

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Teleconference Minutes**

**Monday, December 3, 2012**

**Attending:** John Yoder, Chair (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Tim Labor (UCR), Jan Frodesen (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Jeanette Natzle (UCD), Troy Carter (UCLA), Cristian Ricci (UCM), James Nieh (UCSD), Mona Vakilifathi (Graduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Bob Powell (Chair, Academic Senate), Bill Jacob (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

**I. Announcements and Updates**

The agenda will be rearranged to take care of a few items right away. UCEP has been asked to look at time to completion and this issue may have been raised by the governor and the Chair sent everyone a list of strategies that members should prioritize. It is hoped that the priorities will be clear by the end of today's meeting. The governor is interested in the use of technology to move education forward and this was not limited to online courses. UCEP should think about how the committee can facilitate ensuring that quality online courses are on board.

**II. Consent Calendar**

The minutes were approved.

**III. UCOE Course Approvals**

UCEP has several online courses to approve today.

Political Science 115D from UCLA: There are positive things about the course including that it engages students and poses questions in a novel way. One reviewer has serious concerns about enrollments into this course. If this is already an impacted course it means there is greater demand than capacity to offer the course, and it is being offered to more students through this proposal but not more often. The reviewer does not oppose the designation because of these concerns but suggests that this is an issue that UCEP should discuss further. Members discussed the student feedback noted in the proposal. Instead of opening the course to non-matriculated students, UCEP should recommend that UCLA students be enrolled first. The instructor mentions problems with technology several times and some members indicate that this is an additional reason to not approve the course. The committee expressed concerns about the survey results included in the proposal but it is difficult to determine how meaningful these results are. The instructor will be asked to explain more specifically how fees from non-matriculated students will help UCLA students. The revenue may not ever make it back to the department. The course could agree to increase the enrollment of UCLA student for every "x" number of non-matriculated students. It was also noted that the syllabus is not in a traditional format. This course was not approved.

Math 19A Calculus for Mathematics, Science and Engineering from UC Santa Cruz: There is not much effort to utilize technology in unique ways even though the faculty developed the integrated textbook themselves. More information about the technology could have been provided. A reviewer felt that the course will be accessible to students interested in mathematics. This course was approved.

Physics 7E from UC Irvine: The presentation and pedagogy were well-explained according to one reviewer. The committee discussed issues related to the proctoring of mid-terms and final exams, and the course grading policy does not mention the mid-term being in person. The committee approved the course pending clarification that if there is a mid-term it will be proctored.

CS 010V: Introduction to Computer Science for Science, Mathematics, and Engineering\_I from UC Riverside: The reviewer indicated that the proposal looks like a normal proposal, and does not explain the online component of the course. The proposal does not explain the interaction with students online. The formulation for the number of units should be clarified. The chair agreed to send this packet to the entire committee for review because of the primary reviewer's concerns.

CS 012V: Introduction to Computer Science for Science, Mathematics, and Engineering\_II from UC Riverside: The chair agreed to send this packet to the entire committee for review because of the primary reviewer's concerns.

Spanish 2V and 3V from UC Davis: The reviewer does not think it is possible to teach a language course online from a pedagogical point of view. Interaction with the instructor is needed. Another committee member pointed out that questions raised by one campus about teaching writing online seemed focused on the specific student population in developmental writing. It was also noted that the department chair sponsoring this course is a linguist. The course has an in-class component and a hybrid online component. An ideal language course would have between fifteen and twenty students and this instructor is proposing to have forty students. The reviewer would like more information from faculty in languages to know if this type of course helps students or is a detriment to students. The committee approved this course.

**Discussion:** Members think they are not receiving enough basic information about the proposed online courses and would like to develop a form with additional questions so the criteria are clearer. There is uncertainty about many issues related to the online project. Vice Chair Jacob is concerned that UCEP's course reviews will focus on enrollment and service issues that the departments should handle instead of examining the quality of the courses to ensure they merit approval as systemwide courses. The committee was encouraged to provide feedback about the strength of each course. Only one non-matriculated student is currently enrolled in a UCOE course, so UCEP should keep in mind that these courses are currently primarily serving UC students.

#### **IV. SR 760**

The current definition of a unit is too vague for WASC and last year UCEP proposed establishing a systemwide definition or having the divisions define units themselves. Three campuses indicated their preference to have UCEP create the definition. The chair will send the request to the divisional CEP chairs again. UCEP has been asked to create a systemwide definition of a unit that could be used by both semester and quarter campuses.

**Discussion:** The question is how semester and quarter transferable credits articulate. A member pointed out that the Department of Education is behind WASC's requirement for a more specific definition. A systemwide definition of a unit that includes contact hours is needed. UCSC has three quarters but students take three courses a year, so the per week formula does not work for this campus. UCSC students do fifteen weeks of work in ten weeks. This highlights the need for local discretion. Chair Yoder will edit the definition proposed last year for the committee to edit.

#### **V. Compendium Section on Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs with Unique Titles**

Chair Yoder explained that UCEP proposed language for the Compendium to address program discontinuances. There are both vague and contradictory descriptions in the current sections on the discontinuances.

**Discussion:** The definition of degree program and degree title should be at the beginning of the section which we clear up other parts of the text.

#### **VI. Time to Completion**

Chair Yoder sent a poll to members about the strategies to address time to completion and the responses should be sent to the analyst.

**Discussion:** A member indicated that after being asked to look at time to completion at his campus, the data did not show that there is a problem. It will be important for UCEP to have data that shows the real extent of the problem. Some of the indicators are lagging. Chair Powell indicated that the list shared with the committee may include activities that UC is doing or has already prioritized. There will be a presentation to the Regents in March focused on how UC uses resources, and the question of how quickly students are moving through UC will be included in this discussion. UC can always look at ways students are moving through and determine if there is anything else that can be done. Associate Director Baxter believes that UC is doing well but that there is a perception that there are many problems.

Meeting adjourned at: 11:05 a.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: John Yoder