

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2010**

**Attending:** David Kay, Chair (UCI), Jose Wudka , Vice-Chair (UCR), Constantin Teleman (UCB), John Yoder (UCD), Michael Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM) (telephone), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Cynthia Skenazi (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Laurie Smith (UCSD) (telephone), Peter Loomer (UCSF), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Jason Chou (Graduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Judy Sakaki (Vice President, Student Affairs), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel), Shawn Brick (Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy) Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Chair), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Welcome, Announcements and Updates**

Chair Kay emphasized the importance of faculty participation in shared governance especially during difficult times. UCEP deals with the broad range of educational policy and CCGA is its counterpart for graduate students. As a standing committee of the Senate, UCEP has the opportunity to provide input on educational policy issues. The committee generally should keep its opinions focused on the impact that issues have on educational policy and it does not need to opine on every systemwide review item. Chair Kay explained how committee memos will be drafted and reviewed by the committee and submitted to Council. UCEP's Chair also sits on Council, the Assembly, and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates. UCEP's Chair and Vice Chair sit on the advisory committee for online education. Members will represent UCEP on a number of subcommittees. Chair Kay prepared a list of the subcommittees and asked members to consider those on which they are willing to serve.

The Chair provided an overview of the issues for UCEP this year, the first being transfer and articulation issues. This involves students within UC, students at the community colleges, students in the EAP, and students at the Sacramento Center and in UCDC. Arabic without Walls was approved as a systemwide course by UCEP and it is now time to see how this program is operating. Regulations are in place mandating that students receive baccalaureate credit for a course taken at another campus. But for major requirements, individual decisions are made for individual students at individual campuses. This should be streamlined for a variety of reasons including to help students complete their degrees on time. This is an issue the legislature cares a lot about as legislators hear from their constituents about problems with transferring into UC.

The second big issue is the budget which includes the post employment benefits, the Commission on the Future recommendations, and the recommendations from Council and UCLA on how UC should deal with budget issues in the near term. UCEP has been asked to comment on what the effect of downsizing on educational quality will be. As part of the Commission on the Future, there was an attempt to define UC quality; UCEP may choose to adapt or adopt that definition as a reference point in discussions about "UC-quality education." A third issue is online education. Some see this as a way to fix UC's budget issues; some see other opportunities brought by technology. UCOP is implementing a pilot project to develop and offer online courses. The effectiveness of the courses will be evaluated. Questions include how the assessment will be done so its results are convincing. There is a question about the definition of residency which may need to be adjusted to incorporate online courses. This year UCEP may want to have another discussion about emergency planning. Members reported that UCSF, UCD and UCSB are developing plans for how courses are handled during emergencies.

## **II. Consultation with the Senate Office**

- *Dan Simmons, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Bob Anderson, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

The UC Retirement Program is severely underfunded to meet its current obligations. The Regents re-initiated employee contributions to UCRP starting in April 2010 [better check that date]. They plan to increase the contribution rates in July 2011 and July 2012. It is not yet known what will happen in July 1, 2013 and it will depend on decisions made about post-employment benefits. Current employees will have a choice to maintain benefits under the existing plan at a higher price, and the Senate has been arguing that the price should be no higher than 7% of covered compensation or to go into the new tier plan. The options will be presented to the Regents in November and the president will make his recommendation to the board at that time. At a special December meeting, the Regents will make a decision about the post-employment benefits and reductions in retiree health care. Council will formulate its recommendation to the president at its October meeting, adopting a formal position to present to the Regents at the November Council meeting.

A special committee of the Council will develop a plan for UC and it is being chaired by the Senate's immediate past Chair Harry Powell. The special committee is comprised of former members of the Commission on the Future workgroups. The special committee's work should be completed in November. The goal is to develop a plan from the Senate about the strategic direction for UC over the next five years. A continued decline in state funding is a given. The state may take longer to recover than the rest of the nation. We desire to maintain the quality of the faculty, the diversity of the student body, and access to UC for all qualified students. If UC loses the quality of the institution because it has lost the quality of its faculty, there will be no need to worry about affordability and access. A plan is needed that protects the quality of faculty that includes comparative total remuneration for faculty. At a Regents meeting, the president listed a number of priorities that are competing for the same dollars and stated that UC does not have a plan. UCEP is asked to consider the impact of downsizing on undergraduate educational quality.

Another big issue this year is the need to simplify the transfer process from the community colleges and the CSUs, which will include full implementation of SR 477. SR 477 which will move toward uniform lower division prerequisites. Chair Simmons indicated that the committee's letters or reports to Council should include a list of specific recommendations in the first paragraph and a draft of the motion UCEP wants Council to adopt. This will help focus Council's discussions on the recommendations.

Vice Chair Anderson reported that there was an ICAS meeting last week devoted to discussion of transfer issues. There was a session with the Executive Director of California Post Secondary Education Commission who seemed interested in working with ICAS. SB 1440 was signed last week by the governor and this legislation mandates development of associate degrees for transfer and requires that the CSUs accept this degree. It does not guarantee admission into a specific campus. SB 1440 allows individual community colleges to create the associate degrees. The process for developing the degrees will be done in collaboration with the CSUs. The mechanism for doing this will be the C-ID project and UCEP has been asked to identify a volunteer to serve on the C-ID advisory board. There is not currently a lot of UC involvement in the C-ID project. It is not clear that it will be possible to get an accredited engineering degree within the constraints of 18 units at the community colleges and 60 units at the CSUs. This may result in bifurcated majors.

Vice Chair Anderson looked at mathematics at UC where students can get a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science and the requirements for the two degrees are very different. SB 1440 does not impact UC but there is pressure for UC to get on board to make the transfer process smoother and more efficient.

A separate bill, AB 2302, does not mandate that UC do anything but requests that UC work with the community colleges to develop transfer associate degrees that will match well with UC's majors. UC is calling together two people at each campus in math, history, psychology, biological sciences and computer science who will meet by discipline to discuss the variety of major requirements and the lower division prerequisites. A goal is to identify which differences are there for good reason versus which ones could reasonably be reconciled. Initially this will involve just UC faculty but eventually there will be discussions with the CSUs. These disciplines are among the top 20 majors and also provide a broad range of disciplines. C-ID has recently posted a new set of course descriptors and UC needs to determine if the descriptors provide enough detail for UC to decide to accept the courses. UCEP members were asked by Executive Director Winnacker to look at those descriptors in a wide range of disciplines. C-ID envisions moving from course articulation to designing programs that lead to these transfer major degrees, which will have an impact on UC. A requirement for uniform lower division courses has been discussed by the Commission on the Future. The learning outcomes are also important but how assessment of learning outcomes can be done is not clear. UCEP can indicate that for C-ID to be useful to UC student learning outcomes need to be explicit.

**Discussion:** A member commented that it is a simple question for a student to ask if the courses taken will prepare them for UC. However, the legislature is asking for changes that allow students who do not know to which UC campus they will apply to take a set of courses that will be accepted at any UC. A valuable outcome of the upcoming discipline-specific discussions across the UC campuses might be identification of the range of knowledge students need to achieve in their lower division years to move into a major and how best to go about ensuring that students have that range. It may not mean having the same courses across the campuses but if there could be a common outline or preparation appropriate for the lower division across a number of majors, this would help figure out what preparation is needed.

Concern was expressed that there may be a loss of creativity. One physics department has recently revised the undergraduate physics curriculum and requiring common prerequisites would have prevented this from happening. The assumption that undergraduate education is the same at each campus is not true and this could ultimately devalue the education. Students are advised to prepare broadly for multiple campuses and this rings hollow if there is no way for them to efficiently do this. Transfer students will have trouble in this physics department in the future. About one-third of graduating seniors at another campus who came from community colleges did not meet benchmarks that include working independently, asking analytical questions, and applying what is learned in one situation to another, although they did pass the courses. The more successful community college students typically came from wealthier, urban community colleges. How well students learned and how well they are able to use what they learn must be examined.

One of UC's strengths is that across the campuses there are different approaches to questions raised within disciplines so the question is how this is balanced with the need for individual departments to design their programs in a way that is creative and flexible and allows the programs to evolve in the direction that they deem appropriate. At the same time the system needs to work well with the community colleges so that the transfer process functions as intended. Chair Simmons pointed out that it is not clear if looking at articulating courses is the right question but UC does need to make a good faith effort to respond to the legislature. It is true that it is difficult for students to figure out how to transfer since it is complex. This activity may help the community colleges currently not among the main feeder schools to improve their programs. One question is whether students are prepared to succeed and which UC will accept the courses taken. There can be more than one way for students to prepare to be successful in the upper division of a major. Looking at the issue on a course by course basis would be labor intensive. Institutional Research could provide some data but it may not be able to identify which students took which courses. It would be counter-productive to look at articulation issues without looking at the larger policy issues.

UC should be able to keep its admissions standards. SB 1440 does mandate that the CSUs give priority to the transfer students. There was a concern that the associate for transfer degree would not give students something to fall back on if they did not transfer but this concern was addressed by requiring 18 units although these units do not have to be in the major. What is necessary for sequencing in the lower division in order to move to the upper division should be determined. For students not covered by IGETC, how articulation for general education requirements will work is another question that needs to be answered and one campus is grappling with this issue now.

### **III. Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition**

Chair Kay explained that traditionally the term fee applies to things that were ancillary to the basic cost of instruction and tuition applies to the cost of instruction. UC has not called anything tuition although in the past 10 to 15 years educational fees have been charged that actually go to the cost of instruction. The proposal is to rename educational fees as tuition.

**Discussion:** One member favors it because fees are already thought of as tuition within UC. It might also be less offensive to the public in light of the increasing costs. GIs going to a private institution only receive what the state tuition level is and by calling it fees they receive nothing. Fees refers to the non-instructional costs. A comment was made that the term supplemental should be taken out of “non-resident supplemental tuition.” The term fees is confusing to students and there should be outreach to them to explain that the term is being changed but the amount they will pay is the same. There should also be clear communication so the public understands that tuition is not being charged in addition to fees. The impact of changing the definition on student financial aid should be carefully considered. It should be clarified that students pay the educational fee as well as non-resident tuition, which is why they are distinguished from one another. Members agree that they support calling fees tuition and will emphasize the need to communicate to students and the public that it is just a change in name only. UC should take a proactive approach in doing outreach about this change. It should also be noted that financial aid will cover tuition just as it has covered fees.

**Action:** The Chair and analyst will draft the committee’s response.

### **IV. Resolution and Statement on Near Term Choices for UC**

These recommendations address how UC should deal with having less money in the short term. There are five recommendations from Council. UCEP can endorse either of the recommendations or suggest something else.

**Discussion:** Discussing downsizing may be premature, and more information and data about the impact of the choices is needed before considering downsizing. If faculty are downsized without downsizing the student body, the result will be much larger classes or finding alternative ways to deliver classes possibly by using non-Senate faculty. Downsizing the student body will result in the loss of fees, a major source of revenue. Part of the problem is the number of unfunded students in the system. One CEP discussed the recommendations and had a number of objections. With regard to the UCLA statement, this CEP objected to saying that faculty should be paid more in light of the high unemployment rate in the state. UC should also stop accepting cuts while striving to maintain quality. Quality could be maintained at the price of reducing enrollment. There is no statement about the value of UC to the general public. Faculty should not pit themselves against staff. Money for construction is cheap now so freezing all new building may not make sense. The suggestion that this will make the legislature happy enough to give UC money is not realistic. UC may have to provide remedial education in the future which is very expensive. The UCLA recommendation more broadly applies to faculty and staff whereas the Council statement puts faculty

first. UC is at the point where, if quality is to be maintained, there will be a cost. UC should begin by stating what UC contributes to the state, the nation and the world, that the University is vital. UC could increase access to students but there is a lack of physical capacity to accommodate them, so there should not be a moratorium on building. If UC keeps raising fees, there will be a need for more financial aid and there eventually will be students who cannot afford to attend resulting in the loss of revenue.

A part of downsizing may mean increasing non-resident students. UCB is aiming to have 20% of students who are non-residents. The quality of research needs to be maintained and this should be emphasized. It is the opportunity to attend a research university that is an experience students cannot get at a non-research university. The committee discussed student access to researchers. The public does not understand UC's contribution to research. Selling the quality of research in the right way is critical and includes explaining the benefit to the public. It is important for students to be engaged in the research and with the faculty. For-profit schools have the financial resources to promote themselves although one UCEP member argued that these schools target a different population. Chair Simmons indicated that the need to maintain the value of a UC education and the quality of research are unstated assumptions in the Council recommendation because the document is not focused externally. Most undergraduate students question why they are paying for faculty's research when it does not benefit them. A member indicated that the UCLA letter suggests that UC can have everything which is not the reality. There is the potential that faculty will lose hope and start leaving UC. Vice Chair Anderson indicated that the purpose of the Council recommendation is to force faculty to look at the reality of the situation.

Is a solution to have ladder rank faculty teaching more which would drive away those faculty more interested in research. UC has to determine what is under UC's control. Ultimately it might be up to each campus to make decisions. UC will take deep cuts in the quality of research unless revenue increases through non-resident tuition. A member felt that the Council recommendations will hurt education. It is not clear that the recommendations are the right ones. There is no statement about the consequences of the cuts in the Council letter.

Options include increasing numbers of non-resident students, decreasing the number of unfunded students, and increasing revenue. If there is an increased use of lecturers they should be made Senate members so they can also participate in service. There is a risk of losing one or two generations of researchers. The audience for UCEP's response is the president and the Regents and UCEP should tell them what should be done. Ways to improve the situation without impacting the quality of education and of research need to be identified. The quality of undergraduate education will diminish if no cuts are made. If the number of non-resident students was increased by 10%, \$400 million would be generated which would help but not close the budget gap. It is also no certainty that the numbers of non-resident students can be increased. UCEP should provide specific examples of how the quality of undergraduate education has been or will be negatively impacted and a list of everything that has or will change at their campuses. The problems students have with getting classes is an example. If faculty are really a priority, cutting athletic programs and other things related to student experience should be a recommendation.

## **V. Community College Transfers**

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy*

One of the things Student Affairs is working on is to smooth the transfer pathways from the community colleges into UC. One initiative for the fall is to put together discipline task forces that will look at aligning lower division requirements. The disciplines are math, history, psychology, biological sciences and computer science. The five discipline groups will be convened soon and the first meetings will be convened at UCOP. The discipline work groups will not be looking at which courses at the community

colleges will qualify but what kinds of courses UC would look for in terms of preparation for a given major. The courses that qualify will be looked at by the existing articulation process at the campuses and at UCOP.

The Common GE discussion started last year at ICAS and was perceived at the time as a piece of low-hanging fruit. There are two patterns for general education that students can follow if they are trying to satisfy all of the general education requirements before they transfer. IGETC is a set of courses that, over the years, ICAS has come to agreement on that either CSU or UC would accept as satisfying GE in either system. In addition, the CSU has its own CSU GE Breadth which is a second set of GE requirements that CSU would accept. Right now about 80% of the transfer students at UC have satisfied IGETC and the other 20%, because of their major, are not advised to complete IGETC and instead focus on their major preparation courses. Between 10% and 20% of students going the CSUs have completed the IGETC requirements and the remaining students have completed the CSU Breadth requirements. The focus for UC has been how things can be simplified for transfer students. Two alternatives discussed include UC accepting the CSU Breadth requirements so students could do either pattern. The second alternative Student Affairs is considering is determining the best parts of both IGETC and the CSU Breadth requirements and come up with a single pattern. For some particular majors students are not advised to complete IGETC because they might have to do more major-specific lower preparation, particularly in the sciences. Students are being advised to apply to multiple UC campuses because of high enrollment which means transfer students may not get into their campus of choice but the problem is that the campuses may have different requirements. The students end up taking more units and entering UC with more units which is a concern at the community colleges. Students are also applying to the CSUs and UC. IGETC was put together 15 years ago and it is accepted by the CSUs. Student Affairs put together a list of the major differences between the IGETC and CSU general education patterns. There is partial IGETC where a student completes all but one or two of the courses. The workgroup on CSU Breadth will consider areas where UC is willing to compromise.

**Discussion:** All nine campuses have agreed that it was okay for community colleges students to do IGETC but some colleges at one campus have opted out. Unless a course has been matched through articulation, a student will not get GE credit. If a student completes IGETC no additional GE work is needed. Even though UC agreed to accept IGETC the issue is that there is also the CSU breadth, and the goal is to streamline the process for students. It is the number of units per course that is different for the CSUs. UC could tell the CSUs that UC likes IGETC and begin the conversation there. The question for the students is can they take certain courses that will qualify them for both CSU and UC. The core problem with transfers is the lower division preparation piece. Whether IGETC be cleaned up so it really is one IGETC for both the CSUs and UC needs to be explored. Students could be given categories of courses they should complete. Student Affairs could talk to CSU about why they have separate requirements. UC likes the category certification. For IGETC purposes, the language requirement is waived if students took a foreign language for two years in high school.

## **VI. CSU Breadth Workgroup**

This item was not discussed during the meeting but Chair Kay asked for UCEP members to submit a note indicating their interest in participating on this workgroup.

## **VII. Post-Employment Benefits**

- *Bob Anderson, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

UCEP does not need to opine on this matter but Vice Chair Anderson encouraged the faculty to educate themselves. There are two changes in retiree health. The maximum university portion being is reduced to 70% of the premium, meaning the out of pocket premiums for retirees would roughly triple. This will

impact every retiree, including current retirees. The other change is that UC is moving toward a system that requires 20 years of service and an employee cannot retire until age 65 in order to receive the full UC contribution. Currently, an employee can retire at age 60 and receive the full contribution. In order to receive the UC contribution an employee has to be at least 55 years of age and have at least 10 years of service. This applies to people who are not grandfathered. When the changes take effect in 2013, to be grandfathered an employee must have at least five years of service and moreover the employee's years of service plus age must be equal to at least 50. Full professors will be grandfathered, assistant professors are not grandfathered, associate professors may or may not be based on their circumstances, and a full professor new to UC will not be grandfathered. If one retires at age 60, one would pay two-thirds of the premium. Retiree health will have a bigger impact on staff than faculty. These are substantial reductions which cut the so-called normal costs roughly in half from 8% to 4% of wages. Even with this reduction the plan is more generous than what most other employers offer.

There is controversy over the pension plan for new employees. There are no changes to current employees except potentially higher contributions to stay in the current plan with its current terms for future service. - Three main options are on the table. Option C: current UCRP terms delayed five years with some pieces removed. With 30 years of service the employee would get 75% of the employee's 36 months average. This option would not have a big affect on faculty because the average age of retirement is 66 but it would have a bigger impact on staff because the average age of retirement is 59.

UC's pension plan has been generous. Allows retirement at age 60 if the employee has the years of service and the plan has been free. The other two options would save UC money because they are less expensive plans. Options B and C cost essentially the same. Option B provides lower benefits, especially for lower-paid employees. Option A is cheaper, comprising 7% percent of payroll versus 9% of payroll, and it would provide lower benefits. Because UC has a large unfunded liability, UC will have to come up with 20% going forward. The unfunded liability is \$30 billion. Options B and C can be financed with the same contributions out of the operating budget until 2017. Under option A the contributions decrease in 2029 and for B and C the decrease would begin a few years later. There is no way to rationalize that option A is competitive. If salaries were competitive, options B and C would be competitive with what other institutions offer.

**Discussion:** Administrators and staff retire before they are eligible for Medicare, so people are encouraged to retire later. Having fewer different unique individuals working longer does result in savings. UCEP could express concern that these choices will impact the competitiveness of remuneration for faculty which will have an impact on quality. In the past UC was able to say that the salaries may not be at the top but UC has a generous retirement plan. Reducing the value of the plan will have an impact on the ability to attract faculty and may increase turnover especially in mid-career. Staff would either stay longer or also leave mid-career. Option C is the plan that UCFW prefers. There are legal problems with offering a choice between plans. The Council of University Staff Assemblies is a body drawn from non-represented staff that could weigh in on this issue. The unions have not agreed to the 7% increase though some have agreed to a 2% increase.

**Action:** The analyst will draft the committee's response.

### **VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- Hilary Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

The immediate past chair of UCEP, Keith Williams, is at UCOP one day a week working with the Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination. The RFP for pre-proposals for the online education pilot will be released at the end of the month. A group of these faculty will be selected. Selected faculty will participate in a course design process and put together an evaluation framework. There is no money yet to

fund development of the courses. If the courses are shown to be effective, more of them will be developed.

**Discussion:** Faculty will be asked to commit to at least one offering of the course. Campus committees on courses and CEPs need to be notified that these courses are going to be implemented. The content of the course may be required to be made available to the public though people would not receive credit. The intellectual property right issue still needs to be resolved. A portion of the revenue should go back to the faculty teaching the course and this has been discussed with Vice Provost Greenstein. Another question is what happens if the faculty member teaching an online course leaves UC. It is not clear how the RFP will be disseminated. How teaching assistant resources will be managed will also need to be figured out.

WASC is preparing to revise its handbook on how they do accreditation reviews to make it less onerous and more helpful. WASC is working actively with five UC campuses. UCB, UCD, and UCSC have not submitted institutional review plans. UC wants to get to the point where there is just one visit, the educational effectiveness visit. UCM has had to run the gauntlet with WASC because it is a new campus and does not have established programs.

CCGA is discussing how dollars are going to drive policy and choices. There are proposals for professional degree fees for new programs and seven existing programs. One new program is proposing \$30,000 for tuition for one year. The distinction between professional programs and others is unclear. The definition of a self-supporting program is being examined. The effects of these efforts to bring in revenue will have to be monitored.

## **IX. Member Items**

There were no member items.

## **X New Business**

### *Adding the student representatives to listserv*

Members voted to include the student representatives to the committee listserv.

### *Agenda Items for Future Meetings*

Chair Kay indicated that members should suggest any additional topics that members feel UCEP should address this year.

### *Subcommittee Volunteers*

Chair Kay asked members to indicate the subcommittees on which they are willing to serve. A member suggested that a subcommittee could work on improving how UC is portrayed to the public. We will invite Lynn Tierney to the November meeting to discuss this matter.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:20 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: David Kay