UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JUNE 6, 2011

Attending: David Kay, Chair (UCI), Jose Wudka, Vice Chair (UCR), Michael Dennin (UCI) (telephone), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Mark Appelbaum (UCSD) (telephone), David Pan (UCI) (telephone), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Cynthia Skenazi (UCSB), Jason Chou (Graduate Student Representative) (telephone), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I.   Announcements and Updates

At its last meeting Council discussed the online pilot project and approved a resolution. There was not much time to discuss implementation of the Powell Commission recommendations, which will be discussed at the next meeting. Another committee is working on a plan to distribute state funds to the campuses, which has not been done transparently heretofore. One principle that has been endorsed is that the amount of money for a student of a given type (undergrad, Ph.D., medical, …) should be the same no matter what campus. UC is still waiting to hear what will happen with the state budget. Regent Reiss, incoming chair of the Educational Policy Committee of the Regents, joined the last Council meeting and had questions about tiered tuition pricing.

Discussion: According to Chair Simmons, non-resident tuition will stay with the campuses where it's generated.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

Action: The memo on the BOARS proposal on transfer students was approved.

Discussion: A report to the legislature is being drafted detailing UC's actions in support of transfer students, to comply with AB 2302. UC has not done much in terms of developing a core transfer curriculum, but it has instituted a variety of other measures.

BOARS looked at AP several years ago and determined that AP was not predictive of success at UC.

III.   Removal of a Unique Major

A degree program at Davis in Textiles is being disestablished and there is regulatory language that states that UCEP can comment on this. A provision in the compendium states that campuses can do what they want but if it is the last one in the UC system, UCEP can weigh in. The committee should discuss criteria to use when considering whether a program should be disestablished.

Discussion: It is unclear what UCEP can do, practically speaking, when a program is proposed to be disestablished because there are no faculty or students. Decisions to disestablish programs take months to be made. The UCSD representative commented that there is a formal policy that mandates Senate

review of proposals to eliminate programs. Consolidations at UCI also must go through the Senate and a proposal is submitted the undergraduate council.

UCEP's criterion should be whether the state needs the program. The case needs to be made to UCEP about its importance. The Compendium should be reworded to make this clear. Associate Director Baxter is keeping track of wording changes that need to be made; once the new wording is ready to propose, UCEP will also submit a memo regarding this.

IV.   UC Decision Support Network

Kathleen Dettman was not able to join UCEP. The committee would like to see the data in the future.

V.   Report of the Library Planning Task Force

The committee can comment on the Library Planning Task Force report.

Discussion: The libraries often play a direct instructional role, particularly in research methodology and on information literacy. This role is valuable and should be preserved.

Faculty whose publications are covered by strictly enforced copyright licenses cannot assign those works to students without imposing additional costs on those students. Especially for graduate students, these costs may be significant.

Decisions about cancelling journal subscriptions and deacquisitioning titles must be made in full consultation with the faculty. Deacquisition of a title that is available at a second campus decreases access for students at the first campus. Electronic availability may mitigate this.

Breaking the stranglehold of high-cost commercial journals must be approached carefully, given the sensitivity of the academic promotion process to the particular venues of publication.

Action: The analyst will draft a memo providing UCEP's feedback.

VI.   Assist.org
* *Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy*

Associate Director Brick joined UCEP to provide a tour of the Assist.org website. Chair Kay explained that UCEP should be aware of the tools available to potential transfer students to help streamline the process. The committee would like to be involved in the current efforts to redesign Assist. The system has been around for twenty years and started at Irvine. UC, CSU and the community colleges fund Assist. There is an intersegmental executive oversight committee that sets policies. Assist employees are UC employees who report to UCOP. There are eight employees and a temporary programmer helping to prepare the new system, which is being called Assist Next Generation. It is not yet clear if an outside vendor will be used or if the new system will be developed in house. There are two Assists, one is the website and the other is the database behind it. The scope of the redesign has been purposely narrow so that a robust website can be developed. The goal is to have a set of flexible tools. A student will be allowed to enter the courses taken so far, which cannot be done now. The admission guarantee tool is the only tool available now that gives students information about whether they are on track for an admission guarantee.

Articulation agreements are currently between two institutions and in the redesign will allow students to select multiple institutions. It would be ideal for a student to get information about what institution as student could be enrolled in. The articulation agreements start with general notes from the receiving institutions. Articulation agreements are not reviewed every year unless UC is notified of a change in the course. Course to course articulation decisions are under the purview of departments. The system also provides information for students who are not sure what they want to major in.

The system is outdated. Having UC to UC articulation in Assist may be a governance question and the partners would need to agree to this. There are CSU to CSU agreements in the system already. A UC systemwide catalog could be created to show the relationships among UC campuses. Assist will be the backbone for other web tools being developed. One question is whether private institutions should be included in Assist and there is pressure from these institutions to do this. Students may have taken courses at multiple community colleges, private institutions or institutions like Kaplan or Heald. These other institutions lose interest when they learn they would be charged for participating in Assist. Which types of additional institutions that could be allowed to be in Assist would need to be determined and these institutions would not be part of the governance structure.

Discussion: The receiving institution is obligated to make sure that the information in Assist is correct. The timing of when a student should take a particular course is an issue and counselors and students need to be made aware of when a course can be taken. The courses required for the degree is the information in Assist. Advice on when a course should be included can be included in the general notes. Community college counselors want to help students in order to provide information that is not in Assist. Assist provides the infrastructure, which could be the basis for showing UC to UC articulation agreements. Since Assist does not require people to log in, it is not known who is using Assist and whether high school students are using the system. Anecdotally UC has heard that high school students and counselors are using Assist. Assist covers all of the big majors. UC has done a good job of establishing articulation agreements with all of the CSUs. Assist is pretty comprehensive although there may be some specialized majors not in the system. The system includes articulation agreements dating many years back.

It has not been determined how C-ID will be displayed in Assist. Because the C-ID number will be associated with more than one course number it will be difficult to show students how that the relationship is in place at both institutions. This will be an issue for the CSU articulation agreements. The California Articulation Number set a precedent for how C-ID numbers will be incorporated into Assist. Chair Kay will participate in reviewing to responses to the RFP. Faculty who will be asked to provide feedback on the design of the interface of Assist Next Generation will be identified in the future. Associate Director Brick will put this on the agenda for the Assist Manager.

VII.   Evaluation of the Educational Quality of the Online Pilot Project

There was an extended discussion at Council about the Online Pilot Project. Everyone on Council was upset with the internal loan funding. The people running the project created suspicion because of the promises made to the media. There have been statements about how there will be academic results that show faculty the value of online education. There was concern that the enthusiasm about the possible outcome is driving the process. Council created a resolution about the project. UCEP is responsible for helping to ensure that the process is appropriately independent and that the results are credible. The committee needs to decide how to do this. Questions have been raised about the personnel on the UCSB group that will evaluate the project, whose backgrounds seem to be in K-12 education. The project plan was written to justify the borrowing of money from UC, so it did not address the

evaluation from a scientific perspective. According to Chair Kay, compliance with human subjects requirements has been addressed.

Discussion: Making the evaluation a credible research project will be a huge effort. UCEP could ask for periodic updates. The evaluator could visit UCEP, the campuses or Council to report on evaluation activities. Metrics should be set in advance and there should be communication and review of them. Evaluation of online courses at other universities has probably been conducted and it would be better for the evaluator to have experience in this area. How other systems are evaluating the quality of online courses should examined. UC's experience should be compared with that of other institutions. The carrot for UCEP in the whole online project has been that there is a research component, but it appears that is now being trumped by the goal of generating revenue.

An independent panel of experts in online and higher education should be involved with evaluation of UC's project. A blue ribbon panel could be established to monitor the evaluation and provide an independent assessment of how it is progressing. It would be desirable to have someone from outside UC to be involved with the evaluation. This review panel would tell UC about the educational quality and if the money is being spent well. The panel should report to UCEP. The panel would look at data collection to make sure no data was withheld to ensure that the integrity of the results is there.

UCEP is the consumer of the evaluation that will be provided and will ultimately make the judgment about the impact the online project has on educational quality. Chair Simmons remarked that having an external review of the project makes sense. Existing UC programs have external reviewers. The committee can make a recommendation to Council that there should be an external review paid for by Academic Affairs. Faculty Advisor Williams could be asked about how the center was selected. It may be that the UCSB center was thought of as an independent body. The committee discussed whether it is important to know the center's funding sources. One question is whether the evaluation is based on the best scientific research methods. A bad evaluation will make UCEP look bad. Vice Chair Anderson commented that what is being evaluated is not clear.

The evaluation will look at how well students achieved the learning outcomes among other things such as faculty workload. UCEP is responsible for looking at the educational effectiveness of online courses. Why other institutions' online programs failed or succeeded should be examined. Experts in online education should be involved with identifying the criteria to be used to evaluate the effectiveness. Formative advice should be provided before the evaluation begins to ensure the right questions are being asked. The people providing the advice in the beginning should not be involved in the reviewing the evaluation. The review panel could check in regularly without waiting for all of the courses to be offered multiple times. Looking at the questions that will be asked as early as possible will help prevent the project from going off track. The criteria for the evaluation should be circulated in advance. UCEP will ask for a presentation that includes the criteria. The administration may have the answers to UCEP's questions.

Faculty developing the courses are focused on the educational quality of the courses. Revenue will be generated by fees paid by non-UC students to enroll in online courses. How non-UC students will be vetted and segregated has not been determined. Provost Pitts has stated that, if the project is a failure, the project will be terminated and UCOP will pay back the loan. Instead of a presentation to Council, UCEP should have a video conference with Professor Yun, the director of the evaluation project at UCSB, or, if the Senate office has funding, an in person meeting. Professor Yun should be asked in advance for any materials about the evaluation questions and then meet with UCEP. UCEP would then make a report to Council about whether the evaluation is heading in the right direction or not. The

meeting with Professor Yun should be held within the next month so UCEP can learn the details.

Questions UCEP would like the evaluators to answer include: is there a written proposal; what are the criteria for the evaluation; what data will be collected and how will it be used; how often will the courses be evaluated; what are the benchmarks; what methods will be used for the evaluation – will the same questions be used for all 29 courses or will different questions be asked for each course; what has been done with respect to protocol or approvals for human subjects; what is the expertise of the team; how was the case made for the appropriateness of the team; have evaluations of other online courses been reviewed. There have been discussions about what will be evaluated but decisions have not been made. According to one faculty member who will be teaching an online course, all of the faculty in the pilot have different ideas about the questions that should be asked. The evaluators are willing to collect data to answer any questions UCEP has.

Part of the evaluation design will include collection of data on the courses given in their synchronous forms. What is collected on these courses before data is collected them in their asynchronous forms is going to make a difference. If the information the evaluation generates is limited or the big questions are not addressed, UCEP can say that the pilot should not be expanded. It would be a mistake to compare online courses to summer courses, which are inherently different from academic year courses. Members have not received information at their local campuses about meeting the needs of students facing accessibility issues. One CEP has received a directive that the courses in the pilot must be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act even if disabled students are not enrolled. With the traditional courses, no accommodation has to be made until a student asks for it. If a blind student enrolled in an online course, a reader would be needed. Adaptive technologies are available to help disabled students. Vice Chair Anderson reported that in general UC websites have issues with compliance. In traditional courses, someone can be brought into the classroom to provide sign language.

UCEP will either be relatively satisfied, in which case the committee will not worry about getting formative information as soon as possible to guide the evaluation. If the committee is dissatisfied UCEP will state that members have concerns. UCEP is charged with providing oversight to the pilot, which will guide the Senate in order to make a recommendation to UCOP. If the materials provided by the center in advance are clear, UCEP will decide if the meeting is necessary. The evaluators should be invited to a UCEP meeting in the fall. Chair Kay will contact Chair Simmons and Faculty Advisor Williams about contacting the center.

VIII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Vice Chair Anderson stated that there may be news on the budget this week as the legislature may make a decision.

Discussion: UCEP had proposed submitting a resolution that athletic programs should not be funded. Chair Kay reported that Patrick Lenz, Vice President of Budget and Capital Resources, stated that state funding has not been used to fund athletic programs in thirty years. The memo could state that money available for educational purposes should not be spent on intercollegiate athletic programs.

IX. Consultation with the Office of the President

The undergraduate deans are interested in having a university conference on undergraduate education. It will be attended by approximately eight people from each campus and senate leadership. The deans feel like they are not prepared to have a conference of this size. The plan has been scaled back to have

about forty faculty attend and Louis Menand, author of Marketplace of Ideas, will be the keynote speaker. A set of issues will be the focus. The university will help shape the dialog about undergraduate education on such issues as educational delivery including online courses. Several members of the Reinvention Center Board will participate. This will be the first systemwide conference since 1994.

Feedback from the undergraduate deans about protecting the quality of undergraduate education and about the experience of undergraduate students will be shared with UCEP. Associate Director Baxter reported that the Regents are thinking about making all of the business, medical and law schools self-sustaining.

Discussion: Members of the Committee's on Academic Personnel should be included in the conference so there can be a discussion about how undergraduate teaching can be rewarded.

X.   UCEP's Course Approval Process

The chair edited the course approval process for systemwide courses. The existing policy was written with UCDC in mind and the wording was changed to make it apply to online courses. This is important because it establishes that there is a policy for how online courses will need to be approved.

Discussion: A UC approved instructor allows for the hiring of non-UC faculty at UCDC. Courses are not tied to the original instructor once approved. A member commented that the changes clarify the policy. The policy will be submitted to Council as an information item. All members approved the revised memo.

XI.   WASC Assessment Changes

The UCM representative directed the committee to the WASC handbook on implementing the 2012 evaluation. WASC has stated that it wants to reduce the cost of accreditation. Some of the language in the handbook is a concern. A consumerist attitude has infiltrated discussions about higher education and the focus is only on economic value. The member stated that there is a shift from caring about student learning to instead caring about institutional indicators of performance, which will distort the educational enterprise. WASC is working with the Lumina Foundation's degree qualifications profile, a rubric for degrees, for its accreditation process. WASC is stating that it is consulting with UC and the university should give feedback. The wrong reward structure is being imposed on the institution to get the outcome it really wants. UC should advise WASC to use the Lumina profile as only a guideline.

Discussion: Associate Director Baxter indicated that team members are not well informed about research institutions. External, national guidelines will tell UC how to assess itself which will not be good and UC should push back. Critical faculty as well as faculty involved in recent accreditation processes could share UC's concerns with and advise WASC. In addition to UC, other major universities will not agree with WASC's proposed changes to the handbook. The faculty participating on the handbook revision group may not provide a systemwide perspective. Members should take this issue back to their campus CEPs. Some faculty may feel that the Lumina profile is preferable to the CLA. WASC has been told that the accreditation process is too long. There is no political will for distinguishing institutions for the purposes of distributing aid and WASC is caught in the middle.

UCEP has an advocacy role and needs to help UC's constituents to understand what is happening. President Yudof could talk to the CSUs and advocate with the federal government. An information sheet outlining the issues could be drafted for faculty who are not familiar with the details. The UCM

representative agreed to draft the information sheet. Some aspects of the Lumina profile could be acceptable.

XII.   New Business

The committee thanked and applauded the chair for his service this year, and thanked the analyst.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:05 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: David Kay