

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
ACADEMIC SENATE
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2011

Attending: David Kay, Chair (UCI), Jose Wudka, Vice Chair (UCR), Constantin Teleman (UCB) (telephone), John Yoder (UCD), Michael Dennin (UCI) (telephone), Benoit Dayrat (UCM), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Cynthia Skenazi (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC) (telephone), Laurie Smith (UCSD), Peter Loomer (UCSF), Jason Chou (Graduate Student Representative), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Shawn Brick (Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy), Debora Obley, Associate Vice President, Budget Operations), Michael Clune (Director, Operating Budget), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome

The governor's proposed budget includes a \$500 million cut to UC. Most of the campuses held back some of the increase in funding received last year so the immediate hit will not be quite as bad. At the systemwide level there is currently no discussion about furloughs. Council is looking at how money flows from UCOP to the campuses and vice versa. UCEP will hear about the funding streams proposal during the meeting today; the next step is "rebenching," which will reconsider from scratch the formulas for allocating funding to campuses.

From the ICAS meeting, Chair Kay reported that the community colleges have course syllabi, which are the individual instructors' descriptions of a course offering, and course outlines, which are official standardized descriptions. The course outline should be requested when attempting to determine if a course articulates.

Seventy letters of intent were received for the online education pilot and thirty of these will move to the full proposal stage. Most of them are for large undergraduate courses. There is still no money to pay for the online courses but UCOP is seeking external funds. The Senate has stated that the pilot must utilize external funding; to fund fifteen would require two million dollars. Some technology to support online courses already exists on the campuses. All members agreed that external funding should be used for the online courses.

The UCI representative reported that he attended a meeting about the evaluation of the online courses. There was insufficient focus on what faculty would want to evaluate. It was noted that there is not routine evaluation of regular courses. The group decided to keep track of as much data as possible in order to evaluate such things as achievement of learning outcomes, student experience, cost effectiveness, and resource utilization

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Streamlining Students' Credit in "Nonresident" Programs

A long term problem has been ensuring that students receive appropriate credit for a course taken at another UC campus. This issue comes up with UCDC and the Sacramento Center, with EAP, and potentially with an increase

in on-line courses. Senate regulations specify that a student's home campus must recognize units completed at another campus, but the mechanisms for achieving this are not simple or transparent. There is a regulation that specifies that a course, once approved by one divisional Senate, can be designated by UCEP as a "systemwide course" and included in a systemwide catalogue. However, no such systemwide catalogue, on paper or on line, currently exists.

Discussion: The campus where the course is offered does not have to accept the student. UCEP has approved Arabic Without Walls as a systemwide course; its director will provide a progress report to UCEP next month. All of the UCDC courses have been approved; these should be submitted to UCEP for systemwide approval. Eventually, online courses will also need to be approved as systemwide courses.

Credit for completing a remote course does not automatically show up on the students' transcript. At one campus the student has to go to the Registrar to receive approval before taking the course. A member asked if this is a problem for students in the Education Abroad Program. On a course by course basis, individual faculty decide if an EAP course counts. The issue is that the processes for listing courses in the catalog and ensuring that the credit is reflected on transcripts has not been implemented.

For UCDC, one campus could be designated as responsible for approving the UCDC courses and submitting each course to UCEP for systemwide approval. The information about these courses would at least be included in the designated campus catalog. The administrative process of publicizing courses and transferring credit is the primary problem; the Student Affairs liaison to the Registrars will ask them to identify the challenges related to this. Chair Kay will recommend that the UCDC advisory body designate a campus.

IV. Harmonizing Transfer Requirements

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy*

At the end of last year, Council and Academic Affairs convened five groups of department chairs—from math, biological sciences, psychology, computer science, and history—to discuss the commonalities in their lower division course offerings that might afford a more streamlined transfer path for community college students. The meetings were productive. There is a common core of course work across the campuses although there are some outliers related to lower division courses required. The faculty agreed to discuss the differences with their departments. The faculty appreciated having these discussions with their peers. One group had the idea of having a systemwide calculus textbook. UC needs to do a better job of communicating the commonalities across the campuses and explaining the differences. There is a proposal to conduct more of these meetings in additional disciplines. The meetings were chaired by immediate past UCEP chair Keith Williams, who is suggesting that SR 477 (which mandates that once four campuses have identified a course as transferrable, the others will accept it by default) may be irrelevant since campuses will likely chose to opt out.

Another outcome of the meetings was the sense that it is not beneficial for every community college student to concentrate on completing IGETC to satisfy all of GE before coming to UCI. In some disciplines with long prerequisite streams, such as STEM, it is better for students to complete lower division major preparation at the community college and postpone some GE to take at UC.

These discussions will lay the foundation for UC's response to legislation about streamlining the transfer process. There is interest in expanding these meetings to the top 20 transfer majors.

Discussion: The STEM disciplines sometimes make it difficult for students to finish in four years even if they are native students, so this may not be a problem restricted to transfer students. The same policies should apply to transfer and native students. Some campuses may accept lower division biology courses from the community colleges but it is not clear that all campuses do. A member commented that the students' level of success at the community college is an important factor. There is an effort to use the C-ID project to provide feedback to the community colleges on how their courses are being taught. The ability for students to transfer into UC should be made more straightforward and transparent; UCEP could encourage faculty to be more flexible in articulating

courses for major credit.

The sequencing of courses is also a factor that may contribute to when prerequisites are taken and how long students are at UC. Student flow through the degree is not examined and a comparison across campuses on prerequisite requirements should be conducted. The UCD representative has created “trees” that illustrate the flow and will share examples with the committee. One member looked at community college biology courses and found a wide variety of courses under this umbrella. At one campus, students have been found to take too few courses and also need to retake courses if their grades are too low, which prevents other students from getting into those courses. Prerequisites are often waived but not formally removed by faculty. One question is whether students get all of the content in courses at the community colleges. Administering exams to potential transfer students is expensive and the predictive value is questionable. Faculty need to discuss prerequisite requirements and whether there are unnecessary requirements. Eliminating some requirements may help with impacted majors. Members were asked to explore what has been done at their campuses to streamline requirements. Lower division courses also need to be examined.

IV. Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership

The committee has the opportunity to opine on the report from the Task Force on Senate Membership.

Discussion: It is not clear whether there will be an impact on undergraduate education. One concern is that medical school faculty would overwhelm faculty in the non-professional schools. UCEP could express agreement with the separation of authority for undergraduate curricular decisions. As UC considers potentially major changes in its structure in response to the budget problem the use of non-Senate faculty will become an important consideration. UCEP can endorse the recommendations especially the recommendation to separate the authority.

Action: The chair will draft the memo endorsing the recommendations.

V. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Bob Anderson, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Members of Council are on an implementation group working on recommending how to implement the Powell Committee recommendations. Whatever is recommended will be discussed broadly by the Senate. Some recommendations will have an impact on undergraduate education. The budget is likely to be an issue for several years. There will be a higher ratio of students to ladder rank faculty in the future. UCEP can provide input on what strategies to apply (e.g., more lecturers, more adjuncts, more GSIs).

The Challenge 45 program at UCLA encouraged majors not to require more than 45 units of upper division courses. A presentation on Challenge 45 to UCEP would be beneficial. Small classes could be consolidated or offered every other year. Classes now taught by a ladder rank faculty member could have more students with the support of graduate student instructors although the cost of the GSIs needs to be considered. There is a question about whether UC has appropriate job titles; the possibility of having at the general campuses a title similar to professor of clinical X is under discussion. The creation of teaching positions for two to three years for post doctoral students is also being discussed. They would have an assistant professor teaching load with a lower salary.

Discussion: Some of the pressure to not use more non-ladder-rank faculty has come from the Senate. Students may not necessarily be aware of the titles their instructors hold and instead are focused on the quality of instruction. It may not be clear what strategies will be good or bad but there should be guidelines and best practices for preserving quality. The continuity of faculty is essential. UCB and UCLA are in the position to create a revenue stream based on non-resident students but this is not the case for other campuses, such as UCM. The principles that will minimize the consequences of any action UC takes to address the budget should be in place.

A member asked if there is data on faculty student ratios and faculty teaching efforts across the campuses. Teaching could be made equal with research with respect to how it is rewarded, but UC needs to maintain the same standards as other top research institutions. The APM prohibits UC from paying extra salary for extra courses taught during the regular year although this could be changed. The amount that would have to be paid for teaching extra courses would probably be higher than the cost of paying a good lecturer.

Chair Kay will write a summary of this discussion.

VI. Consultation with the UCOP Budget Office: Funding Streams Proposal

- *Debora Obley, Associate Vice President, Budget Operations*
- *Michael Clune, Director, Operating Budget*

Associate VP Obley reported that the campuses were interested in having a more transparent way for the allocation funds and for having all funds remain on the campus on which they were generated. The campuses also wanted more predictability in terms of how much funding they will receive. The proposal guarantees that all funds generated by a campus are retained by the campus. There needs to be a way to fund UCOP and systemwide initiatives which are now funded by the campuses. This will be in the form of a flat tax that each campus pays. Campuses with more money will pay a greater share of the tax.

The principles associated with the education finance model need to be maintained. Workload expectations are uniform across the system. The campuses with higher proportions of needy students will receive more funding. The work started with the budget offices at the campuses and the Executive Vice Chancellors and has expanded to other bodies that will be impacted by the proposal. The mechanical details are being worked through. Funds at UCOP will be returned to the campuses at the same time the proposal is implemented, which will make the first year revenue neutral for the campuses. The funds that will be returned are equal to the tax that the campuses will have to pay this year.

Discussion: The budget office has a model that shows what the tax will be at each campus. The proposal is not likely to save UC any money in terms of budget and accounting processes. It is hoped that UC will act as a system on issues that cross campuses so that programs that UCOP believes should be protected are funded. The tax rate may be 1.67% although the governor's proposed cuts are a factor. Any excess funds at UCOP would be returned to the campuses. The UCM representative indicated that faculty at his campus had significant reservations about the proposal including efforts at some campuses to increase the numbers of out of state students. Non resident tuition revenue was decentralized several years ago. UCM has been treated differently than the other campuses.

The campuses will decide what fund sources will be used to cover the assessment although there are some sources that cannot be used for the assessment. The proposed cuts are distributed on the basis of the campuses' ability to pay which is not necessarily fair to UCB and UCLA. The goal was not to redistribute funds from some campuses to others. UCSF will be very disadvantaged by the proposal because the campus does not have undergraduate students and is therefore not receiving student fees. The budget office has a new philosophy that student fees are not intended to replace state funds. Undergraduate student fees have to subsidize graduate programs because these programs are not funded sufficiently by the state. There will be much more transparency at UCOP. AVP Obley predicts that there will eventually be differential fees across the campuses.

Chair Kay asked how campuses will receive funding for students enrolled in online courses. According to Director Clune, this will probably be similar to how the EAP funding is treated but it will be complicated administratively. The UCOP budget office will assist campuses with this. The proposal should state that the assessment level will be evaluated with the participation of the campuses. There is concern that implementing this proposal will create ten different campuses. The EVCs already have the authority to not fund a program. Until rebenching is done it is not clear which campuses will gain and which will lose. This proposal will lower UCOP's ability to tell the campuses to fund certain programs. It is believed that the current formula is more

generous to certain campuses like UCB and UCLA.

Half of the tax will support administration at UCOP and the other half will support systemwide programs such as the California Digital Library and DANR that are central to UC's mission. UCEP could state that during the periodic revision of the proposal, funds could go to UCOP to support systemwide programs. One member felt that campus based fees that students impose on themselves should not be included in what is taxed. UCEP identified a number of issues with the proposal, including concerns about the lack of transparency in the current process, the potential effect of campuses being coordinated less than they currently are, and the value of some systemwide initiatives that might lose funding under this proposal.

Action: Chair Kay will draft a memo stating the committee's position.

IV. Teaching Assistants' and Readers' Appointment Terms

- *Dwaine Duckett, Vice President of Human Resources, UCOP HR*

This item was not discussed.

V. Implementing Powell Committee Recommendations

There are several recommendations from the Powell Committee that are related to undergraduate education. One broad issue is using more non-ladder rank faculty for teaching. UCEP should make recommendations for principles for using these faculty. UCEP was asked by Vice Chair Anderson to discuss what should be done if it became necessary to reduce the use of ladder rank faculty. Other recommendations include the three year degrees and reducing time to degree.

Discussion: A member also noted that another issue could be the appropriate use of Extension courses. Regarding the use of non-ladder rank faculty, principles include having continuity from term to term in the curriculum by using Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOEs). A member remarked that as more faculty retire there is a concern about who will replace them. LSOEs might be a way to increase quality and UC could make more use of them. It was noted that peer institutions have higher ratios of teaching faculty. The dean or provost would need to make the decision to hire someone as a LSOE instead of in another title. Members were asked to look at the use of Unit 18 and LSOEs at their campuses. CEPs could endorse the idea that FTEs should be allocated for LSOEs in certain units. A member remarked that having fewer researchers could be a concern for parents.

Reviews should be tied to teaching evaluations and people should not be hired or retained unless their teaching evaluations are positive. There should be mentoring, peer evaluation or class room visits for new instructors in particular. Hiring short-term part-time instructors as Unit 18 lecturers should be discouraged. Post doctoral scholars could be used. Teaching Assistants could be trained to teach and provided with close supervision. Postdocs and graduate students could be given preference over Unit 18 lecturer positions. The students' research would decrease to some extent, although they would be gaining experience. Mentoring is the key for these students.

The use of non-ladder-rank faculty can change the character of the curriculum; it might be prudent to determine the minimum proportion of a curriculum that should be taught by ladder-rank faculty, although a lower proportion could be sustainable with effective monitoring, mentoring, and support by the Senate faculty.

The administration has moved away from encouraging campuses to reduce the numbers of unfunded students since the tuition is a valuable source of revenue. New classes are not being added, resulting in more crowding and the inability of students to get into classes. If class sizes are increased more help will be needed in the form of funding for Teaching Assistants and Readers.

Units should be encouraged to examine the flow of students through their courses as it is not clear that curricula

operate as efficiently as they could. The distribution of teaching resources may not be aligned with where students are. Chair Simmons encouraged UCEP to stress that the focus should not be on through-put and efficiencies. The Senate can keep track of this during program reviews. UCEP should encourage campus Senates to request more information, including budget information, in program reviews. Working with the campus Ed policy committees, UCEP could indicate what a good program review looks like.

Changing all the campuses to the semester system was mentioned, but that is costly, requires significant faculty time and the benefits are not significant. Expansion of self supporting programs may be worth exploring as an income stream and may not degrade quality if implemented well. Extension could be used as a revenue stream for the campuses. The Senate created a barrier that prevents Extension from providing degrees. Chair Simmons indicated that there is some discussion about self sustaining undergraduate degree programs and the Senate opposed the Commission on the Future recommendation to implement these programs. Members agreed that UCEP does not support self sustaining undergraduate degrees but would support self sustaining courses. Some Extension programs are more effective than others but they are not a significant source of revenue.

The erosion of quality will catch up to UC and that is when the real impact will be evident. UCEP should state that the loss of quality cannot be quantified. President Yudof has stated that UC is not going to be able to admit all of the students required by the Master Plan. Substantially fewer students should be admitted this spring but the EVCs want the revenue from tuition. UCEP could state that the things that need to be cut are those that are not central to teaching and education. The money that is spent on things not related to education should be used to make UC more affordable to middle class families.

VI. UC Quality

This item was not discussed.

VII. Pass/Not Pass Regulations

This item was not discussed.

VIII. Authenticating Students' Work in Online Courses

This item was not discussed.

IX. Pre-Major Requirements for Impacted Majors

This item was not discussed.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: David Kay