UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Minutes of Videoconference
Monday, April 7, 2025

In attendance: Rachael Goodhue, Chair (UCD), Catherine Sugar, Vice Chair (UCLA), Oscar Dubon (UCB Alternate), David Kyle (UCD), Allison Perlman (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Sara Lapan (UCR), Carrie Wastal (UCSD), Angel Kuo (UCSF), Jason Duque (UCSB), Tanner WouldGo (UCSC), Isabelle Escobar (Undergraduate Student Representative), Tanya Golash-Boza (Executive Director, UC Washington Center), Jimmy Ellis (Director, Academic and Student Services, UC Washington Center), Carmen Corona (Director, Academic Planning & Policy, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Ethan Savage, (Academic Planning & Policy Analyst, IRAP), Steven W. Cheung (Chair, Academic Senate), Ahmet Palazoglu (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Consultation with UC Washington Center (UCDC) Representatives
Tanya Golash-Boza, Executive Director & Jimmy Ellis, Director, Academic and Student Services, UC Washington Center

UCDC representatives joined the videoconference to report on the overall status of the program Executive Director Golash-Boza reported that enrollment it has remained steady so far in 2025. UCDC is working to increase the number of students who have access to the Center through outreach and by creating scholarships and new programs. Currently there are 220 students in the building, which is the most in the program in some time, and enrollment is expected to increase in the fall. The main challenge is related to internships. In fall 2024, 9% of UCDC's students were in various Federal agencies and 3% were in the White House but the percentage at these sites is down to zero at present and it is unclear if this will change. The agencies are very understaffed and are not in a position to figure out how to move forward and hire interns. On the other hand, the number of internships in Congress is growing. Of the 180 students from the quarter campuses who arrived in Washington, D.C. two weeks earlier only 14 have not found internships.

Although UCDC does not actually place students into internships, the students receive significant support. The program maintains a database of approximately 800 different internships which students search. A manager of internship services and three internship advisors provide hands-on support which exceeds what they would normally get on campus from an advisor since the staff to student ratio is much lower than on campus. New internships are added to the database every term, and UCDC builds relationships with new sites. About one-quarter of students arrive in D.C. with a solid lead on a placement or with an internship already secured. The three-quarters of students who need help finding an internship receive more support as the search matures, with advisors aggressively networking on their behalf. The semester campuses require their students to take two classes to meet their credit hour requirements and students from the quarter campuses are expected to take one class and while they are discouraged from taking two classes this is sometimes allowed. The curriculum proposal submitted to UCEP aims to regularize it, so students get the same amount of credit hours for their internships and every student takes one class. The

vision is that every student enrolls in one class and dedicate 24 to 32 hours to their internship for which they are awarded standardized credit.

Discussion: One question is if most of the internships are supposed to address the multiple program learning objectives (PLOs) UCDC has identified or if there is a focus on a specific objective. Executive Director Golash-Boza explained that the PLOs are primarily for UCDC's classes but sometimes an internship is related to an objective. Instructors are to draw from one or more of the PLOs to guide their course learning outcomes, all of which is connected to the kinds of courses UCDC wants to offer and the educational experience students can expect. UCDC had to think about how curriculum is structured when students are only taking one class which is different from the approach a department would take. Students who have internships with members of congress are reportedly extremely busy as these offices are bombarded with calls and letters from constituents. Other students have described the research they are conducting related to the new tariffs. Once agencies have the infrastructure in place, UCDC will make it as easy as possible for interns to be hired.

II.   Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership
Steven W. Cheung, Chair & Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Academic Council met on April 2 and nominated the former UCSB division chair to the vice chair-elect position for the 2025-2026 academic year, and Academic Assembly will vote on the nomination on April 23. Council unanimously approved the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw (SB) 145.B.7. During this Council meeting, Chair Cheung underscored the importance of confidentiality regarding the information exchanged during executive session. A member of Council recently disclosed confidential information communicated by President Drake before the recent Regents meeting to several news outlets. The faculty discipline workgroup has completed its first report on several issues of interest to the Regents related to privilege and tenure. The workgroup recommends that local processes should be followed, but any cases that take longer to be heard should be referred to a systemwide network. Chair Cheung explained the other approaches considered by the workgroup and indicated that the report has been transmitted to Provost Newman. The original charge of this workgroup, to address concurrent faculty misconduct and advancement cases, is postponed to the fall.

During the March Regents meeting, President Drake announced the hiring freeze effective March 31 and implementation details are being distributed to the divisions. All employment offers made on or before March 31 will be honored with some limited exceptions to be determined by campus leadership. The Regents also directed the Office of the President (UCOP) to eliminate the use of diversity statements in the hiring of faculty and staff, although this will not change Academic Personnel Manual policy 210. The systemwide Senate is establishing a task force called the UC Adaptation to Disruptions Initiative to address critical institutional concerns: restructuring academic programs; resizing programs and the workforce; recalibrating growth objectives; and realigning funding sources with activities. A draft charge has been shared with Council and the task force will be chaired by Vice Chair Palazoglu. The first deliverable, due in mid- June, will address the most pressing concerns. UCSF memorials petitioning for extension of Senate membership to faculty with greater than 50% effort in the health sciences, clinical, and adjunct professor series were voted down by the other nine divisions.

Chair Cheung has been advised by the search firm lead that a new president will be announced by mid-May and Provost Newman has made an offer to a candidate for the new vice provost for academic affairs and programs. Regents Chair Riley and President Drake will meet with candidates for the UCSB chancellor position, and the president is committed to seating this new chancellor before June 2025. Chair Cheung will review the list of candidates for the UCR chancellor position which should also be filled by June. The total remuneration and benefits and employee engagement study workgroups convened by systemwide Human Resources are finally moving forward and each will include Senate faculty representatives.

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) held its annual Legislative Day on April 1 at the UC Student and Policy Center in Sacramento. Over the course of the day, ICAS met with various State legislators to share each other's priorities. The visitors made three main points: there is strong support to minimize the governor's scheduled budget cut to UC; there is continued interest in forming a coordinating body to oversee the three segments due to a prevailing view that the segments do not work well together; and that ICAS should produce annual reports to highlight intersegmental achievements. Republican State Senator Ochoa Bogh appeared very supportive of higher education and expressed an interest in learning more about what the segments do.

Chair Cheung hopes that the State budget for UC is flat and shared that the legislators in Sacramento recognize that this is a particularly difficult time for UC and for higher education across the country in general. There are budget uncertainties related to the Los Angeles area, a major source of tax revenue, since the deadline for tax returns from residents there is delayed until October due to the wildfires. UC will have to wait to see if the cut to UC's budget is reduced from 8% to 2%.

III.   Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda items and their priority were approved.
Action: The March 3, 2025 UCEP meeting minutes were approved with corrections.

IV.   Chair's Announcements and Updates

Analyst Abrams provided additional details about the ICAS Legislative Day. The visitors included three legislators, the lead consultant for the Assembly Budget Committee, a representative from the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), the legislative director in Assembly Member Berman's office, and the Lieutenant Governor's higher education advisor. One of the legislators, Assembly Member Fong, has four pending bills that are being monitored by the California Community Colleges (CCC), California State University (CSU), and UC systems. The issues of student housing and cradle to career programs came up several times throughout the day, and the LAO representative painted a very sobering picture of California's budget situation for the next few years.

Vice Chair Sugar attended a portion of the most recent Council meeting on behalf of Chair Goodhue and reported on a presentation from Academic Personnel on the hiring freeze which emphasized that the objective is to not create barriers for an individual campus to meet its needs. There was a discussion about the use of diversity statements for hiring and promotion and more guidance about how these statements will be handled is forthcoming. The Senate was not happy with the policy on official versus unofficial letters of recommendation related to accusations of sexual harassment so this will undergo revisions. The results of a recent faculty survey were shared

with Council and the main concerns are: excessive workload demands; administrative burdens; lack of recognition and compensation; inadequate institutional support and resources; and work-life balance challenges.

Council received a presentation on the proposed A-G ethnic studies requirement which is related to Assembly Bill 101's requirement that high school students complete a one semester course in ethnic studies. UCOP surveyed the A-G course management portal users who reported that their institutions have developed plans but only half of the respondents said their institution will offer courses that are A-G approved. Respondents also reported challenges with designing and implementing the ethnic studies courses with existing teachers who lack the relevant expertise.

V.   Proposed Definition for "Systemwide Courses"
Jason Duque (UCSB)

The UCSB representative utilized UCEP's 2011 and 2014 guidelines for approving systemwide courses to devise a definition for a "systemwide course" and highlighted several issues that may need to be addressed or resolved. The initial draft definition of a systemwide course is "a course that has been approved by UCEP for students to receive UC unit credit and it represents the entire UC system and must meet the highest standard of quality." The 2011 guidelines were originally written for UCDC and state that UCEP will determine "the appropriateness of the course to be a systemwide course," suggesting that UCEP is granting the systemwide designation to courses that have already been approved by another UC body. These courses will typically be taught at a site not specifically associated with a campus such as the courses at UCDC or UC Sacramento. The guidelines describe online courses available for enrollment by students from multiple UC campuses, which sounds like courses currently funded by UC Online, as well as courses specifically intended to be multi-campus courses. This raises questions about whether UCEP will take responsibility for approving online courses and how multi-campus courses are defined. The 2011 document also lays out procedures for courses with UC-approved instructors and instructors who are not from a UC campus.

The 2014 guidelines explain that the systemwide course designation provides a mechanism for the stewardship of such courses when the proposing entity is not campus-based. The UCSB representative recommends criteria accompanying the definition should include that systemwide courses are not guaranteed to fulfill general education (GE), pre-major, or major credit. The 2014 guidelines define intercampus courses as those that fulfill GE, major, or pre-major credit and multi-campus courses are those developed, delivered, and administered by entities at multiple campuses, and these two types of courses could be confused with a systemwide course. The systemwide designation assigns special responsibility to UCEP and/or other systemwide bodies for critical review and ongoing evaluation.

Discussion: Some UCDC courses are not taught by faculty with a UC affiliation so it would not make sense to get those courses approved at a UC campus. The review of UC Online courses would be a major workload for UCEP so it is important that these courses have campus approval. Much has changed with online courses since 2014. Analyst Abrams noted that the Natural Reserve System California Ecology and Conservation field course is the most straightforward example of a systemwide course and it might be useful for the UCSB representative to review the materials for that course. Analyst Abrams agreed that approving and reviewing UC Online courses would be a great deal of work for the committee, but UCEP could recommend that the relevant campus

committee review these courses frequently. Courses that are part of UC Online are approved by the campus committees on courses of instruction (COCI) and when UC Online's Executive Director joins UCEP in May, members can ask about the campus approval process. At UCSC, the courses funded by UC Online have to be approved by the COCI and are reviewed in the context of the individual faculty member on the six to eight year cycle. It is critical to distinguish between UC Online-funded courses and other online courses. Another member recommended excluding UC Online courses from the definition of a systemwide course.

One suggestion is to indicate who can submit a course to UCEP for approval and since the Senate has the responsibility for the curriculum, perhaps only ladder-rank faculty should be permitted to propose a course. However, the point was made that it is unclear why Unit 18 lecturers would not be allowed to propose systemwide courses. The systemwide course designation could be limited to only those courses that are not approved or reviewed by any campus, thus narrowing the responsibility of UCEP to do what campuses cannot because of the nature of the course. UCEP seems to be the appropriate body to evaluate the quality of courses at UCDC taught by non-UC faculty and to sign-off on the proposed instructor as well as the reasonableness of the allocated credits and the assignments. In the near future, the committee should discuss how the non-UC faculty teaching UCDC courses are evaluated and how their teaching is assessed. UCEP could have a discussion in June about UC Online courses and consider making recommendations to COCIs.

VI.   Curricular Review of UC Washington Center (UCDC)
Allison Perlman (UCI), Carrie Wastal (UCSD), & Jason Duque (UCSB)

The UCI, UCSD, and UCSB representatives have reviewed a sizable collection of courses proposed by UCDC and are supportive of the proposed curriculum. However, there are a few courses that raise concerns, and the review team would like to request additional materials from UCDC. In general, UCDC did a thoughtful, thorough job of presenting the courses, indicating how they fit into the curriculum, providing background on the instructors who would teach the course, and providing course materials, especially syllabi that illustrated the learning goals, assignments, and workload. The way that UCDC is structuring its curriculum is along the lines of four program learning objectives (PLOs), each of which has a series of courses that are taught regularly and a course designation, UCDC 191, and a different suffix depending on the PLO that functions as a placeholder for classes that will be taught in the future. The topics of the courses might vary based on the faculty member participating in the program.

The UCI representative explained that the additional information to be requested includes revised syllabi for five of the courses. The representative noted that the majority of the courses being offered by UCDC are not taught by UC Senate faculty or Unit 18 lecturers. Instead, the courses are led by instructors who live in the D.C. area, many of whom have advanced degrees or extensive professional experience that qualifies them to teach in the program. The curriculum appears to honor and rationalize the courses that are being taught while also trying to create some freedom for new faculty who will teach on a quarter or semester basis. However, these are the courses that seemed a bit more slapdash in terms of their presentation as part of the broader collection of materials. The UCI, UCSD, and UCSB representatives agreed that many of the UCDC courses are very good, but the syllabi lacked detail or was off base. The courses are clearly aiming to provide students an opportunity to engage with what is specific and important about being in Washington, D.C. and UCDC has enlisted interesting speakers.

Discussion: A member expressed concerns about the boilerplate language used to describe several courses, and the reviewers indicated that they looked closely at whether or not the workload and assignments seemed appropriate for an upper division course and concluded that they are four-unit courses. The UCI representative remarked that a concern with UCDC is that there has been serious variance across individual divisions in terms of how credits for internships are allocated. As a result of creating this experiential learning course, there is a clear indication that this kind of activity yields this type of academic credit at UCDC regardless of a student's home campus. UCDC has thoughtfully created a course that honors what the majority of students are doing in their internship, while also providing opportunities for them to talk with each other and to write about what they are learning. Members thanked the reviewers for their work and agreed to send the request for additional information to UCDC's executive director.

VII.   Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)
Ethan Savage, Academic Planning & Policy Analyst, IRAP

UCEP will receive an update on the online program management workgroup from Director Corona during the next meeting. Analyst Savage reported that the sixth cycle of the CCC bachelor's degree program has been completed and there were no duplicates. The ICAS workgroup that devised the criteria for determining duplication recommended that when there is a dispute a mediator should be brought on to help resolve the disagreement. The CCC Chancellor's Office, with input from the CSU system, contracted with WestEd and UC will be expected to pay for WestEd's services when it flags a potentially duplicative program. Analyst Abrams suggested that ICAS should be informed if the negotiations about the proposal review and duplication concerns continue to be difficult. Analyst Savage indicated that the common calendar workgroup completed its work and its report is out for 90-day public comment.

VIII.   Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw (SB) 170 (UCEP) and Rescission of SB 192 (University Committee on Preparatory Education)

Chair Goodhue will draft a memo in response to the proposed revisions to SB 170 (UCEP) and the rescission of SB 192 (University Committee on Preparatory Education). Analyst Abrams commented that the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools discussed this matter on April 4th and questioned the wisdom of eliminating UCOPE when there are serious, ongoing concerns about preparatory education.

Discussion: Analyst Savage learned from the undergraduate deans that they will form a workgroup on math preparation. A UCEP member consulted with their division's representative to UCOPE who shared reservations about eliminating that committee and how preparatory education was narrowly focused on writing. Campus educational policy committees do not have the bandwidth to manage preparatory education issues. The proposed subcommittee structure that will deal with math and writing placement as well as multilingual speakers does not sound robust enough, and coordinating various subject matter experts would be challenging. UCB's College of Engineering has a two-year pilot project focused on understanding math preparation within the college.

IX.   Community Input on Academic Planning Council's Systemwide Academic Calendar Workgroup Draft Report

Chair Goodhue invited members to share their thoughts about the report from the workgroup on the common calendar.

Discussion: Faculty at one campus are under the impression that the move to a common calendar will not occur so they might need to be encouraged to comment on the report. The fundamental questions about changing the calendar will not change and should be taken seriously. The report includes claims about things that cannot be done on a quarter calendar but could be done on a semester calendar when in reality different approaches would be required for implementation. A study on student success at schools that convert from semesters to quarters found that it is not beneficial to students in terms of pedagogical outcomes and UCEP's memo should highlight pedagogical concerns. There are concerns about the impact changing to the common calendar would have on faculty workload because the curriculum must be entirely redesigned.

A separate workgroup conducted a costing exercise which involved looking at the expenses related to redesigning the student services, registration, academic progress, and other systems that would have to be redesigned, and it is unclear where the funding for this work would be found. The report also points out that the majority of CCC campuses are on the semester calendar so aligning UC's calendar would help CCC students who transfer to UC. The UCM and UCI representatives volunteered to draft UCEP's response to the workgroup report and members were encouraged to also fill out the Qualtrics survey.

X.   Campus Reports/Member Items

UCSD: The committee would like the systemwide Senate to issue a statement or guidance related to what is happening with international students.

UCI: The committee has been discussing classes with large enrollment for a couple of years and a policy has been developed so there will be a mechanism to review these courses to ensure there is meaningful student engagement. The divisional Senate cabinet has been contemplating its role in terms of writing statements about or pressuring the administration to demonstrate leadership and publicly acknowledge the troubling issues everyone is dealing with.

UCB: The need for reliable proctoring for different groups of students has been under discussion along with establishing a seven-day bereavement period for students.

UCD: There are a range of concerns about the educational experience of international students. The committee is participating in the review of policies related to the division's START initiative which is re-envisioning how certain work is handled on the campus.

UCSF: The funding cuts are a major concern on this campus and there are various workgroups trying to address the impact the cuts will have. The division is trying to figure out how the five health profession programs and the graduate division manage remediation and collating this information in order to provide resources to faculty and programs.

UCSB: While the campus is waiting for the appointment of its new chancellor, everyone is in a holding pattern with respect to the budget or new initiatives. The representative may reach out to UCEP colleagues for guidance related to authority and governance.

UCR: The committee is conducting reviews of undergraduate programs and new 4+1 degree programs in a few departments, and it has discussed the common calendar report.

UCSC: This campus is facing a massive structural deficit and is also struggling with enrollment management as it relates to a lack of classroom space. The UCSC representative is seeking clarification regarding what type of approval is required for a second fully online program being proposed. There are subcommittees addressing writing and math placement.

UCM: The committee is trying to standardize the writing curriculum since the courses have drifted and students are having uneven experiences, and the administration of the writing program by lecturers challenges how this is managed. UCEP members were asked to share if their campuses have a common assignment or a common evaluation assessment for writing. The campus is creating a joint faculty and administration workgroup focusing on ensuring an environment of respect and civility in response to faculty who are being threatened, and the representative would welcome hearing how other campuses have dealt with any similar situations.

XI.   New Business/Executive Session

There was no New Business or Executive Session.

The meeting adjourned at: 4:50 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst
Attest: Rachael Goodhue, Chair