

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, MAY 6, 2019

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter (UCD), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Deborah Johnson (UCSF), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Jim Chalfant (Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: The April 1st minutes were approved.

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

II. Updates and Announcements

The organization of the student evaluation task force is being discussed, including how to connect it to the Centers for Teaching and Learning's effort related to this issue. The Committee on Academic Personnel and UCEP chairs will co-chair the task force which will include representatives from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). The scope of work and timeline are being outlined. Academic Council discussed UCSF's proposed affiliation with Dignity Health and there are questions about why this affiliation is unique and whether there are alternative ways this partnership can be structured.

The national admissions scandal has had implications for UC and there is an internal audit to assess and strengthen UC's processes. The focus is on vulnerabilities in policies such as admission by exception, and there may be challenges related to athletic programs. In November, the Regents did not vote on a 2% increase in non-resident tuition. In response, UCOP is now proposing a return to aid funding approach for non-residents which may increase the diversity of this pool of students. The Regents Basic Needs Committee has \$15M allocated in the budget and more details related to this will be forthcoming.

Chair Zanzucchi mentioned the letter from the Vice Provosts and Deans from Undergraduate Education (VPDUEs) to the Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) regarding the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) and the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). Since at several divisions, preparatory education matters are handled by Committees on Educational Policy/Undergraduate Councils, UCEP members may be aware of this matter.

Discussion: The UCSF representative will check with the division's Committee on Educational Policy about meeting with Chair May and Vice Chair Bhavnani to discuss the affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health. Members agreed that UCEP will send a memo to Academic Council about the affiliation being contrary to UC's mission. The memo will point out that more information and transparency are needed. It is not clear that VPDUEs have shared their concerns about the AWPE and ELWR with their divisional Committees on Educational Policy and Undergraduate Councils.

III. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 636.E

UCSB identified an unfair restriction related to how matriculated students are allowed to satisfy the Entry Level Writing Requirement and the systemwide Committee on Preparatory Education has proposed a

revision to Senate Regulation (SR) 636.E. Approximately two students per year are impacted by the restrictions imposed by the current language of SR 636.E. Two student athletes were advised to take a California Community College writing course in order to satisfy the ELWR and the UCSB registrar refused to grant credit for the course.

Discussion: The UCSB representative clarified that SR 636.E is intended to prevent a student from satisfying a course subsequent to the ELWR before having satisfied the ELWR. A member does not think the proposed revision corrects the issue raised by UCSB and that it could make more sense to propose eliminating the entire regulation. UCEP could recommend that the regulation be examined more closely, noting that not all campuses may be adhering to the regulation as written.

The proposed language for the exception could have the unintended consequence of opening the door to petitions. Chair Zanzucchi proposed working with the UCSB and UCI representatives on a response that may include alternative language to the regulation.

IV. Transfer Initiative

- *Jim Chalfant, Special Advisor on Transfer, Provost's Office, UCOP*

Focus groups with transfer students have been conducted and comments on the transfer guarantee proposal from Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) have been received. Special Advisor Chalfant indicated that the transfer memorandum of understanding (MOU) did not require the Senate to create something completely new and what has been proposed is the blending of the Transfer Admission Guarantee agreements (TAGs) with the Transfer Pathways. One challenge is related to governance and faculty authority over the TAGs. The feedback about the transfer guarantee proposal highlighted concerns about capacity in some departments.

Structural barriers to reviewing the TAGs have only recently become apparent and should be addressed before any progress can be made. The fact that faculty in the major are responsible for overseeing the TAGs has not been understood. The role of Admissions offices and divisional Admissions committees has been unclear.

Discussion: At UCSC, the conditions for admission are controlled and approved by the CEP and what is approved is to be accepted by the Admissions office. The relationship between the division and the department and potential tensions related to enacting changes may be worth exploring. Members will provide a summary of the processes for setting conditions of admission for the June meeting. Some division chairs were reportedly not responsive to a letter sent to them two months ago about reviewing TAGs. Special Advisor Chalfant will share the six letters with UCEP so the members are aware of who was contacted.

V. UCI Online School of Business Administration

On April 24th, Chair Zanzucchi and Vice Chair Serences reported to Academic Council about UCEP's deliberations about UCI's proposal for an online undergraduate Business Administration degree. Questions are related to the admission process, fee structure and access to on campus resources. Without this information, it is difficult to determine how this degree should be defined. It could be viewed as a revision to a current program, a new program, or as a UC online degree. It was explained to Council that this proposal is a significant shift from current undergraduate degrees. UCI's divisional chair informed Council that the division will not accept this as a pilot. The School of Business Administration may be asked to provide a new proposal that does not characterize the program as a pilot.

The UCI representative described an April 30th meeting with systemwide Senate leadership and representatives of the UCI School of Business Administration. UCI's registrar stated that a degree program cannot be piloted. The Business School does not want the program listed as a new degree but it is not clear if this is negotiable. The Admissions office indicated that applicants cannot be asked to disclose any conditions which prevent them from being on campus and that applicants would instead select the on campus or online program.

The more the proposal is discussed, the more questions arise and a longer discussion is needed about the ramifications of this program. UCEP could suggest that the students admitted to the program would self-select into courses that are online or on campus in order to provide the School with data. Accreditation thresholds might guide consideration of the program as a new degree, although the School asserts that the relevant accreditation bodies have been consulted.

Discussion: The School of Business Administration has resisted the idea of indicating that it will grant an online degree. It will be difficult to determine the quality of the program so indicating that it is an online degree is an important distinction. Since the School will offer existing online courses, there is a question about what makes it a new degree program and modality is central to this question. UCI will have to reallocate resources to support this program. Members agree that having another year to discuss the proposal and to gather more data would be valuable. A systemwide discussion about seeing this as a new degree type should occur.

UCEP's position might be that handling this in a piecemeal fashion would not be optimal and the School of Business might be encouraged to increase the number of students enrolled in the existing campus program and to allow these students to take online courses. UCEP will not approve this program until there has been a systemwide discussion about a fully online degree program. The committee will recommend that UCI continue its effort to generate data by increase the online offerings to more students. UCI should be advised that the issues raised by their proposal go beyond the specifics of what the School has proposed. One of these issues is related to the value of the intangibles associated with a UC education, such as what it means to be on a campus or to have the ability to take courses outside of one's major. The intangibles are things that are described when the value of a UC education is discussed.

UCEP should compile a list of questions to guide future discussions across the system and to help UCI understand the specific information needed. Students who are unable to be present on a campus (including incarcerated students) are students that UC should want to serve. UCSC implemented a policy that prevents online courses from being the only offering available to students. UCEP will send a memo to Council delineating the committee's questions and concerns, and request that Council initiate a systemwide discussion about the policy framework needed for implementation of online degree programs. A separate memo to UCI would document the status of UCEP's deliberations. A draft of the memo to Council will be shared with the committee before the May 22nd Council meeting.

Action: A motion to send a memo to Council was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*

UC is in the middle of the enrollment process and most campuses are now using their waitlists to reach their targets. The campuses are all focused on reaching or maintaining the 2:1 ratio of freshman to transfer student enrollments. The argument is being made to have more financial aid for domestic non-resident students. UCOP is also trying to get last year's one time funding for faculty salaries to be permanent. The Academic Planning Council will discuss what the academic principles and goals for non-resident students should be. The Provost has issued a letter stating that the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative will

stop offering courses to non-matriculated students. Director Greenspan attended a meeting of the VPDUEs where the letter about the AWPE and the ELWR was discussed. The VPDUEs also reviewed data on the use of Teaching Professors at the campuses.

Discussion: Director Greenspan will find out if UCEP should expect to receive restructuring proposals for ILTI and UC Washington D.C. Center.

VII. Preparedness of Transfer Students

Concerns were raised during a BOARS meeting about the preparedness of transfer students in writing and the impact of Assembly Bill 705. Several colleges at UCSD are reportedly requiring transfer students to take an additional writing course to address these concerns. The committee will monitor this issue.

VIII. State Assessment Report of UC Center Sacramento

Chair Zanzucchi indicated that there are questions about the availability of classroom space, housing for students, procedures related to ILTI's Cross Campus Enrollment System, and advocacy for increased funding. One recommendation is that UCD should be compensated for its support, noting that there has been an MOU between Davis and the Center since 2010. There is a desire to expand the program but there are constraints, including issues related to enrollment. Increasing the involvement of graduate students is proposed.

Discussion: Participation in policy is an important educational experience and the interaction with lawmakers is student-centered. UCEP might look at issues related to shared governance and the diversity of the students able to participate in the program. The report does not fully address the review of the Center and it is not clear if the review would be at the campus or systemwide level, or how frequently the reviews would be conducted and UCEP's memo will include these questions.

Action: Chair Zanzucchi and the UCSC representative will work on UCEP's memo.

IX. Incarcerated Students

Chair Zanzucchi and the chairs of UCAADE and Rules and Jurisdiction joined last week's CCGA meeting for a discussion about incarcerated students. In June, UCEP will consult with the director of UCB's Underground Scholars program to learn about barriers. An understanding is needed about whether the barriers are related to policy or practice. Members of CCGA involved with this work discussed social justice issues. Principles articulating what UC is trying to achieve are needed.

X. New Business

There was no New Business.

XI. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 2 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Anne Zanzucchi