

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2018

Attending: Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, (UCD), Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair, (UCM), David Paul (UCSB), Patrick Chuang (UCSC) (alternate), Hugh Roberts (UCI), John Serences (UCSD), Ken Uneo (UCB), Robert Gould (UCLA), Jennifer Perkins (UCSF), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Daniel Potter (UCD), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Evera Spears (Associate Director, Advocacy & Partnerships, Admissions), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Shane White (Chair, Academic Senate), Robert May (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Updates

Chair Caswell-Chen announced that the committee will meet in person at UCOP on April 2nd. The members have been asked to gather information about the training for Teaching Assistants at their campuses. UCEP's graduate student representative would also like information about training for Graduate Student Instructors, which might include readers. Members will receive information from the ILTI Coordinator on specific policies or practices (systemwide or per campus) that give rise to the nine barriers to cross-campus enrollment. This will allow each representative to discuss with their campus EPC or UGC whether to recommend possible changes to the systemwide or campus policies to mitigate the barriers to cross-campus enrollment.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) discussed the Transfer Forum held on February 1st and the improvements that can be made for the next such event. The idea of sharing resources for students in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program was discussed by ICAS, but it seems that UC students are fully utilizing the resources the University is providing. If DACA students are forced to leave the country, UC is considering how to help identify where they might complete their degrees.

The report from Huron Consulting on the Office of the President indicated that OP is of modest size given the services it provides, and praised many aspects of its organization and function. Options for modifications proposed by Huron included moving the UC Education Abroad Program or the UC Washington D.C. Center to the campuses, but it is not yet clear if UC will adopt any of the suggestions. Huron did not provide any data to the Senate or look at costs associated with the options they presented.

The chair attended a recent meeting of the UC D.C. Center's Academic Advisory Council (AAC) and the Center's Executive Director indicated that Huron did not speak to her about the Center. An in-depth analysis of the costs is needed before any options should be seriously considered, and ensuring that the level of support for the Center is maintained is an important factor. Chair Caswell-Chen mentioned the Center's Annual Reports to the AAC participants, and proposed the idea that these reports should be reinstated and that both the AAC and UCEP could review the reports as, effectively, a form of program review. Chair Caswell-Chen asked the ACC that UCEP have the opportunity to consider the information included in future Center Annual Reports, with the possibility of requesting additional information, to assure that the annual reports for UCDC would be sufficient to serve as program review.

Provost Brown invited Council to share examples of problems related to the faculty student ratio and resources, such as deferred maintenance and students' ability to get the required courses when needed. Chair Caswell-Chen shared that during program review at Davis, an external reviewer commented that a facility visited during the review was subpar, even by high school standards.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The February 5, 2018 minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Evera Spears, Associate Director, Advocacy & Partnerships, Undergraduate Admissions*

Associate Director Spears explained that she was an Admissions Evaluator at UCB for twenty years and has worked in Admissions at UCOP for the last seven years. In this role, she works with the Admissions Evaluators on the nine undergraduate campuses to make decisions, based on Academic Senate regulations, about what is or is not transferable and what courses meet University graduation requirements, including the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). The chair of UCSB's Undergraduate Council had sent a memo to UCEP requesting clarification of Senate Regulation 636.E. SR 636.E was amended in 2008 and UCSB expressed concern that the current language is vague and open to different interpretations. In April 2011, the University Committee on Preparatory Education provided clarification to the Admission Evaluators about what happens when a student who has left UC wants to satisfy the ELWR at a California Community College (CCC) or elsewhere and then wants to transfer to a different UC campus.

Currently, UC looks at what a freshman has done prior to matriculation at UC, and the ELWR can be met by a standardized examination score or through a college-level course prior to high school graduation. Once a student matriculates at UC, the ELWR must be satisfied within the first year of enrollment or there will be consequence, but faculty at a given campus can make case by case exceptions for students who cannot complete the requirement in the first year. For CCC students, UCOP has a Transfer Articulation Department that works directly with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to review the guidelines for what will be transferable to UC and what will meet specific requirements for Junior Transfer Admission. The CCC must meet certain criteria which includes that the course has content that will meet the ELWR for UC.

SR 636.E states that after a student matriculates at a UC campus, the requirement must be fulfilled at that UC campus. If a student leaves that campus, and returns to a different campus, a course taken elsewhere can satisfy the ELWR at the different UC campus. In response to the memo from UCSB, Associate Director Spears indicated that a student who has matriculated at UCSB cannot satisfy the ELWR at a CCC per SR 636.E. It was noted that students at UCD are taking online courses in order to satisfy the requirement. For students entering UC, BOARS has said the method of delivery of the course does not matter as long as the content meets UC's established criteria.

The regulation includes a clause that the ELWR must be completed in the student's first year. When the regulation was written decades ago, the focus was on freshmen, hence the requirement for completion within the first year. Transfer students enroll in UC having already completed the English Composition Literature courses therefore the regulation was not interpreted to mean that a junior transfer student in their first year at UC has to complete the ELWR within the first year.

Discussion: The UCSB representative thanked Associate Director Spears for the clarifying that SR 636.E means that if a student leaves a UC before fulfilling the ELWR and takes courses at an institution other than UC, the courses (which would normally count for a transfer student enrolling in UC) will satisfy the ELWR if the student enrolls in a different UC campus but not if he or she re-enrolls in the original UC campus. Associate Director Spears explained the rationale that UC faculty did not want students to attempt to circumvent the requirement.

UCSB investigated how the regulation is being enforced, finding that some campuses are enforcing it closely while others may not. The UCSB representative will share this information with the Associate Director so that she can bring any campuses not complying with the regulation into alignment. Associate Director Spears will ensure that the Admissions staff are in agreement and applying the regulation in the same way across the campuses.

Action: The analyst and chair will prepare a memo for the UCSB Undergraduate Council.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Robert May, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair White reported that Regent Tauscher joined the last Council meeting and it was a positive visit. Regent Tauscher indicated that she would like to use her position to support the University. Past Senate Chair Dan Hare has been appointed by President Napolitano to be her Senior Faculty Advisor and the president is sharing more information with the Senate leadership and Council. The State budget is a significant issue. The planned budget presentation and request was not made during the Regents' November meeting. The Regents are expected to vote on an increase in tuition for non-resident students in March and have a vote on a tuition increase for California students in May. UC will request funds for "overcrowding" which is how students describe their experience on campus. The budget request will include \$5M for graduate students. The University's Office of Government Relations is discussing the state budget with the legislators, and the Senate hopes that Provost Brown and faculty are included in the advocacy efforts.

Huron Consulting's report on the Office of the President described aspects of the operations that are "best in class." The report suggested that Academic Affairs should be strengthened. Chair White and Vice Chair May believe that separating UCOP governance functions from the operations functions might clarify the range of support provided by UCOP for the UC. From the Senate perspective, any realignment inside OP should continue to reflect the importance of Academic Affairs.

UC is meeting the 2:1 ratio of freshmen to transfer students on a systemwide basis but there is now a specific focus on UCR and UCSC which have difficult challenges. The UC continues to find ways to improve the transfer processes and CCC student awareness of transfer options.

The president has formed a working group to identify strategies to improve retiree health so that UC has a substantive benefit going forward. UC is committing itself to a 4% contribution to retiree health which will maintain the agreed upon 70% floor to UC's contribution. However, the gap between medical inflation and maintaining the 70% floor to UC's contribution needs to be addressed. The charge is to look at how to maintain an important and highly valued benefit. A plan developed by the Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity, and the Committee on Academic Personnel has been submitted to Council to close the faculty salary gap between UC and the Comparison Eight institutions. Senate leadership believes that the president is considering taking action on the salary gap this year.

Chair White mentioned the recent Los Angeles Times article on the rankings of UC campuses. Some of the rankings are more rigorous and subjective than others. The Senate leadership is preparing a report on the rankings for the Regents' March meeting.

Discussion: The plan is for the Senior Faculty Advisor to meet with President Napolitano every other week to provide advice that is independent from the Senate. Chair Caswell-Chen thanked the Senate leadership for their work on behalf of the University.

V. UCSF Variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 750.B

UCSF is requesting a variance to Senate Regulation 750.B to change the language to include Health Sciences Clinical Faculty series. The request for the change is primarily because there is a workload issue for UCSF's Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) that has to continually approve of faculty in this series to be instructors of record on case by case basis. A large percentage of the full-time career faculty are in this Health Sciences track. Chair Caswell-Chen believes that the request is reasonable but would like the members to comment.

Discussion: The UCSF representative reported that the faculty in the HS Clinical Faculty series undergo review that is similar to that for adjunct professors. The COCI considers changing the course director to be a minor issue and the COCI reportedly always approves these changes. The committee unanimously approved a motion to grant the UCSF request for a variance to SR 750.B. The analyst will investigate if UCEP's memo about this matter should be submitted to Council.

Action: The analyst will draft a memo to UCSF.

VI. Transfer Task Force

Since UCEP's last meeting, Immediate Past Senate Chair Jim Chalfant and Provost Brown met with ICAS and with vice provosts across the system. There was a meeting of the UC group connected with the CCCs on the degree program focus, and the Transfer Task Force met on March 1st. The UCSC representative has agreed to participate on the Transfer and Beyond subcommittee that is considering articulation agreements. Vice Chair Zanzucchi reviewed the statement of principles for the Task Force. The Task Force is working on a systemwide guarantee, which will go beyond the six campuses that currently have Transfer Admission Guarantee agreements. TAG agreements have been a successful model for raising the profile of UC with CCC students, with about 50% of students participating in TAG enrolling in their UC campus of choice and 88% of participants overall enrolling in a UC.

The degree program group meeting in mid-February included discussions about how the pilot programs in Chemistry and Physics can help diversify the pool of transfer students enrolling in UC. A challenge for UC is that applications come from a small percentage of CCCs. Fewer than 20% of the CCCs send the majority of transfer students to UC campuses. Transfer patterns are often highly regional so there should be consideration of pathways that might be broader and less regionally specific. In terms of matriculation, issues mentioned during UCEP meetings such as transfer shock and associated support services have been discussed by the degree program group. Evaluation of what works well in terms of attracting students from diverse backgrounds was another topic. The group also considered sustainability as in whether the guarantee will help individual campuses with capacity planning.

Vice Chair Zanzucchi remarked that it is important to keep the 2:1 agreement in mind during strategic planning because not all campuses can easily participate in this type of commitment. Some UC campuses are geographically near "low sending" CCCs or may lack the capacity to enroll high numbers of transfer students. Campuses that cannot reach the 2:1 ratio have a different contribution to the effort to diversify UC's recruitment. Many of the discussions have touched on General Education (GE), including the idea of a comprehensive program to bridge major requirements and GE requirements, although this could be complicated for Engineering. If GE becomes a central focus, there might be a role for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum related to engineering and lower division unit caps. The requirements for the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology could be a potential constraint for engineering. The discussions about evaluation and development have touched on the possibility of having a five-year limit for the degree requirements in the pilot program. UCEP might look at catalog

rights for returning students and the idea of having more unified language for how catalog rights are handled.

UCB's Physics department has been asked by the workgroup to share its perspective on articulation and what would be best with regard to faculty governance. The subcommittee is considering creating a systemwide set of expectations but the ultimate authority is with the faculty in the relevant department at a given campus. Vice Chair Zanzucchi noted that the articulation subcommittee has only recently convened. The subcommittee on transfer advising, innovations and communication is assessing how to better communicate UC's focus and to make the University more appealing to potential transfer students. This group will develop a template for existing resources and UCEP members may be asked to gather information about the services campuses offer transfer students. The vice chair emailed several relevant links to the committee including two from Institutional Research at UCOP and a link to a UCR website. A proposal for a guaranteed admission pilot may be available for UCEP's review in April.

Discussion: The challenges for UCR are significant. The importance of a four-year college experience for first generation students cannot be overstated. In terms of campus culture at UCR, diversity will decrease and the transfer population for this campus has lower GPAs compared to transfer populations for other UC campuses. The vice chair suggests that it may be important to look at transfer behaviors when there is a guarantee of admissions to see if there is a difference related to higher levels of preparation or different kinds of success. Director Greenspan indicated that the UC dashboard has first-year retention data by campus.

At UCR, getting freshmen up to speed is a focus, particularly in Math even for Math majors, and there is also a need to teach students how to be in college and to do college level work. The notion that a transfer student matriculates at UC and is able to graduate in two years is problematic. First-year experience programs specific to incoming freshmen allow students to have a cohort. At UCD up to a third of the students in first-year experience programs might be transfer students. Student bonding does not necessarily happen in the classroom because students commute or have multiple jobs. It is concerning that UCR is being asked to downplay the experience of incoming freshmen. UCR's representative will consult with individuals at that campus regarding different ways transfer students might be included in first year experience programs. Chair Caswell-Chen suggested that members could identify programs at their campuses that support transfer students in their first year. The first year experience program at UCR is a three-course sequence in which the same cohort of 75 students have a consistent set of classes that follow a theme and are taught by faculty from different departments but the Teaching Assistant is the same for the year. This program has been extremely successful in terms of writing, study skills and cohort building, and it produces a social effect but it is a scholarly and pedagogical program. Whether the programs for transfers are working as well as they could is not known. Members are asked to gather information about specific and ongoing programs for transfer students for the April UCEP meeting and this information will be shared with the Transfer Task Force and its subcommittees.

Action: Members will investigate programs that support transfer students at their campuses.

VII. New Business

UCEP has been asked by Chair White to look at the campus policies for posthumous granting of degrees, specifically what proportion of the degree requirements need to have been met is a question. The UCD representative will be asked to update UCEP in April on the UC Education Abroad Program's Governing Committee. The member reports on training for Teaching Assistants will also be on the April agenda.

VIII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:30 pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Ed Caswell-Chen