

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, MAY 2, 2011

Attending: David Kay, Chair (UCI), Jose Wudka, Vice Chair (UCR), Constantin Teleman (UCB) (telephone), John Yoder (UCD) (telephone), Michael Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Cynthia Skenazi (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC) (telephone), Laurie Smith (UCSD), Jason Chou (Graduate Student Representative) (telephone), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Todd Greenspan (Director, Academic Planning, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Do Quyen Tran-Taylor (Planning Analyst, Academic Planning Programs and Coordination), Keith Williams (Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Rebecca Landes (Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements and Updates

Last Monday was the ICAS legislative day. ICAS includes leadership from UC, CSU and the community colleges and on this day they visited with legislators. Due to term limits, legislators need to be repeatedly educated about issues related to higher education. One message is that the faculty of the three systems do work together on issues such as transfer students. Another is the difficulty of planning when decisions about admissions and enrollment must be made before the funding level is known. A third is that the state should not restrict or pre-designate the nature of funding cuts, leaving those decisions to the institutions. A final message is that when questions about higher education arise, legislators can consult ICAS for the faculty point of view, in addition to the administration perspective they receive from the presidents and chancellors.

At Council, the president discussed requesting the state to establish a baseline for funding and plan for incremental increases over the next several years, which would help rationalize longer-term UC planning. A task force is working on “rebenching,” which will change the allocation of state funds to the campuses. The status of the online education pilot was discussed. Seven hundred fifty thousand dollars from the Gates Foundation and several million dollars in loans internal to UC will fund the pilot. Council will again note that it approved the pilot on the condition that it be funded only by external funds. Aside from the funding issue, the pilot is being rolled out in a thoughtful way. The UC-internal loan will come from the short term investment pool (STIP), which can be used for projects that generate savings or revenue. The plan is to pay back the loan with fees from non-UC students and summer session students in ten years, although this is not a guaranteed source of revenue.

Discussion: There should be more frequent meetings with the legislature. It was noted that there is currently not a student on ICAS though it is possible that there is a position for one. The tax extension initiative will not be on the ballot for June. At the moment, UC leadership is not planning on raising tuition beyond the already-planned 8%, but this is one of the few things under the university’s control and if an “all-cuts budget” is enacted, further large increases will be inevitable. The state is not funding eleven thousand students and a goal is to get back to a level where all resident students are fully funded. The change in funding streams will move forward as the rebenching is being discussed. The STIP funds are generally used for administrative efficiencies and it should be noted that these funds would not be available for general educational purposes. The CEP on one campus has a very negative response to how the STIP loans will be repaid. There is concern about spending significant resources on developing a single common online course delivery platform. One campus is in the process of drafting guidelines for approving online courses.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

Action: The memo on the Rules and Jurisdiction ruling about SR 610 and “in residence” with respect to online courses was approved. The proposed language will be discussed by Council next month.

Action: The memo regarding academic student employees was approved.

Action: The memo regarding SR 544 was approved. This memo will be sent by Chair Simmons to the Provost.

Action: The committee voted to adopt the Consent Calendar.

III. Transfer Students

ICAS drafted two memos (one for CSU/UC faculty and one for community college (CCC) faculty) to inform faculty about transfer student issues. UC faculty need to know whether a community college course prepares students adequately for UC courses. Existing articulation agreements embody past determinations; the CCC official “Course Outline of Record” provides course content that is applicable to all offerings of a course; and an individual offering’s syllabus provides information about a single offering of the course. The CCCs want UC to use the course outline of record for this process instead of the course syllabus; UC, in turn, would like more detailed information in course outlines of record. The memo to CCC faculty explains that requests for individual syllabi come when the UC faculty can’t make their determination from the outline and encourages greater detail in the outlines. The memo to UC/CSU faculty distinguishes outlines from individual syllabi, encourages the use of the former, and encourages as a standard for articulation a determination of whether a student can succeed in subsequent courses, rather than whether the articulated course is entirely equivalent to the UC course with which it might articulate. The memos will be sent to department chairs at UC who will identify the faculty involved with articulation decisions.

Another issue is how to help UC faculty make articulation decisions more easily. SR 477 stipulates that a course that has been approved by four campuses has to be accepted by the other campuses unless they opt out. There could be a database of articulation decisions that have already been made. Apparently no such list of courses has yet been compiled. ASSIST.org is a web site that provides comprehensive information about transferring to four year colleges although it may not easily show what courses have been articulated. An update to this web site is planned. The committee should provide feedback on a BOARS’ report on transfer admissions.

Discussion: The course descriptions are available on the C-ID website. A member pointed out that the terms objectives and outcomes should not be used interchangeably and Chair Kay indicated that the community colleges use the term objective to refer to learning outcomes. Whether the students are achieving the desired outcomes should be the focus, not the community colleges’ objectives. Identifying which courses at community colleges lead to success would be valuable. Faculty may be comfortable with granting unit credit for courses that may not satisfy major requirements.

In terms of articulation decisions, SR 477 may never have been used because of administrative issues. It would be good to have a mechanism in Assist.org for listing courses and designating who has accepted them at other campuses for other purposes. A database of course equivalencies between UC campuses does not exist and it would be a way to help junior transfers finish their degrees on time and native UC students to finish quickly. If UC campuses could look at each other’s past articulation decisions they could more quickly determine which courses articulate for basic major requirements. Standardization and knowing what is equivalent at UC would support articulation with major preparatory courses across multiple campuses.

BOARS’ proposal is comprehensive and outlines a solution that UC may be able to accept. The proposal gives UC flexibility since it guarantees that UC will review students’ applications rather than

guaranteeing admission. The proposal will allow students to be admitted even if they have missed one minor requirement. One concern is that UC admissions offices may not have the resources to comprehensively review a potentially larger number of transfer students if this proposal is adopted. BOARS is now looking at what UC does with transfer students to see if it is consistent with what is done with freshmen students. Chair Simmons commented that UC needs one clear policy with respect to transfer admissions.

A member was concerned that students who are not prepared to be successful in their chosen major may be admitted. Students need to know which majors can realistically be completed in two years after transferring, and they may not receive the advising that would help. What will ensure students are prepared and successful needs to be provided in a separate document and this needs to be done in a simple and clear way. SB 1440 model transfer programs are being evaluated to determine if fulfilling these would be sufficient, if additional courses are needed, or if there are courses that will not help students prepare. The transfer process should be simplified but student success must be emphasized early in the proposal. BOARS should define what comprehensive review means as well as other terms since campuses have different definitions. The proposal would require transfer students to declare their major at the same time native students do. One member suggested preparing graphic visualizations of prerequisite paths to identify bottlenecks and unnecessary requirements. The committee noted again that while completing general education via IGETC is effective for students in some disciplines (more typically humanities and social sciences), students in other disciplines (more typically STEM, which tends to have longer prerequisite streams) would be much better served by completing some major preparation courses at the community college. Without that, STEM students are seldom able to earn their degrees in just two years at UC after transfer.

UCEP will recommend to BOARS that junior transfers should be treated like the junior native students by giving them the criteria for becoming eligible for a major. Community college students will be evaluated based on their preparation for completing their degree in a reasonable time. Some community colleges will not be able to prepare students to finish in four years and a member noted that there are multiple pathways to success. UCEP could state that the approach outlined in the proposal is reasonable and that students should be told how they will be evaluated for a given major. There is tension between giving priority to students with the strongest likelihood to complete their major in two years and viewing academic accomplishments in the context of opportunity. Campuses should have guidance in terms of how to reconcile these two things.

IV. UC Wide Class and Lecture Availability Student Survey

- *Justin Riordan, Undergraduate Representative*

A survey on class and lecture availability was conducted across UC campuses. This survey followed a 2010 survey at UCSC of students' perception of the impact of the budget crisis. The survey on availability was conducted in February 2011 and every student in the system had the opportunity to respond but only UCSC and UCSB had response rates high enough to be statistically significant. The UCSC data was presented to UCEP. Class availability varies by year and discipline.

Discussion: A member asked if UC has the right rules in place to help students succeed. Across the campuses, rules vary on how many times a student can retake a class. Based on the survey results from 2009-2010 departments did reallocate resources that resulted in improvements this academic year.

V. Assessment of Online Courses and Pilot Project

- *Keith Williams, Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*
- *Do Quyen Tran-Taylor, Coordinator, P-20 Programs/Initiatives, Education Partnerships*

The development of the assessment of online courses is a work in progress. Faculty Advisor Williams

became involved with this last year while working on a definition of UC quality. Currently, quality is based on the campus course committees' approval of courses, faculty approval by department chairs, and student evaluations that are not negative enough to draw attention. The online project is attempting to set a higher bar in terms of how the courses will be assessed. Basic assumptions about the online pilot include that the courses will be taught by UC faculty, that there will be an instructor presence in the courses, there will be an emphasis on interaction between students and instructors, and there will be a specific emphasis on the evaluation of quality.

A group of individuals in Academic Planning is involved with developing the assessment and a goal is to ensure that, at the campuses, there are people to support faculty teaching the online courses. Lead instructional designers at UCB and UCI will help faculty organize instructional design. The UC Education Technology Leadership Group (ETLG) is providing pedagogical, technical and content support for course design and development. The goal is to have a team of people available to help faculty at every stage.

A general, flexible learning environment that meets the needs that faculty have identified will be used and will probably be based on something like Moodle or Sakai. Additional course design and development will occur after an initial approval of the concept by the Senate. The courses will not be fully designed before Senate approval. Since the learning management system is not in place it is difficult for faculty to state precisely how they will conduct their courses. The evaluation of the course may lead to redesigning the course. How the common learning environment interfaces with local student information systems is being discussed. UCOP will work with a multi campus research unit at UCSB, which will archive data so that educational research can be conducted. It is not yet clear if this research will be conducted only by UC faculty.

Actual outcomes are being embedded in learning activities at the course and topic level. Actual outcomes will be compared to the intended outcomes, and the project evaluation will assess how successful faculty have been in meeting the intended outcomes. Learning feedback for online courses will include the feedback now provided in the classroom setting as well as formative feedback which includes embedded practice, assessment and learning reports, peer review and forums or blogs. This information will be available to both students and faculty. The assessment will also use the formative feedback. Faculty will be encouraged to have module level objectives for their courses. The students' experience, faculty and student workload and cost will also be assessed, and the assessment will evaluate the technology used as well. Benefits of the pilot include developing a common, but flexible, learning environment and offering courses that can be shaped by learning outcomes and take advantage of a flexible learning environment. One question the research will ask is whether the formative assessment can be used to identify at-risk students better than is done in traditional courses. Most of the courses in the pilot are hybrid models and a few are fully online.

Discussion: Funding for ETLG is from the Gates grant. The lead instructional designers are permanent positions supporting all of the campuses. The fact that the course will not be fully designed before approval is sought is an issue that UCEP will need to discuss. What the committee on courses will need to see must be determined. Last year, UCEP asked the committees on courses about their approval process for online courses and this survey should be conducted again to update the information. UCI has devised criteria for approval of online courses and UCR is in the process of doing the same. A member asked if the online courses will be subject to WASC review and Director Greenspan will investigate this. The common learning environment may be flexible enough to be compatible with what is now used at the campuses.

A member expressed concerns about non-UC faculty having access to the data archived by the UCSB researchers for educational researchers. It was noted that traditional courses are dynamic and it is important to recognize that faculty will need to make changes to online courses or they will be static.

UC will have the right to offer the online course even if the course designer leaves UC. Whether the course designer will be paid even after separating from UC is still to be determined. Some UC faculty do not currently have experience with online courses and how to get learning feedback. Faculty should be required to provide more detailed information about how they will teach their online courses and ensure that there is interactive feedback.

UCSD is revising its policy that bans online courses and developing an approval process that outlines expectations. UCEP may request that campuses that do not have a policy for approval of online courses develop one. A member proposed that one systemwide policy be developed stating how online courses are approved, especially since the courses will be accepted by multiple campuses. A policy will lead faculty to think through the issues involved. UCEP's policy could be given as examples for the campuses that need to develop their policies. Course committees could submit their proposed policies to UCEP for approval. The courses committee may wish to review and re-approve courses every three years because the faculty will change. Community colleges approve online courses and the instructor for five years. A member commented that UC has the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of all teaching along the lines contemplated for this online project. It will be important for students to get feedback from the instructors. Remedial modules could be built into the online courses for students who are doing poorly or these students could be connected to mentors. One campus is focusing on fully online courses for summer session and hybrid models for courses offered during the regular academic year.

VI. Online Courses

The committee should review the systemwide course approval process UCEP finalized last year and discuss how online courses will be approved.

Discussion: Vice Chair Anderson emphasized that a solid approval process is needed for online courses in the pilot project to ensure that they are of the right quality. The existing policies will be reviewed by the members to identify important components and examples will be given to the campuses. The committees on courses and CEPs should be advised that online courses are being developed but should not be told what to look for. UCEP should provide examples. If the pilot shows that online courses satisfy learning outcomes, more faculty may develop them in the future. A member indicated that the stated goals of the pilot seem to have changed since it was initially introduced to UCEP, as there is now a shift away from teaching introductory courses to UC students. There is a disconnect between the funding model which relies on fees from students outside of UC and the twenty-nine courses in the pilot. Some campuses may not review a course that moves to the online modality if it is already an approved course. Chair Simmons remarked that UCEP needs to provide guidance to Council about how online courses are approved and whether courses already taught need to be reapproved when offered online.

The articulation and credit-transfer process for UC students taking an online course needs to be spelled out. The regulation governing Extension courses may need to be changed to include online courses or UCEP could propose that there be a separate category for online courses. Another question is whether UC students and non-UC students should be enrolled in the same online course, which will mean they are graded the same way, or if the non-UC students should have separate classes or sections. BOARS will need to consider if non-UC students who took online courses are eligible for comprehensive review when asking to transfer to UC and how many online courses will be acceptable. Currently UC faculty do not know if transfer students took online courses at community colleges so UC may not want to label the online courses.

The number of online courses a student takes could be limited. Online courses could be treated the same as Extension X(blank) courses and except for the grade, the course credit can transfer into UC.

Faculty should identify the mode of delivery and the regulation on X(blank) courses should be amended to state that it applies to online courses, regardless of the mode of delivery. UCEP should draft proposed amendments to the regulation. UC students will not take online courses as X(blank). UCEP does not want to eliminate the campus approval of online courses. A systemwide regulation could state that an X course must meet all relevant approvals including mode of delivery set at the campus level.

The committee discussed concerns about enrolling students who are not qualified for UC since the students who are qualified may suffer as a result of being in the same class. How many non-UC students should be admitted into online courses should be left up to departments and faculty, although members agreed there should be a limit. Having non-UC and UC students in the same class could be problematic and there may be pressure to have more non-UC students in online courses because of the need to make money. Prerequisites may be one way to limit the number of non-UC students in a class. The course approval process may ask if there is a limit on the number of non-UC students who will be enrolled concurrently with UC students. How non-UC students will be enrolled in online courses through Extension or through some other entity is another question. Currently, UCOP is proposing that non-UC students will be enrolled in separate sessions.

The transfer regulations now describe transferring courses from a college, so a question is whether online courses constitute a course from a college that makes a student eligible to transfer. BOARS will need to consider if there should be a limit on the number of online courses potential transfer students have taken.

Fees from non-UC students will go to UCOP, the instructors, the instructors' departments, and to repay the loan. Chair Simmons would like a new regulation to be in place as early as possible. A member is concerned about the focus on making money from online courses and sacrificing educational integrity, and there are serious concerns about the loan. The committee agreed the design of online courses should be reviewed because of the change in modality. Course approval forms should eventually have questions about what to look for in online courses. WASC will require a substantive change review if a campus implements a significant number of online courses. If they are a pathway for admission, WASC will definitely be concerned so courses should be submitted for approval if the change in modality is to mostly online.

VII. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

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

Chair Kay reported that the committee does not want athletic programs to be funding priorities. Chair Simmons advised that UCEP could draft a resolution. Five people voted in favor of a resolution and one person voted against it.

At the next Regents meeting a five-year plan for UC will be presented by the president. It will outline an 8% increase in state funding and an increase in tuition of the same amount for the next five years. The \$500 million cut has been absorbed by the campuses in various ways and UCOP will have an \$80 million cut. The campuses have been asked by Council to comment on the online education project description. CCGA adopted policies on self-supporting programs and the question of the role of Extension needs to be resolved.

VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*
- *Rebecca Landes, Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*

UCEP has developed a policy about how systemwide courses are approved and listed. Chair Kay explained the components of Senate Regulation SR 544. The Registrars were polled and reported that they have implemented SR 544, but apparently implementation of all steps of SR 544 does not occur. Analyst Landes is mapping out the different aspects of intercampus offerings.

Discussion: The undergraduate student representative indicated that there is a staff person who helps students navigate the system of getting credit for courses taken away from the home campus and the amount of assistance that will be needed when online courses are offered will increase significantly. Credit for electives taken off campus did not transfer back to the home campus. An off-campus course should be listed in the department in addition to the systemwide or campus catalog. A member reported that the Registrar at his campus was concerned about how the course description will be updated on a regular basis. Analyst Landes stated that a technical fix may be needed to resolve this matter. Chair Kay indicated that UCEP wants to provide the secondary approval after approval at a campus. The committee will make sure there is a provision for quarter versus semester and ask questions about online modality.

IX. New Business

At UCEP's next meeting, the UCM representative would like to discuss the revision of the WASC handbook. The UCSC representative would also like to discuss the discontinuation of the Textiles program which is the only one of its kind.

Discussion: WASC wants to change assessment so that campuses can be compared to one another. The UCM representative wants UC to push back against this change. A member asked about the program that allows students to get a bachelors and masters degree in five years and a course can count toward both.

X. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: David Kay