UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, March 7, 2022

Attending: Mary Lynch, Chair (UCSF), Katheryn Russ, Vice Chair (UCD), Dana Carney (UCB), Katie Stirling-Harris (UCD), Melanie Cocco (UCI), Kathleen Bawn (UCLA), Holley Moyes (UCM), Bryan Wong (UCR), Daniel Dubin (UCSD alternate), David Paul (UCSB), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Todd Greenspan (Director, IRAP, UCOP), Ethan Savage (Analyst, IRAP), Robert Horwitz (Chair, Academic Senate), Susan Cochran (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**
- *Robert Horwitz, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Susan Cochran, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

During the February Regents meeting, the vice president for UC Health expressed reservations about lifting the mask mandate at the campuses. The vice president also discussed the affiliations contracts between UC and religious hospital groups including Dignity Health and Adventist Health. UC is currently negotiating contracts with Providence, the Veteran's Administration, and the Indian Health Service. The Senate will review the contracts with Dignity and Adventist and continue to monitor affiliations issues. The Regents Special Committee on Innovation Transfer and Entrepreneurship Committee learned that the Office of the President (UCOP) has reached an agreement with chancellors that much of the work on this issue will occur on the campuses, including that each campus will choose its own patent tracking system. UCOP will maintain a data warehouse with patents and best practices across the campuses and provide the backup on licensing and other legal matters.

The state's 2022-2023 budget for UC proposes an annual 5% increase on the permanent budget for five years. The state tax receipts are higher than expected, so the Chief Financial Officer at UCOP intends to ask for $1.6B in one-time funds for deferred maintenance and seismic retrofitting. Chair Horwitz described the lawsuit filed by Save Berkeley Neighborhoods against UCB on the basis of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and, as a result of a separate case, the campus was ordered to freeze its enrollment at the fall 2020 level. It was estimated that 3400 students would not be admitted to UCB which would have impacted the other campuses. The California Supreme Court rejected UC's request to stay the enrollment freeze pending an appeal of the substance of the case. Senate Weiner has introduced a bill to exempt enrollment growth from CEQA but it may be some time before this is in place. In the meanwhile, UCB has shuffled who will be on campus in the fall and this may involve a joint program with UCSF. UCB stands to lose about $57M million as a result of the decreased enrollment.

There are people who are pushing for online solutions to the problem of increasing access to UC. The February Council meeting featured a report from Vice Chair Cochran on online degrees at other institutions based on publicly available data. The data shows that none of the other institutions have fully embraced online degree programs and the programs have mixed results. Before the Senate decides to enter the fully online undergraduate degree space (OUDP), UCEP needs to provide Council with a comprehensive set of guidelines to address philosophical and operational issues.

The Senate has been divided on the issue of OUDPs for the last few years and unless the Compendium is revised, the Senate may have only one opportunity to opine on an OUDP before subsequent campus-level review. In a public meeting, UCI's chancellor announced that an online undergraduate degree at the Business school has moved on from the pilot phase, and Chair Horwitz explained that the Senate has not approved this or any other OUDP. Council will continue to engage in serious discussions about this issue over the next several months and these will be informed by UCEP's work.

Students at UCLA held a sit-in at the Chancellor's Office to advocate for a number of things to ensure they receive a proper education. This included mandatory recording of all courses and mandatory hybrid teaching modalities. The Senate asked the systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) to look at these issues and UCAF sent a comprehensive memo to Academic Council that states that Americans with Disability Act (ADA) accommodations are powerful and take precedence over any abstract assertion of faculty academic freedom. Importantly, ADA accommodations are granted on an individual student basis but the UCLA students have called for the universal expansion of the mandatory recording and dual modality of instruction. The UCAF memo indicates that faculty are willing to be as flexible as possible but the Senate will not contemplate mandatory recordings or dual instruction. The memo was endorsed by Council and transmitted to the divisions and it should be useful for divisional Senate chairs in discussions with students and administrators. Chair Horwitz pointed out that a serious discussion about resources is needed because meeting the demand for hybrid instruction is a significant burden for faculty.

UC Online's new Advisory Committee met for the first time in late January and Senate leadership was pleased that the members had knowledgeable comments and questions. UC Online needs to determine its mission and the value it adds to the campuses. Chair Horwitz explained that the passage of Assembly Bill 928 charges the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) with creating a singular General Education (GE) transfer pathway from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to the California State University (CSU) and UC systems. This task is difficult because each segment has its specific pedagogical orientations, so ICAS is trying to limit this effort to changing the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum framework. ICAS has a limited amount of time to complete this work and, if the committee fails, this activity will devolve to the administrations of the three segments, which would be problematic since faculty are the experts on course curriculum and admissions. The special committee established to design the new GE transfer pathway has reached agreement on a plan which will need to be approved by the CCC, CSU and UC faculty senates.

Chair Horwitz explained that there are a variety of difficult issues related to transfer and because the Senate does not have a committee dedicated to housing expertise in this arena, Senate leadership has been responsible for this work. Rather than adding to the workloads of UCEP and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), Chair Horwitz has proposed creating a special committee of Council to advise Senate leadership on transfer. The special committee shall be comprised of members with some expertise on transfer issues and might not have a representative from each campus. It is very likely that the legislative interest will continue, so it is critical that the Senate establish a body exclusively dedicated to advising Senate Leadership on transfer issues.

Discussion: Senate leadership clarified comments to UCEP in February regarding data on student satisfaction from the 2020 Undergraduate Experience Survey. It is unclear if student satisfaction was related to remote instruction or the more generous approach to grading. Vice Chair Cochran also noted that violations of academic integrity increased with the shift to remote instruction

because of the pandemic. Chair Horwitz explained that UC will probably not join the investors' lawsuit against Chegg since the University does not have standing. If UC filed an amicus brief, the purpose would be to describe the theft of faculty intellectual property and the impact it could have on a faculty member's livelihood, especially if they are not tenure track faculty.

A member remarked that the data on online degree programs at UC and other institutions showed that UCLA's expenditures per student FTE were twice those of other UC campuses. Vice Chair Cochran suggested that the rules for reporting this data may have allowed UCLA to include the Health Science students for which expenditures would be high.

II.   Announcements and Updates

Chair Lynch shared that the future of online undergraduate degree programs (OUDPs) has been discussed at a variety of recent meetings. There are questions about the right match of content with the pedagogical approach or the pedagogical approach to how content is delivered. Faculty and programs will debate important questions about what should be on campus face-to-face or what might be a better fit in a hybrid format. The framework that UCEP establishes will be critical. It is likely that UCSC will send the proposal for the Creative Technologies degree program to UCEP in 2022-2023. There is a concern that, per the Compendium, UCEP will only approve the first OUDP and subsequent proposals will be approved at the campus level, so one question is whether the Compendium guidelines should be revised. The committee analyst remarked that it is unknown when the Compendium could be revised because the new provost may not prioritize this undertaking, but divisional Educational Policy Committees/Undergraduate Councils (CEPs/UGCs) could agree that UCEP should review and approve all proposals for OUDPs over a certain period of time regardless of what is in the Compendium.

Chair Lynch urged committee members to get their divisional committees' responses to the questions about OUDPs asked during the February meeting. UCEP will probably not have a complete framework for OUDPs to share with Academic Council in April because the questions are not easy to answer. Chair Lynch shared that the Academic Planning Council is establishing a workgroup on the future of undergraduate education at UC which will consider issues beyond online degree programs. Any UCEP members who might be interested in participating on this workgroup should let Chair Lynch know. According to Analyst Savage, the workgroup will focus on seven questions and the endeavor may last 18 months or so.

III.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP's February 7, 2022 videoconference minutes were approved.

IV.   Update on UCI Paul Merage School of Business Online B.A. in Business Administration
   - *Melanie Cocco, UCI Representative*

The UCI representative requested that UCEP send the 2018 UCI Paul Merage School of Business ("Merage") proposal for an online Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration back to the divisional Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) for review and discussion. The proposal was rejected by UCI's CEP and the divisional Council at the time but was still transmitted to the systemwide Senate with the request that it be reviewed because the program would be the first degree of its kind. UCEP did not approve the Merage proposal, and then-Council Chair May notified Merage that it had the option of expanding its offerings of online courses in tandem with face-to-face courses in the

existing Business Administration degree with a commensurate increase in enrollment. The school was also asked to gather data about students' success and experiences in the online offerings. In June 2021, Merage provided a report comparing the online courses to in-person courses, but the comparison was problematic because most of the in-person offerings were taught remotely as a result of the pandemic. The report was not discussed by the divisional Council but was forwarded to UCEP without comment by the then-chair of UCI's CEP. The UCI representative would now like the divisional CEP to work with Merage to develop the proposal.

The proposal described the program as a degree completion program, not an online degree program and the proposal did not state that students could not live on campus. A UCI administrator was against admitting anyone other than transfer students into the proposed program, but the rationale behind this is not clear. There is a high demand for UCI's Merage, which received in excess of 12k applications for 275 seats in 2018, and the program is nationally recognized for serving significant numbers of low income and first generation students. The undergraduate degree is ranked in the top 50 by UC News and World Report. In light of this high demand, Merage wanted to increase enrollment by making online courses available to students unable to be on campus for whatever reason and the school received funds from UCI's provost to hire more faculty and add seats specifically for these online classes.

The number of students in the degree completion program was to be capped at 400 because there is a series of seven upper division core classes are capped at 200 students per class. Additional electives are limited to 100 students per class and the online courses have the same cap. Most of the transfer students enter with 105 units and will take another 75 units at Merage. Students would need to take 52 units of upper division courses online to earn the Business Administration degree, but UCI does not offer all of the necessary electives online.

The UCI representative does not believe students in the program could earn 90 units, the minimum 50% level. Although the program is not fully online, for the last two years students have had the option of online courses. In the 2021 report from Merage, students gave the program ratings from 3.5 to 3.7 on a 4.0 scale and students said the online courses were challenging. Merage is designing an evaluation form to help clarify where those challenges are so the courses can be improved. The school is not considering offering a four year online degree program in part because the campus does not have the resources to offer the first two years online and the degree completion program is a way to enroll more transfer students.

Discussion: A member noted that WASC Senior College and University Commission's new definition of online degrees is that over 50% of the courses in a program are online, and the UCI representative indicated that Merage does not have enough online courses available for students to earn a degree. UCM has just instituted new measures through the registrar to prevent students from earning over 50% of their units from online courses. Vice Chair Cochran suggested that instead of comparing online to in-person courses, the evaluation should look at completing a degree online versus some other way along with other aspects of the student experience.

V.   Credit by Examination
   - *Monica Lin, Director, A-G and Transfer Policy Analysis & Coordination, Educational Innovations and Services, UCOP*

Director Lin reported a surge in external national and international organizations eager for UC to approve for their curriculum for college credit. Last year, BOARS heard the proposal from the Cambridge Assessment International Association Group about expanding the advanced level

curriculum they have been disseminating internationally in an attempt to increase its use in the U.S. and in California, in particular. This curriculum could be thought of as a variation of the International Baccalaureate (IB) curriculum and an international variation of the College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) curriculum. Cambridge pointed to the long-standing practice by UC and other institutions of awarding college credit for AP and IB exams, and the company to partner with UC to demonstrate that their curriculum is a viable alternative to the aforementioned exams with which many U.S. students are familiar.

BOARS reviewed the data and found that only about 150 Cambridge students have enrolled across the UC system which does not justify having faculty review the exams to determine how they would translate into college credit, and that committee suggested this issue could be revisited when the number of students increases significantly. The director has also been contacted by the Central Board of Secondary Education, the system in India that offers similar standardized exams and the American Councils for International Education which offers the National Examinations and World Languages proficiency exam. Since the question is about the equivalence of curriculum offered to high school students or the equivalent, it may be more appropriate for UCEP than BOARS to consider this question.

The director does not have any data about how students who have participated in these curricular offerings are faring at UC, but the numbers of these students is slowly growing. The question for UCEP is whether UC should expand the current credit by exam opportunities beyond the AP and IB courses. If so, UCEP could recommend a process for how this is done and Director Lin advised that the process should be efficient and expeditious. The process will involve faculty content experts in the particular areas covered by the exams and how the exams can be assessed will need to be delineated, though it will likely be consistent with how the AP and IB exams are evaluated.

The AP and IB are the courses to which high school students in the U.S. would be exposed and currently the only general international exams international students might bring when they enroll at UC are the A Levels. The main benefit of expanding credit by exam would be to give students who completed and performed well on the exams the ability to move to the next level without having to repeat the same course content, which could reduce time to degree or at least give students the opportunity to take higher level upper division coursework sooner. A central challenge might be related to maintaining a process that preserves the integrity of translating standardized exam scores into college credit. There is a difference between awarding students unit credit versus giving students unit awards, and the external organizations have a strong preference for ensuring that the exam scores translate into meaningful credit.

Discussion: There is a concern that offering credit by exam gives students a UC degree when they have taken a number of courses elsewhere and tested out of UC requirements. Some faculty find that students who have tested out of a required course have not actually mastered the material, so there is a preference for students to take the UC courses. Director Lin posited that if UCEP were to decide against expanding credit by exam beyond what is currently allowed, it would be helpful to have a formal statement about the decision UC faculty have made and the rationale behind it. On the other hand, if faculty determine that credit by exam should be expanded, there should be an explanation to support this decision as well.

One member expressed support for giving students credit for having learned something on their own through a non-traditional pathway, study in another country through study or an AP class, and noted that students who transfer to UC from other schools are considered UC graduates. Director Lin indicated that UCEP looked at the use of credit by exam in 2016, so members might want to

review the information in that report. Analyses by Institutional Research at UCOP have shown that AP students do not use those credits to reduce their time degree but the credits do allow students to skip over entry-level courses once they arrive at UC. These students may not finish earlier by advancing more quickly but they might have been able to add a minor or do a double major. The director explained that the exams are not revisited on a regular basis in part because of how the College Board, in particular, has designed their process to engage UC faculty and faculty from across the country in maintaining the quality of their exams. The College Board has a faculty-driven process that that has given higher education institutions, including UC, great confidence in how the exams are designed, how validity is maintained over time, and then the scores can translate into the unit or credit awards.

In April, UCEP will discuss if it supports the expansion of credit by examination. If the answer is yes, the committee will work with Director Lin's unit to design the process for evaluating the curriculum offered by Cambridge and other international organizations. Director Lin recommended that a solid policy foundation ought to be established in order to proceed. In addition, UC could propose a plan for faculty outreach to the new organizations in an effort to keep the exams current and to maintain faculty confidence in them, as is done with the College Board.

VI. UCSF School of Dentistry International Dentist Pathway and D2 Curriculum Proposals

This item was postponed.

VII. Responses to Critical Questions about Online Undergraduate Degree Programs and Feedback on Draft Principles

Chair Lynch invited members to report the feedback from their divisional CEPs/UGCs to the questions they were given last month.

Discussion: UCM's committee discussed competition between UC campuses and asserted that OUDPs should only be offered if they are unique to the system. The committee also wondered how students in these programs would be counted for a campus's total enrollment and whether the process for admission into the OUDPs will be as rigorous as it is for in-person programs. The registrar at UCM will track how many units from online courses students are taking and will notify students when they reach about 30% of their units. The UCD committee recommends that "online" should be defined and that new structures for evaluating OUDPs and online courses will be needed as these do not fit into existing structures. It was suggested that continuous improvement practices be used to ensure that OUDPs undergo frequent examination. UCD's committee also agreed on the importance of dispelling the myth that online programs can save costs.

The UCSB representative explained that the committee is resistant to accepting the idea of OUDPs and there is concern about UC leadership's support for these programs in part because they are so expensive. The proposals for these programs should describe how they meet the definition of UC quality and the robust questions asked in the process for approving online courses could be reframed when an OUDP is under consideration. The UCSB committee also felt that asking about the pedagogical reasoning for an OUDP is somewhat vague and that there may be other reasons for offering these programs like reaching a larger group of students. There was confusion about how transferring from an OUDP to another degree program might work. UCSD's committee just started looking at the set of questions last week and indicated that the questions are complicated, especially since this campus has not thought much about OUDPs. The divisional committee will engage stakeholders on campus including the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Center for

Teaching and Learning with the hopes of having feedback for the April UCEP meeting, but the committee does view the questions as too vague to use for evaluating an OUDP.

Members of UCLA's committee were also frustrated about being asked about OUDPs and the discussion continuously veered to the debate between faculty and students about teaching modality. The committee recommended that more concrete questions are needed and that it would be useful to look at rubrics and data for online graduate degree programs. Another suggestion is to look at the British Open University which reportedly has good learning outcomes but low retention rates. Some members of this committee think that a way to ensure UC quality is to not make a distinction between online versus in-person degrees while there was also support for a UC campus that is online. This committee discussed increasing access and pointed out that the Extension model has failed at this.

UCR's committee suggested looking at the employment opportunities for students who participated in UC's online graduate degree programs. The committee wondered what would happen if an OUDP had students enrolled from multiple UC campuses and how conflicting deadlines and schedules would be reconciled if some courses are from campus that has quarters and others are offered by a campus on a semester calendar. If there is cross-campus enrollment, the committee asked which campus will be responsible for funding the Teaching Assistants (TAs) since the resources for TAs come from student fees traditionally tied to a campus. Another question is how faculty will receive credit from their department for their course load, especially for faculty with appointments in two departments.

The UCI representative noted that the campus does not have the resources to offer all GE courses online. The CEP questioned if there should be a limit on the amount of asynchronous instruction. The UCI committee also thinks that ladder faculty would not be in favor of having a recording of their lecture used by someone else to deliver the course. There is support for reviewing OUDPs and online courses on a more frequent basis. This committee agreed that transfer students should be able to enroll in these programs. Recommendations include that OUDPs should have same level of TA support, and there should be clear definitions of contact hours and teaching credits for the online courses. There are concerns that faculty teaching in OUDPs could become alienated from others in their department and that their colleagues may not appreciate the amount of time a faculty member puts into these courses. This committee recommends that students in OUDPs who do not have access to campus services should pay lower fees. It was also suggested that OUDPs could benefit students in the state who live very far away from a UC campus and are from socioeconomically disadvantaged groups.

The UCSC representative shared that the proposed Creative Technologies program is not thought of as a degree completion program and that the transfer students in the program will have completed the GE requirements. The UCSC committee has discussed the idea of provisionally approving a program and having faculty report on its efficacy, which might include looking at student performance in downstream classes and student evaluations of the programs. This campus has mechanisms to protect the intellectual property rights of faculty. Chair Lynch shared that concerns about quality, access, faculty time and labor, and keeping students engaged were all issues encountered during the development of an online doctoral program at UCSF. Vice Chair Russ commented that there seems to be a divergence of opinion about OUDPs meant to increase access versus niche programs, and more thought should be given to this. The information shared today will be summarized and members may have more feedback to report and discuss in April.

VIII.   Senate Regulation Loophole Related to Online Courses and Degrees

Vice Chair Russ explained that due to the historical interpretation and recent revision of residency under Senate Regulation 610, any traditional degree program could create online versions of all their classes, effectively offering an online degree without having had that program approved as such. Academic Senate leadership has charged UCEP with closing the loophole in systemwide Senate regulations and the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction advised UCEP that it should propose a new regulation. Online degrees can be defined in terms of the percentage of online courses or by the percentage of overall degree or major credits. The simplest approach may be to focus the definition on the overall major because a program does not have much control over the range of other courses that students have access to online. Either way, this requires defining online courses.

Vice Chair Russ proposed defining an online degree as a degree program with X percent or more of online courses and that an online course is defined as a course where at least one credit unit/designated contact hour a week is delivered remotely without differentiating between synchronous or asynchronous. The definition of contact hour is when students receive instruction from the faculty, which excludes office hours. For the purposes of the new regulation, UCEP could say that one or more designated contact hour per week being delivered online would classify the course as being delivered in a virtual (online, hybrid, etc.) format. Chair Lynch wants to make sure the approach to closing the loophole is not made more difficult by counting units or contact hours. Vice Chair Russ clarified that the proposal is not to tally individual units or contact hours delivered online, but instead to tally the number of virtual versus in-person courses, without splicing virtual versus in-person credits. Using the mode of delivery of contact hours or units is one way to designate what is or is not an in-person course and therefore would need to be specified in the definition of online degrees.

Discussion: At least one member advocated that if the "online" definition is for an entire degree program, all of the students' courses have to be counted, not just the ones for the major. Defining contact hours can be challenging. One member indicated that a regular section that is in-person is enough contact hours to be considered in-person but hybrid courses make this determination more complicated. VC Russ clarified that as long as the faculty member or TA is in class in person for some minimum number of hours a week (total credit hours—say, four—minus one), it is considered an in-person class regardless of whether additional material is delivered online. The draft of the proposed regulation will be shared with the committee using Google Docs so members can provide comments or revisions and the updated draft will be discussed again during the April meeting.

IX.   Consultation with Institutional Research and Academic Planning
- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

Last year, the legislature passed AB 927 which allows the CCCs to turn their pilot baccalaureate degree programs into permanent ongoing BA degrees and these are not supposed to duplicate what UC or CSU offer. Director Greenspan indicated that UC has 30 days to review the degrees and identify any duplicates, and while a process for conducting the review has not been established, it seems that UCEP should be involved with this work. It is not clear how comprehensive the review can be in light of the 30 day turnaround time. Director Greenspan does not think there will be any duplicate degrees because most of them are career-oriented. Members can share the proposals with the divisional analysts or other relevant campus committees.

The director noted that enrollment planning is a big issue right now between the lawsuit against UCB and the development of the 2030 capacity plan. Analyst Savage reminded the committee about the allocation in the 2019 budget for bachelor degree and certificate completion efforts. UCLA, UCM, and UCSB received funding in the first round, and a new request for proposals has been issued because roughly $5.1M was not allocated. One proposal was submitted jointly by UCSB and UCR in response to the second request for proposals and a proposal review committee has been formed that includes Chair Lynch and the UCR and UCI representatives. In addition, the committee will need to consider a request from UCSD for more funds to continue their market demand research effort they started with the $200K awarded in the first round. UCSD has requested another $250M.

X.   Member Items/New Business

There were no Member Items or New Business.

XI.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:50 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Mary Lynch