UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, May 2, 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), David Paul (UCSB), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Todd Greenspan (Director, IRAP, UCOP), Ethan Savage (Analyst, IRAP), Robert Horwitz (Chair, Academic Senate), Susan Cochran (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**
- *Robert Horwitz, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Susan Cochran, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

- Academic Assembly passed a climate Memorial calling for at least a 60% reduction of campus carbon emissions by 2030 and 95% by 2034. The Memorial was disseminated to the campuses last week for a vote by all Senate faculty.
- The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates recently approved a plan for a single general education transfer pathway called for Assembly Bill (AB) 928. The proposed plan will be sent to the Senates for each segment for review. UC will continue to emphasize the importance of major preparation prior to transfer, which will be challenged in the next phase of the AB 928 which will focus on associate degrees for transfer (ADTs).
- Senate leadership and President Drake discussed problems with the Navitus pharmaceutical benefit. It is possible that UC will cancel the Navitus contract and return to the previous benefit provider. The President acknowledged the inappropriateness of having UC Health handle the benefit and agrees it should be handled by Human Resources (HR). President Drake also acknowledged the conflict of interest with UC Health running the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) on health benefits. Employee benefits should be treated as benefits and not be part of UC Health's business plans. The future of the ESC is unclear but a new advisory committee could be constituted within HR.
- An augmentation of the HR budget was approved, and HR will hire 16 people to restore retirement counseling in person. They will be hired at UCOP to be deployed at the campuses.
- The workgroup with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) and administrators has completed examining the review process for self-supporting graduate degree programs and confirmed that the current process should be continued. The administrators indicated that this is acceptable for now and this issue may reemerge once the new provost is hired. Chair Horwitz might discuss this with the Regents.
- The Senate leadership and UC Legal will meet with outside counsel to discuss strategies for dealing with third-party contract cheating websites and theft of faculty intellectual property. A meeting with counsel and Senate leadership for the California Community College (CCC) and California State University (CSU) systems will take place after that.
- Search for Provost Brown's and Vice Provost Carlson's replacements are getting started.
- Monica Lin has been selected to be the new Executive Director of the Academic Senate and will start the job in June.
- The workgroup on mitigating the impact of COVID-19 on faculty submitted its final report to Provost Brown who will forward it to the campuses. UC Davis Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Croughan and Chair Horwitz will present the report to the Regents in May and President Drake will be asked to endorse it. The key concept is achievement relative to opportunity which is recognition in the merit and promotion process of how the pandemic disrupted research.

- The [faculty survey](#) is underway and the data from this survey last year was valuable for the workgroup on mitigating the impact of COVID-19. The survey results were also important to convey how teaching went during the pandemic to the Office of the President and Regents.
- Academic Council sent the proposed revision of Senate Regulation 424 to add the Ethnic Studies requirement back to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS).
- Council also asked the Committee on Academic Freedom to revise its recommendations about posting political statements on department websites.
- The administration is eager to put an abusive conduct policy in place and the revised policy will be sent out for systemwide review in the fall.

II.   Chair's Updates and Announcements

Chair Lynch encouraged members to put aside any biases against online undergraduate degree programs (OUDPs) during UCEP's discussions today. During the last meeting, at least three members indicated that their campuses will submit proposals for OUDPs within the next few years, so the deliberations about the structure of these programs are important.

III.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP's April 4, 2022 videoconference minutes were approved.

IV.   Senate Regulation Loophole Related to Online Courses and Degrees
- *Kadee Russ, Vice Chair, UCEP*

Last week, Academic Council discussed the draft proposed new regulation to close the loophole in systemwide Senate regulations related to online courses and degrees. One campus was opposed to requiring online degree program names to have the "online" designation. Vice Chair Russ explained the revisions that have been made to the proposed new regulation based on Council's feedback.

Discussion: Some campuses offer numerous online courses during the summer but would never come close to the 50% threshold during other terms. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) would take the summer online courses into account when considering if a program is an online program or not because the Commission looks at all offerings, but UCEP does not want to force the online label onto a program because of the summer offerings. A member suggested that the proposed regulation use the parameter of online course offerings during the academic year plus summer session. Chair Horwitz reported that increased utilization of summer session is one strategy being considered by President Drake and others to increase enrollment. As UCEP drafts this new regulation, it should be kept in mind that summer session could eventually be counted as a fourth quarter.

A flipped classroom would still be considered an in-person class since there is substantive interaction with students. One idea is to supplement the draft regulation with a frequently asked questions document which includes definitions of various terms including flipped or hybrid flexible classrooms. Vice Chair Russ noted that the revision of SR 610 did not create the loophole but did make it more explicit. The committee's memo will include information about the two options not endorsed by UCEP so Council has that additional background for its discussion. Director Greenspan recommended that the memo clarify how UCEP is interpreting the Compendium policy about the need for a systemwide review of a proposal for a degree that is the first of its kind at each campus. It was noted that the systemwide review of the proposed new regulation should reveal any technical issues not identified by UCEP.

Action: Members agreed to postpone transmitting the proposed to Academic Council this month to allow for further discussion in June.

V.   Framework/Criteria for Online Undergraduate Degree Programs

Chair Lynch recapped the thematic analysis of responses to a series of questions regarding OUDPs. The questions may have been difficult for divisional Undergraduate Councils/Committees on Educational Policy (UGCs/CEPs) to answer and in some cases, input from other committees was called for. Many issues about OUDPs are directly relevant to the work of the upcoming Academic Planning Council (APC) workgroup on the future of undergraduate education.

Discussion: UCI's CEP is reviewing a new proposal from the Paul Merage School of Business and the representative will recommend that Merage ask other UC business schools to provide written feedback about any concerns about competition. UC quality is defined in the process for approval and review of degree programs but the scrutiny involved with the approval of on campus courses and programs will need to be reframed for OUDPs. Both Council and divisional committees indicated that degrees from online programs should not be labeled "online." An unresolved question is how students, faculty and the delivery of course content will be supported. UCEP has looked at the issue of OUDPs for the past three years and this year's committee is now tasked by Council with coming up with a framework. The committee should focus on designing an approval process so the Senate is ready when proposals for OUDPs are submitted for systemwide review.

VI.   Consultation with Institutional Research and Academic Planning
  - *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
  - *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

The vice provosts and deans for undergraduate education met at UCB and agenda topics included: 2030 goals for increased enrollment; the addition of technology fees for online courses; and the increased burden on staff of disabled student programs to meet the demand for accommodations (this topic will be discussed next year). The APC will discuss issues related to OUDPs tomorrow including fee structures and student rights. On Wednesday, the first meeting of APC's workgroup on the future of undergraduate education will be held and questions related to OUDPs will be deliberated by this group.

VII.   Draft White Paper on Online Undergraduate Degrees
  - *Kadee Russ, Vice Chair, UCEP*

Council asked the committee to pull together all of the work UCEP has done related to online education since 2019 and create a process for approving proposed OUDPs. The synthesis provides faculty with concrete information and definitions and highlights relevant Senate and WSCUC policies. The Compendium may need to be amended to extend the time period for reviewing proposals for OUDPs and to address if minors should be reviewed at the systemwide level. The recommendations in the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force report are consistent with UCEP's discussions this year and the feedback from the review of the report has rich campus input.

One recommendation is to keep OUDPs within the structures of existing college budget frameworks, and UCPB should participate in assessing possible budget models. Appendix D includes a draft approval process based on existing campus processes with the addition of the information identified in the thematic analysis. Members should closely review the draft process and suggest if any key elements of the campus review processes should be added.

Discussion: Members thanked Vice Chair Russ for preparing the white paper and indicated that a comprehensive document is valuable. There is an interest in sharing the draft white paper with divisional committees soon because it will facilitate discussions with campus stakeholders. Members will edit the current document and the revised draft will be on the June agenda, but Senate leadership might also want Council to provide input on the draft in May.

VIII.   Concerns about UC Online

In the past three years a number of questions have come up about the scope and quality of UC Online courses, how many students have enrolled, and how many students completed the courses. The 2018-2020 report on the future of the program, then known as the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative, recommended a new Advisory Committee and Chair Horwitz, Vice Chair Cochran, and Vice Chair Russ are on this committee, which is a positive outcome. However, the presentation of UC Online data to UCEP in April generated confusion and more questions about how many students actually completed courses.

The analyst and Vice Chair Cochran have followed up with UC Online Program Director Osmundson with the suggestion that the Advisory Committee review and discuss the enrollment and completion data in May and for the director to share revised data with UCEP in June. The analyst also explained that, when discussions about what would eventually become UC Online began in 2009-2010, the Senate asserted that online courses should be evaluated. It appears that the only evaluation of all UC Online courses occurred in 2011-2012 and primarily consisted of student satisfaction. An evaluation by UCSC's Institutional Research unit of a UC Online-funded Calculus course at that campus was shared with UCEP several years ago. Senate leadership have indicated that a memo from UCEP about the committee's concerns would be useful.

Discussion: Following the presentation to UCEP in April, the UCI representative met with the program director to get more information about UC Online courses at that campus. Reportedly, the campuses do not always provide the data requested by the program director, which makes it difficult to answer some questions. For example, the program director does not have the divisions' definitions of course completion. It was suggested that the Senate, UCEP in particular, could facilitate getting campus data and other information needed by UC Online. There are ongoing issues with communication between UC Online and the systemwide Senate or the campuses. Ideas for UC Online's involvement in efforts like providing courses needed by CCC students to transfer to UC or in degree completion programs are hindered by poor communication among the stakeholders.

Action: Chair Lynch will draft a memo delineating UCEP's concerns about UC Online.

IX.   Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI)
   • *Jim Chalfant, Chair, ACSCOTI*

Chair Chalfant, who chaired the systemwide Academic Senate five years ago, described some of the history behind creation of the new Special Committee on Transfer Issues. There is outside pressure on UC to streamline the process for transferring from a CCC to a UC and to improve time to degree for transfer students, and one issue is that the CSUs and UCs have different transfer requirements. Chair Chalfant explained problems related to ADTs, Transfer Pathways, the Pathways Plus program, and transfer admissions guarantees. One requirement from Assembly Bill 928 is for the CCC, CSU and UC systems is to align the ADTs with UC's Pathways. Legislators and other outside groups do not want to make the two years at a CCC more difficult but transfer students find that they are not

prepared when they arrive at UC and need to take additional courses, making it difficult for them to graduate from this system in two years without exceeding 60 semester units.

The goal is for ACSCOTI to work with UCEP, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and the Committee on Preparatory Education to prioritize what needs to be done to improve transfer to UC campuses. This may include groups of discipline faculty reviewing and determining if the requirements for a major are appropriate. Chair Chalfant would like a member of UCEP to participate on ACSCOTI and members were invited to contact him with any questions.

X.   Member Items/New Business

A member proposed that UCEP discuss issues related to grading and Pass/No Pass. Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOEs) at UCI were asked to write papers on pedagogy for their merit reviews, including a description of their innovations in education. One ideas is that groups of students research and discuss exam questions and then individually write the responses. The stated goal of this strategy is to reduce the stress of an exam by letting students collaborate. However, students involved in this exercise have later disclosed that they tricked other students into believing wrong answers.

Another idea is to replace letter grades with Pass/No Pass and the rationale being that this was done by Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). MIT did this in an effort to reduce the high suicide rate among first year students, but the university found that students in year two had not learned the material and were failing. After ten years, MIT changed the policy so Pass/No Pass is only used in the first term of the first year. One problem with the MIT strategy is that all students take the same courses in their first year which is not the case at UC.

The UCI representative obtained the pre-pandemic grades from the registrar for students in their first year and in their graduation year. The analysis showed that the grade point averages (GPA) of 38% of UCI students who were not given letter grades their first went down. Eliminating letter grades means that students do not receive credit or acknowledgement for their work and this jeopardized scholarships that required a certain GPA. The representative explained to the LSOEs that these two strategies did not increase students' knowledge, and the representative cautioned that UC campuses considering eliminating grades in favor of Pass/No Pass should think carefully about this strategy. When the UCSC representative joined the faculty of that campus in 1990, students received written narrative evaluations which faculty had to translate into letter grades when students were applying to medical, veterinary or other professional schools. UCLA is considering giving students until the ninth week instead of the sixth week to decide if a course will be taken for Pass/No Pass. UCB has had many discussions about eliminating grades but faculty always decide against this change.

Chair Lynch shared that it is not yet clear if UCEP will meet in July but a decision might be made by the committee's June 6th meeting.

XI.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2:40 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Mary Lynch