

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2019

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter (UCD), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Deborah Johnson (UCSF), Adriana Galvan (UCLA), Megan Thomas (UCSC Alternate), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Kimia Akbari (Undergraduate Student Representative), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Angus MacDonald (Principal Counsel, Intellectual Property, OGC), Brad Buchman (Medical Director, Student Health and Counseling, UC Health), Taisha Caldwell-Harvey (Mental Health Program Manager/Clinical Coordinator, Student Development and Engagement, Student Affairs), Jim Chalfant (Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: The February 4, 2019 minutes were approved.

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

II. Updates and Announcements

Chair Zanzucchi reported that the committee will provide formal feedback on UCI's proposal for the online School of Business Administration degree and requested a volunteer to be the lead reader. The Standardized Test Task Force (STTF) convened in early February and UCEP's chair, graduate student representative and UCSD representative are members. A progress report will be provided in June but there is no firm deadline for the STTF's work in the interest of comprehensive planning.

The chair shared that the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senate's (ICAS) Legislative Day was held on February 20th, and the day involved meetings with legislators focused on higher education. ICAS presented a set of priorities shared across the segments: transfer, student basic needs, faculty diversity, and resources. With the new governor, education bonds may be a possibility and there is also significant interest in reforming student financial aid. A new bill, SB-3, proposes the establishment of a new higher education oversight body along the lines of the now defunct California Postsecondary Education Commission, and another new bill, SB-2, would involve statewide data collection. This relates to the California Master Plan. ICAS strongly recommended that faculty and student participation in this coordination effort.

One topic discussed during the recent Provost's Monthly Budget Call was the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) report on the proposed 2019-2020 budget. The LAO provides an independent report in response to budgets proposed by the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU) and UC and it will inform the interaction between UC and the legislature in March. The report discusses student success and notes that the amount of funding relative to the scope of what success would be is unclear, so more specifics are needed. The focus on student success funding reflects the new attention on degree attainment and time degree. The governor has set aside funding to study degree attainment through UC Extension, although the demand for this offering is unknown. The report suggests that large lecture halls are obsolete and that online education could be a remedy for infrastructural needs.

The chair joined last week's meeting of the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC). The need for faculty representation on campus information technology committees was highlighted. UCACC discussed privacy policies and how research priorities may be driven by contracts

and vendor agreements rather than coordinated faculty input. A report is being developed on academic analytics by UCACC and the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication. There are concerns about how research is being framed in terms of the assessment of faculty and this may primarily be an issue for Academic Personnel committees. Academic Council met last Wednesday and the negotiations with the publisher Elsevier were discussed. A new policy issue for UCEP and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs to consider is incarcerated students and questions include access to resources, residency and awarding degrees. The systemwide Academic Personnel (UCAP) and Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) committees have proposed a task force to look at inappropriate comments on student course evaluations and UCEP members' feedback is invited.

Vice Chair Serences joined the Education Financial Modeling (EFM) Steering Committee meeting on Friday which included vice chancellors and financial offices. The UC student aid program will have a budget increase of about \$12M over 2018-2019 as a result of increased student enrollment, and \$3.5M of this will be used for the DREAM loan program which started in 2017-2018. Campus utilization of DREAM loans varies, with one campus over spending its funds while others barely touched the money. The funding model may change so that campuses receive a partial allocation at the beginning of the year and additional allocations later based on usage. Transferring funds between campuses may be considered although the logistics of how this will happen are not yet clear. The EFM group discussed how the \$15M UC has requested for students' basic needs might be allocated. The state may distribute the funds, campuses may be given local control or the aid may be given directly to students who will determine how it should be spent, and the Regents Special Committee on Basic Needs will weigh in.

Discussion: The UCSF representative agreed to be the lead reader of the UCI online degree proposal. The UCSD representative remarked that the STTF will have much to consider and will need a good deal of data. The graduate student representative commented that the members of the STTF are enthusiastic and engaged. The UCSF representative attended Legislative Day and noted the importance of ongoing communication with legislators. UCI's representative reported that the campus is considering a proposal to grant a bachelor's degree to incarcerated students which raises a range of questions in terms of how this will be managed. It will not be a strictly online program but will involve faculty going into prisons. What policy elements will need to be in place to support this type of structure are unclear. There will be difficult challenges, with the potential for both political backlash and support.

III. Compendium Proposed Reviews

UCEP will receive a new proposal to review later this month and has one proposal to approve today.

1. UCLA Music Performance Degree Proposal

Chair Zanzucchi explained that UCLA is proposing a Music Performance Degree which is the first of its kind and volunteers will be needed to serve as lead readers.

Action: The UCI and UCM representatives agreed to be readers.

2. UCSD School of Public Health Proposal

The new school at UCSD is intended to complement the programs at other campuses but will capitalize on UCSD's expertise on climate change and border health, existing research projects, and close ties to the Navy, Marines and the Veterans Administration. A few issues were noted when UCEP reviewed the pre-proposal including that the funding would be drawn from other departments. UCSD has since received a significant private gift so the funding model initially proposed is unnecessary. The campus has also

established unique admission criteria for each program. The questions asked in response to the pre-proposal have been answered satisfactorily.

Discussion: Some faculty within Family Medicine have expressed interest in having their lines shifted to the proposed School of Public Health as are some faculty in Scripps School of Oceanography.

Action: A motion to approve the proposal was seconded and the proposal was unanimously approved.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Angus M. MacDonald, Principal Counsel, Intellectual Property, Office of General Counsel (OGC), UCOP*

Chair Zanzucchi welcomed Counsel MacDonald to the videoconference and explained that the committee has discussed the posting of course materials to websites such as Course Hero, Koofers, and Chegg in the past. Counsel MacDonald works with all UC campuses on a daily basis on issues related to intellectual property and consults with various groups across the nation, and this issue comes up frequently. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) as written requires the copyright owner or copyright agent (e.g. the lawyer for the owner or other agents) to submit the take down request. Counsel MacDonald would like to focus on what faculty can do to mitigate this threat as much as possible. As described in UC's 1992 [Copyright Ownership policy](#) and 2003 [Course Material policy](#), course materials are generally owned by the faculty member. With ownership, faculty also have the responsibility to police their materials.

Counsel MacDonald has spoken with representatives of Course Hero and the company provided a one page document which included a sentence that its filtering tool looks for. Competitors might have a similar filter. The sentence is: "This content is protected and may not be shared uploaded or distributed." Course Hero said in nearly all instances, the filter will catch this sentence. Faculty can also inform students that selling and distributing course materials not only violates the student code of conduct, but probably also violates UC's 2005 [policy on the Use of Recordings of Course Presentations](#). Faculty should take advantage of the take down portals on these websites which offer a straightforward process. Faculty can also submit a takedown request letter. The online service providers have a duty to expeditiously take down the materials once they receive the request but there is no clear definition of expeditiously. The Academic Senate could hire outside counsel or a legal consultant to be on retainer to handle copyright notices on behalf of individual Senate faculty or the Senate as a whole.

Discussion: One question is if the student code of conduct is strong enough. Chair Zanzucchi proposed that the committee should look at the student code of conduct and consult with Counsel Drown, who deals with academic affairs, and Counsel MacDonald for ways to strengthen it. Generally speaking, the course materials are the intellectual property of the individual faculty member, not UC.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Brad Buchman, Medical Director-Student Health & Counseling, UC Health*
- *Taisha Caldwell-Harvey, Mental Health Program Manager/Clinical Coordinator, Student Development and Engagement, Student Affairs, UCOP*

Dr. Buchman and Dr. Caldwell-Harvey provided an overview of the services provided by the campus counseling centers, including training for faculty and staff. From 2012 to 2017 there was a 30-40% increase in need for services nationwide based on the 2017 annual report from the Center for Collegiate Mental Health. Between 2007-2008 and 2017-2018, there was a 78% increase in the number of unique patients seen in the UC system while there was only 27% enrollment increase over the same period. While mental health issues frequently emerge in late adolescence, the exact reasons for the dramatic increase in recent years is not easily explained. Factors might include decreasing stigma about mental illness, changes in the demographics of the student population, and students having already engaged in treatment or prescribed medications before enrollment.

Services are based on a three tier model: Tier 1 is the creation of healthy learning environments; Tier 2 is targeted interventions; and Tier 3 is critical mental health and crisis response services. The history of funding allocated to each tier was outlined and funding sources have included student registration fees, student services fees, and grants through the California Mental Health Services Act. In 2014, a five year plan involved increasing the allocation of student registration and services fees was approved by the Regents. The funds were projected to add \$19M to the budget for tier 1 services and to support the hiring of approximately 93 FTE of direct service mental health clinicians from 2015-2016 through 2019-2020. However, the long term plan was derailed by a one-time allocation of funding from the state to defer the student services fee increases for academic year 2018-2019. The Mental Health Program is now advocating for funds for the final two years of the plan, especially for tier 2 and 3 services.

For July 2017 to June 2018, about 50% of students had one to three visits. Students may be able to talk through a problem with a counselor or learn problem solving skills in one visit. Data suggests that four visits is the norm although students often ask for more. Students also request increased informal supports and one stop shopping for information about how to access various services, and suggest that sources other than student fees should be used for permanent funding. The Red Folder Initiative in 2012 created campus-specific quick reference guides which UCSF installed on faculty members' computers. More can be done to ensure that everyone understands the resources available to students and where to send them.

Discussion: Chair Zanzucchi asked if provision of mental health care takes cultural differences into consideration. Dr. Caldwell responded that some campuses do better than others and the focus is on ensuring that all counselors are culturally competent regardless of their particular backgrounds. Diversifying staff has also been a priority. A member remarked that a high level of stress is associated with students' workloads in the engineering department and asked if any data is collected by the counseling centers about students' majors. The mental health program would like to conduct an environmental scan and provide data and feedback to the campuses so they can take action about settings linked to stress. The program's oversight committee would like to perform a qualitative review of why students are seeking services.

Counselors and staff could do more outreach to departments known to be high pressure environments. More thought could be given to developing informal offerings for students and faculty about stress. Decisions and strategies for addressing student mental health may need to come from faculty and from a higher level such as the Academic Senate level in order to change the way we think about education and about how students are educated. Decision makers would be swayed by a qualitative study and prompted to develop a response. Chair Zanzucchi proposed that UCEP should continue to have this type of conversation and could write a memo advocating for funding for the types of studies discussed today.

VI. Proposed Amendment to Santa Cruz Division Regulation 10.1.3

UC Santa Cruz has proposed an amendment to Divisional Regulation 10.1.3 that recommends the review of residency should be conducted by the Senate rather than the administration. It is proposed that the Committee on Course of Instruction will be the first point of contact. UCEP is not being asked to approve the proposed amendment but the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction recommended UCEP review it.

Discussion: It is not clear how often exceptions to the regulation have been sought. Having a specific body to approve the residency requirement in consultation with the department is appropriate. The language regarding how students complete the final quarter should be revised because it is not clear if the final 10 credits are part of, or in addition to, the 35.

Action: The committee will submit a memo in support of the amendment and suggest clearer language about the credits in the final quarter.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

The Regents meet next week and on Tuesday the Special Committee on Basic Needs will convene. IRAP Vice President Brown will discuss data on student needs and Provost Brown will discuss the funding required to address those needs. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting on Wednesday will focus on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition approvals. Vice President Brown will present information on the public value of a UC degree which will be based, in part, on earning data and the value of an educated citizenry. Chair Kieffer has asked Chair May for a presentation on the meaning of a UC degree and this is planned for May. The multi-year funding plan continues to be discussed with a focus on investing in faculty, research and graduate education.

The president has issued the enrollment target letter to the campuses. The legislature has not suggested a target and the governor's budget did not include funding for additional enrollment. UC is asking for funding for 2500 California residents and it is hoped that the May revise includes this money. Decisions about admissions are being made now at the campuses without the benefit of information about funding. Another letter was sent to the chancellors about non-resident enrollment and Director Greenspan reported that two or three campuses may exceed the established limit of 18%. Tuition will be taken from those campuses over the limit and placed into a fund for basic needs. Finally, IRAP received a presentation from UCD's Michal Kurlaender on an interesting analysis on whether the Smarter Balanced Assessment, first administered in 2014-2015, predicts student success as well as the SAT does.

Discussion: The LAO recommended against the funding Governor Newsom included for degree completion programs. Some education to the legislature will be needed especially to clarify that UC's Extension programs have not received funds from the state since the early 1970s and that the role of Extension programs is connected to state priorities. How each campus will close the achievement gap for all students is under discussion and the Regents were not pleased when told that graduation rates for certain groups would lag behind.

VIII. Transfer Initiative

- *Jim Chalfant, Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office, UCOP*

The agenda packet includes a one page document drafted by Advisor Chalfant which attempts to pin down common language about the transfer guarantee. Chair Zanzucchi noted that there have recently been meetings of the Advising Innovations and Communications and the Pathways and Articulation work groups. The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has been discussing data on

ethnicity in relationship to the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG). UCEP should continue to think about its role in the transfer dialog. In particular, the transfer readiness of UC campuses, student success and what happens to transfer students after admission are issues to consider.

Advisor Chalfant reported that the Pathways and Articulation workgroup has been discussing ways to improve the transfer pathways, including confirming that pathways are comprised of the right sets of courses and looking at why certain courses were not articulated. A letter will be disseminated to the campuses about reviewing the TAGs. Another focus is how to make the articulation process work better in the future and on ways to ensure there is better dialog between UC and the CCCs about what UC would like to see in certain courses and reasons why a course was not approved for articulation. Making sure the pathways are right is critical and the plan is to contact each of the pathway majors with any questions or suggested clarifications.

The transfer guarantee proposal is out for systemwide review and focus groups with students are still being planned. The one page document is intended to plainly state the goals of the transfer guarantee. There is an immediate need to explain to CCC students and academic advisors what the transfer guarantee means. BOARS is primarily focusing upon the meaning of the minimum 3.5 grade point average (GPA). If a campus offers at TAG with a GPA lower than 3.5, the 3.5 GPA has less significance for the guarantee. The 3.5 GPA is intended to signal that if a student takes all of the pathway courses and attains this GPA, the student will be well-qualified for all UC campuses, including those that do not offer TAGs. A student who only meets the requirements for a TAG is less likely to be admitted to a more selective campus. A question is how to frame the 3.5 GPA so that it seems attainable, and the results of the review of the BOARS proposal will help inform what should be clarified.

Discussion: A member asked what aspects of the BOARS proposal divisional Educational Policy Committees/Undergraduate Councils should be focusing on now and over the course of the next few months. A concern is the number of different audiences that need to be told about and understand the guarantee. Useful feedback from divisional committees might be related to capacity. The administration may need to be encouraged to address practical considerations, which might include requiring pre-majors or a way to ration the number of freshman admitted to majors at capacity.

Campus decisions to eliminate a TAG will impact the systemwide nature of the guarantee. It was noted that several terms are being used interchangeably, which is contributing to the confusion. Faculty should have a key role in conversations about transfer. Based on discussions at Academic Council, divisional chairs did not understand the implications of the TAGs when they were established. More precise communication is needed to ensure that the correct information is reaching the people reviewing BOARS' proposal. Perhaps each department should designate someone to serve as an expert on transfer, especially to help with communication. Undergraduate deans would need to agree to rely upon these experts.

IX. California State University's General Education Task Force Report

Former UCEP Chair Barbara Knowlton has participated on the CSU's General Education Task Force for the past two years. The Task Force has now completed its report and UCEP members are asked to elicit feedback from their divisional committees which will be shared with Chair Knowlton in April.

X. Campus Closure Policies ~ Next Steps

UCEP's February discussion about campus closure policies is summarized in the minutes. Chair May encouraged the committee to look at policies following the wildfires in Northern California last fall. In the midst of the emergency, ad hoc solutions were implemented and the lack of a plan was evident.

Discussion: In the absence of a draft plan, it is hard to conceptualize what type of plan is needed. The report that the president's workgroup eventually produces may help identify the role of the Senate in responding to an emergency. One suggestion is that UCEP create a list of questions that may need to be answered. At UCSC, closures have been related to political events and a closure related to climate is very different. Divisions may be encouraged to conduct localized planning. At UCI a building was closed due to a leak, suggesting the need for plans that are narrow in scope. Decisions have to be made, including whether students are expected to complete their course work or if it is optional. A few guiding points about who decides what would be helpful. Chair Zanzucchi proposed submitting a progress report to Academic Council and will draft this memo.

XI. Campus Reports/Member Items

There were no campus reports.

XII. New Business

The UCAP and UCAADE proposal for a task force on student course evaluations will be shared with UCEP and members are encouraged to provide feedback.

A reader is needed for the online UCI School of Business Administration and the UCSF representative volunteered. She will provide a written report as she will be absent in April. Readers are needed for UCSD's 7th College and the UCLA representative volunteered.

UCEP will meet in Oakland on April 1st.

XIII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:50 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Anne Zanzucchi