

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, MAY 1, 2017

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair, (UCLA), Edward Caswell-Chen, Vice Chair, (UCD) (telephone), David Paul (UCSB) (telephone), John Tamkun (UCSC), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Arvind Rajaraman (UCI), Kimberly Topp (UCSF), James Rauch (UCSD), Laura Nelson (UCB), Beth Lazazzera (UCLA) Kimberly Peterson (Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP, UCOP), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Announcements

Vice Chair Caswell-Chen attended the Academic Council's April meeting. Regarding the non-resident enrollment, the policy is still under discussion but there will not be a systemwide cap on non-residents. The cap could end up being anywhere from 18 to 20%. Proposed legislation would grant whistleblower protection for anyone videotaping a lecture. Provost Dorr is retiring this summer and recruitment is underway and the president has indicated that it will be an internal recruitment. Council received an update from BOARS on letters of recommendation and in January, it was reported that BOARS decided that letters of recommendation would not be implemented at a systemwide level. Augmented review was explained by the chair of BOARS. These reviews include some supplemental information such as the letters of recommendation. Concerns that letters could be unfair to some students were discussed.

President discussed the audit with Council and noted that many recommendations will be implemented. UCOP continues to monitor changes in federal policy regarding immigrant students and what will happen is unknown. Arthur Ellis, the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies, discussed the idea of increasing opportunities for undergraduate students to participate in research.

Chair Knowlton described the ICAS Legislative Day on April 3rd and the main issues discussed with the aides working on higher education were access, diversity as well as transfer students. Another topic was mental health care for students and more support from the legislature is needed. The fact that a couple of UC campuses have not met the 2:1 transfer to freshman was discussed. UCEP has been asked to help with messaging about readmission of students and Chair Knowlton will discuss UCEP's proposed language with the Academic Planning Council in June.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Chalfant commented on the audit. The Senate may be asked to comment on the carbon neutrality initiative which is one of the initiatives President Napolitano announced soon after coming to UC. An idea being floated is that research on climate change should be singled out in the merit and promotion process. Students have expressed concerns about the handling of Title IX cases. The Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) policy will be discussed by the Regents in June. The Regents discussed two PDST programs and one issue the Regents focused on is diversity.

Regent Perez joined Academic Council in March and the discussion was positive. Chair Chalfant expects that the non-resident policy will be resolved at the next Regents' meeting. It is important for UC to demonstrate how non-resident students benefit the UC campuses. BOARS continues to assess the compare favorably policy and is also looking at the UCB letters of recommendation pilot. Outside of BOARS there are many critics of letters, which have been found to favor applicants from more advantaged backgrounds and schools. BOARS is considering a systemwide policy on letters of recommendation in augmented reviews. The data from the pilot is not yet available but UCB has asserted that their students are different which necessitates the letters. UCLA admitted a slightly lower percentage than UCB but the percentage of underrepresented students were higher, and Admissions at UCLA is being asked what they are doing differently lead to this result. Chair Chalfant mentioned the ongoing discussion about Teaching Professors. It was also noted that UC and the Community Colleges will be work on creating associate of science degrees based on UC's transfer pathways for chemistry and physics.

Discussion: Chair Knowlton commented that with the current level of enrollment, providing research opportunities to undergraduates is more difficult and this is particularly true for underrepresented groups. An important point to make is that UC brings research to the classroom. Given high school counselors' workloads, the letters of recommendation may become boilerplate. Chair Knowlton remarked that the policy on Teaching Professors provides clarity at the systemwide level but there is significant work to be done at the campuses, or even within individual departments. Members discussed the role of Teaching Professors at their campuses. At one campus, the Teaching Professors are tasked with looking at the undergraduate program as a whole and the department is leaning toward a decision to not hire more Teaching Professors. Vice Chair White suggested that members may want to consider if there should be a limit on the numbers of Teaching Professors and what the criteria for advancement will look like. A member cautioned against letting the Teaching Professor series become an entry level position and against the title being used largely for underrepresented groups.

IV. General Education

This topic was not discussed.

V. Review of Systemwide Courses

Chair Knowlton explained that there was a question from UCLA about the review of the systemwide Natural Reserve System Field Course and UCEP's review of the systemwide courses in general. UCEP will also review any systemwide online courses offered by an entity that is not campus-based.

Discussion: The UC Washington D.C. courses may be reviewed by UCI however Vice Chair Caswell-Chen recommended that a standard program review of UCDC by UCEP makes sense. While every campus has a piece of the Washington program, the program is separate from the campuses with respect to how it is governed and the oversight for it. UC Sacramento is reviewed by UCD and UCEAP programs are reviewed by UCIE. UCDC is under Academic Affairs/Academic Personnel and the analyst will follow up on this issue. The vice chair suggested that campus templates for undergraduate program reviews could be adapted by UCEP for program reviews. UCDC was specifically noted by the state auditor.

VI. Innovative Technology Learning Initiative (ILTI)

In June 2016 UCEP was asked a series of questions about perceived barriers to cross-campus enrollment in online courses and UCEP briefly discussed the questions in the fall. In addition to responding to the set of questions, Chair Knowlton would like to provide ILTI with a summary of larger issues and concerns related to underprepared students, differences between hybrid and fully online courses, the value of face

to face time, multi-campus courses, and testing centers including how to test students who are not on physically on campus.

Discussion: Response to question 1: From UCM's perspective, locally defined predictors of success are important. UCLA will discuss whether there should be limits to how many fully online courses a freshman can take. At UCSB, some exceptions have been granted to the limit. Campuses with underserved students who may be less prepared seem to have more concerns about freshman enrolling in cross campus courses. The focus is more on ensuring student success with the idea being that the 12 unit limit is important for underprepared students. Response to question 2: Members agreed that requiring seniors to take all last quarter courses at the home campus is not necessary.

Response to question 3: Provided there is a mechanism to alert the home campus if a student drops below the required number of units at the home campus so that financial aid is not jeopardized, changing the requirement is okay. Response to question 4: The committee has similar concerns about financial aid if a student is not full time. Response to question 5: If the good standing requirement does not apply to traditional courses, it is reasonable to treat the online courses in the same way. The requirement for using the grades from the immediately preceding term might be replaced with using the grades from the previous quarter. A student in poor academic standing in the previous quarter would not be eligible.

Response to question 6: Students need to know if the online course will meet the requirements of their home campus before they enroll. This will take time, as it does with in-person courses as well. A member looked at the ILTI website and found that courses are listed as equivalent but it is not clear what this term means exactly. Response to question 7: Students could be advised that if they want to take an online course they cannot add it after 3 weeks. Response to question 8: This restriction should remain but students could be allowed to petition to be allowed to enroll in more than one course at another UC campus. Response to question 9: There is agreement that the requirement that each online course be reviewed and approved by each UC campus to determine the type of credit (GE, pre-major and/or major) each course will earn should not be removed. Each campus provides a different experience.

UCEP should ask for clarification about course equivalency as indicated on the ILTI website. It is not clear who has determined that the courses are equivalent. Even with the removal of these barriers, UCEP does not believe that cross campus enrollment will grow.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President ~IRAP

Manager Peterson reported on the recent Western Association of Schools and Colleges' conference. There is a proposal to move toward a focus on risk sensitive approach to accreditation. UC campuses with nine or ten year accreditations would likely be eligible for a more streamlined process for reaffirmations but implementation of this new pathway will take several years. UCOP has requested that WASC request institutional feedback as it develops revised indicators. The proposal will be shared with the committee.

VIII. Metrics for Measuring Quality of Education

Following a discussion with the chair of the Committee on Planning and Budget, Chair Knowlton suggested it would be useful for UCEP to identify more specific metrics for measuring quality which are not currently reflected in the data usually collected such as class size. For pre-majors and applications to majors at UCLA, students are asked about a backup major if they cannot pursue their first choice. Even if admitted to UC students may not be able to study what they would like. Another metric could be the number of students involved in research at a high level. Students might be given a watered down capstone experience where they are placed in a lab course instead, resulting in a research experience that is not as rich. Well-prepared students will know they need to find a lab immediately. Once students are at a

campus, differences in the experiences for under-prepared students can easily be seen. This will be discussed with the chair of UCPB and IRAP might be asked what data can be collected. Members are asked to think about indicators of the quality of a UC education that are now at risk at their campuses or metrics that could be investigated. If data is not available now, UCEP could ask IRAP to collect it going forward.

Discussion: Members suggested a variety of potential indicators. The amount of time students are getting with academic counselors is decreasing while the number of counselors has not increased. Whether libraries have been given adequate resources relative to the growth in student population is a question. There may be an issue with the availability of mental health counseling. Placement into graduate programs may be impacted for undergraduates who cannot compete because they have not had the types of research experiences they may have been given in the past. Another indicator might be the frequency of referrals to student judicial affairs for academic misconduct. First year experience programs could be tracked to see if there is an impact on the self-selected cohort of freshman when compared to students not in the program. Students may not be developing proficiency in writing by the time they are seniors, and there could be a review of the GRE scores of students graduating from UC.

In the STEM disciplines, there is a limit to the number of students who can be fit into a lab courses. A possible metric could be unmet needs in terms of waiting lists for courses. Students who requested on campus housing and are turned away after their first year could be an indicator of academic difficulty. The number of students taking on one or more part-time jobs could be researched. There are also issues related to food insecurity.

It was suggested that UCEP should concentrate on issues which are more specific to UC, as students at the CSUs or CCCs are also likely to be struggling with issues such as housing and food insecurity. One area of focus could be impacted majors. When faculty FTE growth slowed and student growth did not, certain majors became bottlenecks and access was limited. Less qualified students admitted to UC are unable to get into their major and this is especially true in computer science and engineering. Students in certain majors are becoming less diverse. If the legislature cares about diversity, access, and upward mobility this shift towards less diversification should be emphasized. Students who are working part-time and struggling to maintain their grades in order to graduate will be cut out of job opportunities. A member pointed out that some people may respond to these issues by saying that faculty should work harder.

UCEP might want to reaffirm the values of General Education. Impacted majors should not necessarily be responsive to demand. There is a concern about the impact on the system when some campuses implement policies that are gatekeepers and communicating to the Regents and the legislature that there is a cost, particularly on diversity. Unless there is pressure from the faculty no other people at UC will improve the funding per student. The UC Undergraduate Experience Survey may be a good source of longitudinal information about high impact practices. Next fall, UCEP might Invite UCUES to meet with UCEP in the fall. Manager Peterson can share the UCUES questions with the committee.

IX. Policy on Readmission of Students

The aim is to clarify the options for students interested in returning to UC to finish their degree. Chair Knowlton has drafted language that distinguishes between the students in good academic standing and those who were not in good academic standing when they left. UC also want to reassure and encourage students with concerns about changes in the requirements. This will be reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee in June.

Discussion: In cases where a major or department has been absorbed, there would have to be a discussion with the new department. If the department has been eliminated, it would be possible to offer an

individual major and faculty would be asked to sign off on a course of study. UCEP may not want to specifically suggest an individualized major in the policy but students could be instructed to contact an academic counselor who is ideally in the department or college. In the fall UCEP will help with reviewing the new language on campus websites and Manager Peterson will coordinate this process.

X. UC's Analytical Writing Placements (AWPE)

UCEP briefly discussed the Committee on Preparatory Education's review of data about the AWPE in March but the role the committee might have was not clear. Chair Knowlton explained that because several campuses do not have Preparatory Education committees, local education policy committees or undergraduate councils would provide input about this matter. The committee received a 2002 report that included specific recommendations from UCEP about the exam. How the Entry Level Writing Requirement is satisfied varies across the campuses and UCEP may want to consider if this is appropriate. General writing proficiency, the appropriateness of the requirement, and whether the AWPE is measuring what should be measured are a few of the issues that might be discussed.

Discussion: The campuses without separate preparatory education committees are UCI, UCLA, UCM, UCSF, and UCSB. UCD's Committee on Preparatory Education is a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council. It was noted that the number of international students at UC has grown significantly since the AWPE was last analyzed by Institutional Research in 2012. Reportedly, the UCSC Education Policy Committee has discussed the AWPE and ELWR for the past three years. UCEP should discuss this matter next year because it is in the gray area between preparatory education and first year experience. There is significant variation across the campuses in terms of how students satisfy the ELWR and the credit that is granted, so the ELWR is far from being standardized across the system. Given both the cost of programs for students who have not satisfied the ELWR and the vulnerability of the students who do not satisfy it, it would be a worthwhile use of UCEP's time.

At UCD the Preparatory Education Committee is a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council and provides regular reports about the AWPE and ELWR. Campuses without preparatory education committees might identify the type assistance that UCEP could provide related to these issues. The ELWR influences student progress to their degree, student retention and student success. Since issues related to the AWPE have been under discussion for many years, perhaps the exam should be eliminated and instead more funding could be used for courses that satisfy the ELWR. However, it was noted that the AWPE is a self-supporting program. UCOPE may be interested in the predictive aspects of testing whereas UCEP may consider baseline expectations so one question is how the committees could work in partnership.

The 2012 analysis is being replicated by IRAP and the new report should be completed in July. Why UC has a writing requirement should be articulated. UCEP might look at the range of composition requirements in the first year. Writing classes need to be small and it is difficult to make these online. UCEP might offer guidance on the minimum UC standard of writing instruction UC students should get because it is important not to erode this standard. It is not clear what will happen when there is no SAT writing to satisfy the ELWR. UCSC looked at the UC campuses and was surprised at students' poor writing skills in comparison to their GPAs. A perspective seems to be that taking a writing class is somehow punitive. While in the Humanities having the ability to express oneself in writing is a baseline requirement, faculty in the STEM fields are not necessarily aware of the ELWR. It is in the students' best interest for their careers to take composition in their first year. Students may have to take an additional three courses in order to satisfy the writing requirement and in the STEM fields this makes it very difficult for them to complete the major preparation courses.

UCEP might focus on the first year experience and how students fulfill the requirement in the first year. Questions include how students fulfill the ELWR through course work in their first year at each campuses, the impact on international students or students in STEM fields, and how well the ELWR works in terms of campus implementation. Another issue is how to secure the resources to adequately support students. Members should connect with the Preparatory Education committee members at their campuses before the June meeting and UCEP will then develop an action plan for next steps which will include clarification of the committee's role and any concerns about the ELWR courses. UCOPE should be made aware that UCEP is willing to help.

XI. Policies Related to Travel Risk

There are concerns about the need to register international activity whether it is travel for research or university business-related. When students are involved, the concerns may be more serious and what happens if something occurs while a faculty member is abroad is a question. This would require registering with an entity that is specific to when a faculty member is in a particular setting. UCEP will consider any specific policy when it becomes available.

Discussion: There are issues in terms of liability, extraction, and acting as a parent. How faculty handle a situation if a border agent will not allow a student to re-enter the US after traveling abroad. The members agreed that this policy could be beneficial when students are involved.

XII. New Business

Vice Chair Caswell-Chen asked members for information about how Advanced Placement credit is used to count for GE. This topic will be discussed by UCEP during the June videoconference. There is a CSU GE task force considering systemwide policies on GE.

UCEP will meet by videoconference from 10 am to 1 pm on June 5th. Chair Knowlton will circulate a draft document on ILTI and remind members to find out about any problems with the campus writing programs.

XIII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:30 pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Barbara Knowlton