Attending: Melanie Cocco, Chair (UCI), Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair (UCLA), Darlene Francis (UCB), Katie Harris (UCD), Manoj Kaplinghat (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Holley Moyes (UCM), Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR), Stephane Mel (UCSD Alternate), Thuan Le (UCSF), Julie Bianchini (UCSB), David Cuthbert (UCSC), James Weichert (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCB), Sadaf Bandeali (Graduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning), Susan Cochran (Chair, Academic Senate), Jim Steintrager (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
   • Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Senate
   • Jim Steintrager, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

   o The Regents voted to allow UCLA to join the Big 10 but will require UCLA to provide financial support for student athletes at UCB. This is shift in thinking that, while only related to football at the moment, might come up in other situations if a campus does something that might harm another campus. UCEP might think about if this principle will apply if, for example, UCB proposes an online degree program that could harm UCM.
   o Katherine Newman, the new systemwide provost, is starting today.
   o A report from the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) in response to large capital funding requests from UC and California State University (CSU) systems states that capital requirements will decrease because so much education will be done online. What the LAO fails to understand is that most buildings are used for research and administration rather than instruction.
   o Before the winter break, Vice Provost Haynes sent guidance to the executive vice chancellors regarding certification of work by personnel during the strike. The principal investigators (PI) are the starting point for a federal audit and the Senate has alerted PIs that they should not sign work effort reports unless they are confident of their accuracy because signing incorrect reports is fraud.
   o UCOP will ask faculty to complete self-attestation forms and Senate leadership has encouraged the administration to think about its goals and how it will define the striking behavior that could lead to a reduction of a faculty member’s wages.
   o The financial model for supporting graduate students has blurred the line between academic work and labor, and the involvement of the UAW in discussions going forward will fundamentally change the nature of the conversations.

Discussion: The UAW’s statements have only referred to the graduate students as “graduate research employees.” Campuses continue to work on entering grades.

II. UCB’s College of Computing, Data Science, and Society Proposal and UCSD’s School of Computing, Information and Data Science Pre-Proposal
   o Geoff Cook (UCSD) and Dottie Wiley (UCLA)

  ➢ UCB’s proposal for a College of Computing, Data Science, and Society (CDSS)
   o The UCSD representative stated that the rationale for the new school is reasonable but there are a few concerns.
The proposal is to merge the Department of Statistics, School of Information, and Center for Computational Biology into one school, a change that makes sense structurally.

UCB’s Graduate Council expressed concerns about Electrical Engineering and Data Science being under the two colleges and two deans.

Faculty in the School of Information objected to the school being folded into this new entity whereas the School of Information’s dean is enthusiastic about the merger.

The proposal indicates that the CDSS will rely heavily on donations but it is not clear if this approach is sustainable.

Discussion: The governance structure is complicated and the proposal raises questions about whether there was consultation with all relevant stakeholders because it seems like the school is a top-down initiative. There seems to have been a lack of consultation with undergraduate students or people focused on teaching and administration of undergraduate education, and UCEP has questions about the impact of the CDSS on resources for undergraduates. It is possible that the new school would be the second or third largest college at UCB because of the sheer number of undergraduate and graduate students it would absorb. Members have doubts about the rationale for the creation of the CDSS and there are already questions about undergraduate students’ access to various courses.

It is unclear how funds will be allocated and how the two deans will reach agreements about funding, and UCEP can recommend that there should at least be a memorandum of understanding. Committee members are interested in seeing this school succeed but the proposers should address the details missing from the proposal before it can be approved. The analyst shared the October 2021 memo from UCEP in response to the pre-proposal and it was noted that UCB did not respond to the questions raised during that review. The UCSD representative will draft questions to send to the proposers.

UCSD’s School of Computing, Information and Data Science Pre-Proposal

The UCLA representative explained that the two founding groups are being combined and there will be two co-directors and five additional directors of the unit.

The appointment of dedicated academic leadership in the form of a new dean who will report to the executive vice chancellor will be important for the new school’s ability to succeed.

The proposers assert that the formation of the school will regularize how various bodies in the Academic Senate engage in the review and oversight of academic experiences.

There are no letters of support from the divisional Senate and there is no information about a vote.

Discussion: The analyst will contact the UCSD Senate office to request the divisional Senate’s feedback on the pre-proposal. There are concerns about the creation of boutique schools in response to trends and the consequences of prioritizing resources for new schools.

III. Chair’s Updates

Academic Assembly voted to approve Senate Regulation 479 to establish the California General Education Transfer Curriculum. The Committee on Faculty Welfare sent Academic Council a report describing how behavioral health or mental health options and treatment are substandard. Both faculty and students have a difficult time connecting with therapists or mental health providers, so one suggestion is for UC therapists to prioritize UC colleagues. Academic Planning Council discussed the five-year planning perspectives and there are four online programs in the works: UCI’s Business Administration proposal; UCSC’s Creative Technologies proposal; and proposals from UCM for education and journalism programs. UCB’s proposed online degree in Education will be a concern because given
Berkeley’s reputation and that tuition will be the same, undergraduate students will question attending another UC when they can take UCB’s online program. This is related to Chair Cochran’s report about the Regents being concerned about the impact of one campus’s decisions on the other campuses.

IV. Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP’s December 5, 2022 videoconference minutes were approved.

V. Draft Principles for Online Majors and Minors

- Manoj Kaplinghat (UCI) and Eric Schwitzgebel (UCR)

The UCI representative invited members to add their comments to the draft principles for online majors and minors and discussed some of the questions that have been raised. One question is whether a principle should be that online majors and minors are successful for all students or if this should be more narrowly focused on specific types of students. It is not clear if the definition of an online course should include office hours or if the definition is about scheduled instruction.

Discussion: Chair Cocco clarified that there are requirements related to federal financial aid and accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), and office hours for online classes are not part of WSCUC’s calculations. It was noted that transcripts for transfer students do not necessarily indicate if a course was online and the chair explained that WSCUC is only concerned about the online courses taken at UC. When transfer students enroll in an online major as juniors, the major could become a de facto online degree. Once UC reaches the point where students are taking more than 50% of their courses online, it will be critical to ensure that all online courses meet the requirements for an online course versus a correspondence course because students are not allowed to get financial aid if they exceed the 50% threshold.

A member suggested that UCEP consult with instructional designers who understand pedagogy. The committee could establish that the courses in an online major have to meet a certain standard of engagement with instructional designers. Members were asked to provide their campus’s information about approving online courses. A subcommittee of UCEP might work on the details about minimum standards for online courses. Evaluations of student performance in online courses have to be stringent.

VI. Questions for UCSC about the Creative Technologies Proposal

- Holley Moyes (UCM) and Julie Bianchini (UCSB)

This discussion was postponed until the next meeting.

VII. Guidelines for Proposal Reviews

- Darlene Francis (UCB) and Julie Bianchini (UCSB)

This discussion was postponed until the next meeting.

VIII. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCM: The campus is considering if there will be a special category for online courses taken in the summer. At UCLA, each department’s vice chair checks whether courses will be online and asks for
information about academic integrity. UCSD has an onerous approval process for online summer courses which includes a 27-point review by the Teaching and Learning Commons.

IX. New Business/Executive Session

Chair Cocco shared that IRAP will present data on first year persistence rates, graduation rates, and data from the undergraduate experience survey to UCEP on February 6th. Members would be interested in data on online courses offered during the pandemic and data on transfer students in impacted majors.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:20 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Melanie Cocco
I. Consultation with UC Online

Program Director Osmundson provided an overview of the evolution of UC Online since 2013. Full-time matriculated undergraduate and graduate UC students are allowed to take a UC Online course at another UC campus at no additional cost through the cross-campus enrollment system (CCES). The CCES serves as the registration system as well as UC Online’s course catalog. A UC Online course must be open to students on the home campus before being opened for cross-campus enrollment. UC Online funds support for students taking a cross-campus course, including additional teaching assistants. The program is no longer using a rigorous reporting system to document the allocation of funds and no longer requires award recipients to submit six-month reports to the provost about their activities and expenditure of funds. Instead, the funds are sent to the executive vice chancellors who are responsible for making the expenditures. UC Online surveys students at the conclusion of every term about their experiences in the courses.

Deloitte submitted its report on the CCES to UC Online’s Advisory Council and Vice Provost Gullatt for feedback and clarification and the report will be shared with UCEP once it is finalized. The analysis includes information about how many students complete the cross-campus courses. There is an ongoing discussion about the demographics of students who enrolled in UC Online courses, both at the home campus and in cross-campus courses. Moving forward, Institutional Research (IR) at UCOP will have students’ demographic information.

Discussion: Since the campuses make decisions about how UC Online funds are spent, Director Osmundson does not know how many teaching assistants were hired but did indicate that 6k students took cross-campus UC Online courses in 2021-2022. UC Online courses can be synchronous, asynchronous and hyflex. One problem for Massive Open Online Courses was that many students who enrolled in courses did not complete them and Director Osmundson estimates that 90% of the students who enroll in UC Online courses complete them. The campuses are responsible for assessing efficacy and UC Online is careful to not overstep its role, but some campus IR units have studied efficacy and Director Osmundson offered to share the analyses with UCEP. It was noted that most campuses have moved away from using external proctoring services. The director does not have information about the number of students who have taken one or more than one UC Online course, and a member remarked
that it would be interesting to see if students who took multiple courses had different performance outcomes.

Chair Cocco explained that State law allows California Community College (CCC) and California State University (CSU) students to take UC courses and asked students in these systems are taking UC Online courses. According to Director Osmundson, this happens through UC Extension courses and CCC and CSU are allowed to take one course per term for $60 to $75 depending on if it is a semester or quarter course and if there are seats available. However, because CCC and CSU students must wait until the enrollment period closes, they will be three weeks behind when they start the course and at a disadvantage. UC Online has argued that these students should be given access to courses, but they should be advised that they might be dropped if a course is over enrolled. It is better for students to wait until it is confirmed that there is a seat for them. Chair Cocco remarked that it would be beneficial if CCC and CSU students could take UC Online courses when the classes they need are not available at their campus.

II. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning

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

The Academic Planning Council’s (APC) Future of Undergraduate Education workgroup will meet in person next week to work on their report. APC’s workgroup on Faculty Mission, Priorities and Balance Post-pandemic is poised to start once the new provost is briefed. Senate leadership wants a workgroup on the graduate student funding model. The governor’s budget which was released on January 10th will fully fund the compact with UC and includes additional funding to convert 900 non-resident students to California students.

Discussion: Director Greenspan indicated that the budget office will have information regarding whether the administration will provide the additional funding for graduate student researchers required as a result of the strike.

III. UCB’s College of Computing, Data Science, and Society Proposal (CDSS)

- Geoff Cook (UCSD)

Chair Cocco explained that most of the questions about the CDSS raised by the UCSD representative were asked by the Senate during the review of the pre-proposal and have not been addressed in the full proposal. The analyst notified the chair that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and the Committee on Planning and Budget are close to finishing their reviews, and Chair Cocco does not think it makes sense to stall the review process by sending UCB the same questions the proposers have already failed to answer. Chair Cocco asked all members to review the proposal which the committee will vote on during the February meeting. The UCSD representative remarked that there are many aspects of the proposal that could be re-tooled but there is clearly significant momentum at UCB for the CDSS to be established.

Discussion: Structural issues that could potentially impact undergraduate instruction are under UCEP’s purview. The proposal does not respond to the concerns of stakeholders at UCB, and UCEP should offer strong feedback. The analyst noted that the Compendium spells out a process whereby the provost can work with the campus to resolve the systemwide Senate’s objections to a proposal.
**Action:** Members will review the proposal and related materials in preparation for a vote in February.

**IV. Guidelines for Proposal Reviews**

- Darlene Francis (UCB) and Julie Bianchini (UCSB)

Chair Cocco indicated that the Compendium includes instructions for writing proposals which should be referenced in UCEP’s guidelines. Proposers should be asked to include the pre-proposal documents in the full proposal packet.

**Discussion:** Proposers should consult with staff and students early on. The assumption is that a proposal has gone through the divisional Senate. Members discussed if letters from deans should be explicitly requested. The committee suggested that it would be valuable to have letters in a proposal from the executive committees at each school.

**V. Questions for UCSC about the Creative Technologies Proposal**

- Holley Moyes (UCM) and Julie Bianchini (UCSB)

Chair Cocco stated that UCSC’s Creative Technologies proposal is actually a pre-proposal since this is the first round of review by UCEP. UCSC will be asked to respond to UCEP’s questions before the committee sends its feedback to Council. The analyst shared that immediate past Chair Horwitz suggested that UCSC should send the Senate a revised proposal for an online major. The UCM representative described the questions prepared for the proposers and Chair Cocco asked members to suggest additional questions.

**Discussion:** A member remarked that it is unusual to develop a major with all new classes. The proposers should be asked to describe what cohort building looks like and, if UCEP’s proposed campus experience requirement is approved by Council, when students will be expected to be in residence. The syllabus is based on a generic template and more detail should be provided, and the allocation of student hours should also be clearer. Chair Cocco explained the information that the program needs to document in order to be accredited. The proposers should describe the overall strategy for assessment and examinations.

**Action:** Chair Cocco will add the information about the WSCUC review to the questions and send it to the UCM and UCSB representatives before they are forwarded to UCSC. The UCSC representative can inform the proposers about UCEP’s discussions regarding online majors.

**VI. Scheduling UCEP’s In-Person Meeting**

Chair Cocco selected April 3rd for the committee’s in-person meeting so the committee can carefully flesh out the text for the guidelines for online majors and minors. The chair would like to invite someone from WSCUC to join UCEP in March to discuss federal regulations for online courses.

**Discussion:** The UCSD representative explained that April 3rd is the first day of the quarter at that campus and he is scheduled to teach, but he can join UCEP’s meeting by videoconference. The other members indicated that they are will attend the April 3rd meeting in person at UCOP.

**Action:** The committee confirmed the plan to meet at UCOP on April 3rd.
VII. Campus Reports/Member Items

Following the wildcat strike at UCSC a few years ago, the CEP developed a rule that students will be given a Pass if a letter grade has not been entered within 30 days of the deadline for entering grades and instructors may alter the grade later. The decision was controversial but the committee felt it was necessary. Since the end of the most recent strike, UCSC’s CEP found that 85% of grades have been entered whereas over 90% of grades have been entered at the other campuses. Faculty and teaching assistants have been asked to work on getting the grades entered because students were complaining about issues related to the lack of grades.

VIII. New Business/Executive Session

There was no New Business or Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:15 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Melanie Cocco