UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2019

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter (UCD) (videoconference), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD) (videoconference), Adriana Galvan (UCLA), Noah Finnegan (UCSC alternate), Trevor Hayton (UCSB) (telephone), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Maia Young (Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs, UCI Merage School of Business), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Consent Calendar

Action: The March 4th minutes were approved.
Action: Today's agenda was approved.

II.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair May described various conversations about the national admissions scandal, noting that the scope of the issue is still in progress and it is possible but also yet uncertain if the Senate will issue a statement on the matter. A proposed policy to provide academic freedom protections for non-Senate appointees, APM 011, has been sent out for systemwide review and the represented librarians are satisfied with how their request for academic freedom has been resolved. Chair May reported on the controversial proposed alliance between UCSF and Dignity Hospital. The Regents voted against raising tuition for non-resident students.

III.   Chair's Updates

A small Senate workgroup involving the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools is working on a statement on the admissions scandal and UCOP has prepared a packet for the legislature on the issue. Council also discussed incarcerated students and the chairs of UCEP, the Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction had a brief discussion about how to proceed. Academic Planning Council has discussed UCEP's memo on student mental health and the memo on training for Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). The committee will meet by videoconference next month.

IV.   California State University (CSU) General Education Task Force Report
- *Barbara Knowlton (UCLA), Former Chair, UCEP*

Former UCEP Chair Knowlton joined UCEP to discuss the CSU General Education (GE) Task Force Report and Recommendations. UCEP members were asked to share with divisional educational policy committees and also provide feedback on the report. The Task Force aimed to identify aspects of GE which are barriers to time to degree and to make the requirements coherent to students. The Task Force recommended a set of core competencies along with courses in cross-cutting values and redefined upper division GE requirements. Senates at several CSU campuses have issued resolutions objecting to the

report citing procedural issues with how the Task Force operated and to the proposed elimination of the American Institutions requirement. It is not yet clear how the CSU Senate will proceed in light of the objections. UCEP members inquired about the double counting of courses passage for elaboration and noted several views that were also considered by the task force.

Discussion: The change in CSU's GE requirements is unlikely to impact UC's Transfer Pathways. One question is whether the CSUs have considered the costs involved with revising their GE requirements and Chair Knowlton agreed that specific proposals with budgets will be needed. It was also noted that substantial curriculum development will be necessary. A UCR History professor concern about the proposed elimination of the American Institution requirement was passed along to UCEP.

V.   Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*

Director Greenspan reported that enrollment of non-resident students is being discussed by the Regents and legislature. A few campuses have exceeded the cap on non-residents and others are close to it. The budget impact of lowering the cap on non-resident enrollment and how the fees from non-resident students are utilized are under consideration.

Discussion: The analyst will arrange for the Centers for Teaching and Learning to update UCEP in May or June on the training for TAs and GSIs project. Implementing a survey for graduate students modeled on the Undergraduate Experience Survey is being explored.

VI.   UCSD Variance Request to Senate Regulation 782

Chair Zanzucchi summarized that the request is to have a threshold for Pass/No Pass courses and to reconcile independent study courses often used for research activity which are also Pass/No Pass. The threshold would be maintained but the independent study courses would be set aside because they are supplemental to research. The UCSD representative reported that the campus is encouraging students to take more independent study courses.

Discussion: It is not clear why students take the independent study courses for Pass/No Pass but, historically, UCSD has not given grades for them. One issue is that it is difficult to use one tool to ensure consistent grading by faculty offering independent study courses. These courses involve multiple students engaged in different activities which makes it difficult to grade each of them on equal footing.

Action: The committee voted unanimously to approve the request for a variance.

VII.   Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)
- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI*
- *Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director, Course Development, ILTI*

Director Kreher explained how the Canvas learning management system (LMS) was selected for ILTI courses. In 2012, the UC Online Education project started with funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and was required to use an open source LMS. Sakai was selected, but problems with Sakai soon prompted campuses to move to other systems. ILTI considered the available alternatives and, working with Procurement, identified Canvas. Canvas allows new applications to be added easily and campuses prioritize security. All CCC campuses utilize Canvas.

In 2017, UCEP received information from three instructors of ILTI courses about how they monitor cheating in their classes. Proctor U utilizes two proctors, one of whom handles identity verification. Students show their identification and faces and the room is scanned to confirm that there are no artifacts or ways to access information. A student must remove any such items from the room and a note about the items is added to the student's file. The proctor watches the students (there are about nine) and the computers are locked down so only the window with the exam can be accessed. The internet protocol address for the computer is using for the exam is recorded. Proctors monitor students for unusual behavior. If there is a violation, the test is not interrupted but the proctor documents the incident and notifies the instructor. The instructor is provided with video of the incident and decides on the next steps.

Examity is an alternative proctoring system being explored by some campuses. Examity does not lock down the browser but the student must submit a picture ID and set up security questions known only to him or her. This system also uses biometrics to capture a student's typing rhythm and pattern and this data is stored for future comparison. When the student takes an exam, if Examity's biometrics identify a different pattern, this is recorded in the student's file and the instructor is notified. The student's home campus is also notified of the violation which is discussed by the instructor and academic advisor. Coordinator Osmundson pointed out that cheating occurs in traditional classroom settings. Several years ago, a group of seniors were involved in an organized cheating ring for in-person courses and were ultimately expelled. Only a few instances of cheating in ILTI courses have been identified and in these cases, the instructors confirmed the violations. The proctoring services are paid for by students and the fee is based on the length of the exam.

Coordinator Osmundson shared the information ILTI sees in the cross campus enrollment system (CCES) including the pending approvals. For face to face courses, approval is essentially automatic but for cross campus online courses there is a delay. Registrars are immediately alerted when a student has enrolled in a cross campus course and they then notify the student's academic advisor but how quickly this happens varies by campus. Once approved, the campus offering the course is notified and the student added to the LMS, and it may be 24 to 48 hours before the student appears on the instructor's roster.

ILTI has recently surveyed 70 academic advisors about the top reasons they drop students and the additional information they would like to see in the CCES. ILTI did not indicate how many surveys have been returned. To date, 85% of the advisors have indicated students are dropped because they are not in good academic standing. The second most common reasons include that students have too many credits for the term or that prerequisites have not been met. Students who are part time and failure to pay fees are additional reasons. To streamline processes, ILTI would like all campuses to use the last term for which there is data to approve enrollment and for good standing to be assumed until proven otherwise.

The advisors recommended the CCES should include the prerequisites, the type of academic credit given by the home campus courses, and reasons students want to take a course. A petition for credit ahead of time, rationale for taking an overload, and additional student information such as financial aid status were not highly ranked. ILTI would like UCEP to consider the delays from a policy perspective that will improve access to online courses. It was noted that students are currently not required to indicate their reason for dropping a course and ILTI plans to work on this aspect of the CCES.

Discussion: Google Classroom is used by many faculty within their classes and ILTI plans to explore this tool for future use. It is unclear if any campuses pay for the proctoring. If special accommodations are needed, students notify the home campus's support services office.

VIII.   Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 636.E

Chair Zanzucchi explained Senate Regulation 636.E and UCSB's concern that a UC student who leaves the University and then takes a course that satisfies the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) elsewhere is not given credit for that course when they re-enroll at the original UC campus. There is a question about the internal consistency for how Entry Level Writing is fulfilled and the current language is unclear. The intention is that, once matriculated, students' writing experience should be at UC. The deadline for comments is May 15th.

Discussion: Members agreed that other sections of SR 636.E are confusing. UCSB's goal is to add the ability to grant exceptions to 636.E. The Regulation as written may suggest that a student is allowed to take a course subsequent to Entry Level Writing at another institution without ever satisfying the ELWR. The first sentence of 636.E should be re-written. A member asked if the Regulation was written to prevent students from satisfying the ELWR with a non-UC course, an issue UCEP may wish to discuss at a later date. The analyst shared that UCSB also has concerns about fairness because a student who transfers to UC having taken an ELWR-satisfying course does receive credit for that course. The number of students impacted by SR 636.E may be small. The Committee on Preparatory Education did not approve the language which qualified the reason for a student's leave and only the language proposed by UCSB is to be considered, but Chair Zanzucchi noted that there are implications based on whether the leave is for academic or non-academic reasons. Members may want to find out how many petitions related to SR 636.E are filed at their campuses.

Action: The committee will consider and vote on this matter in May.

IX.   UCSD Proposal for a 7th College

The lead reader shared a written report on UCSD's proposal for a seventh undergraduate college. The campus has six colleges and the primary reason for the additional college is the anticipated enrollment growth which those colleges will be unable to accommodate. The infrastructure is already in place to add the new college and the proposal has been approved by divisional leadership. UCSD's survey of the GE requirements to identify ways to improve them may be of interest to other campuses.

Discussion: One member inquired why the existing six colleges cannot accommodate the growth the proposed new college will address. Students are able to take courses at any college and each college has a theme. Director Greenspan reported that UCSD has been thoughtfully planning ahead for growth.

Action: The committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal.

X.   Student Course Evaluation Task Force

Chair May would like the chairs of UCEP, CCGA, Faculty Welfare, Academic Personnel and the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity to participate on a task force to study student course evaluations. The Committee on Committees will identify additional members and a graduate student and undergraduate student will be appointed. Issues include inappropriate comments by students as well as the bias and validity of these evaluations. The task force will begin its work in the spring.

Action: The UCD and UCSD representatives have volunteered to participate on the task force.

XI.   UCI Online School of Business Administration - Presentation
  - *Maia Young, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs, UCI Merage School of Business*

Associate Dean Young joined the committee to discuss UCI's initiative to expand its online offerings. The School is committed to access and affordability, and with technology, there is an opportunity to redefine what access is. There is a huge demand for the Business major, with 12k applicants for 200 spots annually. The School graduates 90% of its transfer students in two years. It has also hired experts in online pedagogy and invested in recording studios. For online minor lower division courses, students in the in-person vs online courses report similar rates of satisfaction. Students in the hybrid MBA program get 50% of their content online. The MBA program is comprised of courses that are fully online, courses that are in person, and courses with face-to-face meetings and online modules.

The School has adopted the Online Learning Consortium's Criteria for Excellence in Online Learning and aligned its courses with international accreditation standards. There are tools to allow students to interact with the instructor and one another. Students are able to upload a video question and receive a video response from the instructor. The orientation materials can be revisited as needed. The School has been considering how students will experience the UCI community and one idea is to give them a welcome package including a UCI sweatshirt. Students can take advantage of the existing online Anteater Network which quickly connects them to mentors. To ensure program effectiveness, courses will be designed around learning goals and instructors will receive student learning progression reports.

Discussion: The School does not have survey data or market analysis indicating that students would apply for the online program due to geographic distance or other obstacles. The Associate Dean agreed that online courses are expensive and that learning online is not easy. The courses will be refreshed every three years. A cohort of online instructors will meet monthly to collaborate and share information. There is a commitment to have 50% of ladder rank faculty teaching the courses in the long-term but, at present, the percentage of ladder rank faculty currently teaching undergraduates is small. Students will have access to online office hours and online access to academic advisors.

It was noted that the current degree program is saturated, but rather than increasing its capacity, the School believes access will be improved with the online program. UCI believes it is a leader in online education. The School assumed the new program would be the same degree since the same courses with the same curriculum will be delivered and Associate Dean Young does not think its degree should be different. How students will be admitted is still to be determined but one approach may be for students to select the online program or the on-campus program upon applying. The School does not intend to increase capacity for the new program beyond 200 students per year. Offering an online course is small-scale, in contrast to MOOCs, as a high enrollment course design would negatively impact the instructors' ability to interact with students.

The School is still considering students' rights such as whether they can take a double major or minor degree. An additional factor would be upper-division general education coursework. Ideally the current student fees would be redirected to online proctoring and other services that the students in the new program can access. Ways to improve engagement in research are being explored. UCI is working on responses to multiple questions from its divisional Senate.

XII.   UCI Online School of Business Administration - Next Steps

Vice Chair Serences, one of the lead readers, shared his questions and concerns about the proposal. While there is enthusiasm about the School and the infrastructure exists, critical fundamental questions remain about the future of UC. The details for the fee structure will need to be worked out. It will be hard to avoid creating a two tiered degree and it is unclear if the goal of increased access can be achieved.

Discussion: The admission process has not been worked out and it might not be possible to structure admissions to guarantee preferential access to students citing geographic barriers. The absence of market

research is problematic and it is unclear if the existing program's capacity could be expanded to meet the demand. Rather than a fully online program, a pilot could include offering more online courses to mix and match, potentially allowing students to take all of their courses online. Members are concerned about how much access to other students and resources on campus and UCI seems to have given limited thought to this. The proposed target population is typically unsuccessful in online programs in terms of persistence and retention.

Important factors to consider are that UCI proposes a high quality program which will allow students to meet their educational and professional goals. Letting students decide which program they participate seems student-centered, if admissions guidelines are clear, and it was noted that some students may not initially place much value on face-to-face interaction. An option is to call this a "UC Online Degree" to distinguish it from traditional offerings, which is similar to the idea of an 11th UC campus. Implementing a fully online program could be deemed a threat to UC's reputation and potentially undercut the message that UC offers a distinct type of education well worth the expense. It might be that this program is similar to UC's professional school graduate degrees. The plan is to update Academic Council on UCEP's deliberations at the end of this month.

XIII.   Incarcerated Students

Chair May would like UCEP and CCGA to determine if policies or a set of best practices are needed for students who are incarcerated. Some issues may be similar for students whose circumstances limit their ability to interface with campus, such as the chronically ill or people imprisoned in their home country. A question is what role UC might have working with these students. There are existing campus programs for incarcerated or formerly incarcerated students which can inform the committee's discussions.

Discussion: A Bachelor of Arts specifically for students in the justice system is in the early stages of discussion by some faculty at UCI. The program would not be strictly online and relevant policies, including on residency, and pros and cons are being carefully considered. UCEP might consult with Val Jenness at UCI. Practical issues include access to the internet and how students would participate in research. UCEP might write a statement of principles on the value of this contribution as it relates to rehabilitation and recidivism. Chair Zanzucchi would like UCEP to discuss this further in May.

XIV.   Discontinuation of UC Davis Degree Programs: Textiles and Clothing and Fiber and Polymer Science

UCD's plan to discontinue its degree programs for Textiles and Clothing and Fiber and Polymer Science has been under consideration for several years and brought to the attention of UCEP by the UCD representative in the past. The campus process has been comprehensive and there was a question about whether UCEP's approval would be needed.

Discussion: The campus process was thorough and students will not be impacted by this discontinuation.

Action: The committee voted unanimously in support of the discontinuation.

XV.   New Business

UC Sacramento: A lead reader is needed to review the new UCOP proposal to restructure UC Sacramento. The UCSC representative will be asked to read and report on this proposal.

UCI: A faculty member authored a text book and set up a paywall for student access. Which fees require approval by administrators or the Regents is not clear. Other questions are if the text book is part of the

LMS and if the fee for this book can be covered by student loans. UCI will consider the issues and try to clarify the policies and practices, including which fees students should be required to pay.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:50 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Anne Zanzucchi