



# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY Minutes of Videoconference Monday, May 5, 2025

In attendance: Rachael Goodhue, Chair (UCD), Catherine Sugar, Vice Chair (UCLA), Gireeja Ranade (UCB), 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), Todd Greenspan (Executive Advisor for Academic Planning & Policy Development and Institutional Research, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Carmen Corona (Director, Academic Planning & Policy, IRAP), Ethan Savage, (Academic Planning & Policy Analyst, IRAP), Ahmet Palazoglu (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

### **I. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

*Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Chair Palazoglu shared that James B. Milliken has been appointed as the next UC president and is expected to start August 1, 2025 and Dr. Monica Varsanyi has been appointed to serve as the vice provost for faculty affairs and academic programs. The searches for the next UCR and UCSB chancellors are ongoing and appointments are expected to be announced during the May Regents meeting. Academic Assembly approved the appointment of Susannah Scott at UCSB to the Senate vice chair-elect position for 2025-2026. Assembly approved revisions to Senate Bylaw (SB) 145.B.7 which codify how the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) will consult with the California K-12. Assembly also considered proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 to introduce an A-G ethnic studies requirement for freshman admissions, but this was voted down. Finally, Assembly endorsed Academic Council's statement on the defense of the University.

The April 30 Academic Council meeting included discussions about the state's budget for UC and the creation of a special systemwide Senate committee on clinicians. The joint Senate and administration workgroup charged by the Regents with looking at faculty discipline policies and procedures submitted its first report will be presented to the Regents by Chair Cheung, Provost Newman, and interim Vice Provost Haynes later this month. If the Regents agree with the workgroup's recommended guidelines, it will be distributed for a 30-day expedited systemwide review so the guidelines can be finalized in July.

A new Senate task force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD), to be chaired by Vice Chair Palazoglu, will address four critical institutional concerns: restructuring academic programs; resizing programs and the workforce; recalibrating growth objectives; and realigning funding sources with activities. UCAD will meet weekly and produce an interim report in June 2025. Council considered the feedback from the systemwide review of the proposed revision to SB 170 and the rescission of SB 192 and there was no support for eliminating the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). Reviewers emphasized that preparatory education has become more complex and it is important to maintain a mechanism that ensures coordination and consistency across the system. The next step is for Senate leadership to work with UCOPE, BOARS,

and UCEP to contemplate new bylaws and possible ways to reinvigorate UCOPE. It would be ideal to have a solid plan to move this forward by September.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** Today's agenda items and their priority were approved.

**Action:** The April 7, 2025 UCEP meeting minutes were approved.

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

Vice Chair Sugar shared highlights of the April 14 meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates. Revisions to the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) are under consideration including changes to the Subject Area 2 (Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning) and Subject Area 5 (Physical and Biological Sciences) and adding partial certification and Cal-GETC for Science, Technology, Math, and Engineering. During the April 30 Council meeting, President Drake and Provost Newman acknowledged UCEP's quick response to the administration's request for guidance on helping students who might not be able to complete their education at a UC campus. Chair Goodhue indicated that UCEP will meet as planned on July 7 and the committee may have work to complete over the summer, so members should identify alternates in case they are unavailable.

## **IV. Draft Principles for Common Assessment**

*Vice Chair Sugar, Jason Duque (UCSB), & Tanner WouldGo (UCSC)*

Vice Chair Sugar shared a draft list of principles for a common assessment which highlights several overarching issues UCEP should explore. The principles will apply to all programs and courses in both in-person and online modalities but the target audience for the principles needs to be identified. Questions include whether the evaluation is only of the academic content or also the wraparound services and if metrics are needed for short, medium, and long-term evaluation. The UCSC representative remarked that offering a common assessment framework would equate to principles to practice for good assessment regardless of modality. UCEP needs to understand how program learning outcome assessment is working at each division as it appears to range from satisfying accreditation requirements to more in depth, meaningful efforts. The aim would be to create something that is not prescriptive, is based on divisional differences, and is mindful of how faculty participate in shared governance. The principles should allow for in depth information gathering and analysis that accounts for the differences between modalities.

The form of the assessment will depend on what UC wants to achieve with its fully online degree programs. Vice Chair Sugar described the potential objectives including pedagogy, access, scaling, resources, and synergy. Current processes involving student evaluations and peer teaching reviews during merits for individual faculty provide broad oversight of programs by departments and these can be applied to online courses and programs. However, UCEP should prompt the next task force to examine these processes more broadly and identify improvements. Additional key issues for evaluation include what student-faculty engagement looks for the different groups of students taking online versus in-person programs and how assessment needs to adapt to the differences between these modalities. At the systemwide level, considerations include where online programs are housed, the role of UC Online, and the standardization of assessment in terms of sustainability.

**Discussion:** A member noted that some students do not have equitable access to the technology needed to participate in online courses. One challenge with creating principles is how a one size

fits all approach to evaluation can work given that campuses have differing ways of doing things. UCEP should focus on sustaining the highest quality of undergraduate education for students and pedagogical concerns rather than offering online degrees as a way to increase access or save money. The assessment may need to address in-person programs that integrate some online courses along with fully online programs. It is unclear if admissions into online programs will differ from how it works for in-person programs. UCEP could recommend that the new task force study past innovative assessment processes to inform principles moving forward. There are concerns about academic dishonesty in both in-person and online courses, so thought should be given to how exams are conducted. The principles should emphasize the importance of maintaining the high quality of a UC education no matter how it is delivered.

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

*Allison Perlman (UCI) & Jay Sharping (UCM)*

The draft memo in response to the Academic Planning Council's (APC) Systemwide Academic Calendar Workgroup report was reviewed. The report did not include a pedagogical rationale for adopting a semester calendar or evidence that shifting from quarters to semesters would improve learning outcomes. The Workgroup flagged that switching from quarters to semesters would increase demand for larger classrooms or adoption of new modalities for instruction, such as hybrid or online, and raised concerns about a student's ability to complete degree requirements in a timely manner. The estimated costs of converting the calendar cited in the report are likely too low because they do not factor in the substantial faculty labor involved with revising or creating courses and redesigning all degree programs.

**Discussion:** Members commented on the work associated with changing courses, requirements, degrees, and approvals. Even if UC's financial situation dramatically improves, converting the calendar should only be done if there is overwhelming evidence that student outcomes will improve. There is a question about whether changing the calendar would impact accreditation. The UCI and UCM representatives will incorporate today's feedback into the memo which will be then circulated to the members for approval.

**VI. Consultation with UC Online & Institutional Research & Academic Planning**

*Rolin Moe, Executive Director, UC Online; Chris Furguele, Director, IRAP; Clarence Wheeler, Jr., Institutional Research & Academic Planning Analyst, IRAP; & Chris Parmelee, Cross-Campus Database Analyst, IRAP*

Executive Director Moe reminded the committee about UCEP's past requests for UC Online to provide specific data on its courses and explained collaborating with IRAP to determine how to provide the data. When the executive director and Director Furguele met with UCEP in November, the committee was advised about what the dashboard for UC Online would and would not do. Director Furguele described the work that has been done on the UC Course Enrollment Dashboard to date, noting that it contains data from 2019-2020 forward. The goal is to deploy the new dashboard sometime this summer. The dashboard aims to provide transparent and consistent basic information on various metrics for in-person courses; all online courses; online courses specific to a campus, courses funded by UC Online at a specific campus; and UC Online-funded courses available for cross campus enrollment. This data includes a unique, unduplicated count of undergraduate students who ever take one of these modalities in an academic year. In 2023-2024, almost all 236K undergraduates took at least one in-person course; another 75K of them took at

least one of the four types of online courses; 47K took a UC Online-funded course at the home campus; and 4K unique students took at least one UC Online-funded cross-campus course.

The dashboard provides a duplicated count of course enrollments across all the different courses students take: the 236K students represented over 2M course enrollments, and for UC Online-funded cross-campus courses 4K students translated to about 4,800 course enrollments. There is data on the total unit load represented by all modalities and the percentage of all units attempted. During the fall, winter, and spring of 2024-2025, in-person courses represented about 92% of all units attempted and online courses were about 8%, and the dashboard also shows the number of unique course sections that were delivered in each modality. All of the data can be disaggregated by campus; student ethnicity student; 1st generation status; Pell Grant status; and summer term.

**Discussion:** There is some confusion about the data on course enrollments across the sections delivered and the IRAP consultants explained that there is no standardized way to count a course section so how this data is being calculated will be noted. The data on students who took at least one course in a particular modality is consistent with what UCOP reports to the federal government. Executive Director Moe reported that UC Online does not fund summer session courses and most students take just one UC Online funded course per term. Data that is course-specific such as grades will never be in the dashboard but course completion data will eventually be incorporated. The data available to IRAP does not link courses to the classification of the instructors. IRAP will not include the department because there is no systemwide taxonomy for departments which means it cannot be aggregated across the campuses. Campus institutional research units can look at student performance in a course sequence. Executive Director Moe shared that UC Online is having conversations with deans about how students can receive credit if they take foreign language courses through cross-campus enrollment.

## **VII. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)**

*Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning & Policy Development and Institutional Research; Carmen Corona, Director, Academic Planning & Policy, Institutional Research and Academic Planning, & Ethan Savage, Academic Planning & Policy Analyst*

Director Corona provided UCEP with an update on the State's auditor of the use of online program management companies. The Auditor asked UC to develop policies in response to their findings by June 2025. Policies have been drafted on instructor transparency for online and on campus courses; standardized course evaluation forms and student feedback; transparent and equitable procurement practices; compliance with Western Association of Schools and Colleges' Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) regulations; and the prohibition of incentive-based compensation for recruitment, admissions, or awarding financial aid. Most of the findings were related to self-supporting graduate and Extension programs. IRAP worked UC Legal to ensure adherence to Federal guidelines in responding to the Auditor's findings and to ensure that business practices are not negatively impacted. UC Legal provided supplemental language that clarifies the permissible use of tuition and revenue sharing agreements. The draft policies have been presented to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and APC. After the PAC reviews the policies again on May 29, an interim policy will be put in place, and there will be a 90-day comment period. The policy will receive final approval by the APC, Provost Newman, and the new President by October 2025.

Executive Advisor Greenspan reported that IRAP has received the campus multi-year enrollment plans for 2026-2027 through 2028-2029. UC was expected to grow about 6K FTE in 2024-2025 and there was significant growth in the summer last year. Campuses added unit loads to above pre-

pandemic levels. The campuses are projecting another 1,500 FTE next year and even more growth is proposed in 2027-2028. It will be critical to think carefully about potential enrollment reductions and their impacts. Provost Newman, Executive Advisor Greenspan, and Director Corona met with WSCUC representatives to learn about any accreditation implications related to the situation with international students whose visas have been revoked. WSCUC's position is that all UC campuses are approved to offer distance education programs and nothing additional is required. Analyst Savage reported that there are ongoing conversations with the California Community Colleges (CCC) and the California State University (CSU) systems regarding baccalaureate degree programs proposed by the CCCs. It is not clear how effectively WestEd will mediate when UC or CSU are concerned about duplicative programs. The seventh set of CCC proposals are expected in August.

#### **VIII. Proposed Definition for "Systemwide Courses"**

*Jason Duque (UCSB)*

The UCSB representative shared an updated definition of a systemwide course that has been informed by the committee's previous discussion as well as numerous historical UCEP documents. One goal is to have a streamlined and precise definition of systemwide courses which clearly distinguishes them from other types of courses, such as those open for cross-campus enrollment.

**Discussion:** One suggestion is for the definition to state that a systemwide course is any course that has not gone through the campus committee on courses of instruction approval process. Members agreed that the definition should apply only to classes that do not fit the standard campus approval process. Systemwide courses are not necessarily taught by faculty from multiple UC campuses and many courses at UC Washington Center (UCDC) have no UC faculty involved. The definition could point out that systemwide courses are typically not associated with or offered at one of the campuses. The UCSB representative will send members an updated definition.

#### **IX. Campus Reports/Member Items**

UCM: The divisional Council will meet this week and one agenda topic is UCB's resolution on academic freedom. Everyone on campus is looking forward to commencement.

UCSF: The campus is looking at policies for artificial intelligence (AI) across the various professional schools. There have been a number of large forums on how AI can be applied in classroom simulation as well as in clinical training. Information is being gathered about shared resources and guidelines across the health profession programs related to the remediation policy.

UCD: The committee is discussing AI including the report from the AI Council. There are multiple requests for consultation related to START initiative proposals that impact undergraduate education. The committee is trying to avoid having the budget situation influence its work on the needs of students and programs.

UCSD: The committee has contemplated what will happen when the new UC president takes the helm and has questions about whether the administration or an appropriate Senate committee will make a statement about achievement relative to opportunity since faculty are losing their grants. A new student services system has been the subject of lengthy debate. Another topic is a new law about military personnel called into active duty and the policies about how much time they will have to withdraw from or complete courses once that service ends.

UCSC: There are subcommittees on math placement, writing placement, and online course policies. Work is being done on internal processes for collecting and structuring data because the responsibility currently falls on department chairs or program managers to make data-driven decisions about curricula.

UCI: This campus offers a significant number of online courses so guidelines and best practices for balancing instructional modalities on campus are under development. The committee received a presentation on the efficacy of online courses that highlighted a rubric to assess online courses and recommended activities. The vice chancellor for teaching and learning would like to explore eliminating the grade of F because of the implications for students who might be in the wrong major or adjusting to college. UCEP may be asked to consider this topic next year.

UCSB: The campus is excited about the appointment of its new chancellor. It has been challenging to ensure that faculty are aware of the guidance for students who may be prevented from completing their education at a UC campus.

UCR: The committee is reviewing degree changes and course updates that have been submitted by various programs. There are concerns about the sunseting of UCOPE and the report on the common calendar.

## **X. New Business/Executive Session**

### **Approval of UCDC courses**

Last month UCEP approved the majority of courses submitted by UCDC and the review team asked the Center to provide clarifying information about five courses for which the syllabi were unclear. UCDC sent updated materials for two courses and withdrew three courses from consideration. Based on the new information, the UCI, UCSB, and UCSD representatives recommended that UCEP approve the UCDC 191C (Policy and Governance Focus) and UCDC 173B (Law and Society) courses.

**Action:** Members agreed to approve the two UCDC courses.

### **Follow-up regarding students unable to complete their education at a UC campus**

A member asked if the campuses have encountered any logistical problems related to making exceptions for students stemming from the guidance about supporting students who may be unable to complete their education at a UC campus. This could relate to the pass/no pass grading option or having targeted exceptions and not policies that apply to everyone. Systemwide regulations give the divisions the flexibility to make exceptions and UCEP does not need to interfere.

**Discussion:** At one campus, the Undergraduate Council has determined that decision-making should take place at the department or college level because the campus does not have a consistent policy for granting exceptions.

The meeting adjourned at: 5:00 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Rachael Goodhue, Chair