

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, MAY 7, 2012

Attending: Jose Wudka, Chair (UCR), John Yoder, Vice Chair (UCD) (telephone), Michael Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Tim Labor (UCR), Tania Israel (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Eileen Zurbruggen (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Jon Rossini (UCD) (telephone), Dick Weiss (UCLA), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Bob Anderson (Chair, Academic Senate), Bob Powell (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Shawn Brick (Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy), Tongshan Chang (Institutional Research), Erika Jackson (Institutional Research), Bill Jacob (Chair, BOARS), Ralph Wolff (President, Senior College Commission, WASC), Teri Cannon (Executive Vice President, WASC), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Wudka had a conference call with UCDC and the Center will send UCEP its systemwide courses for approval. The UCDC group discussed the long approval process for instructors and wants to approve the instructors. UCDC is interpreting its systemwide status as giving UCEP the freedom to approve instructors. Chair Wudka will include a clarification that the systemwide courses were approved but this does not address instructor appointments. UCEP provided feedback on the “Crisis of Competence” report and Council decided not to comment right now. Council endorsed a statement supporting faculty engaged in controversial research. The UCB chancellor proposed a new model for UC, but the president has indicated that the proposal does not address any of UC's problems and that the Regents will not support it. The UCLA School of Management has proposed to become self supporting. Nothing has happened with the rebenching proposal and the administration seems to have gone back to square one.

Chair Wudka was in Sacramento for the ICAS legislature day. Instead of going to the legislators offices as in previous years, ICAS was in a room where the legislators were to meet the members. Mr. Ezpinoza was angry that the UC talks between the president, the governor and the financial office did not include the legislature from the very beginning, and therefore the legislature will shoot it down no matter what. Mr. Ezpinoza also remarked that ICAS is not visible in Sacramento and suggested that ICAS buy a piece of a lobbyist. An attempt is being made to revive CPEC. The segments are interested in facilitating veterans’ participation in higher education as a way to either finish a degree or reintegrate into society.

UCSD's chancellor search has been completed. The budget discussions with the budget are ongoing but the budget situation for the state has gotten worse. Report on the response to protests at UCD and UCB have been released and they contain a number of recommendations. The OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel has met and also had a teleconference with John Yun from UCSB. Council was concerned about whether the UCOE leadership is dealing with the project appropriately. Several campus visits by UCOE leadership went badly. Council considered changing the charge of the Blue Ribbon Panel to include looking at the business plan, but it was decided that the chairs of UCPB, BOARS, and UCEP will critically examine the plan as the project moves along. BOARS approved UCOE as an online a-g course provider and have loosened restrictions on enrolling non-matriculated students. UCEP will review the proposed guidelines today and meet

UCOE's May 15th deadline. UCOE indicated that a handful of courses will come to UCEP for systemwide approval once the guidelines are approved. UCOE has talked about delaying the enrollment of non-matriculated students and Council has discussed postponing the debt repayment to see if that produces a product not driven by finances but by quality. Council charged BOARS, CCGA and UCEP to clarify the language in the Compendium regarding programs that are the last of their kind and are being killed. The committee agreed that Chair Wudka should work on this and bring the proposed language to UCEP for consideration.

Discussion: The UCLA representative reported that the School of Management's proposal to become self supporting was voted down by the UCLA Graduate Council, the faculty have appealed and faculty are trying to figure out the appropriate means by which a faculty appeal should be heard. The head of the UCLA Academic Senate has proposed to take the case to the Executive Assembly. The executive vice chancellor has said that regardless of what the Senate says the school will be given financial autonomy. By legislative degree, UC cannot waive the non-resident fees for active members of the military.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Report on UC Admission System

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, BOARS*

Chair Jacob shared a link to a UC fact sheet on admissions with the committee. BOARS is just beginning to get outcomes data from the statements of intent to register. UCEP may be interested in admissions outcomes this year because there have been several policy changes. Four years ago, BOARS' proposal to change eligibility was approved. Eligibility was split as follows: the top 9% in the state are guaranteed admission; the top 9% are guaranteed admission; and a group that is entitled to review. Students entitled to review have completed the a-g requirements, have a 3.0 weighted GPA, and are guaranteed a comprehensive review of their files, not admission to a campus. This came into effect this year. At six campuses a holistic review system was implemented in response to pressure from the Regents. This year there is new eligibility criteria as well as new review procedures. The financial crisis as resulted in the campuses recruiting and admitting non-residents. BOARS informed all campuses that the non-resident cannot be weaker than a resident student denied admission.

California resident applications went from 116,000 in fall 2011 to 124,500 in fall 2012, a 6.6% increase in applications. BOARS expected a great gain as a result of the change in eligibility. Out of state domestic applications went from 13,600 to 19,800, a 46% increase in just one year. International applications went from 11,000 to 16,000, a 40% increase. There were 160,000 unduplicated applicants to the system with the lion's share of the growth coming from non-residents. UC continues to admit more students each year. Over 61,000 California residents were admitted, the largest number in this history of UC, and it represents a 3.6% increase. Out of state admits went from seven to ten thousand and international admits went from five to eight thousand, a 58% increase. The admit pool is changing and this plays out differently from campus to campus. All UC campuses will meet the California targets set by the president, and the

campuses are allowed to pull in non-residents and international applicants as they feel they can accommodate. Growth in both of these populations is expected.

The provost was concerned that the compare favorably rule was violated, but according to Chair Jacobs the data shows that the non-residents were stronger overall. In terms of the applicant profiles, GPA and test scores dipped slightly which was expected since the door was opened for more applicants. Of 93,000 California applicants, 27, 000 are in the new category of entitled to review. A quarter had no guarantee other than that their files would be read. Of the 27,000 entitled to review, 48% were admitted to a campus. Seventy-four percent of students in the eligibility in the local context category were admitted, and three-fourths are being admitted to the campus of their choice. Seventy-six percent of these students in the eligibility in the local context are first generation college students and from this perspective the change in policy worked well. There was tremendous concern from the Asian Pacific Islander community when eligibility was changed, and the data shows that the policy has not impacted admission from students in this community. Large numbers of students decided not to take the two subject area tests - the number dropped to 48% from 80% - and BOARS will be interested in examining the impact of eliminating this predicator on the students' ability to succeed. The math subject test is strongly recommended. BOARS feels that the applicant pool is strong.

Discussion: A member remarked that the criteria for admissions international students is reassuring but there are unintended consequences for the campuses. UCB is talking about offering special courses for non-English speaking students, which will require using the additional fees to hire graduate students instructors to teach these courses. There will be special applications for students from India and China because of the way grades are reported in these countries. UCOP is making an effort to provide good data to BOARS. UC is not showing the gains in African American students that were hoped for, but there was growth among Chicanos/Latinos. While there was no dramatic change in diversity, Chair Jacobs feels there was some overall improvement. It is hoped that the statements of intent to register should show greater diversity.

IV. SR 610

Last year, UCEP's proposed changes to SR 610 generated a number of comments and the committee decided to issue a clarification of the original changes. Whether physical presence is required or not is one of the remaining questions. Chair Wudka indicated that UCB was adamant about having physical presence as the requirement. The current revision will not prevent this as it is an opt in/opt out policy.

Discussion: A member indicated that not all classroom courses require physical presence. The all modes are equivalent approach will eliminate the need to determine whether instructors require attendance and how they monitor it. Another member reported that his campus prefers not requiring physical presence because of the number of exceptions that will be required otherwise. It was noted that the feedback from last year focused primarily on the online courses. A member suggested the following revision: "Limits on qualifying coursework based on physical location or mode of delivery may be stipulated by a division of the Academic Senate or by the student's department, college or school." A member expressed concerns about the

regulation enabling students to take as many online classes as possible, but it was noted that this issue would be difficult to regulate at UCEP's level. The current definition of residence does not ever specify physical presence on campus, and R&J ruling was in agreement with this. The revised regulation should allow any campus to make the requirements stricter. A motion to make the proposed revision was approved, and the committee voted to approve the revised regulation.

V. SR 760

SR 760 is an issue because of WASC's desire to clarify what work students are doing and Chair Wudka borrowed language from UCB for the proposed revision of the regulation. When the committee last discussed this, members wanted language to allow for additional units to be accrued in certain courses if enough work was done.

Discussion: Members discussed the amount of student contact with faculty and what the appropriate amount of credit is. The following revision was suggested for "d": "A course that demands...may justify additional units of credit beyond what would be expected based on the contact hours. Such courses must require at least three units of additional work per week per term per unit." This language will provide flexibility. The Department of Education is insisting that accreditation agencies push campuses to define so when a campus agrees to an online course the course has to stipulate what the workload will be.

Student instructor contact hours and the workload issues seem to be separate. WASC is responding to the Department of Education's concern that for profit online providers are abusing students. One member felt that the original language of the regulation seems to address the student faculty contact hours but it was noted that UC will need a policy when the systemwide courses are offered. It was noted that faculty have less support, and there is pressure on faculty to inflate the amount of course work. At UCB, all courses are being normalized down from three to four units, and justification is required if a five unit course is proposed. A member suggested incorporating the concept in "b" into "d." One member suggested that the lab section on might say: "require on at a minimum per week per term average." The committee discussed whether the regulation should specify online courses and members made suggestions for the revised regulation. A second paragraph, 760b, could state that contact hours with the primary instructor are considered to be one per unit. It was suggested that "b" should be revised to say: "In general, courses require a per week per term average of one student instructor hour per each course unit."

VI. Transfer Students

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy*
- *Tongshan Chang, Institutional Research*
- *Erika Jackson, Institutional Research*

Several months ago, UCEP reviewed data on transfer students and several questions came up based on that analysis. Associate Director Brick stated that UC has become much more selective in terms of the transfer students who are admitted. Data has been requested from the community colleges on students who are transfer ready. The Associate Degree pathway has not had an impact yet on the number of transfer students.

Discussion: The admission policy guarantees admission for California students with GPAs of 2.4 who have satisfied certain courses and have 60 units, but a member pointed out that engineering departments have significantly higher standards. . Transfer students in the humanities are taking over two years to graduate but there is no clear explanation for this. It was noted that the two year graduation rates improved. Students are not getting the necessary counseling and according to Associate Director Brick the community college counselors report that this will get even worse. A member remarked that the analysis reflects what should be expected including that it takes longer for students in the sciences. The drop out rate for freshmen was higher than the drop out rate for transfer students.

VII. WASC

- *Ralph Wolff, President, Senior College Commission, WASC*
- *Teri Cannon, Executive Vice President, WASC*

President Wolff thanked the committee for the opportunity to meet with UCEP. The Commission took the concerns of UCEP and others seriously and engaged in further consultation. Many of the issues the chancellors, ALOs, and UCEP raised made sense and were important to WASC. The Commission is in the process of working through a variety of issues. Next week a steering committee will meet to discuss all of the feedback WASC has received and this group will report to the Commission's policy and planning committee, which will meet in mid-June. The hope is that the Commission will identify one or more proposals to circulate to the region for more comment over the summer. President Wolff would like to meet with UCEP again in the fall to report on what has been done. The goal is to include whatever is adopted in the new handbook which will include revisions to the standards criteria for review which have not been circulated. The standards criteria for review and the guide to the institutional review process. The question will be how does an institution demonstrate meeting WASC's standards. WASC wants to make the review process adaptive and responsive to some of the issues UCEP has raised.

WASC wants to provide something that people can react to. There is a pilot with several institutions including Davis and WASC needs to determine what the next steps will be following the pilot. President Wolff stated that the Commission rolled out its plans without having worked through all of the implications and President Wolff appreciates the questions that UCEP and others have asked. A lot of attention is being paid to for profit and this bleeds quickly to everyone else. President Wolff stated that WASC did not get it right the first time and wants to be in position to defend and protect what its institutions do by clearly identifying what a degree means. WASC wants to be able to keep the standards inside the institution. The Commission wants to be able to evaluate and validate whatever UC does. WASC is working on a proactive public campaign to talk about the quality of the institutions it accredits. President Wolff remarked that it sounded like WASC was reifying the five competencies as separate activities to address and that there would be the need to identify graduation proficiencies in each of the five separate from the work that UC faculty do in the disciplinary fields. The president stated that this is not what WASC intends or will do. It would be preferable for UC and other institutions to incorporate this into the disciplinary process. WASC wants to say that in the major, graduates should be able to think critically, write, and present in the context of the discipline. The Commission wants to work with UC on how this might best be done. UC has made progress on program review and identifying outcomes and the Commission wants to build on this instead of

creating five separate reified activities. Some institutions may want to do the latter but WASC will not require it.

The steering committee will consider several options. One institution has proposed keeping the five but use a one every year or five year time frame with everything being in the hands of the institution in terms of what it means and how it will be incorporated. Others suggested picking three of the core competencies and identifying what is important. Some schools told WASC that creativity and visual communication is equally as important as written communication. WASC wants to encourage new skills and competencies. The Commission has not fixed on the number of competencies. WASC will need to approach this in a way that does not look like it is defining the curriculum or that it is giving flexibility to every institution to define the most important outcomes. WASC is trying to reframe by asking what a degree means and what the core competencies are. Institutions will be asked to tell WASC what the evidence of achievement is.

The Commission is trying to reframe the construct of proficiencies within the larger view of what a degree means. WASC is asking how to encourage institutions to set the bar high throughout the region. The Commission would like UC's help in defining good outcomes. President Wolff has recommended that WASC not use the terms "external validation" and "benchmarking" and it has been suggested that WASC talk about what is good evidence of learning and how this evidence is validated. There should be a collective conversation about how the WASC team validates that evidence and what are good methods. President Wolff asked for feedback on how WASC can approach issues like terminology, how many core areas, or how this might be approached if no quantitative value is used. The CSUs want WASC to address the concept of the public good and that part of the accrediting process should be about the value of the institutions contributing to the public good. WASC will work on this to determine what this would mean, what the metrics might be, and how it would be evaluated. As President Wolff has told Provost Pitts, WASC would like UC to be the standard bearers of what is good learning and what is good quality. President Wolff stated that UC is the most faculty centered and driven institution around setting standards and would like UC to be a partner with WASC.

Discussion: The UCM representative thanked President Wolff for joining UCEP and for taking UCEP's concerns seriously. WASC could consult with people studying the scholarship of writing across the disciplines to help address questions about what good evidence looks like. WASC still has funding to set up the proposed learning communities and UCEP is invited to provide input on how this could be done. President Wolff is concerned about how to describe the things that people expect of graduates beyond the major and bring it into ways of looking inside the major. Pieces of what a degree should look like in the future are missing. The degree profile is not forward thinking and WASC should be talking about new skills. Innovation should be encouraged by rewarding positive consequences. A member cautioned against setting up a system where faculty teach to the test. The quality of the teaching and of the faculty really determine who will come out of a program. UC should tell WASC what the standards are so WASC can represent UC accurately. UC and WASC together need to make the case that a degree as a whole means something more than a series of courses do. UC can take a leadership role in defining what a quality education will look like in the near future. The differentiation between types of institutions is important to make. WASC is trying to make the review process simpler, but not simple and to fit the campus. When an institution is due for a comprehensive

review, the Commission asks for the policy defining the credit hour, to identify if they have hybrid, online or other types of courses where students are not occupying seats for a certain amount of time to get the units and how the award of credit is made for these types of non-seat time courses. There are three concerns about online courses: authentication of the students, the integrity of student work and the quantity of credit given for that work. UC needs to define what the appropriate level of interaction should be.

VIII. UCOE Guidelines

Originally the plan was to draft regulations but the time line to pass them would have been impractical for UCOE. UCOE has pushed back on any restrictions on enrolling non-matriculated students. The restrictions are intended to protect students. How the quality of non-matriculated students will be determined is not clear. People have suggested using an exam to weed out unqualified students. UCOE is making decisions about proctoring exams. Chair Wudka proposed a cap on the number of students in courses that can get full credit (e.g. major or GE). If the cap is exceeded the students will receive only college credits and this would apply to both matriculated and non-matriculated students. The guidelines can easily be changed in the future. Departments will be asked to make a good faith effort to estimate how many non-matriculated students will enroll, and UCEP can revise the 50% limit.

Discussion: Chair Anderson met with Dan Greenstein and Keith Williams who reported that only a small number of courses will be offered in the fall. The issue of admission of non-matriculated students is not in BOARS jurisdiction according to Chair Anderson and UCEP should assert its jurisdiction over the completely non-matriculated student courses. Registrars need clear rules on who gets credit for what, and a member is concerned about whether the guidelines are as formal as regulations. UCOE is not allowing cross campus enrollment of any UC students this year. The intention for transcripting is to have it done for UCOE by the UCM registrar who will presumably do what is asked. It is important to be clear when communicating with students and to not promise them more than what UC is comfortable with. Students can easily be given more credit in the future. The Senate has authority over and responsibility for what appears on the transcript. Chair Wudka had proposed that the transcript would say “transcript for non-matriculated students” but UCOE wants to call it a “UC transcript” which UCEP members do not support.

A member commented that UCEP is creating regulations for a horse that has already left the barn. UCB has established an internal, high-level committee to look at online instruction. Millions of dollars need to be invested infrastructure to truly teach online courses, and the four million UC is spending on marketing should be put towards this. The systemwide effort will die because faculty are moving as they see the technology evolving. This project is innovation driven from the top and it is not clear how it will be sustained. The guidelines will not prevent any faculty member from developing and profiting from an online course.

When a department applies for systemwide approval they will tell UCEP what they expect their enrollment to be and this is when the courses will become UC or UCO. The student has to know at the time of enrollment what kind of course it is and what kind of credit will be granted. UCEP will need to decide whether what is required for systemwide approval is insufficient or overly

burdensome. There are two categories of systemwide online courses that can enroll non-matriculated students, UC and UCO. The guidelines need to state that upon transfer to UC the students will receive UC credit. Upon transferring to UC, students will receive unit credit for UCO courses. Departments need to specify which type of course it is when applying for systemwide approval. Among the issues UCEP will consider is the expected enrollment of non-matriculated students versus matriculated and justification of which category was picked based upon how the department will serve those students. UCEP can also ask how departments plan to check prerequisites. There could be a statement that UCEP is concerned about maintaining UC quality and, in particular, the impact that large numbers of non-matriculated students will have on matriculated students in the course. The instructors may come up with stricter regulations than UCEP would. Every course with a UC or UCO designation should be re-evaluated when the guidelines sunset. Chair Wudka will incorporate the changes discussed today and send the guidelines out for the committee's approval tomorrow.

IX. APMs 010, 015, and 016

UCEP has the opportunity to comment on proposed revisions to APMs 010, 015 and 016.

Discussion: A member expressed concern regarding who defines when faculty are acting as a member of the faculty. The Office of General Counsel wanted this language in the policy. UCEP should submit a memo indicating that this language should not be in the policy. The potential problems the clause could cause seem to outnumber the potential problems the absence of the clause would create. OGC has not provided any reasonable explanation of the problems the clause would solve. The punctuation also makes it unclear what the clause applies to.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a memo stating UCEP's concerns.

X. IGETC

IGETC was intended to facilitate transfers into UC but when it was designed there was insufficient consultation with the hard sciences. Most campuses opted to tell students not to follow IGETC and at least one college has said it refuses to accept it. To facilitate the transfer of students into the hard sciences, IGETC may be modified for students in the STEM fields. The proposal is to allow students to postpone two courses from IGETC and fulfill them at the CSU or UC and the intention is to use the two courses to take additional math and science courses so they can fill in more sequences or slots in the sequence and be better served when they transfer.

Discussion: SciGETC may have been approved by the Assembly in 2005 but it may not have been approved by ICAS. Committee members agree with the proposal and voted to support it. Chair Wudka will write a memo to Chair Anderson.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Jose Wudka