

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Videoconference Minutes

Monday, March 4, 2024

Attending: Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), A. Katie Harris, Vice Chair (UCD), Darlene Francis (UCB), Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD), Jose Antonio Rodriguez-Lopes (UCI), Catherine Sugar (UCLA), Christopher Viney (UCM), Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Madeleine Norris (UCSF), Ben Hardekopf (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs), 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), James Steintrager (Chair, Academic Senate), Steven W. Cheung (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consultation with Senate Leadership

- *James Steintrager, Chair, Academic Council & Steven W. Cheung, Vice Chair, Academic Council*

Chair Cocco created an abridged version of the video recording of the Regents' February discussion about Senate Regulation (SR) 630.E, adding comments as well as data, and members are encouraged to watch it. Chair Steintrager explained that the Regents February 14th vote to disapprove SR 630.E does not require a formal action by the Senate as the regulation simply reverts to the previous iteration. The Board vote included an affirmation of campus autonomy, and the Senate is seeking clarification from the Regents office about whether this impacts the processes outlined in the Compendium related to undergraduate degree programs. In the memo to Chair Lieb and Chair Park, Chair Steintrager emphasized that there is a single Academic Senate, and its regulations extend to all divisions. It is unclear if the Regents are asserting authority over the Compendium which is owned by the Academic Planning Council and reflects Senate and administration agreements about review processes.

Chair Steintrager noted that some campuses have variances to SR 630 that are more restrictive than SR 630.E. and divisions may implement their own campus experience requirements. UCEP might offer guidance regarding accreditation and the substantive change review process triggered when a program reaches a certain threshold of online courses. The divisions should make the changes needed to institute a Senate review when a program moves to the online modality - otherwise there are no policies in place to mandate the review of these programs.

Discussion: Members contemplated actions their divisional Senates might take regarding campus-specific campus experience requirements.

II. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken during Executive Session.

III. Consultation with Undergraduate Admissions

- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs*

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu joined the meeting to ask the committee to reconsider its recommendation that the Advanced Placement (AP) Pre-Calculus exam should not be accepted for credit toward a degree. Undergraduate Admissions is mindful of the need for consistent and clear messaging to prospective first year and transfer students, and part of this is letting them know ahead of time that successful passage of certain exams will afford credit. UC has transfer agreements with the California Community Colleges (CCCs) where pre-calculus courses will confer a maximum number of units, and when CCC students apply to transfer, it is understood that those credits will be applied towards their minimum required semester or quarter units.

Oftentimes, CCC students have exam credit that is applied to the minimum 60 unit that makes them eligible to transfer. If credit determinations are left to the campus, any students relying on having passed the AP Pre-Calculus exam could potentially be eligible for transfer or not depending on to which campus they are applying. A practical implication of UCEP's decision is that it is more difficult for Admissions to convey that UC will award credit or not for the AP Pre-Calculus exam depending on the campus, especially when systemwide credit towards a degree is already conferred for most AP exams. The associate vice provost commented that AP African American Studies will likely be used to satisfy the California General Education Transfer Curriculum requirement for ethnic studies, and it may be hard to justify why UCEP would not allow systemwide credit for it.

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu would also like UCEP to consider developing guidelines for when unit credit should be awarded for external exams, whether it is AP, International Baccalaureate (IB), or any of the new exams offered by different organizations or state agencies in other countries. This is high school curricula in the 13th year, which might be equivalent to the first year of university in the U.S., and there is a precedent at UC for awarding various types of credit. But there is no formal process or rationale delineating when Admissions should bring an exam to a Senate committee for a recommendation about whether it should be considered for credit. The associate vice provost discussed this matter with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) last week and that committee concluded that the awarding of unit credit is in UCEP's purview. It is not clear how Admissions will communicate UCEP's recommendation against extending the awarding of additional credits or defend the committee's position to review new exams offered by College Board or IB but not exams from other organizations like Cambridge.

Chair Cocco explained that there are different practices across the system with how pre-calculus is handled in terms of it being a remedial class or overlapping with introductory math. These differences led to UCEP's recommendation that the divisions should decide if credit is awarded for AP Pre-Calculus. Another factor is all campuses use a math placement exam and students with a low score will have to retake pre-calculus, so they would end up with units from both the AP exam and the course. The chair acknowledged Undergraduate Admissions' position, but the committee cannot mandate that campuses accept this AP exam for credit. The chair informed Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu that UCEP is preparing guidelines about unit credit for external exams.

Discussion: At UCLA, pre-calculus is considered a remedial course and cannot be used to meet the general education requirement for quantitative reasoning. Students who need pre-calculus for other courses can take it a UCLA for elective credit, but it is not allowed to meet any campus requirements. Requiring campuses to accept this AP exam and the possibility that students will have to re-take pre-calculus based on the math placement exam could be problematic. The UCEP representative reviewing the AP African American Studies exam expects that the committee's opinion will be different from its perspective on AP Pre-Calculus.

A key concern is that granting credit by exam fundamentally misconstrues the nature of a UC education. From Chair Cocco's perspective, reviewing exams involves significant work and there is a reluctance to ask faculty to engage in this effort for for-profit entities. The chair remarked that UC has substantial experience with students who have taken AP exams and the faculty know that students are proficient in those exam areas. In contrast, the newer exams are unknown quantities, so it is reasonable for UC to prefer the established entities. The point was made that there are many components important to a UC education other than performance on an exam, including classroom and campus experience and interactions with peers and instructors.

It was also noted that AP and IB involve classroom experience and interacting with instructors, and students typically do not take those exams without having taken the course. The analyst indicated that for several years Undergraduate Admissions has been requesting a policy statement explaining why UCEP will not expand the use of credit by exam beyond AP and IB. The UCSD and UCSF representatives will be drafting guidelines for why the use of credit by exam will not be expanded and the UCR representative agreed to send language to support that effort. Chair Cocco will discuss this matter with the chair of BOARS.

IV. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved today's agenda.

Action: The February 5, 2024 minutes were approved.

V. Chair's Updates

UCEP leadership and the UCSC and UCD representatives spoke with the executive director of the UC Washington Center (UCDC) a few weeks ago. The executive director stated that she does not believe UCEP is qualified to review UCDC because it is an experiential program, but she agreed to submit a revised report by April 19th. Once the reviewers complete their report, the executive director will be invited to join the committee's discussion. The provost's congress on artificial intelligence (AI) focused on how it can be applied but did not look at AI critically. The work of the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Education is not going smoothly and there is no consensus among the members.

The UC Online Advisory Council met last Friday and Chair Cocco described concerns about how well the program is doing. Executive Director Moe told Chair Cocco that the Deloitte report on the assessment of the cross-campus enrollment system will not be made public. A representative from the National Education Equity Lab (NEEL) made a presentation to the Advisory Council and numerous concerns about this partnership were raised, especially since UC Online is already struggling. President Drake and the administration have committed UC faculty to teach online courses for high school students, and UC Online will receive \$356k for three years, with two-thirds of this coming from the high school students. UC is not charging NEEL for much of the work involved with this project, and administrators on the Advisory Council asserted that the funding is not enough to operate the program given how faculty and teaching assistants must be compensated. It is unclear how UC can provide a good program for students who have differing levels of knowledge. Close attention to the design of the online courses will be needed to make sure UC does not damage students by making them feel like they will not be successful in college.

Discussion: The analyst confirmed that UCDC has never undergone an academic review. There are questions about comments made by the systemwide provost about UCDC and

Executive Advisor Greenspan speculated this may be similar to the provost's desire to encourage faculty engage in policy research at UC Center Sacramento to potentially influence legislation. Self-studies are a valuable opportunity for programs to identify where improvements can be made, and UCEP would like to see more thoughtful, detailed responses to the review questions in the new report. The committee has heard good things about UCDC which is a program that not many universities have.

VI. Review of UCDC's Design Your Life Course

- *Geoff Cook (UCSD) & Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR)*

Chair Cocco shared the language for the draft memo regarding UCDC's Design Your Life course. The chair will finalize the memo indicating that UCEP is approving the course for two units instead four and restricting against offering it for credit more than once.

Action: A motion to approve the memo was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

VII. UCSD School of Computing, Information, and Data Sciences Full Proposal

- *Gerardo Con Diaz (UCD) and Ben Hardekopf (UCSB)*

Chair Cocco explained that UCEP's first memo with questions about UCSD's full proposal was misinterpreted as a vote against the new school. Upon further review, Chair Cocco found that the full proposal includes new sections addressing questions raised by the committee about the pre-proposal. UCEP has a very high bar, but members are asked to consider if the proposal is solid enough to be approved. The chair noted that although joint appointments can be problematic, they are not uncommon. Reviewers pointed out that plans for advising and paths for transfer students are not addressed in the full proposal. The chair suggested that UCEP could recommend that the UCSD Senate review the school after a specific period of time.

Discussion: Members reiterated concerns about the committee rubberstamping proposals that are not responsive to questions raised by reviews of pre-proposals. There are specific concerns about the motivation for the new school being more about what faculty need instead of what will benefit students. The analyst noted that when the Compendium is revised the committee will have an opportunity to identify the specific information UCEP needs to see in proposals. Another recommendation is that UCEP should closely scrutinize proposed schools backed by major funding.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to send a memo to Chair Steintrager delineating the shortcomings identified by UCEP with a recommendation for the divisional Senate to review the school in two or three years. The motion was approved with 10 votes in favor and two abstentions.

VIII. Proposed New Regulation for Awarding Degrees Posthumously

- *Jose Antonio Rodriguez-Lopez (UCI)*

The UCI representative worked with members of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs to draft a policy for awarding degrees posthumously which UCEP has approved. The workgroup was then asked to transform the policy into a proposed new regulation and the committee is asked to approve the draft.

Discussion: Members contemplated how the family of deceased students should be involved in the process for determining if a degree should be awarded. The analyst reminded the

committee that the proposed new regulation will be distributed for systemwide review so further wordsmithing now may be unnecessary.

Action: A motion to approve the draft proposed new regulation was made, seconded, and approved unanimously.

IX. Further Discussion/New Business

There was no Further Discussion or New Business.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:00 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Melanie Cocco