

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 2018

Attending: Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, (UCD) (videoconference), Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair, (UCM), David Paul (UCSB), Onuttom Narayan (UCSC), Hugh Roberts (UCI), John Serences (UCSD), Ken Uneo (UCB), Robert Gould (UCLA) (videoconference), Jennifer Perkins (UCSF) (videoconference), Paul Lyons (UCR) (videoconference), Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student Representative), Daniel Potter (UCD) (videoconference), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, IRAP), Michael Brown (Provost, UCOP), Ellen Osmundson (Coordinator, ILTI, UCOP), Shane White (Chair, Academic Senate), Robert May (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Announcements and Updates

Chair Caswell-Chen reported that the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) held its last meeting in May and the Legislative Day in April was a positive event. Legislative Day will take place earlier in next year and future agenda topics will include faculty diversity and a review of the Master Plan. The transfer guarantee for California Community College (CCC) students will continue to be discussed. Academic Council approved UCEP's memos regarding the UCSF variance of Senate Regulation 780 and the UCR simple name change for the School of Business Administration.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The May minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Michael Brown, Provost, UCOP*

The State has given UC the \$50M that had been withheld from the 2017-2018 budget until the University implemented reforms identified in last year's state audit. It is possible that these funds will not be in the budget for 2018-2019. The May revise provides a 3% increase to UC's base budget but the Office of the President (OP) is not included. The proposed budget for next year has a number of one time allocations for UC. Provost Brown supports some of these increases but is concerned that this detracts from the focus on the overall support needed for UC.

Last week, Academic Council endorsed the memo on the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) prepared by UCEP with the Planning and Budget and International Education (UCIE) committees. Provost Brown thinks several good ideas have been put forth including a formal review of the Governing Committee every two years and he supports including a student representative on the Governing Committee. The provost expressed enthusiasm for shared governance and the value of the Senate's input. Budget management is a recognized issue for co-curricular programs overseen by the Provost's Office. Improving how UCOP's budget is presented will be a major benefit to UC.

Evaluations of other systemwide initiatives are planned and will include UC Mexico, UC Mexus, and Casa de California, noting that combining these three programs may be a strategy that will be considered. The provost will give the Senate a document that reflects his early thinking about systemwide programs. UC Washington D.C. Center (UCDC) and UC Press will also be assessed. Alternative arrangements for UCDC and possible hosting by a campus will be considered. While UC Sacramento is hosted by UC Davis, the provost wants to ensure it is truly a systemwide program. Provost Brown is closely examining

the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) and decisions about this program will be made soon. The provost will appreciate UCEP's recommendations.

Discussion: Chair White asserted that systemwide academic programs like UCEAP should be located at OP. Chair Caswell-Chen noted that UCIE has the most relevant expertise for the UCEAP Governing Committee and it is reasonable for UCEP's representation to be relatively limited. UCEP looks forward to consulting early and often as Provost Brown contemplates future restructuring of systemwide programs.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Shane White, Senate Chair*
- *Robert May, Senate Vice Chair*

Next year the Senate should focus on closing the faculty salary gap with the Comparison 8 institutions. Closing the gap would require an increase to the scales of 5.6% over three years but the president has only committed to 4% per year. President Napolitano's understanding and prioritization of the salary scales is a positive step. The Comparison 8 includes four public and four private universities, and there are some who believe UC should be compared to public systems, not necessarily public universities.

Vice Chair May reported that the retiree health workgroup's discussions have progressed and are now focused on the real substance of the issues. The members have agreed to continue working on a long-term plan and will identify a concrete timeline and priorities for its work. There is also agreement that there is no interest in an exchange plan even though this would be the biggest cost saver for UC. The workgroup's report to President Napolitano is due this month.

The president established a small taskforce to look at UC Health. UC Health is currently situated within OP and the Huron report suggested separating it in some way. Chair White noted there is no plan to change the structure of the medical centers. The problem this taskforce is trying to solve is not entirely clear at the moment but its report is to be ready for the Regents' November meeting. Another taskforce is examining the Agriculture and Natural Resources Division.

UC Berkeley was investigated by the Office of Civil Rights for its handling of the cases involving sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH). The Office asked UCB to work on the timeliness of the Privilege and Tenure process for faculty SVSH cases. Chair White indicated that UC recently updated policies in this area but more can be done. An audit examined whether the settlements were unduly restrictive on the complainants and victims and the report on this matter is also forthcoming.

Chair White's May remarks to the Regents focused on increasing faculty diversity and he has asked President Napolitano to hold deans and other administrators accountable for who is hired. The chair also recommended expanding the Presidential Post-Doctoral Fellowship program. The Regents' agenda included a relatively brief presentation on ILTI. Chair White thanked UCEP members for investigating the barriers to cross-campus enrollment and would like the committee to think about whether these barriers serve a valid purpose or if they hinder enrollment.

Discussion: Chair Caswell-Chen stated that the committee has been investigating whether the nine "issues" that were identified by ILTI are a result of specific policies. UCEP notes that it is not clear whether the issues are actual limiting cross-campus enrollment in online UC courses. Data has not been provided to support that low cross-campus enrollment numbers are a result of these nine issues.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

The directors of the Centers for Teaching and Learning held their first systemwide meeting in May and agenda topics included the organizational structure of the Centers, evaluation of teaching, and training for Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Instructors. The group will develop work plans on the last two areas as well as ways to increase awareness of the Centers. UCEP might want to meet with the directors in the future.

The state has floated various funding scenarios for enrollment over the next two years. Statements of Intent to Register are currently being submitted by freshmen and transfer students and the numbers for most campuses will be very high. The targets set by campuses will be exceeded. Academic Planning may assist the campuses with modeling for enrollment so more manageable target numbers can be identified.

A May presentation to the Regents on long-range enrollment planning to the Regents was postponed due to lack of time. One question is why UC does not have a multi-year planning process, which has been difficult because of the year-to-year fluctuation of UC's budget. Another issue is the capacity for physical expansion, as some campuses risk exceeding the agreements negotiated with their local communities.

Discussion: Chair Caswell-Chen remarked that there has been some reluctance to engage in long range enrollment planning partly due to concerns about the availability of necessary resources. After UC released enrollment numbers this year, we were told by the state to find the money from existing resources. The budget includes a 5% increase in student services fees, which may primarily be for mental health services and one house added \$25M in one time funding for mental health services. Director Greenspan will find out the specifics about this for UCEP.

VI. UC Merced Extension

The overview of UC Extension programs provided to the Regents in May is a helpful synopsis. Numerous ILTI courses are offered through Extension. One idea that Merced Extension is considering developing the curriculum for an online course but not offering the credit for it. The proposed partnership with a local community college arranges roles and responsibilities in a unique way, and the UCM Undergraduate Council (UGC) suggested language for a contract. The UGC recommended collecting data to help determine if what is offered is high quality and serving the community well.

Another idea being explored is for Merced Extension to offer an undergraduate degree for students who have left UCM at some point but are still in good academic standing. It would be a liberal studies degree and Extension is preparing a proposal, which will be sent to the Senate for a comprehensive review. Typically, undergraduate programs are approved by the campuses but Merced's concept has been brought to the attention of UCEP due to the potential ramifications for the system. Vice Chair Zanzucchi suggested that, in the future, the committee may want to discuss Extension and how it relates to academic work. Extension also dovetails with ILTI. Any advice on UCM's plans will be appreciated.

Discussion: The degree program sounds like a good idea but a member asked why it would not be offered by Academic Affairs. When a degree is on the main campus, it benefits from faculty participation in decisions about the courses.

VII. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

- *Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI*

Coordinator Osmundson debriefed the committee on the May 23rd presentation on ILTI to the Regents' Academic and Student Affairs Committee. The Regents were interested in learning more about the status of online education and broader efforts related to alternative modes of education delivery. The last presentation to the Regents five years ago included commercial representatives offering to aid in

development of Massive Open Online Courses. The time allowed for the May ILTI presentation was cut short so, while rushed, it seemed to be well received.

The coordinator explained that the nine issues related to cross campus enrollment were identified six years ago when the campuses jointly developed requirements for the cross campus enrollment system, the Hub. It is likely that the most restrictive policies became the requirements for the Hub, so when there were variations, individual campuses had to determine how enrollments were approved. Since that time, some of the enrollment requirements have changed. Initially the Hub did not track the specific reason enrollment was denied but ILTI started collecting more detailed information two years ago.

Discussion: Because of simultaneous Regents' subcommittee meetings, several Regents who have shown an interest in alternative methods of delivery missed last month's presentation. There was no opportunity to discuss whether ILTI can save UC money. Chair Caswell-Chen noted that the governor proposes to fund creation of an online community college, an idea that reportedly concerns the CCC faculty. Governor Brown recently said that UC should be like the fast food restaurant Chipotle to allow students to get quickly in and out. Ongoing efforts to clearly communicate to the Regents about the undergraduate experience, the quality of a UC education, the role of innovation, and sufficient state funding are important.

Information has now been collected from most of the campuses about the nine issues that may influence cross campus enrollment in online courses. Several of the members noted that the Registrars' expressed more reluctance to change campus practices or policies than did the divisional Committees on Educational Policy (CEP) or UGCs. The issue related to the requirement that students have 12 units has not been found explicitly specified in any systemwide policy or regulation. One divisional committee was frustrated about discussing the nine issues again without any specific evidence of how many students each barrier has prevented from enrolling. Furthermore, it is noted that the issues seem to arise from practices and policies that do have sound academic justifications. Coordinator Osmundson noted that some of the online courses have been formatted into modules and the process is currently underway to export a UCI writing course to UCD.

Coordinator Osmundson noted that some campuses have successfully implemented petition policies for students having an issue enrolling in cross-campus online courses. She noted that it would be helpful for the Coordinator to provide UCEP with information about current petition processes that facilitate easier cross campus enrollment. The chair proposed that a student who wants to enroll in an online course and had difficulty obtaining an approval could petition the academic advisors and this generic petition would cover any of the nine issues. The petition process would need to be well advertised and flexible. It is essential that CEPs/UGCs be involved in any discussions with Registrars about changes to local practices. The vice chair suggested that the value of cross-campus enrollment needs to be made clearer so advisors are more inclined to encourage students to take advantage of the option. Examples might be that multi-modality is valued by UC or that a course meets a need the home campus cannot fill, or is enriching to students - rather than from the perspective that budget cuts force a campus to send students elsewhere.

If an advisor supports a student enrolling in an online course at another campus, it does not seem reasonable for Registrars to not approve the enrollment. Campuses can collect data on the petitions requested, which may help identify problems with the petition processes or the need to revisit campus policies or practices. Coordinator Osmundson will document specific best practices that have solved problems related to the issues for individual courses. The goal is for campuses to have a generic petition process that enhances the cross campus enrollment process. A member emphasized the need to draw attention to other potential flaws with ILTI courses, including resources needed to support proctoring for testing. UCEP will forward to the Academic Council its request that the AC state support for those divisions that lack a petition process (for those cases wherein a student is disallowed from enrolling in a

cross-campus online course) to institute such a process. UCEP further discussed that it requests from ILTI data on the frequency and magnitude of the issues in limiting student enrollment in cross-campus online courses, but it is not completely apparent that the issues function as actual limitations to enrollment.

VIII. UC San Diego Pre-Proposals

The committee will have until June 18th to provide comments on the School of Public Health pre-proposal. Members were asked for feedback and the vote on the pre-proposal for a 7th Undergraduate College.

Discussion: UCSD's pre-proposal for a 7th College was vague and the committee looks forward to receiving a more detailed proposal. Comments on the School of Public Health pre-proposal will be shared via the listserv. Changes to the draft guidelines for proposal reviews should also be suggested.

Action: The committee approved the pre-proposal for the 7th College.

IX. Posthumous Degree Policy

Chair Caswell-Chen thanked the UCI representative for drafting a potential systemwide policy for the granting of posthumous degrees.

Discussion: Members agreed to forward the draft proposal to Council. The goal is simply to provide campuses with conservative guidelines that allow for exceptions in unique cases.

Action: The draft proposal will be submitted to Council.

X. Student Mental Health

The committee was asked to investigate the mental health services available to students on campus.

Discussion: UCSB has seen a 20% increase in the number of students needing mental health services in the past five years. It is possible that limiting the number of visits opens up slots for additional students. UCLA has reported morale issues among mental health providers and keeping clinical staff in place is problematic. There is no cap on the number of visits when deemed clinically necessary.

Chair Caswell-Chen noted that helping students who present with a mental health issue can be a stressor for faculty. UCEP could advocate that mental health support be prioritized. Next year ICAS plans to discuss student needs related to housing and mental health. The chair will draft a short memo to Council which will be shared with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the Committee on Faculty Welfare who may be willing to co-sign. Members agreed to move forward with this memo now rather than waiting until next fall.

XI. UC Transfer Task Force and Issues for Transfer Students

Chair Caswell-Chen and Vice Chair Zanzucchi called into the June 1st meeting of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). It is not clear if the Transfer Task Force has completed its work with the issuance of its recent report, but UCEP and BOARS will continue to consider recommendations related to the Task Force report. BOARS' discussion focused on admission rates by major degree and campus which was then broken down by GPA and ethnicity. BOARS seem to be gravitating toward GPAs but the committee was encouraged to think about other factors such as

comprehensive review or diversity. The attempt is not to find the right GPA for nine different campuses but rather guidelines in different cluster areas that give students a sense of what the thresholds are in terms of the guarantee.

A pressing matter is the associate degrees for science in physics and chemistry and a recommendation about this from UC to the CCCs would be needed before September. The chair and vice chair will coordinate with leadership of BOARS and Task Force Co-Chair Chalfant. The focus will be on what to advise Council in light of the report.

Unanswered questions include how the pathways will be governed and reviewed and how affiliated degrees will be managed. How well the pathways are working should be evaluated include persistence and retention. The pathways need to be examined in terms of how their utilization contributes to student success and access. It is not clear if there is a plan related to creating new pathways for majors. Affiliated majors can be permitted and encouraged to join existing pathways. UCEP could recommend against new pathways until there is an analysis of the success of the 21 now in place. The admissions, persistence and retention data could be a rationale for the timeline for creating new pathways.

Discussion: A likely concern with any guarantee for transfer admissions is determination of which campus will be required to admit transfers who meet the minimum requirements, but have not been admitted. Some campuses have guarantees based on the pathways. The Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Articulation, Monica Lin, should be invited to future UCEP discussions related to transfer students.

XII. Training for Teaching Assistants/Graduate Student Instructors

The committee reviewed campus information on training for Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) and the analyst has shared feedback from the May meeting of the Centers for Teaching and Learning directors because they are addressing training for TAs and GSIs. The committee may want to work with the Centers on the training issue. There is variability across the campuses in terms of the training available and how well the training is utilized, and even required training may not be offered consistently due to resource limitations. Sometimes the number of students wanting to participate in training exceeds the capacity. Given that departments are charged with providing the training, it may be difficult to uncover everything that is being offered. Campuses are seriously engaged in efforts to provide meaningful training.

Discussion: The analyst will add the missing campuses and/or updates to the table. UCEP might want to bring the committee's concerns to the attention of CCGA and members could reach out to the director of their Center for Teaching and Learning.

The Graduate Student Handbook section of UCSC's Academic Regulations mentions an "Associate In____" Title with the same duties as GSIs for less pay. UCEP might want to point out that the titling for TAs varies across the campuses and it may or may not be linked to pay. In unexpected or emergency situations, it might be necessary for someone who has not been trained or mentored to teach a class.

UCD has a petition process through the Committee on Courses of Instruction and candidates must meet specified criteria, have teaching experience, and submit sample student evaluations. It was noted that TAs and GSIs are paid less for teaching in summer session, but the reasons for the salary differential are not clear. UCEP will not propose policy but there is agreement to send a memo to Council outlining best practices to campuses that may strengthen the training such as having formal training courses and mentoring or apprenticeship relationships, and using LSOEs to provide the training. At the same time, the

committee should also establish connections with the Centers for Teaching and Learning. The graduate student representative's interest in this issue is noted.

Action: The UCSC representative will draft a memo with the best practices UCEP has proposed and Council will be asked to forward the memo to the Centers for Teaching and Learning.

XIII. UC Education Abroad Program

UCEP's UCD representative is on the Governing Committee, which met Friday. That Committee has not been informed when it will be restructured per Provost Brown's recent decision.

XIV. New Business

The committee did not discuss any New Business.

XV. Executive Session

The committee did not hold Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:50 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Ed Caswell-Chen