

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2011

**Attending:** David Kay, Chair (UCI), Jose Wudka, Vice Chair (UCR), Constantin Teleman (UCB), John Yoder (UCD), Michael Dennin (UCI) (telephone), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Cynthia Skenazi (UCSB), Melissa Gwyn (UCSC), Laurie Smith (UCSD), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Jason Chou (Graduate Student Representative), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Bill Jacob (chair of BOARS), Peter Chester (Associate Director-Labor Relations), Robert Blake (Director, UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Announcements and Updates**

The \$500 million cut will occur and if the tax extensions do not pass there will be an additional \$300–500 million in cuts. The legislature is sympathetic but there are not many options. ICAS will have its annual legislative advocacy day in April.

The legislature remains interested in streamlining the transfer process from community colleges to CSU and UC. Articulation of courses for degree requirement credit is left up to individual faculty; UCEP should consider how to educate faculty about the larger issues related to articulation.

A workshop for the principal investigators in the online education pilot was held in February; it was an information sharing and goal setting exercise. It became clear that there are many definitions of online courses and it is likely that there will be a blend of different types in the pilot. Some of the courses have been previously offered online. The focus was on improving education by using technology. Evidence that the online courses are effective will be sought. UCOP still has not found funding to allow the pilot to continue past April. UCEP has gone on record stating that the pilot should be funded only with external funds

The UCLA representative reported on the student health insurance program. A health insurance carrier for the undergraduate students has been selected and it will be the same carrier that provides insurance for graduate students. Every campus will now have the same insurance carrier, which is supposed to make it cheaper for UC.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved with one correction. A member pointed out that the minutes may not have accurately reflected the committee's concerns about the funding streams proposal. The minutes will be amended.

**III. Facilitating Community College Transfers**

- *Bill Jacob, Chair of BOARS*

The legislature is concerned about community college transfer students graduating from UC in two years. There are two common paths. One is to complete general education requirements in two years at the CCC and complete upper division courses at a four-year school in the two following years. This model does not work well for the sciences, which often involve prerequisite streams that cannot be completed in two years. For the sciences, some lower division preparation for the major is desired at the CCC in addition to general education.

IGETC is one codified way to get into UC. The CSUs have a similar GE program but it does not match the IGETC. There was an initial effort to reconcile the UC and CSU requirements so that students in CCC can get into either UC or CSU. BOARS has devised a different approach for dealing with this. Chair Jacobs indicated that there are three things occurring statewide that address transfer students: Senate Bill 1440, Assembly Bill 2302, and SR 477. SB 1440 required the CCCs and CSUs to accept "AA for Transfer" degrees in which a major is specified. The CSUs have to permit the student to complete the major in two years. AB 2302 requires CSU and requests UC to identify effective lower division preparation pathways in high demand majors. SR 477, adopted in 2005, states that when four campuses UC have accepted a course for transfer credit, the others will automatically accept the same course unless opt out. These three measures were designed to ensure degree completion post transfer and eliminate barriers. BOARS has expanded its thinking beyond CSU general education and IGETC and UC in order to deal with these efforts.

The CSU and CCC are working on SB 1440 and developing transfer model curricula. By the end of this year the CCC will develop AA degrees with major designed for transfer, which the CSUs will accept. Provost Pitts convened five working groups of faculty to work on the common core upper division pre major requirements. This will be part of UC's AB 2302 response. The groups have made progress on what is to be required.

The Master Plan expects 60% of upper division students to be transfer students and there is room to grow in transfers. Comprehensive review is used for transfers as it is with freshman students. In some majors, transfer admission restrictions are strictly enforced whereas they are not enforced in other majors. Campuses set up transfer admission guarantees on an individual basis with community colleges. BOARS is considering stating that major preparation is a central component of transfer selection and would be part of comprehensive review for all transfer applicants. This would not change policy but it would still be a major change for campuses that admit students on a generic basis without respect to what courses students have completed for pre major preparation. A plan would be that every major specifies what they want and UC communicates what is required. Evaluation of the student's application will be linked to this. This might result in a decreased number of transfers to UC but students who do transfer will be better prepared.

**Discussion:** There will be increased stringency since students in certain majors will have to be prepared for these majors. Under this proposal, we would be telling transfer students to do the same things we tell native students to do in their first two years. What makes this difficult is the need to coordinate with the CCCs and CSUs. UC needs to specify what the CCCs need to do with respect to the AA degrees being developed. Verification of the requirements will be complex. UC has online systems and the admissions office spends significant time working on this. Infrastructure may need to be developed to ensure that the requirements have been met. Departments will have to look at the transfer AA degrees and document where there is adequate and inadequate preparation. Students will have to be advised about whether a transfer degree in a given major is adequate preparation for junior status at UC or on a campus by campus basis. Admission directors have advised Chair Jacobs that they do not have the resources to conduct this work and there may ultimately be no way to fund this type of evaluation. It will be up to an individual department to decide if it wants to do this work. Unifying requirements could decrease the work required. There will be considerable effort to implement this. BOARS will develop a written description of this strategy that UCEP will review. The CCCs can establish the AA in any major they would like but they are working with the CSUs to have some consistency.

#### **IV. Teaching Assistants' and Readers' Appointment Terms**

- *Peter Chester, Associate Director-Labor Relations*

As money gets tighter, greater efficiencies in how instructional assistants are utilized are being considered, but bargaining agreements with unionized employees prevent doing things differently. Some of these union policies do not seem rational or conducive to achieving instructional goals; Chair Kay provided three examples. (a) Chair Kay reported that UCI would like to use undergraduates lab tutors and compensate them with course credit, which is prohibited at his campus but not at UCB. (b) There is a requirement that when Readers and Teaching Assistants are employed over 25% time, they receive 100% fee remission. The money in the fee remission overshadows what they are paid in salary. Even if there is money to pay for a Reader, a campus cannot afford it because it has to pay the student's fees. (c) The contract allows a 50% full time student appointment, 220 hours over the course of a quarter. There is flexibility that allows students to work a little over 20 hours some weeks and under 20 hours other weeks. For international students, visa requirements mandate exactly 20 hours every week. They would have to be paid for those 20 hours even if they are not working and they could not "carry over" that time to weeks with greater demands.

A three-year contract was ratified last December and Associate Director Chester provided the committee with the highlights. Associate Director Chester indicated that not everything pertaining to work has to be negotiated with the union and the first issue raised by Chair Kay may be something that does not need to be negotiated with the union. Undergraduates could be given credit for tutoring without being given a bargaining unit title. The fee remissions issue is very significant. UC will have to maintain the policy of how fees are remitted for the duration of the contract which is critical for non-resident students and students in professional degree programs. With respect to the working hours, the limits are difficult to implement and inconsistent with the concept of a professional employee. Readers or tutors may not fall into the category of professional employee. There may be some flexibility with the maximums. The legal requirement that has to be satisfied with respect to the student

visas is not a union issue but rather a labor law issue. Associate Director Chester will research these issues and report back to the analyst.

**Discussion:** Vice Chair Anderson recommended that Associate Director Chester speak with Janet Lockwood, Manager of Academic Policy and Coordination, about the 20 hour requirement for international students. The appointment letters are treated almost like contracts and are carefully worded. The unions also wanted the appointment letters to be sent out in April which is not something UC can commit to. Graduate division staff have been involved in the negotiations, which has been helpful as they are able to provide practical information. They are receptive to having faculty participate in the negotiations. It would be possible to have a faculty member check in during the negotiations once a week instead of sitting through the meetings. The UCSA has the right to participate in negotiations to raise student concerns.

#### **V. Arabic Without Walls**

- *Robert Blake, Director, UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching*

The Arabic Without Walls program is the first multi-campus online course and Director Blake joined the meeting to report on how the course is going. The course was developed at UCB and taught two years at that campus. It was then moved to UCI and the UCI Senate approved the distance learning format. UCEP was asked to approve it as a university wide course which was done two years ago. Designating it as a university course has not increased student awareness. There is no place where the registrars can publicize that this type of course exists. The enrollment is low and diminishes over the course of a year. The course is advertised in the spring in student newspapers which is not an efficient way to increase awareness. The first year, 2007, there were 20 students from all campuses. Students from campuses that had closed their Arabic programs enrolled in Arabic Without Walls. The Registrars should facilitate getting the word out about the program. The student credit hours go to the instructor of record. There is significant confusion about the process for how students get credit.

**Discussion:** The entire course is online and a desktop video conference system is used for small groups of students with the instructor to practice spoken Arabic. The course is a year long sequence. Director Blake indicated that he does not have a primary contact at each campus to publicize the course and welcomes any help that UCEP could provide. Chair Kay suggested that the Registrars should be responsible for publicizing Arabic Without Walls and other courses such as the D.C. Center, the Sacramento Center and the upcoming online courses. A catalog for UC wide courses could be developed. A member remarked that Arabic without Walls is a set of courses that do not change whereas UCDC courses change every year and therefore the DC Center does create more work for the registrars. UCEP should submit a request to Council to ask that the Registrars be brought together to figure out how to implement listing the university wide courses in the catalogs. There may be efficiencies to be found if this is addressed.

#### **VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership**

- Dan Simmons, Chair, Academic Senate
- *Bob Anderson, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

There is a Regents meeting next week with a full day devoted to discussing budget issues. The governor has signed off on the \$500 million reduction to UC. There is a suggestion from the state that faculty should teach more although faculty bring in more as a result of research than the state provides in funding. UC will meet enrollment targets. There is pressure on all the campuses to increase the number of non-resident students. UC is asked to set aside \$3 million to increase to AFSME members' salaries. Council has a group working on implementation of the Powell Committee recommendations. Council's letter on the funding streams proposal expresses concerns about maintaining UC as one system. The provost is suggesting postponing the rebenching work until next year but the Senate is asking that discussion about this begin immediately. As a result of rebenching, funding will be shifted to different campuses. It is essential that the Senate develop a plan for the future of UC.

UCOP is seeking to reduce its budget by \$90 million and give this funding back to the campuses in various amounts. The cuts at UCOP will come primarily from research programs. ANR is slated for an 8 or 9% cut. The Senate has set up a committee to look at ANR. There will need to be more outside grants to support the agriculture programs. A new formula may be based on the number of students of different types. Funding from programs that are cut will be given to the Chancellors. Student outreach programs will be cut though the

legislature has requested that they are not cut more than 16%. AIDS research programs are targeted for cuts. The process of deciding which programs will be cut is very fluid.

There are discussions about developing a centralized payroll system. Chair Simmons remarked that the discussions about increasing efficiencies do not consider ways to simplify people's work.

**Discussion:** There are discussions about cutting programs.

## **VII. Implementation of Powell Committee Recommendations**

Chair Kay asked if the memos on the use of non-ladder rank faculty and the Powell Committee recommendations accurately reflect the committee's discussion.

**Discussion:** Members suggested ways to clarify some of the wording in the memo on the use of non-ladder rank faculty. UCEP does not have enough information to state what proportion of students should be taught by non-Senate faculty. According to Chair Simmons ladder rank faculty are significantly involved with upper division courses and UCEP could focus on the types of courses lecturers teach. Vice Chair Anderson recommends that UCEP suggest this issue should be studied. Departments will have the flexibility to decide what the balance of ladder and non-ladder rank faculty should be. Members proposed stating that the number of non-ladder rank faculty should be kept as low as possible to maintain the research influenced character of instruction at UC. The memo should also state that ladder rank faculty should continue to teach. In 2008-09, 45% of lower division student credit hours went to Senate faculty, 32% to non senate faculty and a significant amount to adjuncts and visitors. The memo will go to Council and will also be reviewed by the implementation committee.

A member stated that the memo on implementation of the Powell Committee recommendations makes an honest statement about UC's situation. The request for inclusion of budget information in program reviews could be met with resistance. UCPB, CCGA and UCEP could develop a list of information that the committees deem important for a program review. According to Chair Simmons, the president has suggested that the Senate should conduct a more rigorous, detailed comparative analysis during program reviews. The recommendation from the Commission on the Future related to this issue is an opportunity to increase the authority of the campus educational policy committees to conduct more substantive program reviews that includes budgetary information. Chair Simmons stated that the associate deans at his campus felt that this approach would be valuable.

External reviewers do not understand how UC works so the comparative data would be most useful when the CEPs and deans conduct their part of the review. The comparison could begin with UC programs. Several members expressed concern that this approach may not be workable. It may be hard to get the data in a form that can be compared. The letter may also state that campus administrations must develop and provide the budget information in order to facilitate program reviews. A member noted that it is also important to look at information not related to budget. UCEP may make a more neutral statement such as that stating that the budget information should be made available to the appropriate Senate bodies. Reviewers could be asked to comment on potential efficiencies if they find something that looks like a bad use of resources. The memo should state what UCEP considers to be essential programs and services such as instructional programs taught by ladder rank research faculty. The point should also be made that it is important to use funding to preserve the quality of education. The draft memo will be sent to the chair of UCAP. There was a discussion about whether the public and even the Regents understand the issues related to reputation and quality. The losses faced by focusing on through put and getting more faculty into the classroom are not clear. The Regents are not aware of how hard faculty work.

## **VIII. Enrollment Management**

There is an incentive to increase the number of students being enrolled since the campuses will now keep the funding for them. A number of campuses will increase the number of students admitted. The marginal cost the first year will be zero but in later years this will not be the case. There are implications for quality if the student faculty ratio is increased. Chair Kay will add a statement about this in the memo on the Powell recommendations.

**Discussion:** Coordinating what the nine chancellors decide in terms of the number of resident students to admit with what UC has agreed with the state to accept will be difficult. The memo will state that unrestricted, independent enrollment decisions will make it difficult to provide access to qualified residents. The Senate may

want to decide if there should be tools to manage enrollment at the campuses. UC needs to figure out how it will survive the declining state support as a system. There may also be an impact on quality systemwide.

### **IX. Pass/Not Pass Regulations**

Chair Kay suggested that since some students who take a course P/NP actually earn As, it should be possible for them to receive those As (or whatever letter grade they earn, if they prefer that grade to a Pass). This could be seen as assigning a grade for actual student achievement instead of having the grade depend on the student's confidence level at the start of the course.

**Discussion:** This change could encourage students to take risks. Some members felt that this would result in GPA doctoring. The same limits for which courses a student can take pass/not pass would be in place. The limits include that the pass/not pass cannot be used for courses in a student's major. Limits on how many times the pass/not pass option can be applied would continue, exactly the same as at present. This option could provide an incentive for students to work hard in all their classes. The committee discussed the importance of students understanding the decisions they make and that the emphasis should not be on grades. An option could be that a student opts to take a course for pass/not pass and then takes a letter grade at the end, that course should still count as one where they exercised the P/NP option. In a straw poll asking how many people think there is some hope of considering this further, six people voted in favor and six voted against. Members will bring this to their campus CEPs.

### **X. UC Quality**

The statement on UC quality has been slightly revised. The purpose of this is to be able to indicate when quality might be reduced as a result of certain decisions. Quality is based on the totality of the experience at UC should be the focus, not just any one course.

**Discussion:** The document is intended for internal use and would need to be rewritten for any external audiences such as the legislature. The statement does not address academic achievement. It could state that students understand the benefits of research and scholarship to the state. Additional revisions were discussed. The memo will be distributed to members for approval after the edits are made. The statement will be submitted to Council.

### **XI. Pre-Major Requirements for Impacted Majors**

Students may be admitted to a major needing to complete early courses, which they do not pass, resulting in their exclusion from the major. The question is, is it better to set major admissions requirements (pre-major requirements) than to admit many students who eventually are weeded out. This is especially important for students who transfer into UC as juniors and then are steered out of the major after one year.

**Discussion:** This may vary by department and discipline. According to the Riverside representative, the issue related to this matter at his campus was resolved. At campuses that allow students to declare their major when they arrive, a higher GPA requirement can be set to join a major than the GPA that has to be maintained. Some campuses have rules about the policies that can be used to manage impacted majors.

### **XII. Publicizing Student Learning Outcomes**

Chair Kay explained that UC conducts assessments that are publicly accessible to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs, as for accreditation, but some aspects of program assessment involve collecting work from actual students. Student work cannot be made public unless it is redacted because of privacy rules. UCM has asked UCEP to clarify the official policy on this and reconcile the mandate to make assessment information public with the privacy restriction.

**Discussion:** Students could be asked for their permission to make the work public although it would be a burden to get everyone's agreement at the beginning of every class that their work can be used or to track down students after the class. It should be possible and relatively easy to get the permission of one or two students. One representative was informed that permission is given for work to be used by assessment committees, which may be a violation of policy. UCEP should find out from OGC what the law is. A blanket waiver could be signed by students when they receive their letter of acceptance. There is no need for the student name to be linked to the work although it is their intellectual property. The committee discussed whether there is an issue related to

informed consent. UCEP would like to know about the dissemination of the work and can permission be sought at time of acceptance.

### **XIII. Authenticating Students' Work in Online Courses**

This will be important as online courses are increasingly used. It would be good for UC to have a policy that states it is important for students' work to be their own so there should be a mechanism to authenticate the work. APM 015 already indicates that faculty must ensure that grades directly reflect course performance.

**Discussion:** The issues are the same whether the course is online or not. Faculty use as many strategies as possible to ensure that students are doing their own work so it is not clear what more can be done. One way is to have students take the final exam in person. APM 015 could be changed to state that "faculty are expected to ensure that grades directly reflect the student's performance in the course."

### **XIV. New Business**

Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

Assistant Director Baxter reported that the undergraduate deans would like to move forward with the idea of having a university wide conference on undergraduate education. The last conference was in 1993. The deans feel that given the current budget this is an important issue. A proposal is being developed to bring eight faculty from each campus along with administrators to the conference. The Boyer report will be the jumping off point. Funding from UCOP would be used and the conference would be held at UCLA.

The Lumina Foundation has come out with a "degree profile" which is a framework for what it means to receive a baccalaureate degree.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: David Kay