

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

## Videoconference Minutes

Monday, April 4, 2022

**Attending:** Mary Lynch, Chair (UCSF), Katheryn Russ, Vice Chair (UCD), Dana Carney (UCB), Katie Stirling-Harris (UCD), Melanie Cocco (UCI), Kathleen Bawn (UCLA), Ryan Baxter (UCM), Bryan Wong (UCR), Padmini Rangamani (UCSD), Dana Rohde (UCSF), David Paul (UCSB), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), John Hausaman (Assistant Vice President, Substantive Change, WASC Senior College and University Commission), Todd Greenspan (Director, IRAP, UCOP), Ethan Savage (Analyst, IRAP), Chris Procello (Analyst, IRAP), Ellen Osmundson (Director, UC Online), Robert Horwitz (Chair, Academic Senate), Susan Cochran (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Consultation with WSCUC**

- *John Hausaman, Assistant Vice President, Substantive Change, WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)*

Chair Lynch welcomed Assistant Vice President (AVP) Hausaman to the videoconference and explained that UCEP and the Academic Senate are looking at online undergraduate degree programs (OUDPs). The AVP was provided with a set of questions related to online courses before the meeting.

- What are the WSCUC definitions for online vs hybrid vs on-campus course content application for undergraduate degree programs?
- Is there a tipping-point percentage of content in an undergraduate degree program that is offered online that generates a WSCUC review?
- How does WSCUC calculate the percentage of online courses within a degree program?
- For hybrid courses, do the number of units offered online count?
- How are electives and GE courses counted since there are many options that a student can take?

WSCUC's definition for distance or online education is largely adapted from federal regulations and is all encompassing and complex. The definition helps to differentiate between correspondence education, where the interaction and momentum in a program is largely student-driven rather than faculty-initiated as it is in distance education programs. WSCUC defines an educational program as a series of courses which carry academic credit and lead to a credential which can be called a degree, diploma, or certificate. The program levels include non-degrees which are commonly referred to as certificates, and then there are five degree levels: associates; bachelors; masters; research doctorates; and professional doctorates.

Programs are classified as either an onsite program or a distance education program, and WSCUC does not have a specific definition for hybrid programs but understands what is meant by hybrid. For classification purposes, an onsite program is one where 50% or more of the total program is completed through onsite instruction and a distance education program is where 50% or more is completed just utilizing the mechanisms laid out in the definition of distance education. The technologies that constitute distance education can be found on page 17 of the [Substantive Change Manual](#). WSCUC requires approval for programs in which 50% or more of the units for completion will be offered through distance education. For an undergraduate program this would include all elements in the program, including electives and general education (GE). The Commission's Substantive Change Committee, comprised of faculty and staff of institutions accredited by WSCUC, reviews major changes for institutions, and typically an institution's first three distance education programs or programs in a new modality are reviewed.

After the first three programs, WSCUC starts looking at the institutional context, the overall health of the institution and other indicators before determining whether or not an institution can expand that modality. This would lead to an institution either being able to request approval to implement new programs or the matter could be referred to the Substantive Change Committee if there have been concerns about implementing distance education or other potentially relevant issues in the accreditation history. Once an institution has been approved to utilize distance education, the future accreditation and special visits after implementation of those programs will have an element for distance education review focused on the delivery of those particular programs. To determine what a distance education course is, the Commission simply applies the same measure of 50% or more of the interaction and delivery of that program involves one or more of technologies outlined in the definition.

- Are lab-application courses considered the same as theory/didactic courses as far as the percentage of content online if the lab application course is on-campus?

WSCUC does not split hairs between lab and theory courses, and by and large the same 50% rule tends to apply in terms of how students will participate in that particular course.

- If an undergraduate degree program offers students either an online option or an on-campus undergraduate degree program option, does WSCUC see these two offerings as two separate programs whereby students should only participate in one option?

Nothing precludes an institution from offering a student the opportunity to attend programs in both modalities. But it will be important for the institution to consider how it will ensure the student has access to student services and that faculty will be supported across the entire student experience so that there is equity across the board. The institution has to make certain that the experience for the student is seamless. WSCUC will look at whether the learning outcomes differ between the two modalities and there should be a justification for any differences. Another important issue is that tracking learning outcomes across both modalities can be challenging, and institutions should be able to disaggregate the data for both modalities a student has attended.

- Additional comments.

AVP Hausaman pointed out that one challenge related to implementation of online degree programs is that institutions do not anticipate the cost of state authorization if the programs will be offered out of state. California does not participate in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA), so if UC is planning to enroll students in other states, authorization is needed for each individual states, which is costly. The institution also needs to figure out the target audience for these particular programs, and the pedagogy and instructional design has been difficult for some institutions to articulate. As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, many institutions have reasoned that they have learned how to offer remote instruction and are ready to offer it full time. However, remote instruction during the pandemic emergency did not necessarily rely on best practices for distance education.

As institutions launch these distance education programs, it is important to determine how faculty, staff and others involved in delivering the programs will be kept up to date with the best practices along with making sure institutional policies are updated. Student support is also an important element for launching these programs, and institutions should consider the infrastructure needed to do a good job with distance education and what the program hours will be. A typical Monday through Friday schedule with some limited weekend hours will not work well for students in these programs and students will need greater access to after-hours services along with timely responses when they need assistance. AVP Hausaman indicated that the slides from today's presentation will be forwarded to the analyst so they can be shared with the committee.

**Discussion:** The AVP clarified that WSCUC will review the first three programs at a single UC campus. If the Commission has approved three online graduate degree programs at a campus, a new online undergraduate degree will get some level of review given that circumstances can differ from the delivery of doctoral or master's level education. This review would look at the overall program structure and how students will be served at the undergraduate level, which might entail an expedited review focused on solving contextual issues. If an institution clearly demonstrates that it has had some success and employs best practices adapted from programs that have been previously approved, it will be a bit easier for WSCUC to review the new undergraduate programs. A review would be called for especially if a graduate level program relies heavily on outsourced services for its delivery, while the undergraduate program will be a new undertaking for the institution using homegrown services to ensure everything is aligned with the Commission's expectations for distance education.

Although WSCUC does not have a specific definition of a hybrid course, a class with more than 50% of the lectures online would be designated as an online class. AVP Hausaman explained that the Commission provides "institutional approval" to utilize distance education if an institution has previously received WSCUC approval to offer at least one program in the distance education modality, and this allows distance education to be utilized in other programs and courses that are below the 50% threshold. Once the use of distance education exceeds the 50% threshold, a substantive change review is required according to federal regulations. The majority of institutions now have some sort of institutional approval to utilize distance education and the higher level of review becomes necessary when a program crosses the 50% threshold.

It would be difficult for students in some programs at UCSC to take more than 50% of their classes online especially when it comes to electives. An institution that has a lot of programming available through distance education could unintentionally create a situation where a student is able to complete more than half of that program through distance education, and WSCUC would work with the institution to get that particular program approved. UCI is in the process of calculating how many online courses are available and including electives appears to tip programs over the 50% threshold. Even though students are only required to take five electives, the campus might want to review the data for graduates to determine if any students actually crossed the 50% threshold.

A member asked how the 50% threshold is calculated for students who transfer to UC after two years elsewhere, and the AVP indicated that WSCUC would look at what UC is offering. If UC gives the transfer student the ability to complete more than half of their program online, this would be considered a distance education program, and any transfer credits would not necessarily factor into the equation of what UC is offering.

If a degree has GE requirements and GE classes are a mixture of online and in person, it would be considered a distance education program if a student is able to complete 50% or more of those GE classes through distance education. WSCUC defines a program as all courses that can be counted towards graduation or all credits that are required toward graduation, as opposed to all credits required just for the major program. The program definition is all inclusive for what the institution is offering or what is required for a student to graduate with a particular credential or degree, including GE or electives. The ability for students to take cross-campus courses would not be considered in the context of what is available in the whole system but on a campus by campus basis and in terms of how what is available is applied to a particular student's degree.

The State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement is a consortium that institutions apply to join and Director Greenspan explained that UC's administration has tried to get California to join SARA for the past 10 years. There are politics involved and the state's consumer organizations assert that SARA does not provide sufficient consumer protection from predatory for-profit colleges. Director Greenspan shared that California does have an agreement with Maryland that permits UC to enroll students from that state. Executive Director Baxter posited that most UC campuses should probably have institutional

approval for distance education at this point, but it would be good to have confirmation of which campuses actually do have that general approval. AVP Hausaman shared that WSCUC's annual conference begins April 20 and there is an in-person workshop the morning of April 20 on developing substantive change proposals which will include a walk-through of the program template and the review requirements that encompass those types of reviews. Chair Lynch and UCEP members thanked AVP Hausaman for his presentation.

## **II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Robert Horwitz, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Susan Cochran, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- In March, the Regents Health Services Committee heard from Vice President Byington about UC's affiliation contracts with Dignity, Adventist, and other religious hospital groups, and the Senate is trying to ensure that UC faculty and trainees understand how to file whistleblower complaints.
- The search for Provost Brown's replacement will soon begin, while the search for Vice Provost Carlson's replacement is on hold. The search for a new Senate Executive Director should conclude in the next couple of weeks.
- Academic Council met on Wednesday and Jim Steintrager, professor of English Comparative Literature in European Languages at UC Irvine, was nominated to be the next Academic Senate vice chair and the Assembly will vote to make this official.
- Council's Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) Task Force submitted the report on the first phase of its work to Council. The report emphasizes that the requirement is an essential and foundational tool for student success as well as an instrument of equity for a student population that has become far more diverse in the decades since the ELWR was established.
- Two controversial topics were discussed at Council: the proposed Senate Regulation 478, the Ethnic Studies requirement and the issue of political statements on department websites.
- Council sent President Drake two memos in response to the calls for mandatory recording of classes and teaching in dual modalities, and Chair Horwitz highlighted the Senate's position on these issues in remarks to the Regents in March.
- The workgroup on Mitigating the Impact of COVID-19 on faculty is finalizing its second report, which Chair Horwitz will discuss with the Regents in May. It is critical that the workgroup's two reports are disseminated to all faculty.
- Vice Chair Cochran is updating last year's survey of faculty about their experience during the pandemic. Chair Horwitz hopes committee members will encourage their faculty colleagues to complete the survey.
- Assembly will hopefully vote on the climate memorial on April 14<sup>th</sup>.
- The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) was charged by Assembly Bill 928 to create a singular general education transfer pathway from California Community Colleges (CCCs) to the California State University and UC systems. A special committee of ICAS has devised a plan which should be approved next week.

## **III. Chair's Updates and Announcements**

Chair Lynch did not have any updates.

## **IV. Consent Calendar**

1. UCEP's March 7, 2022 videoconference minutes were approved.
2. The proposal to change the University of California, Berkeley's Graduate School of Education to the Berkeley School of Education was approved.

## **V. Senate Regulation Loophole Related to Online Courses and Degrees**

Vice Chair Russ shared a draft of five options for addressing the loophole currently in systemwide Senate Regulations related to online courses and degrees. The initial idea was to focus on what is

available to complete major requirements but during last month's UCEP meeting, members suggested looking at the total credits that students are taking or can take. One way to resolve the loophole based on total credits as members suggested is to revise Senate Regulation (SR) 610 or expand this regulation to refer to the location of students taking a certain number of courses. Another option is to introduce a new regulation setting a cap on the fraction of total credits students can apply towards graduation taken in courses presented in a virtual or distance education format.

There are pros and cons to each of these approaches. Specifying the geographic location or onsite component would probably be the most straightforward policy for students to understand and to put into practice, but there are practical implications related to the availability of student housing (students still have to pay high housing costs on some campuses). Proposing to revise the definition of residency in SR 610 to accomplish this after it was revised just last year could be confusing. An addition to expand the requirement might be more clear.

Specifying a certain percentage of course credit that must be taken in-person would give students flexibility but the campus would need to plan the staffing for on-site versus distance education/remote courses within the major. In addition, as more online courses are available, it may eventually become difficult for students and advisors to track the timing of online versus in-person courses that are expected as they make a course plan for degree completion. This could generate delays in time-to-degree.

The third option is to propose a new regulation defining an online undergraduate degree program (OUDP) in terms of the fraction of courses in a major or offered at the department level in a virtual format. It is important to keep in mind that the proliferation of online cross campus enrollments means departments do not have full control over the online courses that are available and can only control what they offer. Based on this morning's presentation from the Assistant Vice President at WSCUC, Vice Chair Russ wondered if the focus of the new regulation should not be on what a department offers but instead on what is offered by specific units or specific campuses. Chair Lynch thanked Vice Chair Russ for working on this important matter. The chair is concerned that UCEP does not have any data about the potential for the loophole being used and that the attempt to close it could actually increase the risk that it is taken advantage of. Chair Lynch also worried that the new policy will place a substantial burden on undergraduate advisors.

**Discussion:** A member expressed support for the third option and using units instead of courses as the measure. It was suggested that the definition of an online course should be consistent with WSCUC's threshold and that it is preferable for all campuses to share the same definition, so the regulation might describe the threshold as a minimum of 50% of in-person courses which will help avoid the perception that UCEP does not value online courses. One question is how the third option will work if a department has the same class taught online and in-person with the same course number and might be taught in both modalities during the same term. This might be resolved by establishing a ceiling on the number of course offerings or units a department could offer online in a given term.

Analyst Savage commented that enforcing policy is not a burden to academic advisors and that it is more problematic when the rules are ambiguous. It does not seem necessary to differentiate between upper and lower division courses, especially given that transfer students from the CCCs may have only taken online courses before enrolling at UC which is not indicated on transcripts. Vice Chair Russ remarked that there seemed to be consensus on the third option based on the percentage of courses offered rather than the percentage of courses available and using the fraction of course units offered rather than the number of courses offered. The proposed next step is to submit the memo to Council requesting feedback on the third option but also laying out the other approaches, and ask for guidance about whether the policy should be more student-centered and about the need for a new degree designation for online degrees.

**Action:** Chair Lynch asked Vice Chair Russ to update the draft memo based on the input provided today, with particular attention to option three, and share it with the committee again to solicit input before it is submitted for the Council agenda at the end of this month.

## **VI. Responses to Critical Questions about Online Undergraduate Degree Programs and Feedback on Draft Principles**

Chair Lynch and Vice Chair Russ met with Senate leadership last week to discuss the responses from divisional Undergraduate Councils and Committees on Educational Policy (UGC/CEPs) to the questions about OUDPs. Vice Chair Russ has volunteered to prepare a white paper that pulls together the work that has been done on this issue dating back to the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force. Chair Lynch has begun a cursory thematic analysis of the feedback and will incorporate the comments from UCB and UCSD submitted today. The plan is to present the analysis to Council later this month. The themes in the comments from the UGC/CEPs include: the quality of a UC education; the student experience; the content that might align best with an OUDP; the need for guidance from UCEP or the Compendium; the process of teaching and learning; system issues; and general comments.

Issues related to supporting the quality and excellence of education involve determining the faculty to student ratios in an OUDP and making certain that applicants understand the similarities and differences between an OUDP and the on campus program. The campus committees' limited feedback about content focused on whether specific, targeted content will align better with a particular method of delivery than generalized content. Chair Lynch thinks the questions related to content will be deliberated at the campus level because UCEP probably does not want to make decisions about which disciplines can be taught online. With respect to guidance, the Compendium does not address OUDPs, and rather than trying to fit these programs into existing policies, the Compendium should be revised to explicitly address OUDPs.

**Discussion:** UCSD's divisional committee has provided some feedback but plans to involve other divisional Senate committees including Faculty Welfare, Graduate Council, and Equity and Diversity in consideration of the questions about OUDPs. The divisions should look forward rather than thinking about the experience of the pandemic. Some majors are better set up to be successful online programs while others are intrinsically disadvantaged, and this leads to concerns about there being even higher demand for popular majors while other majors that are not promoted are left behind. The feedback from UCB is consistent with everything in Chair Lynch's analysis.

Chair Lynch remarked that students may need more preparation to participate in online learning and technology will be needed to support students who have challenges accessing course content, so funding for infrastructure has to be provided. Questions about the structure of OUDPs include what the guidelines for class sizes will be and if online classes will be permitted to have hundreds of students. Instructional designers assist faculty with presenting the course content in ways that make it easier for students to participate in the online classroom. Some of the system issues to be debated are related to the fees for OUDPs; whether students will have access to campus-based services; if faculty teaching in OUDPs will receive the same credit as faculty teaching in on campus programs; and what kind of support will be available to faculty. In addition, there are concerns about the potential to over subscribe the course content from one campus at the expense of another and how programs can be delivered in ways that do not result in more competition between campuses. Chair Lynch also stressed that the myth that online programs lead to cost savings has to be dispelled.

The committee's discussion touched on a variety of other questions and concerns including:

- Participation of students in different time zones, especially international students
- Guidelines and expectations about who guest speakers can be
- The administration views OUDPs as an opportunity to increase enrollment and bring in revenue
- Students will think of OUDPs as on-demand education
- The equitable allocation of resources within and across campuses

- Graduate student instructors who teach in OUDPs may not receive adequate support in their own education or research
- The distribution of teaching loads especially if a course is cross-listed between departments
- How parents will view paying the same amount for an OUDP as for an on campus program
- There will be pressure to enroll students in online courses in excess of an acceptable faculty to student ratio
- Quality should be measured in multiple ways beyond class size or faculty to student ratio, such as the percentage of students placed in highly rated graduate degree programs or who have gotten great jobs
- The potential for competition between campuses for the strongest or most qualified students
- The amount of faculty time required to develop online courses will jeopardize the research enterprise
- In the next several years, it is possible that UCD, UCI, and UCSD will propose OUDPs and UCSC will definitely propose the Creative Technologies OUDP
- Minors in Education and Native American Studies are being developed at UCD

Chair Lynch will update the analysis based on the discussion today and members are asked to submit any additional comments from their local committees. The questions about system issues should be referred to the Academic Planning Council since this group develops new policies.

## **VII. Review of Natural Reserve System California Ecology and Conservation (NRS CEC) Systemwide Field Course**

- *Melanie Cocco, Reviewer*
- *David Paul, Reviewer*

The review of the NRS CEC field course was the first systemwide course to be reviewed by UCEP. The course was approved by UCEP in 2015 and has been offered 20 times since then, and the course has two instructors, a graduate student teaching assistant (TA), and two course assistants. This program, which is unique in the nation, allows students to access multiple natural reserves in California. Students spend almost 50 days in the field with the instructors and receive 19 units for the 10 week program. Grades are based on presentations about the literature and their research, individual and group papers, and participation. The goal is to admit three students from each campus and a waitlist is used to balance the admissions when there are not enough students to meet this objective. Overall, 1,020 students have applied since 2015 with more than 500 admitted from a good distribution of UC campuses. One half of the \$3,800 course fee goes to UCSC's Education Abroad Program for administrative costs and the rest covers food, lodging, transportation, and research equipment. The program is committed to securing additional scholarship funding since this course can be expensive for students who have work-study.

The information provided for the review included numerical data from the student evaluations given before the course begins and after it ends and the scores are high. The NRS did not provide the narrative from the course evaluations and the reviewers recommend that narrative feedback should explicitly be requested for future course and program reviews. The reviewers agree that the NRS CEC is a great course and their report describes its many strengths as well as weaknesses which include lack of ethnic diversity among the students. The gender breakdown of participating students is not tracked and, since women are well-represented in Ecology, the NRS is missing the opportunity to highlight this selling point. Another weakness is the CEC has to be careful to not violate the Unit 18 and TA contracts.

A significant issue is related to incidents of sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) in the field. In response to a request from the reviewers for the policies for SVSH, the course administrators indicated that they follow UC policy. However, because this course places students in such unique situations, the reviewers recommend that more proactive procedures should be in place. The report cites a 2014 study that revealed that 64% of field researchers surveyed experienced harassment and 20% experienced sexual assault. Most of the 666 scientists surveyed did not file a complaint, and of the less than 20% who did report it, only 20% of that group felt the problem had been addressed properly. The reviewers

recommend that it is imperative that the course leadership team develop clear guidelines for dealing with SVSH incidents.

The reviewers remarked that the review process was rigorous and they were impressed with the course overall. The NRS CEC should address the SVSH policies, but there are no other major concerns about the course continuing.

**Discussion:** Chair Lynch thanked the reviewers for their excellent work and report. It is not entirely clear if student financial aid can be used for the course fee. The reviewers were not satisfied with the course administrators' response to the question about the SVSH policies. The TAs and instructors receive Title IX SVSH training but there do not appear to be policies on what happens when an event occurs. It is recommended that UCEP ask Council to send its report to the Title IX Officer at the Office of the President. Chair Lynch asked the committee to vote on sending the report to Council.

**Action:** The committee voted unanimously to endorse the report and submit it to Academic Council with a request that it be transmitted to the Provost's Office and the Title IX Office.

### **VIII. Consultation with Institutional Research and Academic Planning**

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

The committee created to allocate the \$5.1M in one-time funding that remained from the 2019 budget act for degree or certificate completion programs through UC Extension reviewed a joint proposal from UCR and UCSD. Analyst Savage is in the process of collecting the committee's written feedback, and UCR and UCSD will be asked to make a few amendments to the proposal. The analyst thanked Chair Lynch and the UCR and UCI representatives for their work on this effort. The first meeting of the Academic Planning Council's workgroup on the future of undergraduate education will be on May 4<sup>th</sup>. The workgroup is likely to consider some of the same questions UCEP has been discussing.

Director Greenspan indicated that the legislature is again pushing UC to increase enrollment and the governor's budget proposes funding growth by 6k students in 2023. The Regents presented their budget which proposes growth by about 2,500 next year, however, there are 4k to 5k students who have not been funded. UC is asserting that the state should give UC money for the unfunded students, but the legislature is resistant. During the most recent hearings, at least one legislator acknowledged that the state should provide this funding but there is an ongoing negotiation with the state over how fast UC can grow, and the substitution of California residents for non-resident students is another factor in these debates. UC has indicated that the marginal cost of instruction, the formula based on student to faculty ratio, will provide insufficient resources and support for any dramatic growth.

### **IX. Consultation with UC Online**

- *Ellen Osmundson, Program Director, UC Online*

Director Osmundson explained that Chair Lynch asked for information about the UC Online courses being offered this spring; anticipated enrollment; course completion rates; and the program's plans for the future. The information pertains to courses for the spring 2022 quarter that have been approved as fully online (not remote). There are more than 150 courses supported by UC Online open only to students at the home campus and there are 73 courses open through the cross-campus enrollment system (CCES), 10 of which are new. UC Online asks faculty and departments about opening a CCE course on a term-by-term basis and to indicate how many seats will be open to the home campus students and to cross-campus students. For the 73 courses open for CCE, there are over 2,500 seats available; on average there are 35 seats per course with a range of five to 200 seats.

UC Online maintains a waiting list and when a course is full, the faculty and departments are asked if they will open up additional seats to CCE. This request might be refused because of instructor workload or because students needed to be in the course on the first day of instruction. As of today (Monday, April 4, 2022), there were currently 2,070 enrollments in the 73 courses open for CCE; of those just over 50%



of students were approved to take the courses. The enrollment processes vary across the campuses and can sometimes take a few months for the enrollment to be approved. On April 4<sup>th</sup>, the beginning of the second week of instruction, there are currently 164 students in the pending approval category. As of right now, 823 (40%) of the concurrent enrollments have been dropped by their home campus due to ineligibility or because students themselves dropped the course for a variety of reasons. The vast majority of the drops happen before instruction begins. UC Online data does not reflect who actually starts and completes the courses. Data will be provided to UCEP at the conclusion of the spring 2022 quarter on the course completion rates.

Since 2013, over 543,627 students have enrolled in and completed UC Online courses including 537,141 at the host campuses (not open to CCES) and 6,486 cross-campus enrollments. Director Osmundson indicated that there has been a recent increase in CCE. UCI has the most fully online courses and the highest enrollments (171,766), followed by UCR (133,489), with enrollments at the other undergraduate campuses below 50k. There were 6,440 total enrollments (home campus and CCE) in 2013; 100k students were enrolled in 2020-2021, but there was a 4% decrease in 2021, possibly because of all the remote courses that were offered on campuses due to the pandemic.

Director Osmundson explained the data on total (gross) enrollment versus completed courses. UC Online collects data at the census date which is when courses are closed to CCE. The data shows total enrollments but not the number of students who were actually approved for enrollment. UC Online will need to analyze the data to determine the completion rate at the conclusion of the term. In 2013-2014, 99 of the 196 students who were approved completed the courses; in 2014-2015, 193 of the 196 approved students completed the courses; and 2,009 of the 2,100 approved students completed the courses in 2020-2021. When the director meets with UCEP in June, the data from the census date to the end of the course will be shared.

In the next three years, UC Online plans to continue to grow the campus enrollments and continue to enlarge the catalog through a series of approaches to developing and offering fully online courses. In 2022-2023, UC Online will focus on digital inclusion and providing funds to support diversity, equity, access, and inclusion through a series of funding mechanisms.

**Discussion:** UCEP does not have data on the drop rates for in-person courses. Asked how enrollment has been supported by UC Online funding, Director Osmundson explained that there is funding for developing and offering courses. In addition, since UC does not have a mechanism for moving tuition from one campus to another for the teaching of students, UC Online provides funds for teaching cross campus students. Finally, UC Online has supported the development of the cross-campus enrollment system. Each campus received funding to build their cross campus process. Director Osmundson speculated that UCI has the largest number of online courses in the system because there has been an interest in online education at that campus, and the UCR administration has intentionally analyzed how to grow enrollments and serve students who may be working or caring for family and commuting to campus. Chair Lynch commented that UCEP is grappling with the idea of online undergraduate degree programs and part of the equation is to have a better understanding of the contribution of courses through UC Online. UCEP members agree that more information is needed about enrollments and completion.

## **X. Expansion of Credit by Examination**

Chair Lynch reminded the committee that during the March meeting, UCEP was joined by Director Monica Lin from Admissions at UCOP for a discussion about expanding the use of credit by examination to include additional international standardized examinations. Members are asked to vote on whether the committee should explore expanding credit by exam to include additional standardized exams.

**Discussion:** A member asked for clarification about whether UCEP is being asked to consider specific exams or to give blanket approval for additional standardized exams to be accepted for credit by examination. The analyst pointed out that Director Lin asked if UCEP would be willing to work with the

administration to develop a policy regarding the feasibility of expanding opportunities for credit by examination or, alternatively, a statement about why credit by examination should not be expanded beyond the current exams. Only after a policy is established would the committee start to entertain proposals from the exam providers.

**Action:** The motion to engage in exploratory processes with the appropriate UCOP office to determine whether a new policy allowing the expansion of the range of standardized exams accepted for academic credit will be feasible was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

#### **XI. Member Items/New Business**

There was no New Business.

#### **XII. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2:45 PM  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: Mary Lynch