

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2018

Attending: Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, (UCD), Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair, (UCM), David Paul (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Hugh Roberts (UCI), John Serences (UCSD), Ken Uneo (UCB), Jennifer Perkins (UCSF) (videoconference), Daniel Potter (UCD) (videoconference), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Barbara Knowlton (Immediate Past Chair, UCEP), Michael Brown (Provost), 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. California State University General Education Task Force

- *Barbara Knowlton, Immediate Past Chair, UCEP*

The California State University's (CSU) General Education Task Force was established a year ago and this is the first time their General Education (GE) program has been reviewed in many years. Discussions in the past year have focused on big picture issues including how the GE is constructed and how to make it more relevant to students. The overarching model for GE has been considered. Most CSU campuses have a cafeteria plan comprised of five areas and students must take one course in each area. Campuses also have a pathway model which restricts students to taking courses within a specific theme. The second issue has been the American Institutions requirement and this is one area where CSU is very different from UC. Except for UCSB, UC students who satisfy the a-g requirements fulfill the American Institution requirement, so few students have to take this course - unlike at the CSUs. Another issue is upper division GE, and a question is whether GE should be completed in the lower division. If all GE is at the lower division, the transfer students would not have GE in the upper division and it is not clear if this is good or bad. The need for students to be prepared for work has been mentioned frequently. Chair Knowlton will report today's conversation with the Task Force.

Discussion: UCSC's representative believes that the "cafeteria model" is fine. Requiring students to select a theme may present disadvantages. At UCSC, students who do not want to take the American Institution course are given the exam, but it is not clear how many students eventually need to take the course. Students who transfer to UCSC do not have GE in the upper division. At UCSB, the exam used to satisfy the American Institution is not well regarded.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The March minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

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

Chair White explained that the Master Plan requires UC to admit a specific number of transfer students, and Provost Brown has convened a Transfer Task Force. There is a new sense of urgency around improving access to transfer students. Anecdotal stories about students who are not admitted into UC influence what legislators demand from UC.

The University has some concerns about how well prepared the California Community College (CCC) students will be, particularly for some challenging majors. UC wants to incentivize and reward preparation. Chair White commented that the Transfer Agreement Guarantees (TAG) are successful as demonstrated by the number of students who enroll in UC after using the TAG program. Some majors, do not easily lend themselves to an existing Transfer Pathway. In addition, what suits one campus may not suit another, so mechanisms for revising or expanding the twenty-one pathways are needed. The President has presented the Senate with a challenge and a specific timeline for work on establishing a transfer process that will guarantee appropriately prepared transfer students a place in the UC system. The president has asked for a plan that can be explained to students entering a CCC in fall 2019.

Discussion: Setting a minimum Grade Point Average (GPA) could result in improved GPAs for CCC students. A concern is that a CCC student who does not have the required GPA will decide against applying to a UC without understanding that admission based on holistic review involves more than just a GPA. A GPA requirement may also have the unintended consequence of decreasing diversity. Director Greenspan pointed out that UC has significantly increased the number of transfer students it has enrolled.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Michael Brown, Provost*

Chair Caswell-Chen welcomed Provost Brown to the meeting. The Transfer Pathways are making a difference, as about a third of CCC students who use them are admitted to UC. The requirements for applying to the same majors at different UC campuses can seem confusing, because are implemented somewhat differently on the campuses, requirements may appear complex and different. Part of the value of the guarantee is the message it sends to students about how they should prepare and to the legislature about the resources that UC needs to uphold the guarantee. Provost Brown is concerned about the impact of the guarantee on diversity. It is hoped that the Transfer Task Force he is co-chairing with Immediate Past Senate Chair Jim Chalfant generates creative ideas for UC. It is important for UCEP to remember the issue of access. UC has to make a better case about its value to California. The provost mentioned that the Senate's "Cuts" and "Futures" reports effectively demonstrated a long-term decrease in state funding.

Discussion: Chair Caswell-Chen commented that legislators need to hear both success stories and stories from UC students that have seen issues due to the effective declines in state funding. Some strategies the Senate might propose to improve transfer into UC could be implemented quickly and efficiently. Vice Chair May remarked that the Senate needs to keep prioritize its work on issues for transfer students.

V. Training for Teaching Assistants/Graduate Student Instructors

It would be difficult for UCEP to delineate simple guidelines for training Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). UCEP's graduate student representative proposes that the job descriptions for Teaching Professors/Lecturers with Security of Employment could include a requirement to train the TAs and GSIs.

Discussion: Most campuses have some form of required training for TAs, but it does vary in terms of what is offered and apparently in whether training requirements are enforced. At one campus, the administrators leave it to the departments to oversee training for TAs and GSIs. A member suggested that it would be valuable to have information about the effectiveness of the training that is provided. The expectations of TAs and GSAs should be clarified for faculty. It was noted that some "mandatory" training is not always provided. Director Greenspan reported that Academic Planning is involved with a systemwide meeting on TA/GSA training being planned for June.

Action: Chair Caswell-Chen will summarize the information members gathered about training at the campuses.

VI. Posthumous Degree Policies

The committee is asked if there should be a systemwide policy for granting posthumous degrees. The requirements for award of a posthumous degree varies across the campuses, with some campuses mandating that a candidate be within one quarter or semester of meeting graduation requirements, while others allow that a candidate could be within two quarters of meeting requirements.

Discussion: UCSC's representative would support a systemwide policy on posthumous degrees but does not have a recommendation about how close to graduation a student should be for consideration. Each campus might be asked to consider if a systemwide policy is desirable or necessary. A member asked if there are ramifications to granting these degrees and the analyst will consult with the Office of General Counsel. Members agreed that campuses should have some latitude for flexibility. UCEP might want to review policies for posthumous degrees at Comparison 8 institutions.

VII. UC Transfer Task Force and Issues for Transfer Students

The Task Force is discussing piloting Associate of Science degrees for CCC transfer students, modeled after the transfer strategy from CCC to the CSUs. Improving visibility and efficacy of transfer pathways in this way might help diversify the transfer students in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math fields. Another proposal is a systemwide transfer guarantee which, in principal, is a referral pool for transfer students and there would be a baseline GPA. The Senate leadership will ask UCEP and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools for ideas and feedback about priorities related to these proposals. When reviewing the proposals, members might consider campus-related issues

VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

This week Director Greenspan will join a call with the undergraduate deans about advising issues. Campuses have been asked for their 2019-2020 enrollment plans. Campuses anticipate that growth might be from 1,500 and 2,500 undergraduates overall, and the incoming freshmen class is expected to be large. Regent Park had a number of questions about UC Extension and how Extension might help with issues such as overcrowding and alternative ways to award degrees. UC Merced Extension has prepared a concept paper for an undergraduate degree which might involve the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative in some ways. The Regents will have a discussion about UC quality that will touch on the faculty to student ratio.

IX. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

- *Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Coordinator*

Coordinator Osmundson was welcomed to the committee. The Coordinator provided some background information about the Initiative for the UCEP members. The ILTI catalog has over three hundred courses and a system for cross-campus enrollment has been built. Information about each online course is circulated to the campuses who are asked what kind of credit they would grant for the course. ILTI has identified certain requirements at the campuses that might make it difficult for students to take courses across UC campuses, and Coordinator Osmundson and committee members will endeavor to clarify if the requirements are based on policy or practice.

Discussion: Chair Caswell-Chen explained his effort last year to collect feedback concerning the nine possible barriers, noting that the nine barriers were not discussed as actual policies versus campus practice, and that it was an information gathering exercise rather than a process intended to lead to recommendations. It is necessary at this point to identify whether the possible barriers are policies or simply campus practices. The Coordinator indicated that the information ILTI collected several years ago is now out of date, and specific policies regarding the possible barriers have not been identified.

The Davis campus does allow incoming students to utilize an online Irvine course relative to the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), and that seems to benefit the students. The Coordinator indicated that in some instances, allowing petitions for cross-campus enrollment on a case-by-case basis was time-consuming. Coordinator Osmundson reported that of the approximately five thousand students who have tried to enroll in ITLI courses this year, about fifteen hundred students have been allowed take a cross-campus course. It was not clear how many incoming freshman were among those that experienced difficulty in enrolling. Students' enrollment must be approved by advisors and Registrars. The denied enrollment numbers are higher for fall than they are for winter and spring, but the numbers are influenced by the number of courses offered. The Coordinator noted that UCSB does not provide credit for a cross-campus course until the course is completed and students then petition for credit.

UCEP members will ask their local committees if they would agree to a trial or pilot to allow petition for cross-campus enrollment for incoming freshman. Four of the nine possible barriers that have been mentioned are related to the need for students to have a certain number of credits prior to enrolling in cross-campus courses. The analyst indicated that UCEP might be able to send letters to the campuses recommending changing practices. In the case of policies, UCEP may have to submit a memo with recommendations to Academic Council and a process potentially involving a systemwide review may be required.

Action: Coordinator Osmundson will revise the barrier matrix to identify whether the possible barriers arise from specific policies or campus practices.

X. ILTI Steering Committee

The leadership of the Senate and of UCEP have agreed that the ILTI Coordinator should be invited to serve as a consultant to UCEP. The ILTI Steering Committee includes the Senate Chair and Vice Chair, several ILTI staff and the provost but not a UCEP representative. The committee analyst has just recently been invited to sit in on the Steering Committee meetings. Chair Caswell-Chen asked if the committee should ask Provost Brown to have a UCEP representative added to the Steering Committee.

Discussion: The analyst explained that inviting the ILTI Coordinator to serve as a consultant will improve the lines of communication with the ILTI Steering Committee. It was noted that the Steering Committee meets every other Tuesday from 4 to 6 p.m. which makes it difficult for a UCEP member to participate. The members decided against asking to have a representative on the Steering Committee. Members discussed the ongoing effort to determine if the barriers to cross campus enrollment identified by ILTI are policies or just campus practices. Problems related to proctoring and platforms were mentioned. Coordinator Osmundson was pleased to learn she will formally become a consultant to UCEP.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Ed Caswell-Chen