UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2019

Attending: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, (UCM), John Serences, Vice Chair, (UCSD) (videoconference), Daniel Potter (UCD) (videoconference), Deborah Johnson (UCSF), Hugh Roberts (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Owen Long (UCR), Haim Weizman (UCSD), Adriana Galvan (UCLA), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC) (videoconference), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative) (videoconference), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Ellen Osmundson (Coordinator, ILTI), Mary Ellen Kreher (Director, Course Development, ILTI), Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: The May 6, 2019 meeting minutes were approved.
Action: Today's agenda was approved.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair May announced that UCSF has decided not to pursue an affiliation with Dignity Health and he expressed appreciation for the active participation of Senate members in deliberations about this matter. The chair praised UCEP for its thoughtful consideration of UCI's proposal for a fully online undergraduate degree in Business Administration. The publisher Elsevier has not yet cut off UC's access to its journals but the librarians have contingency plans in the event this does occur.

The state budget is now in conference committee and the May revise did not include additional funding from the governor for UC. The president continues to state that 5% will be allocated for faculty salaries effective in October. If the Senate approves a memorial for fossil fuel divestment, it will go to the president and Regents. The Regents approved an increase in non-resident tuition. While non-resident students are generally wealthier than residents, they may still struggle to afford UC's tuition. Lowering the cap of non-residents is under discussion. Senate Bill 24 was passed by the legislature last year but vetoed by the governor. This Bill proposed requiring campuses to provide medical abortion services to students. Chair May and Vice Chair Bhavnani thanked the members for their work this year.

III. Chair's Updates

Chair Zanzucchi indicated that the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) continues to gather information about various assessments. Smarter Balanced could be added to the metrics used for admissions consideration. Discussions have included a focus on students from underrepresented groups. Council has discussed the climate for transgender students and General Counsel is being consulted about the use of preferred names on diplomas and whether diplomas are legal documents. Council endorsed UCEP's memo regarding UCI's proposed online Business Administration degree and UCEP's second recommendation was amended slightly to prompt UCI to utilize standard campus procedures to expand online course offerings. Council discussed the Committee on Preparatory Education's proposed revision of Senate Regulation 636.E and UCEP's suggested amendment was approved.

Discussion: The UCSD representative shared that the data the STTF has reviewed indicates that none of the assessments are particularly good predictors of student performance.

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

Senate Chair May encouraged ILTI to draft a proposed revision of Senate Regulation 544 with the goal of facilitating enrollment in cross campus courses. The draft will be forwarded to UCEP for consideration once it is reviewed by Chair May. Director Kreher has completed surveying academic advisors about reasons students are denied enrollment and the information that would help determine if it is appropriate for a student to enroll in a particular cross campus online course. The survey also asked if advisors agreed that an up-front petition process would ease enrollment. The survey was sent to the 70 advisors who use the cross campus enrollment system (CCES) and 23 (33%) of them responded. The registrars at some campuses are responsible for approving enrollment so they will be surveyed in the fall.

The most common reasons for denying enrollment are that students are not in good academic standing; have an overload of credits for the term; lack of prerequisites; part versus full time status; and not having enough credits at the home campus. The interpretation of full-time status varies across the campuses. Some campuses require that students are enrolled in 12 units before enrolling in a cross campus course. Advisors suggested that the CCES include prerequisites, a way for students to indicate the reason for taking the course, the type of academic credit granted by the home campus for the course, the type of credit the students would like to receive as a petition ahead of time, and students' position on the waitlist.

It would also be helpful if students could provide a rationale for taking a course if they have an overload and for the syllabus and course description to be in the CCES. As a result of this feedback, it appears that most reasons for denials would not be addressed by a petition process. The credit granted, prerequisites and links to the syllabi can be added to the CCES. ILTI will investigate what would be required to include a field to enter the reason for taking the course but this modification will have a cost.

Discussion: It is strongly recommended that the CCES include information about articulation of prerequisites from one campus to another. Another recommendation is that ILTI develop a taxonomy, especially for the "other reasons" category which accounts for a large number of denials. Instead of a petition process, improving the structure of the data entered at the time of advising will help ILTI and UCEP more clearly identify specific policies and practices impacting enrollment. The advisors' feedback provides a starting point for creating the taxonomy. Director Kreher noted that one approach would be to require a specific policy reason for denials and to have a taxonomy for the other reasons. It does not appear that ILTI has taken steps to resolve three issues previously reported by UCEP which include verification of prerequisites, providing grades in a timely fashion and problems with online proctoring.

V.   Training for Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Instructors
- *Linda von Hoene, Assistant Dean for Professional Development; Director of Graduate Student Instructor-Teaching and Resource Center, UCB*
- *Kem Saichaie, Associate Director for Learning and Teaching Support, UCD*

A group of representatives from campus Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTLs) has met actively since February to identify existing efforts related to training for Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). The group met last week to finalize details in a report to be presented to the Academic Planning Council (APC) next week and UCEP will receive a copy. UCR's and UCB's CTLs are located within their graduate schools. Programming that is required and programming that is available are delineated in the report. The report will include recommendations consistent with two suggestions from UCEP: using a progressive approach to teaching experience so TAs and GSIs have increasingly

independent opportunities and the expansion of existing opportunities. A central message is that variation across the campuses is not a negative but it was noted that resources do vary across the campuses.

Campuses begin with instructor development outcomes to which the curriculum is mapped. Training might benefit from having a stronger connection to graduate education and to campus graduate councils although the councils reportedly do not want to add more expectations. UCB has an effective process that could serve as a model. TA and GSI development has broader implications in terms of how it can be supported campus wide and efforts related to TA/GSI development should be monitored. A key concern is that campuses should not be asked to do more without additional resources.

VI.   Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP*

The governor did not include funding for enrollment growth in the budget for UC and it is not clear if the student success funding will be provided. The budget includes funding for the California State University (CSU) and California Community College (CCC) systems to work with incarcerated students and it is hoped that UC receives some funding for working with this population as well. Campuses are now reporting their enrollment numbers and some are turning to their waitlists. UCSB has exceeded the cap for non-resident students and UCSD increased the number of domestic non-residents but will have fewer international students. It is too early to know how many transfer students will be admitted. Next year, the APC will discuss what constitutes an undergraduate degree from UC, including the idea of fully online degree programs. The APC will also discuss the tangible benefits of having non-resident students from different cultures and countries at UC campuses.

VII.   UCI Online School of Business Administration ~ Next Steps

Council agreed with UCEP's recommendation for a systemwide discussion about fully online undergraduate degree programs and members can share ideas about the principles to be considered.

Discussion: The Business School's proposal could have been improved if the administration had engaged in ongoing and in-depth conversations with the divisional Senate. The proposal has started a conversation about the fundamental meaning of a UC education and what constitutes an undergraduate experience at UC. There are essential questions that require careful consideration and strategic discussion, and a basic question may be whether or not UC should offer fully online degrees. It is important to note that UCEP is not opposed to a fully online degree program but the context has to be specific to UC.

UCI may need to provide more information about the purpose of its proposed program and perhaps there should be a connection to broader efforts designed to increase access. Members agree that UC should not offer an online degree that is second tier. The development has to be at a higher level to ensure that the online program is equivalent to a traditional program. Data is needed about how students feel about engagement when participating in online courses. The issues are related to values and not just philosophy. The analyst shared UCEP papers on UC quality and undergraduate research along with the link to the 2010 final report of the UC Commission on the Future.

VIII.   Transfer Initiative ~ Support for Transfer Students
- *Alfred Herrera, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Partnerships, UCLA*

This discussion did not occur.

IX.   Articulation of UC Washington D.C. Center Courses

Chair Zanzucchi would like members to share any experiences with articulation of UCDC courses. UCDC tends to attract students in Political Science and yet it may be difficult for courses in other disciplines to be articulated for major or GE credit.

Discussion: UCSC's representative indicated that articulation officers will contact a particular department when questions arise about a UCDC course. It is unclear how information about articulation could be gathered. Unit credit is easier to offer than General Education (GE) credit. Political Science departments could be asked to state that particular UCDC courses are eligible for unit or GE credit.

X.   Incarcerated Students
   * *Azadeh Zohrabi, Director, Underground Scholars, UCB*

Director Zohrabi began by noting that research shows the value of education to incarcerated students. The Underground Scholars program was founded in 2013 by two formerly incarcerated students who met after transferring to UC. The program engages in recruitment, retention and advocacy activities. It has built relationships with legislators and is funded by the state through the Center for Educational Excellence at UCB. The director leads the work with the help of 8 to 10 work-study students. The program recruits currently and formerly incarcerated students and it supports 30 to 50 students during transfer to UC or other universities. Some students may be system impacted. UCLA, UCR and UCI have chapters and the program connects with formerly incarcerated students statewide to identify ways to support this population.

Underground Scholars is unable to meet all the needs of these students so a bigger infrastructure should be created. Students who are currently incarcerated have access to CCC and correspondence programs but more funding from the state is needed to expand face to face programming in prison. The students are able to attain Associate of Arts degrees and some in-prison programs offer all the courses a student will need to transfer to UC. Director Zohrabi expects the number of incarcerated students ready to transfer to a UC will increase in the next few years. Underground Scholars also supports some students who have indeterminate or life sentences. Students have said that higher education was their re-entry program, and they require support while in prison and when they come home. Peer support is a key component of the program.

Links to baccalaureate programs are missing and students need access to academic support including tutors. The timelines for academic programs have to be flexible to accommodate the logistics within the prisons and differing custody levels. Some existing programs are statewide while others are specific to a prison. Partnering with prisons that are committed to the educational programs is critical. Director Zohrabi is aware of cases of current UC students who are incarcerated. In these situations, UC should not take a punitive approach but instead offer these students multiple chances. The Underground Scholars program does not have the capacity to offer legal services but an undocumented student program helps eligible students. The program is working with the Alameda County Probation Department and advocating for changes to relevant laws to allow charges to be expunged from their records. Formerly incarcerated students are prohibited from living in campus housing but cannot afford or are ineligible for non-UC housing. This population is challenged by more barriers than other students face and many standard requirements of parole are obstacles.

Underground Scholars has engaged in legislative work including on an unsuccessful bill that would allow students to earn time off because they are enrolled in school. A California Senate Bill introduced this year, SB 575, would restore Cal Grants to currently incarcerated students and work is being done to give this population access to Pell Grants. Next year Director Zohrabi would like to do more policy work

focusing on two to three pieces of legislation. Advocacy work also focuses on removing barriers that will prevent individuals who have been convicted from earning their degrees. For example, formerly incarcerated students have difficulty gaining the clearance needed to access labs.

The program has a $250,000 annual budget which covers the director's salary and work-study stipends. With additional funding, more staff could be hired to help develop relationships across programs and with jails, to support community building and professional development, and to be more involved with advocacy. The main strength of Underground Scholars is that it is student run. Placing students in leadership positions makes the work more authentic and Director Zohrabi wants to avoid professionalizing the program to the exclusion of the students.

Discussion: Chair May is interested in working with students who start at UC and are then incarcerated as well as students who are incarcerated and connected to a CCC. Opportunities to work with students facing long-term incarceration are also of interest and ways to reach out to this group need to be identified. The Senate will examine the policies and infrastructure that will allow an incarcerated student to get both an undergraduate and graduate degree from UC. Information about the number of incarcerated students ready to pursue a four year degree and about the prisons that would be amenable to a relationship with UC should be gathered. The UC faculty already working in prisons should be identified. A coordinated effort with the CCCs and CSUs might be developed and private-public partnerships could be explored.

XI.   Qualitative Data from Formerly Incarcerated Students

The director of Underground Scholars has offered to send a questionnaire from UCEP to the students involved with the program and members are invited to suggest questions.

Discussion: Students could be asked to share how Underground Scholars has helped them. It would be valuable to ask faculty already working with this population why they are interested in teaching incarcerated students.

XII.   Executive Session ~ ILTI Debrief

Minutes were not taken during Executive Session.

XIII.   Transfer Initiative ~ Campus Review and Updates to Criteria

A document outlining roles and responsibilities related to reviewing the criteria for Transfer Admission Guarantee agreements (TAGs) and Transfer Pathway. Members were asked to describe their campus process for reviewing and updating criteria.

Discussion: At UCSC, the Committee on Education Policy (CEP) approves changes to the criteria. The criteria for TAGs are determined by the CEP in consultation with the administration. The CEP sets eligibility without regard to what will happen to admissions targets but does consider what it will take for students to move smoothly into the academic program. At UCR, admissions requirements are written into the course catalog and there is a standard process to consider any changes, including a departmental vote to approve them. Faculty have control over criteria and are responsible for maintaining and reviewing it. To meet the 2:1 target for transfer student admissions, the dean may suspend or loosen up some criteria to widen the pool of eligible students. It is too early to see how students are doing but the administration has indicated that performance will be monitored. Criteria may also be set for majors that are not impacted.

At UCD, the Committee on Courses of Instruction has to approve designating a major as impacted and faculty select and approve the criteria applies to these majors. The colleges decide upon the requirements

for a major and Admissions handles the criteria for the non-selective majors. At UCLA: any changes to the criteria come from the departments and are then approved by Undergraduate Council (UGC). This information is given to the articulation officer who notify the CCCs. However, there is no confirmation that the information reaches the CCC students. Students might only find out there is a problem upon arrival at campus. At UCSB: proposed changes are initiated by department and sent to the administrator over that college and to the CEP. It can be difficult to change criteria. The Math department is currently trying to make changes about which the Senate and administration have concerns.

At UCI, the structure for review and approval of criteria is largely informal. Faculty may not be very aware of TAGs and there is not a clear Senate role. The rules for TAGs are under the authority of departments and departments notify the Admissions office when changes will be made. The representative may call out the need for Senate involvement and a standard for oversight. At UCM, there was no formal approach to setting the criteria but problems are emerging as some majors become impacted. The campus is now having discussions about when faculty should be involved and a new joint faculty administration enrollment strategy committee has been established to set enrollment targets. The role of an underutilized subcommittee of UGC is being re-evaluated. At UCSD, the criteria review process works well. Changes can be proposed by the department, the administration or the Committee on Admission, and the Committee on Admissions approves proposed changes.

Based on this discussion, it is clear that the point of contact in the Senate varies at each campus and that roles and responsibilities are not always formalized. Some campuses have processes that are faculty driven and rely on information and resources provided by the administration. It might be important to distinguish between students' eligibility and readiness versus the program criteria. Another difference is where a formal catalog review process is utilized versus when more organic and loosely defined practices are employed. It was noted that how much time the campus review processes require can vary, with UCR taking up to a year for a change to be instituted, for example.

One question is how frequently departments should review articulation agreements, and this might be an issue for the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools to consider. Members agreed that this information can be shared with divisional Senate chairs.

XIV. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCSB: The campus will create an advisory committee for the campus police and UGC has been involved with discussions related to this.

UCI: The committee is discussing fees imposed on students related to textbooks. The price of textbooks can include the cost of an online component and a review process to consider the fees is needed. A task force is being set up to create guidelines and principles that take into consideration conflicts of interest and student privacy. Student fees cover certain things and justification should be provided before a new fee is imposed. Systemwide policies about use of core fees may be necessary especially to ensure that they are not a burden to students. There should be a pedagogical motivation behind requiring additional resources for a course.

XV. New Business

There was no New Business.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:55 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Anne Zanzucchi