UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:
The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met eight times in Academic Year 2010-2011 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 170 and in the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows.

UC's Financial Crisis
UCEP discussed and responded to a variety of proposals and recommendations on how to deal with UC's ongoing financial crisis. What emerged over the course of the year from the Academic Council and the administration was an understanding that UC funding levels affect three interdependent axes: access (the number of students UC can serve), affordability (how much a UC education costs the student), and quality (preserving the quality of UC research and instruction—in particular, the quality of the faculty and of the students). By the end of the year it was widely understood that decreases in access or affordability can be reversed relatively quickly if increased funding becomes available, but that quality, once lost, may take decades to recover.

UCEP discussed a variety of cost-cutting and revenue-generating measures, all of which resulted by the end of the year in the report of the Academic Council's Implementation Task Force. One measure discussed by UCEP was to consider increasing the use of teaching-oriented faculty (Unit 18 and SOE lecturers, for example), in preference to increasing the teaching loads of ladder-rank faculty to noncompetitive levels. UCEP developed a set of "best practices" for the use of teaching-oriented faculty; this document is available on the UCEP web site. Another measure was to increase the number of non-resident students (whose tuition more than supports the full cost of their education). A third measure was to encourage the reexamination of prerequisite streams and program bottlenecks, to facilitate degree completion within four years. A measure that UCEP recommended against pursuing was an emphasis on facilitating degree completion in three years.

UCEP members also voiced concern that UC's practice of continuing to accept funding cuts and continuing to produce good research and education was ultimately counterproductive, giving the impression that the funding cuts did not have severe consequences.

Towards the end of the year, UCEP considered the Senate's role in decisions to cancel programs, particularly programs that do not exist elsewhere at UC. In 2011-12, UCEP may choose to propose new language for the Compendium that allows a divisional Senate (or perhaps Senate member) to bring to UCEP's attention the proposed cancellation of a program unique at UC, with arguments focusing on the program's value systemwide.

UCEP also reviewed changes to UC's post-employment benefits and proposals to allocate transparently to the campuses the funds each campus generates ("funding streams").

Transfer Students and Articulation
Over the course of this year, the committee discussed issues related to community college transfer students and course articulation. The focus for UC has been how things can be streamlined for transfer students, enabling them to earn their bachelor's degrees in (close to) two years at UC after transfer. The Legislature, too, is concerned with this issue and has requested in AB 2302 that UC address it. UCEP has attempted to understand the size and shape of the transfer population and to assess the success of transfer students by discipline. The perception that transferring into UC is a difficult process is based on anecdotal information; UCEP has identified and requested from UCOP a range of data that will help determine the nature and extent of any problems; in 2011-12, UCEP may wish to analyze these data and make further recommendations.

UCEP received reports that some students transfer to UC having chosen a major that requires a long stream of prerequisites (as is often the case in the sciences) but without any preparation for that major. BOARS has a proposal, currently out for targeted review, that establishes preparation for a major at UC as a main criterion for transfer admission; UCEP endorsed this proposal in principle and will review it formally in 2011-12. Also in 2011-12, UCEP may choose to review the Associate's Degree for Transfer programs developed by the community colleges, to evaluate their potential for streamlining transfer admission to UC.

The committee also suggested that faculty who make articulation decisions about specific courses for specific programs take a holistic approach to approval, focusing more on whether the course proposed for articulation will prepare the student to succeed in the subsequent courses at UC rather than on whether the proposed course covers 100% of the topics in the locally articulated course. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) drafted and endorsed a memo to this effect, to be distributed to UC department chairs.

UCEP also received reports of an initiative by the provost to identify commonly accepted lower-division preparation for certain majors across the campuses; the initially participating disciplines were math, history, psychology, biological sciences, and computer science. If this initiative produces agreements about commonly accepted preparation, UCEP may choose to review them in 2011-12.

UCEP discussed the creation of a database to collect all of the articulation decisions that are made systemwide, to inform and possibly facilitate subsequent decisions involving similar courses. This is being considered as part of the UC online education initiative; in parallel, UC is undertaking a redesign of the assist.org web site that catalogs articulation arrangements between community colleges, CSU, and UC. In 2011-12, UCEP may wish to receive status reports on these efforts.

Online Education
This year, UCEP continued its discussions about UCOP's online education initiative and pilot project. The pilot project was proposed as a research project aimed at exploring a variety of faculty-driven techniques for employing digital tools in instruction and at evaluating the effectiveness of those techniques. When UCOP was unable to secure external funding for the

project, the president decided to make about $7 million available as a loan from UC funds under a program that supports initiatives that may create new efficiencies or generate new revenue. UCEP members were disappointed with this decision, especially since the committee was on record as supporting the pilot only if external funding was utilized. They were concerned that the focus of the program would shift from its research orientation towards revenue generation from non-UC students, since it is enrollments from that source that are contemplated as providing the revenue to repay the loan and support the online project on an ongoing basis.

Part of the pilot project is an evaluation and assessment framework. Initially, little detail was available about the personnel and plans for this evaluation effort. UCEP requested more detail, which it received in the form of a draft roadmap document in July. Some UCEP members provided comments on this document; in 2011-12, UCEP will probably review and comment on the evaluation plans more formally, taking a formative role in guiding the evaluation team's activities. UCEP also recommended, and Council endorsed, the formation of an independent "blue-ribbon" panel of experts in the assessment of on-line instruction at the postsecondary level. In 2011-12, UCEP will participate (with the assistance of UCOC and the Senate leadership as appropriate) in the formation and formal appointment of this panel, which will be charged with reviewing the evaluation team's plans and reports to help inform UCEP and the Council as they make their recommendations about the future conduct of on-line education efforts at UC.

Most divisional Senates have adopted policies for the approval of courses that involve a significant amount of non-traditional electronic instruction. The current policies have been collected and made available on the UCEP web site. In 2011-12, UCEP may wish to create a model or minimum set of approval criteria for on-line courses.

Many issues surrounding online education have yet to be resolved, including those listed below. Some of these are being addressed by joint Senate-administration working groups in the summer of 2011. As these groups make their recommendations, UCEP will review them in 2011-12.
- What background will be required of non-UC students and how enrollment of non-UC students will be managed so that the character of courses will not be affected.
- How designers, instructors, and offering departments will be compensated for their efforts (both for courses offered to regularly enrolled UC students and for non-UC students, whether concurrently enrolled or enrolled in separate sections)
- How students will learn of the availability of online courses on a given topic, how they will enroll, and how their completion of the course will be reflected on their transcripts (see "Systemwide Courses" below)

Systemwide Courses
One aspect of online instruction is the accessibility of online courses to students who are not geographically located or enrolled at the campus offering the course. Questions of publicity, enrollment, articulation, and recording of credit for non-local students have yet to be resolved; existing measures are reportedly paper-based and difficult for students to navigate. Besides online courses, other UC courses pose many of the same issues: UCDC and Sacramento Center, EAP, Arabic Without Walls, and potentially other programs.

Senate Regulation 544 addresses enrollment by UC students in courses at another UC campus. It also contemplates the designation of "systemwide courses" that would be approved by the usual Senate bodies on a campus and then designated as systemwide by UCEP (or CCGA for graduate courses). Systemwide status under SR 544 mandates listing of the course in every campus catalogue, though practical mechanisms to accomplish this may not be in effect.

Proposed regulations to apply and extend SR 544 to online and similar courses have been drafted with these goals and forward to UCEP:
- Any credit-bearing course must be designed and proposed by an academic department and approved through the existing Senate course approval bodies on campus
- Instructors for credit-bearing courses are approved by the responsible academic department
- For a regular UC course to be open to non-UC students ("concurrent enrollment"), the instructor has authority over what background the non-UC students must have and how many of them can be accommodated in the course
- Courses designated as systemwide must be approved like any other course and then proposed as systemwide to UCEP
- Systemwide courses receive systemwide publicity, not only listings in campus catalogs but also inclusion in the various electronic course information systems
- Systemwide courses may generate expedited consideration for articulation with general education and major requirements across the UC campuses
- The grading standards in systemwide courses should be the same as in the equivalent course offered by the responsible department
- UC students receive credit for systemwide courses to the same extent as they would for the equivalent course offered by the responsible department

In 2011-12, UCEP will need to finalize these regulations and launch the approval process. It will also be necessary to work with UCOP and the registrars to make sure that the registrar functions involved with non-local course enrollment are fully and effectively implemented.

In 2011-12, UCEP may wish to enhance its guidelines and criteria for approving proposed systemwide courses, such as whether the course has differential workload or differential units to accommodate students from both quarter and semester campuses, whether the course provides for an appropriate level of student interaction, and whether sufficient measures are contemplated to ensure that students are evaluated based on work they produced themselves.

Also related to non-local courses is Senate Regulation 610, which defines the term "residency" as used in various degree requirements (e.g., that the final 45 units completed for a degree be earned "in residence"). UCRJ ruled on a close vote that for these purposes, residence refers to courses approved by the relevant UC Senate bodies rather than physical presence on campus. This is consistent with current practice that allows students to complete UCDC, EAP, or field studies in the last term of their degree. UCEP agreed with this determination, noted that it would come into play as online courses become more frequent, and proposed language changes to SR 610 that make the UCRJ interpretation explicit. Council endorsed this language and sent it forward in the approval process; in 2011-12, UCEP will want to monitor the progress of this change.

UC Quality
A statement drafted last year on UC quality was slightly revised by Chair Kay with input from the members. Quality based on the totality of the experience at UC should be the focus, not just any single course. The document is intended for internal use as a more concrete description of the various aspects of "UC Quality." It would need revision before being suitable external audiences such as the legislature. The statement was submitted to Council in March and endorsed. It was also submitted to the Task Force for the Implementation of the Powell Committee Report.

Other Issues and Additional Business
In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCEP also issued views on the following:
- Securing Senate representation in labor negotiations with academic student employees
- Requesting UC to negotiate with appropriate federal agencies to achieve parity in the flexibility of academic student employee working conditions between international students and US citizens
- Proposal to rename fees "tuition"
- Proposed revisions to APM 010 and 015
- Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership
- Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs
- Implementing Powell Committee recommendations
- UC Policy to Address Student Privacy Issues
- Report of the Library Planning Task Force

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy.

UCEP Representation
UCEP Chair David Kay represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, and Academic Assembly, and regularly attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates. Chair Kay also participated on the UCDC Governing Council and a group advising UCOP on the development of the online pilot project.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements
UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, Hilary Baxter, Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, and Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy. In addition, UCEP consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair, who updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate.

Respectfully submitted,