

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

## VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017

**Attending:** Barbara Knowlton, Chair, (UCLA), Edward Caswell-Chen, Vice Chair, (UCD), Stephan Miescher (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM), Judith Rodenbeck (UCR), Arvind Rajaraman (UCI), James Rauch (UCSD), Laura Nelson (UCB), Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCSB), Beth Lazizzera (UCLA), Julie Lind (Admissions, UCOP), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

**I. Updates**

Chair Knowlton welcomed members to the videoconference, indicating that while this may be the last meeting for the year, there may be issues to discuss by email over the next few months. The chair attended the meeting of the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) and had the opportunity to discuss the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) hub for cross campus enrollment. Online courses will be discussed by UCACC next year. In the future, UCEP may want to discuss issues related to student information faculty store on their computers.

During the most recent Academic Council meeting, the chair of the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity reported on that committee's meeting with President Napolitano. One difficulty related to the diversification of faculty is that it is difficult for faculty from underrepresented minority groups to move from associate to full professor. UCB's pilot on letters of recommendation and a proposal from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools about augmented review were discussed by Council. Letters of recommendation may not benefit students from underrepresented minority groups. The proposed augmented review policy would use recommendation letters when there is a gap in the information in the application or an unanswered question. Letters would be just one way a student could address the gaps or questions, and the augmented review would apply to no more than 15% of applicants. If the use of augmented review exceeds 15%, UC's application will be examined. A concern is that some students may not be able to get letters.

There is a California State University (CSU) General Education Task Force and Chair Knowlton will attend a meeting later this week. The task force has looked at the Western Association of Schools and Colleges' core competencies and discussed what General Education (GE) should be and this week's meeting will include reports on what GE looks like at the CSU campuses. The CSU may move toward having a standard for GE across all of its campuses. Since each UC campus has a different goal for its GE, UCEP may eventually want to articulate how the campuses want to use general education.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved with corrections.

**III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

UC's relationship with the state has been discussed by Academic Council and Chair Chalfant reported that several new Regents have been appointed by Governor Brown. In the May revise, the governor withheld \$50M in an effort to hold UC accountable to the auditor's recommendations. Although UC

meets the goal of admitting one transfer student to every two freshmen systemwide, UCR's and UCSC's numbers are being closely scrutinized by the state. The Senate should ask for analyses of how requiring UCR and UCSC to admit more transfer students impacts enrollment across the system. Chair Chalfant indicated that the effort to create associate of science degrees for transfer students with the California Community Colleges is progressing. These degrees will guarantee admission into some UC campus, but not to a specific campus.

**Discussion:** A member remarked that UC would have to cut overall enrollment in order to achieve the ratio the state would like to see and pointed out that campuses are already less restrictive with respect to the transfer students admitted. The 2:1 ratio for freshmen to transfers called for in the Master Plan for Education is an arbitrary goal which does not take into consideration the actual student demand or consequences for students.

#### **IV. UCEP Response to ITLI Questions about Cross Campus Enrollment**

UCEP received a series of questions from the Coordinator of ILTI last year and Chair Knowlton has drafted a memo based on the committee's subsequent discussions about online courses in general and related to cross campus enrollment specifically. The memo addresses UCEP's larger concern that cross campus courses may not be the best use of online education. UCACC is interested in reviewing the final memo.

**Discussion:** Vice Chair Caswell-Chen raised the issue of academic integrity and pointed out that resources are required to ensure that students are not cheating. The committee approved the memo and members will send any final edits to the chair.

**Action:** Chair Knowlton will finalize the memo.

#### **V. Campus Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) Issues**

The committee discussed the AWPE in May and it will be an agenda item for next year. Members were invited to share what they learned about the AWPE at their campuses.

**Discussion:** The UCSD committee supports keeping the AWPE because it serves its intended purpose but did suggest that students could be restricted from responding to the essay prompts with personal anecdotes. UCD's subcommittee on Preparatory Education has been discussing the AWPE extensively and concerns include that it is a timed test and the resources required for students who do not pass the exam. A common observation is that students are not doing as well with writing even though they are otherwise academically strong. There is support at UCD for having the Entry Level Writing Requirement.

A concern for UCSC faculty is that the AWPE does not help distinguish between students needing a little extra help versus those who need more assistance. It would be helpful if the AWPE could provide more information about students' level of proficiency especially given the cost of keeping the enrollment in writing courses small. From UCEP's perspective, the question may be how the AWPE and the ELWR affect the freshman year and the idea of more stratified courses might be something for UCEP to consider. Local committees could discuss what is missing from students' writing, what type of content faculty would like to see, if there is some specific aspect of writing that is not a strength, and the various consequences for students who do not fulfill the ELWR.

How many students at each campus take the AWPE would be useful data and Coordinator Lind confirmed that this data can be provided to UCEP and it may be a part of the report being prepared by Institutional Research for the Committee on Preparatory Education. The number of students who take the

AWPE probably varies by campus. A member commented that there is a significant issue with the exam as it relates to diversity. Students in underrepresented minority groups, particularly in the STEM fields, are impacted by having to take basic writing and math courses, so any data by major would also be valuable. The report from Institutional Research will be available for UCEP's review in the fall.

## **VI. Review of Systemwide Programs**

Chair Knowlton shared that Provost Dorr mentioned program reviews to Council in her comments about the audit, which raised questions about the oversight for systemwide programs. The timetable, the procedure and the questions UCEP should ask need to be clarified. The Natural Reserve System's systemwide Field Course and the UC Washington D.C. Center will need to be reviewed by UCEP. It is not clear if UC Sacramento should be reviewed by UCEP or if UCD handles this program and Vice Chair Caswell-Chen will follow up on this matter.

**Discussions:** The UCSB representative has been a member of UCEAP's Governing Committee. He served twice on the review committee, appointed by UCIE, for UCEAP in Ghana, West Africa. The first time (in 2005), the committee did not conduct a site visit. The second time (in 2015), he traveled to Ghana to conduct a site visit, which enabled a more thorough review. Established EAP programs are reviewed about every ten years. The UCSB representative recommended site visits for the programs UCEP will review, and members agreed with this recommendation. The analyst will follow up with Chair Chalfant about whether ILTI will need to be reviewed by UCEP. Chair Chalfant also suggested that it would be logical to wait until a new provost is hired before making concrete plans for any reviews.

## **VII. Update on UCD Academic Integrity Workgroup**

- *Ed Caswell-Chen, Vice Chair, UCEP (UCD)*

The UCD workgroup has primarily met during this quarter and includes members of the Undergraduate Council and the director of Student Judicial Affairs (SJA) unit which oversees the academic code of conduct and handles disputed cases of misconduct reported to that office. The charge to the workgroup was to consider and prioritize issues of import related to misconduct. The participants started by sharing anecdotal experiences with misconduct but it was pointed out that there are also faculty welfare issues to consider. Some cases adjudicated by the SJA have reached outcomes that faculty have not been satisfied with. The campus revised the academic code of conduct last summer.

Vice Chair Caswell-Chen shared some of the possible recommendations under discussion. One idea is to provide syllabi to students that reference and include a link to the academic code of conduct and there is an emphasis on educating students about the academic code of conduct. The number of referrals to SJA has increased markedly over the past few years and with finals still coming up, the number this year has already surpassed the number of cases last year.

UCD's Regulation 550 about misconduct will be revised so the language about academic integrity is clearer and more specific. For example using the word "cheating" instead of "academic misconduct" can make a difference. Although hearings about referrals to SJA for cheating are not legal proceedings, more students have been accompanied by attorneys. The workgroup is proposing that instead of giving a student a zero for a course when misconduct has occurred, faculty should be allowed to give an "F." A concern is that overly punitive actions may result in under-reporting.

The workgroup is also considering aligning UCD's transcripts with the transcripts of other UC campuses that indicate misconduct. At several stages, students could be asked to read and sign off on having received the academic code of conduct and agreeing to abide by it. The SJA hearing panel is comprised of two students and one faculty member and at UCD the panel makes the final decision about each case. The

workgroup agreed that this would not be changed but that the SJA would review the hearing outcomes. The campus as a whole will be asked to nominate faculty to serve on these panels and criteria for these faculty will be identified.

There are also concerns related to faculty copyright of their material and Course Hero and similar websites have been discussed by the workgroup. Individual instructors hold the copyright to their materials and it is therefore the responsibility of each faculty member to pursue having materials taken down. The workgroup has discussed whether the copyright may be indicated on materials faculty upload to the Canvas system. Another idea is that a student's name could be embedded on any document downloaded from Canvas for a course. Education for both students and faculty is hoped to be the main avenue to communicate expectations. The New York Times has run several articles about misconduct and pointed out that even with programs such as Turn It In, cheating can be difficult to detect. The goal of this work is to be fair to all students who are doing a great job and reward them for their hard work and to discourage and reduce the frequency of misconduct. With the continuing increase in referrals to SJA it is clear that the misconduct issue is not going away.

**Discussion:** Reportedly in the CSU system, a first offense results in a student receiving counseling about misconduct. Some of the issues with faculty not reporting misconduct may be related to their compassion toward students. For example students will report being afraid of losing their financial aid if a certain grade is not attained. It is important to make sure that how reports of misconduct are handled and the consequences for students are clear to faculty. Another point to make with students is how their cheating hurts other students. At UCSD the misconduct cases were managed by the Student Affairs Office but the campus established an independent Academic Integrity Office. At this campus, the international students are very much associated with the rise in academic misconduct issues, which could in part be related to different cultural norms. At UCD, of the approximately 1k cases, 14% are related to international students. There may be different perspectives about plagiarism.

## **VIII. New Business**

The vice chair has compiled information provided by members about GE which will be shared with the committee. Vice Chair Caswell-Chen asked members to correct any errors on the spreadsheet and to include additional information. If members have a sense of how the campus feels about Advanced Placement courses counting for GE this should be noted. UCD is the most restrictive campus in terms of not allowing AP to count for GE and there is a question of whether its policy is too restrictive. Chair Knowlton will also share a report from the CSU GE Task Force with the committee.

Members thanked Chair Knowlton for her leadership this year.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:45 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton