, and Chair Goodhue proposed inviting Provost Newman to another UCEP meeting in the future. Members noted that UCSC's Creative Technologies program had in fact been approved with a variance. Chair Goodhue shared that, during the special Academic Assembly meeting in February, there was an effort to pass a motion about the common calendar which failed because some members abstained from voting. During the most recent Academic Council meeting, divisional chairs reported hearing concerns about the common calendar that are becoming more aggressive. Members of Council also discussed numerous concerns related to artificial intelligence.

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates met on February 24th and the California Community Colleges (CCC) and California State University are also worried about their budgets. The common course numbering project led by the CCCs is still progressing, and the committee discussed grandfathering certain CCC courses that had been approved for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum into the new California General Education Transfer Curriculum.

V. Principles for Common Assessment for Online Programs

The Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Education recommended that campuses should pilot fully online undergraduate programs but it is unclear what these pilots will look like. Vice Chair Sugar indicated that one complication is that these programs would have to be accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission. The vice chair proposed that, in addition to principles for the evaluation of online programs, UCEP might propose principles for how the accreditation process should work. The committee might use the list of principles generated by ChatGPT as a starting point for brainstorming.

Discussion: The principles should address synchronous versus asynchronous and also define student engagement. The committee should not assume that the evaluation of in-person courses is adequate. The campuses have teaching and learning centers that can help faculty learn about learning outcomes. A member commented that online instruction is experimental. The UCSC and UCSB representatives volunteered to work with Vice Chair Sugar on the principles, and Analyst Abrams recommended it might be valuable to review UCEP documents on online instruction.

VI. Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw (SB) 170 (UCEP) and Rescission of SB 192 (University Committee on Preparatory Education)

The University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) is proposing combining the Entry Level Writing Requirement Coordinating Council (ECC) with the English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group and moving this new entity under UCEP as a long-term standing subcommittee.

Discussion: There are questions about how the ECC is doing its work and the impact this change might have on divisional Committees on Educational Policy (CEPs) and Undergraduate Councils (UGCs). There are persistent problems with writing, math, and science preparation so it could be problematic to eliminate the Committee on Preparatory Education. It is not clear if campus CEPs/UGCs and UCEP have the bandwidth to take up preparatory education issues. This work would be different from CEP/UGCs' responsibilities. Analyst Abrams described some of the history related to UCOPE and the now eliminated systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam. Members will discuss this systemwide review item with their divisional committees.

VII. Defining "Systemwide Courses" and "Systemwide Programs"

The committee's discussions about the 2011 and 2014 guidelines for the approval and review of systemwide courses and programs during the last meeting led to the suggestion that "systemwide course" should be defined. One question is whether being designated as a systemwide course by UCEP is required for a course to be listed in each campus's catalog.

Discussion: The UC Washington Center (UCDC) recently submitted a set of courses to UCEP for review that have not been approved by a UC campus. Vice Chair Sugar reminded the committee that UCEP's bylaw indicates that it approves systemwide courses and one goal is to clarify that this applies to systemwide programs including UCDC and the UC Sacramento Center (UCCS) as well. UCDC and UCCS are not based at a particular campus and are accessible to all UC students. Analyst Savage proposed that UCEP could narrowly focus on courses that have not been reviewed by a divisional Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI). A member pointed out that while certain UC Online courses are accessible to all students across the system, they are initially

approved at the campus level, so these would not require UCEP approval and review. The 2011 guidelines have language that is unclear and the 2014 document may have been an attempt to clean up the earlier document. There are concerns about UC Online courses competing with courses at other campuses and this topic will be discussed when the program's executive director meets with UCEP in May. Chair Goodhue proposed that UCEP define a systemwide course as one not approved by a divisional Senate. The UCSB representative will draft the definition for the committee's consideration in April.

VIII. Systemwide Guidelines for Experiential Learning

The experiential learning guidelines for each campus have been collected and they are diverse in terms of detail. This variation would make it difficult to articulate with a systemwide definition for experiential learning activities. Analyst Abrams explained that the need for a definition came up in discussions with the executive director of UCDC. The executive director has been asked to determine which campus policy best aligns with UCDC's programming and UCEP will evaluate the program in the context of that policy.

IX. Updating UCEP's White Paper on Undergraduate Research

The committee is asked if the committee's 2010 white paper on undergraduate research should be revised since it is out of date.

Discussion: A member commented that the audience for the white paper is not clear, and Chair Goodhue indicated that it might be shared with the Regents. The chair also remarked that this white paper addresses why undergraduate institutions have research components and demonstrates that there is direct interaction with students in the research enterprise. The committee agreed that updating this white paper might be tackled next year.

The meeting adjourned at: 4:50 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Rachael Goodhue, Chair