UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Videoconference Minutes
Monday, June 1, 2020

Attending: John Serences, Chair, (UCSD), Daniel Potter, Vice Chair, (UCD), Tony Keaveny (UCB), Katheryn Russ (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Lene Leve-Storms (UCLA), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Paul Goldstein (UCSD), Mary Lynch (UCSF), Ted Bennett (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Pamela Brown (Vice President, IRAP), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Ethan Savage (Analyst, Academic Planning), Ellen Osmundson (Director, ILTI), Mary-Ellen Kreher (Director, Course Design and Development, ILTI), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   **Preview of 2020 UC Undergraduate Experience Survey**
         • *Pamela Brown, Vice President, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)*

Vice President Brown thanked the Senate leadership and Chair Serences for partnering with IRAP to add questions about remote instruction to UC's Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). Usually the survey starts in the spring semester and runs through summer at many campuses. However, due to the COVID-19 crisis, data is being analyzed before the survey window closes in the interest of learning about students' perspectives on remote instruction. IRAP is expecting an additional 15k responses but the initial run of data with 34k responses represents a 15% response rate. There are typically 70k responses to UCUES and IRAP will work with those campuses with low response rates, but major themes have already emerged.

The survey included two sets of questions, one set focusing on the pandemic and the second on remote instruction. More than half of the students indicated that they were very concerned about their ability to learn effectively and find the remote environment challenging. Almost 60% of students are concerned about their ability to do well on tests and assignments. The survey includes questions about challenges related to technology, and 15% of students reported being very concerned about having reliable access to the internet. Significant numbers of students reported worrying about their ability to get a job after graduation and feeling isolated from their friends. Overall, the responses are relatively consistent across the campuses for most questions but some differences are apparent. For example, at certain campuses higher numbers of students indicated concerns about their financial situation.

Vice President Brown shared some of the feedback to questions about remote instruction including how it compares to in-person classes and how much they have learned in remote instruction. There are also questions about recorded and live lectures. Compared to in-person classes, over 50% of respondents said they learned less or much less in live remote lectures while about half said they learned less or much less in recorded remote lectures. Some students indicated that having access to recorded lectures was particularly helpful because of challenges with the internet, being in different time zones, or sharing space with others in the household. Responses to questions about labs and performance and studio-based courses reflect concerns about the ability to offer them in a remote environment. Many students reported concerns about the fairness of tests and about academic dishonesty during this period.

In response to questions about the quality of interactions with different groups in the remote setting, half of the respondents indicated that interactions with graduate student instructors and faculty are worse, but most were concerned about the lack of interaction with other students. Two additional highlights from the preliminary data are that students miss having access to campus resource centers and 42% strongly agreed that remote learning was harder than learning in person. Finally, about 25% of students with previous online learning experiences strongly agreed that this remote learning experience was worse than other

online courses, while 5% of respondents strongly disagreed with that statement. Once all of the survey data is available, IRAP will have the ability to look at responses within subgroups.

Discussion: Factors contributing to why students said remote learning is harder than in person learning include lack of motivation, difficulty concentrating, the need to balance family responsibilities with course work, and concerns about health, among other stressors. Vice President Brown pointed out the difficulty of decoupling the challenges specific to remote instruction from the impact of the pandemic. It was noted that about 1% of students indicated they are likely to return to campus in the fall while over 5% indicated they are uncertain. It is not clear if the UCUES data will help UC understand if certain kinds of classes work better than others in the remote environment. Students expressed concern about losing their internet connection while taking exams. Comments about the loss of interaction with fellow students suggest it may be helpful for faculty to set up small groups that facilitate engagement. A concern is that students do not have access to the support and resources available on campus. The responses to the faculty survey on remote instruction will be provided to UCEP soon.

II.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Bhavnani indicated that the chancellors may announce tentative plans for reopening the campuses in the next few weeks. The Regents voted to support President Napolitano's recommendations to make standardized tests optional until 2022, for admissions to be test blind after that and for UC to have a new test in place in 2025. A feasibility study on UC creating its own test will begin this summer and a report will be due in 2021. Council has established a climate crisis task force which will look at decarbonization of campuses. A task force on extending faculty diversity was set up this year to brainstorm about issues that include retention. Dr. Juan Muniz will begin serving as UC Merced's Chancellor in July.

Governor Newsom has recommended a 10% cut to UC's 2020-2021 budget but the University will not know exactly where things stand until September. Chair Bhavnani is on a small working group with UCOP administrators that is looking at a plan and timeline for expenditure reductions. The Regents will consider recommendations from this working group in July. The Regents are expected to announce the new UC president in July.

III.   Potential Revisions of Senate Regulations

The pandemic and swift move to remote instruction have revealed a number of ambiguities and internal inconsistencies in Senate Regulations and areas where more flexibility can be afforded to campuses. A list of regulations that could be revised has been created and thought should be given to prioritizing the most urgent items.

Discussion: The contradictory regulations on graduation requirements should be addressed. The 2.0 Grade Point Average (GPA) needed to graduate conflicts with regulations that allow students to pass all courses with a 1.7 GPA. It is inconsistent for each campus to set its passing threshold of C or C- when the systemwide standard establishes that a 2.0 GPA is needed to graduate. It could be beneficial to have the same passing threshold across the system. One radical idea that has come up at UCEP is to allow students to take an unlimited number of courses for Pass/No Pass. UCEP will need to clearly articulate the reasons for any proposed changes, especially those that could be controversial. A member suggested adding Senate Regulation 636 to the list because the Entry Level Writing Requirement will be impacted by upcoming changes to the use of standardized tests at UC.

A member recommended against asking divisional committees to begin considering revisions to the regulations right now because faculty are already spread too thin. Chair Serences pointed out that the regulations are complex and interconnected, so this work will take time and it will require consultation with people looking at the regulations from different perspectives to make sure all the pieces fit together. One way to prioritize the revisions is to consider what changes will be the most beneficial, and SR 610 may be the most important revision to begin with.

IV. **Consultation with Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)**
- *Ellen Osmundson, Program Director, ILTI*
- *Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director, Course Development, ILTI*

Director Osmundson described ILTI's efforts to support remote learning over the summer and for fall by offering a mix of online courses that have already been approved and courses that are being taught remotely because of the pandemic. A number of campuses are trying to figure out the universe of existing fully online courses that are available and whether a set of courses can be pulled together for students who cannot be on campus. The idea is that a faculty member could use the videos and other digitized assets developed by someone else and become the instructor of record for the course. This would spare departments from having to create their own materials for a remote course, and the faculty member who created the materials consents to them being used by others while also retaining the intellectual property rights. The faculty member borrowing the course materials would be able to add their own videos and materials as needed.

A second topic Director Osmundson brought to UCEP is campus course approval forms, and UCEP was given two examples, one of which focuses primarily on technology while the other pertains to course content. Currently, ILTI circulates information about a proposed online course to all of the relevant campus groups and agencies that review courses for more than unit credit. At some campuses, this material is sent to Academic Senate units and at others it goes to articulation officers, deans or directors of academic advising depending upon the type of credit to be granted. Courses offered for major credit are potentially sent to individual departments and department chairs review the content.

The varying procedures result in different levels of detail in a course syllabus. People involved with reviewing courses suggested to ILTI that reviews could be easier with a systematic way to evaluate each course, especially for reviewers unfamiliar with the online environment. In addition to the course content, reviewers ask about contact hours or what the assessments indicate. ILTI proposes creating a consolidated form containing the same information usually provided with the syllabus with a common set of questions from current course approval forms. There would need to be agreement about the questions that should be asked to make decisions about fully online courses available for cross-campus enrollment.

Director Osmundson also noted that ILTI is working with Undergraduate Admissions to develop an online administration of UC's systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam for 12k students.

Discussion: Making online course packages available for departments to borrow could be seen by the Legislature or Regents as a way to eliminate faculty or departments. Faculty might be pressured to use this model if it is considered "efficient' so it is important for UCEP to delineate pedagogical reasons against adopting it. The point was made that it is reasonable to take advantage of the available online courses while remote instruction is required for a limited period of time. A concerted effort is required to help the Regents and others understand that remote education is not equal to being on campus.

There should be a discussion about how borrowing online courses relates to campus budget models since this practice could change the budget situation for many departments. Director Osmundson stated that the objective is to save departments the expense of making courses available remotely. Many schools and

departments make budget allocations based on the number of students in the classrooms and student participation in remote courses may lead to campus administration keeping the funds centrally instead of distributing them to schools. Another possibility is that administrators might decide to make graduate students the instructors of record on these online course. Anything that undermines the value of having faculty in a department teaching students is an issue.

Members provided feedback on the proposed common course approval form. It was noted that some campuses already have an extra set of questions for online courses. Rather than imposing a master list of questions on campuses, the current forms could be reviewed so campuses can determine if any questions have been overlooked. An extra set of questions could be required if a cross-campus course is proposed for major or General Education credit. ILTI would like to eventually automate the course review process which would make it easy to add and specialize campus questions.

A member commented that completing the course approval form is onerous for faculty, and Director Osmundson suggested that ILTI staff could fill out the forms and send them back to the faculty for approval. It is not clear where the course approval forms are maintained on each campus, but reviewing the old forms may not be helpful since faculty change their courses frequently. Director Osmundson will gather the forms from every campus and ILTI will start looking at the common questions and identify any which are outstanding or unique from each campus, with the goal of creating a common form that could be individualized for each campuses for special areas.

Chair Serences suggested that UCEP send a memo to Council about the pros and cons of making online courses, which have been rigorously evaluated and approved by a campus, available for use by faculty at other campuses. The memo should make it clear that these courses do not substitute for a qualified instructor being in charge of and taking an active role in the course. It would be useful to mention the UCUES data indicating student dissatisfaction with the remote classes offered as a result of the pandemic.

V.   Updates

Chair Serences reminded the committee that ILTI was one of the systemwide programs that was to be restructured in the last couple years following the report to UCOP from Huron Consulting. Provost Brown has indicated that the ILTI restructuring report would be sent to the Senate for review for at least a year. However, ILTI has already been restructured. ILTI is now a formal program in the new Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs (GUEA) unit and the coordinator is now a director.

UCSD's Associated Students are asking for meetings with the administration as well as the Undergraduate Council to discuss concerns about final exams. The group is asserting that the pandemic and the protests against police brutality will make it difficult for students to take finals. They recommend either a universal pass for all students, extending the Pass/No Pass grading option to the end of finals week, or granting incompletes and allowing students to finish work within one quarter.

Discussion: The analyst noted that the ILTI restructuring report will probably address the governance structure. The current steering committee does not include UCEP representation which would be beneficial. Director Greenspan recommended sending the memo to Vice Provost Gullatt since ILTI is now part of GUEA.

VI.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP's May 4, 2020 minutes were approved.

VII.   Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- *Ethan Savage, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

IRAP has been monitoring enrollment and so far there has not been a significant decrease in Statements of Intent to Register. The numbers of transfer students and non-residents who have enrolled will not be clear until the summer. Most campuses are close to hitting their enrollment targets. There appears to be an increase in the number of students signing up for remote courses for summer. The review panel for the Degree and Certificate Completion Program grants has selected the proposals to fund and the Provost's Office will finalize the decisions.

VIII.   Campus Reports/Member Items

There were no Campus Reports.

IX.   New Business

Proctoring of remote courses
Students have expressed concerns about the proctoring of remote and online courses. There are concerns about access to student data, the equipment that is required, and whether the proctoring systems can be relied upon to prevent cheating. A member believes UCEP should recommend that UC develop its own proctoring system for instructors.

Discussion: A UC-developed proctoring system would be helpful, not just for remote instruction but for general purposes given faculty concerns about academic integrity. A group of faculty at UCR has offered to provide proctoring services for other UCR faculty. A member expressed concern about the difficulty of ensuring the accuracy of grades during this period of forced remote instruction.

X.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Serences