Attending: John Yoder, Chair (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Tim Labor (UCR), David Lea (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Jeanette Natzle (UCD) (telephone), Troy Carter (UCLA), Cristian Ricci (UCM), James Nieh (UCSD) (telephone), Mona Vakilifathi (Graduate Student Representative), Jonathan Ly (Undergraduate Student Representative) (telephone), Jackie Donath (Chair, WASC Policy and Planning Committee), (telephone), Diane Harley (Chair, Senate OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel) (telephone), Kate Jeffrey (Special Assistant, Business Operations), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Keith Williams (Interim Director, UC Online Education), Bob Powell (Chair, Academic Senate), Bill Jacob (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I.   WASC Handbook Revision
   • *Jackie Donath, Chair, WASC, Policy and Planning Committee*

UCEP has seen the draft of the revised handbook and Chair Yoder asked Chair Donath to lead the discussion. Chair Donath explained that the committee will present feedback on November 8 and 9th to the full Commission. The Commission will adopt the new handbook in February. The most controversial matter is related to WASC's conversation about the meaning and integrity of the degree and the ways institutions will demonstrate their understanding of standard 2.2 about the common elements of the degree.

Discussion: One concern is the evaluation of graduate programs and whether the evaluations will differ across disciplines. Chair Donath indicated that it is up to the institution to define the expectations it has for graduate students and how they are met. One campus might have expectations for students in one discipline that are different from the expectations for students in another discipline which is okay as long as the expectations are clear. A campus has general education requirements that straddle categories. There is interest in preserving maximum flexibility for institutions to define core competencies and how they are handled. Core competencies should not be limited to the examples in the handbook. It is the expectation of WASC that institutions will have a common set of expectations for students. It is overreaching for the Commission to define what is expected in graduate school and it is important that WASC not use language that is prescriptive. Chair Donath indicated that the handbook will be cleaned up based on feedback received in the summer. WASC has set up a meeting on November 13th about concerns that people have with the templates. Chair Yoder noted that some of the templates were not felt to be appropriate and campuses were asked to complete the forms anyway.

According to Associate Director Baxter, CCGA has indicated that it is problematic and not meaningful to aggregate PhDs or Masters across programs. More specialization at WASC might involve having a group of people that are specialized in research institutions and institutions that grant large numbers of academic doctorates. Review panels might also be organized around institutions granting academic doctorates Chair Donath thinks that the current language of section 2.2 takes away the prescriptive nature of the language used before. Graduate programs are reviewed every seven to nine years, though not at the same time. A member commented that graduate programs will be required to use a WASC template that will duplicate the work without adding anything.

WASC could think more about specialization as it establishes review teams. A member recommended that there be standards for who is on the review team. The policy and planning committee broke into

subgroups which worked on the three sections. The responses that each subcommittee proposed will be reviewed this week to determine if a next to final version can be prepared for the Commission. The whole Commission will be asked to discuss any issues that the policy and planning committee has difficulty with. By the February meeting, all feedback will have been received and a final handbook will be adopted at this time. Chair Donath thinks another handbook will be produced in December with a final round of comments, and she would be grateful if UCEP could review the next draft. It is not clear that a team that evaluate professional practice can come from WASC's pool. Chair Donath does not think it is WASC's intention to evaluate graduate programs on a micro level but admits that this may not be made clear in the documents. Graduate programs should not be treated the same way undergraduate programs are. Chair Powell indicated that there is a good deal of granularity in graduate programs. The competition for UC's graduate programs is international and a member believes that no UC graduate programs care about WASC's opinion. Chair Donath remarked that the Department of Education requires that WASC look at an institution as a whole which means graduate programs have to be included in the reviews. The frame of reference that includes time to degree does not apply to graduate programs. Chair Donath appreciated the distinction being made between the graduate and undergraduate programs and will share this with the Commission.

UCM has a proliferation of interdisciplinary programs. The representative would like faculty from other UC campuses to review what is being done at UCM before it goes to WASC. WASC could push back against the Department of Education and state that institutions will self-certify their own graduate programs. It was noted that the Department of Education's philosophy changes over time.

II.   Announcements and Updates

Chair Yoder has attended one Council meeting. BOARS reported on the holistic review process and there are two types of eligibility; admission guarantees are given to the top 9% of students statewide and the top 9% of students in their high school. Selectivity remains high but there is concern about the lack of overlap between students admitted based on state versus local context eligibility. The UCFW Chair discussed total remuneration and now that UC is contributing to UCRP, it is still lower than the comparison eight institutions. The Provost discussed UC 2020 which prioritizes funding for seven things including: increasing faculty to student ratios, increasing funding for start up practices, eliminating the faculty compensation gap, increasing graduate student support, and increasing staff salaries. It is now up to the campuses to secure funding for capitol projects. A regent who met with Council indicated that term limits have a negative impact on legislative concerns for higher education, which encompass long term issues. The Governor and Regents are supportive of online education and the Provost is supportive specifically of UCOE. Vice President Lenz discussed Proposition 30. A new payroll system common to all UC campuses, called UC Path, is going into effect. The UC office of research programs has a $60M budget and a new committee will look at what should be centrally funded projects.

Discussion: Students have complained about not being admitted to UC as a result of the new admissions policy. The UCSC representative indicated the campus was happy with the results of the holistic reviews and will use it again. The SAT scores dropped at one campus. The history of the decision was discussed. A member stated that most of the faculty at his campus are off scale. A member reported that UC will take a cut this year whether Proposition 30 passes or fails. If this proposition passes, cuts for next year will not occur. Fixed cost expenses at UC increase $300M annually.

III.   Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

IV.   Systemwide Course Approvals

Six courses have come to UCEP for approval this year, two were discussed at the UCEP October meeting. StatsW21, Intro to Probability and Statistics, was approved at that meeting. UCEP had questions about a UCI writing course, Writing39A, because it was proposed for non-matriculated students only. In subsequent emails, the instructor provided clarification that this was a new section of an existing course and not a new course.

Discussion: The reviewers of Writing 39A were satisfied with the clarification received from the instructor and UCOE and the committee voted to approve this course.

CSw10: The Beauty and Joy of Computing/UCB: the reviewer stated that this is an excellent course that specifies a logical audience. . It will meet in parallel with existing courses. The committee approved the course.

Psychology W1: General Psychology/UCB: it was noted that the campus COCI sent the course back to the instructor for additional information. The mid-terms will not be proctored. There is a demand for Psychology1 at several campuses. The committee approved the course.

CHEM W1A: General Chemistry/UCB: the instructor is non-ladder faculty but most of the materials seem to have been put together by ladder-rank faculty. There will be a combination of low and high stakes testing. The committee approved this course.

WART 23 AC: Internet Citizenship/UCB: one reviewer still had questions even though additional information and a revised syllabus were provided. But this reviewer concluded that the proposal is innovative and should be approved. The committee approved the course.

In general, UCEP felt the UCB guidelines for approving a course are very useful and could be formally instituted in the future.

Action: The analyst will notify the instructors about UCEP's approval.

V.   Rebenching Budget Committee Report

UCEP has the opportunity to comment on the rebenching report. Funding streams enabled the campuses to keep any revenues it generates and the rebenching looks at where the core funds from the state go. Rebenching will reset the finance model.

Discussion: The committee discussed the relationship between rebenching and Proposition 30. Chair Powell indicated that rebenching will move forward even though there are unanswered questions. Sixteen million dollars of new state money will be used for rebenching. President Yudof has already acted on the report. UCSF is not subject to rebenching. The proposed formula is too simple and fails to account for certain things. Concerns include long-range campus level planning and the ability to undo rebenching. Rebenching is an incremental approach that a campus can stop at any time. Bringing historically underfunded campuses to higher levels is a good idea and an important step, but the students at one campus should not be considered more valuable than students at another UC campus. There may be funding needs that are different and cannot be quantified at the level of an individual

student. Some campuses are right to be concerned because there is a possibility that funding will be diverted to other campuses. According to Chair Powell, rebenching will take six to eight years. There is a concern that a lot of time is being spent on a direction that UC may not move.

Action: The Chair and analyst will draft a memo outlining the committee's concerns.

VI. Online Instruction Pilot Project Evaluation Summary Report
   • *Diane Harley, Chair, Senate OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel (UCB)*

The Blue Ribbon Panel has drafted a memo with a number of important questions. The committee may want to add questions following the discussion with Panel Chair Harley. The panel had a call on Friday to discuss the summary report. Outdated or fragmented information has been provided to the panel and panel members were shocked by the low quality of the report and felt that the panel has been disrespected. . Many panel members felt that the report had been put through the spin cycle and to make rosy conclusions. It does not appear that the evaluation being done is the kind that will truly test the experiment. It is clear that there is backpedaling about what the evaluation will provide. The panel cannot come to any conclusions without basic statistical data. Unvarnished data about the project's costs officially as well as the cost to the campuses in terms of in kind staff support is needed. There is no way to assess the effectiveness of the program without cost data.

The panel had a lengthy discussion about activities at the campuses. It is not clear how a project like this can be rolled out without an environmental scan of existing courses. A draft memo goes into detail about the panel's concerns. The panel unanimously recommended that phase II of UCOE be delayed and no additional courses be developed until a full evaluation has been performed.

Discussion: The memo will go through Senate leadership to UCOE. The questions in the memo are the ones that should be asked in order to judge how effective UCOE is. Chair Harley believes that the Evaluation Center has been underfunded for this evaluation and does not have the resources to do what is needed. The Center also appears to be an internal evaluator instead of unbiased, and documents from the Center are vetted by UCOE before being provided to the panel. The UCSC representative reported being told that there are numerous resources available to assist faculty with course development. Several UCEP members indicated that staff have indicated that more campus money is being spent on online courses. The direction of UC's online project has changed direction over time which is an issue. Members discussed that UCOE is in direct competition with campuses which are offering its own courses.

The panel questions whether an evaluation will ever be provided. According to Chair Harley, a majority of the panel members are involved with some type of online initiatives. The panel would like to see good metrics come out. The concern is that the model being used is not the best one for UC, and UC should not be involved in course development. A member asked how UCEP can facilitate online education without working at odds with the panel's recommendation. Chair Harley was asked if all further course approvals should be halted until the evaluation is complete. The Senate's Executive Director contacted Senate offices about online activities at the campuses and it was clear that this information was not reaching the Senate offices. Whether the campuses or UCOP is in control of developing new, online courses is unclear.

VII. Funding for Undergraduate Aid
   • *Kate Jefferey, Special Assistant, Business Operations*

UC has a financial aid funding issue it is trying to resolve and feedback from a variety of constituents is being requested. The informal feedback will be used to consolidate the possible options. Two fundamental, systemwide goals are driving this effort; accessibility and affordability. Accessibility means that all academically qualified students should be able to attend UC, affordability means that qualified students should be able to attend regardless of their financial resources. UC does not want to use financial aid to make campuses compete with one another and students should choose a UC campus based on fit, not on financial support. For admissions and accessibility there is awareness of the need for diversity. There is a high correlation between being a low economic student and being from an underrepresented group. Another issue that arises is time to degree. If the time a student takes less time to achieve the degree the cost to the student is reduced as is the cost to the institution to provide financial aid.

UC enrolls a high number of low income students compared to other selective institutions. There has been a decline over the past seven years in the number of middle income students coming to UC. UC has received feedback that more should be done to assist middle income students. UC also looks at the burden on families. Parents are expected to contribute according to their ability to pay. If UC continues to fund the programs the same way that it does today, UC will not be able to maintain the current burden placed on families since if less grant funding is available, the expected contributions from parents and students will need to increase. UC could consider different formulas to use to capture additional parent resources. One possibility is to expect more from students, either though work and/or borrowing, but the question is whether they can manage this additional burden while maintaining their academic standing. . The borrowing component could be recalibrated or the repayment period for student loans could be extended. Another option is to increase the tuition revenue to provide more grant funding. Higher income students would be asked to pay more so that the lower income students would not have to. The question is whether there would be support for raising the tuition for those who can pay to assist those who cannot. UCEP is asked if there are some options that should be taken off the table.

Discussion: There is a decline in the number of middle income families and a member suggested that the new admissions policy may have contributed to some of this. A representative indicated that faculty are concerned about the tuition increases. One concern is about driving away higher income students; some campuses may price themselves out of the market and lose highly qualified students. The burden on low income students will be increased if UC does not change how aid is funded and UC will have to absorb funding for students who become ineligible for Pell grants. . The cost would be an additional 2% on expected tuitions. Non-resident tuition could be taxed or loan repayments could be spread out. Special Assistant Jeffery indicated that it is up to the campuses to decide on how to use non-resident tuition.

VIII.   Consultation with the Office of the President
   • *Keith Williams, Interim Director, UCOE*

Chair Yoder asked Director Williams about the role of UCOE in relationship to the groundswell of courses at the campuses. Since UCOE first started, there has been a lot of interaction between instructional designers and campus media staff. This has helped foster some of the development at the campuses. People involved early with UCOE benefited and have built on this. Each campus has multiple learning systems. UCOE may play a coordination role across the campuses. Each EVC may be asked to identify people who can talk about what is going on at their campuses. This year an effort will be made to identify how to facilitate cross campus enrollment. One issue is the ability to transfer data across the campuses since campuses use different systems that do not interact with one another.

Discussion: Funds are transferred to departments. There is a per student fee for non-matriculated students. The funds are subject to the local processes at a campus. UCOE minimally guarantees funds for non-matriculated students. Arrangements are made with department chairs. People who develop the course receive a royalty in part to acknowledge that their intellectual property is being used. Interim Director has not been instructed by the president or provost to prepare in the event that Proposition 30 fails.

There is variation in terms of how much online activity has occurred at a campus and UCOE is trying to provide help to foster efforts. More specific data from the evaluation may show that some things did not work and courses may be changed based on what has been learned. The faculty involved with the initial phase may have more enthusiasm for online instruction than subsequent instructors. Recent training sessions by instructional designers have been venues for sharing what has been learned.The ability of people to see what has been developed will encourage faculty to come up with new ideas. Director Williams indicated that an inventory of online courses is not in place but will be developed. UCOE is bringing a style of courses that UC has not seen before and Director Williams indicated that earlier courses were fairly simple. UCOE courses are using tools that have not been available before and Director Williams stated the UCOE courses are different from, not better than, the courses developed at the campuses.

Director Williams explained the process for the selection and development of a course. The instructional designers provide Director Williams with feedback on whether a course should be developed or not. Some of the courses UCEP has approved this year were already developed but have been altered for UCOE while others have been fully developed through UCOE. Outside funding has been used for one course in order to support specific components that UCOE may not have been able to support. It is still possible for a campus to offer an online course to non-matriculated students without going through UCOE. Summer session is an example of how this is done. Director Williams indicated that campuses tend to focus on what can improve the individual campus, not on what might benefit other campuses.

In June, UCOE began looking at solutions to the common learning environment. Last week a low cost pilot with full technical support will begin with Canvas, by a company call Instructure. This is a rapidly growing and solid platform. It should allow UCOE to do things in the same style and mode, and the evaluation with several courses will be used to determine how well it works. Other options are being explored. UCB is in the process of conducting some pilots with Canvas and at least one other UC campus is looking at this system as well. According to Director Williams, UCOE will not offer undergraduate online degree programs. Originally online courses were looked at as a way to address undergraduate education. There are online, self-supporting graduate degree programs, and while it may have been logical for UCOE to start there, this would have created competition.

A member asked about giving provisional approval of courses. Director Williams indicated that some campuses have granted provisional approval. If UCEP were to grant provisional approval, Director Williams suggests giving courses a couple of years to mature. Director Williams has been told that he is responsible for making sure that the loan is repaid, but he would not say that this drives his focus. Other sources of revenue are being explored. The central registration will have significant benefits to UC. Director Williams thinks that last year all people heard about was non-matriculated students and the loan but the effort has focused on UC students.

Meeting adjourned at: 4PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Yoder