

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2014

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Tony Smith, Vice Chair (UCI), Ann Plane (UCSB), Donald Curtis (UCSF), John Tamkun (UCSC), Jonathan Wurtele (UCB), Jack Vevea (UCM), Thomas Stahovich (UCR), Simon Penny (UCI), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Barbara Knowlton (UCLA), Gabrielle Nevitt (UCD), Robby Boparai (Undergraduate Student Representative), Deborah Obley (Associate Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources, UCOP), Pamela Brown, Vice President for Institutional Research & Academic Planning Todd Greenspan (Director of Academic Planning, Institutional Research and Academic Planning, UCOP), Jocelyn Banaria (Analyst, Institutional Research and Academic Planning, UCOP), Michael Trevino (Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs), Dan Hare (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Updates and Announcements

Academic Planning Council briefly reviewed the open access policy and discussed issues related to copyright and fair use. The APC is considering how to make the five year planning perspectives less burdensome. Chair Larrabee will participate on the international activities policy working group. UC is being criticized for not admitting California students when international students are being invited to UC. Campuses began admitting international students when UCOP encouraged them to find other sources of funding. At present there is no plan to place a cap on the numbers of out of state or international students, but campuses may be asked to scale back some. UC states that it continues to admit California students for which the state does not provide funding. Chair Larrabee informed the APC about UCEP's plan to write a paper about the meaning of a UC degree and CCGA may want to contribute to the paper as well.

The total remuneration study was discussed by Academic Council. Council discussed the issue of consultation with the administration. The Committee on Committees has proposed a change that would make vice chairs at large. The chair is concerned that this bylaw change will make it more difficult to find vice chairs for UCEP. President Napolitano is encouraging entrepreneurship. Chair Larrabee attended UC Engage which was about the use of technology in teaching. The cost of instruction for undergraduates and graduates was discussed during the Provost's Budget call. The chair spoke to the California Council on Science and Technology.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Deborah Obley, Associate Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources, UCOP*
- *Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning, Institutional Research and Academic Planning, UCOP*

UCOP has not developed an enrollment plan since 2008 and during the subsequent budget crisis, the legislature stopped funding enrollment. UC instituted a new methodology of distributing state funds that calls for a per weighted student basis for the distribution of state funds after a number of assumptions. For example, it is assumed that all campuses need at least a core amount of money in order to run that would

not be part of rebenching. Based on Merced's core funding UCOP set this amount at \$15M for a campus of any size. Major programs with a systemwide function were brought from the campuses to UCOP. A reasonable timeframe was set to achieve level funding on a weighted per student basis across the system and it was determined that UCLA had the highest weighted per student funding. Over a six year period, the campuses will be brought up to the UCLA level as a result of rebenching. This is being done only with new increments of money. This is the third year of rebenching and it is slowly redistributing the dollars per student in an equitable manner across the campuses. Because enrollment is a key factor, the need for a new enrollment plan became clear.

The campuses were given a set of assumptions and asked to submit their plans for various levels of student enrollment. UCOP received this information about 18 months ago and AVP Obley would like to review some of the findings with UCEP today. A set of principles was developed by the Academic Council and then adapted by the Academic Planning Council. Based on these principles, UCOP has assessed what the campuses have submitted and what UCOP has identified as important systemwide concerns. In the years before the budget crisis, enrollment growth was funded by the state. Since the early 90s UC probably grew at a rate of 2-3% a year. In 2008, the state stopped funding enrollment growth. The governor does not care about funding enrollment but the legislators remain interested in funding it. It was anticipated that there would be a leveling off of high school students but undergraduate growth met the 2020 target sooner than expected by the Department of Finance. Graduate students have grown but not significantly.

Campuses have asked to revise the estimates previously submitted so the information UCEP has is out of date but offers a sense of where there will be growth. It was noted that there are thousands of students not funded by the state, so any growth will be based on the budgeted number of students not the actual number. The campuses are proposing dramatic growth at the academic PhD, masters and PDST levels as well as some growth in health sciences. The campuses will probably want to revise the plans for non-resident enrollment beyond the 9% annual growth rate proposed in 2012. UCSF and UCM are not included in the rebenching formula but UCM does anticipate dramatic growth. The goal in 2020 is to eliminate the over enrollment of students. The growth is mostly proposed for non-residents and enrollment growth of California residents is proposed at the campuses that are currently over-enrolled. There is a tension between bringing campuses to their budgeted enrollment and serving California students at over-enrolled campuses.

The Department of Finance projections for high school growth have been inaccurate for the past seven years. UC thinks this is leveling off but at a slower rate than is projected. Historically, UC has taken between seven and nine percent. Before the budget cut, UC was taking nine percent of the high school graduating class but is now taking between 7 to 7.5%. Fewer students were admitted to the campuses they selected but at the same time UC tried to admit more transfer students to mitigate this. One question is whether UC is really meeting the Master Plan if students are only being offered UCM. Non-resident tuition is not included in the funding streams so campuses with limited numbers of out of state students are disadvantaged.

UC has been in a cut mode since 2008-2009 even with the years where state funding has been provided. AVP Obley notes that the governor's proposed 4% base budget adjustment for UC in 2015-2016 is really a 1.7% adjustment when applied across state funds and tuition, which is below inflation. UC enrolls seven thousand California students systemwide for which the state has never provided funding. 2007-2008 is the last year that UC regarded itself as funded for enrollment. The average cost of instruction is believed to be around \$16K dollars and non-resident students pay \$36K, so these students are subsidizing to help all other students. Non-resident tuition has been essential as a partial mitigation of funding UC does not get from the combination of state funding and tuition.

There has been discussion at the legislature about capping non-resident enrollment. UC's stated position is that no additional California students will be admitted until the state funds them, and regardless of whether non-residents are admitted by UC or the legislature caps them, a new place will not be created for California students. Both houses put money in the budget in recognition of this issue and the governor vetoed it. The governor is not sympathetic to any of UC's concerns. With the new funding model, non-resident tuition is one of the funding streams that the campuses keep and some of the campuses with the fewest number of non-residents are the most over-enrolled which is an equity issue the system could adjust for. The enrollment principles are very broad and general. BOARS defines eligibility and is now considering revising the 9% statewide by 9% by high school using the academic index because it is now yielding more than the 12%. It was noted that for planning, participation rates work better.

UC believes that growing by 1% a year it will still be able to accommodate all eligible students under the Master Plan, make some headway in funding some of the unfunded enrollment, and grow moderately at the graduate level. AVP Obley stated that this depends on 4-5% base budget adjustment and UCEP members were encouraged to listen to the upcoming Regents meeting for new developments related to the budget. Some of the enrollment occurred because of events over which the campuses had no control. UCOP thinks that with better enrollment management techniques and sharing best practices some of the over-enrollment can be addressed. The enrollment plan will forecast out to 2020-2021.

There are differing perspectives about penalizing campuses that miss their California enrollment targets. Faculty who worked on rebenching supported penalties while others disagreed with the logic of attaching a punishment to something that is not an exact science. Any penalties would have to be employed after a campus had chronically missed its targets and seemed to be doing so deliberately, and AVP Obley indicated that UCEP members can weigh in as this question is still under debate. UCOP will discourage campuses from over enrolling because it will dilute funding on a per student basis for everyone, a key point being made to the state. For decades UC was at four percent non-resident enrollment and this has increased to an estimated 13.4% systemwide for 2014-2015. UCB and UCLA are close to 22%, UCSD is at 20% and UCD is in the double digits as well. AVP Obley indicated that no California students have been displaced by non-residents, and currently there is no plan to cap non-resident growth. It was stressed that the campuses are telling UCOP that they can manage what they propose. The increased emphasis on graduation rates may come into play with this issue. Non-residents do not persist in the first year at the same rate as residents, and this could impact the outcome measures the state looks at. There is a systemwide priority placed on the balance between graduate academics and undergraduates. Graduate academics are very expensive and how much growth can be anticipated is under discussion. This is an area where UC may not see progress for many years.

Discussion: Although the budget is not under UCEP's purview, Chair Larrabee remarked that the principles reflect the core of faculty thinking about educating students and thanked AVP Obley and Director Greenspan for offering their expertise. The argument has repeatedly been made, without data, that the fees paid by international students help to fund California residents. A member suggested adopting a three to five year rolling average to manage campuses that have a pattern of over-enrollment. Trying to implement penalties after just a year will be very problematic. Enrollment manipulation by the campuses can have very negative consequences. AVP Obley emphasized how difficult it is for some of the campuses to plan and that decisions made at a campus like UCLA can have a significant impact on an already struggling campus. The AVP would propose that the president would be prompted to investigate when a campus is chronically over-enrolling.

It was noted that the CSU system cut enrollment by 20K students during the budget crises, which impacted UC's growth especially at UCR. That campus reduced its admissions targets and got a higher yield. Flexibility is needed in any response to a campus that chronically over enrolls students. The current rebenching model does not take into account discipline. Campuses could have a major incentive to over

enroll out of state students so any penalty would have to be significant to make an impact. It was noted that funding streams eliminated the ability to distribute the funds equitably from UCOP and some chancellors are voicing concerns about this and rebenching. Some campuses were getting less funding back in their base budget adjustment than they sent back to the center under the old model. A key principle to funding streams is that all revenue generated by a campus stays on that campus. Non-resident tuition has been a boon to UCB and UCLA and this revenue used to be shared.

The issue of resources available for international students has been left to the campuses to manage and will be a point of future negotiations. Non-residents do not persist in the first year at the same rate as residents, and this could impact the outcome measures the state looks at. AVP Obley commented that many non-resident students leave UC when they learn that they must pay the non-resident rate all four years. Many students also lack the English needed to succeed. A member commented that male South Korean students leave UC after a year or two for military service, suggesting this be factored into the non-persistence rate. UCI successfully changed the recruiting focus to address this, and recruiters and campuses are getting better at identifying patterns like this. A program in France requires students to prepare for a year before actually enrolling. Members briefly touched on the importance of graduate students to UC's research environment. Hybrid degree programs should not impact the funding model. There are provisions for campuses to get more graduate students and to help fund them. UC has not done a study of workforce demand as part of this planning process but this may be needed.

IV. Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES)

Chair Larrabee provided an overview of the proposed cross campus enrollment system (the "hub") and UCEP's previous discussions. The current system used to enroll students at a different campus is hobbled together and involves a lot of paperwork and different people. UCEP has previously given feedback to UCOP indicating that the decisions about the system should be made by the registrars. Some registrars have suggested that they are being told what to do by the center instead of consulted. Chair Larrabee remarked that without UCOE and ILTI many of UC's online courses would not have been developed and this is not an investment that UCEP should complain about. Further investments should be made towards course designers and faculty buy-outs instead of a system designed based on assumptions and unrealistic predictions about the number of students who will utilize it.

Discussion: Members remarked that the need for the CCES is not clear. The registrar function is based on a campus and there is no mechanism for the center to certify grades for example. A lot of the initial pushback was because UCOP seemed to be creating a systemwide campus. Right now the majority of students are enrolled in online courses offered by their home campus. UCEP will send a memo to the CCES work group that states the following: no harm should be done to the efforts the campuses are making in developing online courses; the inventory of online courses is large at the campus level; online enrollment is functioning well at the campus level; and the campuses should be allowed to pursue their goals. The memo should note that UCEP is pleased to have representation on the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications. It is critically important that UCEP keep an eye open for unintended consequences decisions about ILTI related matters on undergraduate education.

Action: The vice chair will assist with drafting the response to the CCES workgroup.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

This topic was not discussed.

VI. Member Items/Campus Reports

Discussion: A member asked if campuses have best practices related to interdisciplinary course offerings. One challenge is to ensure that all stakeholders are consulted especially after a few years. It was suggested that the budget crisis climate discourages interdisciplinary collaboration. One issue may be management structures that make collaboration difficult.

VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Chair Hare reported that information about UC's budget will be released this coming Thursday with the Regents agenda. The Committee on Faculty Welfare has learned more about UC Ventures. This is still a work in progress but the information provided to the Senate has been encouraging. UC already makes investments and the \$250M for UC Ventures will come out of funds already earmarked for investing. At the Regents meeting it was made clear that UC will not invest in every start up created by members of the UC faculty. The \$50M property tax trigger that could have given UC and the CSU's extra money was not pulled in the summer when it could have been. All of the campuses are now working on the sexual assault prevention policies. UC Cares does not make sense for the campuses without medical schools.

The associate degrees for transfer have become very important. The first year 500 students received the degree and now in the third year, about eleven thousand students will receive an associate degree. UC may begin seeing transfers with these degrees and the UC majors may need to be aligned with what the associate degrees contain. UCEP and BOARS will have to monitor this closely. The associate degrees guarantee admission into the CSUs but not into the UC system. The launch date for UC Path has been postponed. The Senate has representation on three workgroups of the President's Innovation Council. Vice Chair Hare spoke with the chair of the workgroup on merits and recognition about the history of UC's merit and promotion process.

VIII. January 2015 Undergraduate Completions Conference

- *Pamela Brown, Vice President for Institutional Research and Academic Planning, UCOP*

Vice President Brown joined UCEP to discuss the undergraduate completions conference being planned for 2015. A recent presentation to the Regents generated a lot of debate about undergraduate completions. IRAP took a look at a variety of factors that might impact undergraduates. Data was vetted with the undergraduate deans and campus institutional research offices. This has been a focus of the president and the findings have been discussed with the council of chancellors. A conference is being planned for January 8th and 9th at UCR. The goal is to have cohorts from each campus and systemwide to discuss what has been done.

Discussion: There is a question about whether any campuses are being pressured to offer three year degrees but Vice President Brown indicated that this is not a strategy actively being pursued. There have been discussions about the number of courses required for accreditation. It is known that students in the STEM fields take longer to graduate. Individuals from UC campuses will be invited to the conference to share what they have done. A member suggested identifying strategies that can be implemented at a systemwide level. One goal is for IRAP to compile the information collected and make it available on the web. It was suggested that the message from UC should start by pointing out how successful UC is. A member pointed out that time to completion may be longer because students decide to pursue double majors.

IX. Meaning of a UC Degree

Members were invited to share any feedback from their campus committee's on educational policy about the meaning of a UC degree.

Discussion: The statement from UCSB will be shared with the committee. Members were encouraged to draft responses that will form the basis for the committee's paper. Most of the members have not discussed this with their local committees. One member is concerned about dedicating time to this discussion when it is not clear what can be done. One campus is emphasizing capstones within majors and this might be a way of enhancing the meaningfulness of the degree.

X. International Students at UC

- *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs, UCOP*

Director Trevino reviewed data on international students admitted to UC. Currently UC does not collect data about the reasons for leaving. BOARS made a wise decision when it made the policy that the international students must compare favorably to California students.

Discussion: Some international students may have to leave UC if their parents are funding their education and disagree with the students' decisions about the major being pursued. The expectations related to time to degree may necessarily be different for students for whom English is a second language. UCI reportedly has a large cohort of international students who are undecided/undeclared.

XI. New Business

The proposer of the NRS field course provided a response on Friday to the committee's questions and is hopeful that UCEP can approve the systemwide status so the course can be offered this winter. UCEP is not obligated to rush to a decision but the chair does suggest that

Discussion: Members discussed whether features of this course make it similar to other systemwide courses like UCDC or UC Sacramento Center. The proposer has explained that the 19 units is an optimal number for both the quarter and semester campuses. The NRS course will make use of all of the systems, rather than the subset used by the UCSC course. A member raised concerns about liability issues and it was noted that UCEAP, the proposed administrative home for this course, handles issues related to liability for students in EAP. UCEP's memo to the proposer should indicate that, while not within UCEP's purview, it is the committee's expectation that the proposer will be responsible for handling any liability issues. The administrative functions that the UCEAP serves were described. Information about the prerequisites was clarified as UCEP requested.

The plan is to hire lecturers from the nine UC campuses but members pointed out that not much detail is provided. There is no information about who will hire the lecturers or the timeline for when the hiring will be done. Members agreed that there should be more information about the lecturers given the plan to start this course in the winter. UCEP should be careful not to suggest that the committee will vet lecturers hired for this or other courses. There is a concern about the lack of oversight by a campus and members are also concerned about the lack of letters of support from faculty at other campuses. Several members agreed that this course appears to just be a UCSC course, not a systemwide course and the UCSC representative will look into the division's vetting of the course. Members have questions about whether the proposer is collaborating with others at UC such as the Ecology department at UCD.

UCEP might suggest that the NRS proceed with offering the course in the winter and report back to UCEP in the spring with data from that offering. UCEP would like to receive letters of support and for the identification of an appropriate oversight body to monitor the use of lecturers or graduate student instructors or examination policies for example. UCEP might recommend that UCSC provide oversight for the course and that the proposer will notify UCEP if this changes in the future. A member commented that UCEP's approval may have been requested only because the course has an unusual number of units

and that UCSC could be asked to give final approval. The committee considered requiring a review of the course by UCEP after a certain number of years. It was noted that UCEP has asked for additional information about proposed systemwide courses in the past but that the committee should be careful about being consistent in its decision-making. Members agreed that UCEP approve the course as a systemwide offering and ask the proposer to address the criteria specified in the systemwide course approval guidelines. UCEP agreed to make a final decision about this course after the proposer has provided the data from the winter offering and letters of support and identified an oversight body.

Action: The UCSB and UCSC representatives will work on a draft memo with the Chair, Vice Chair and analyst. Members agreed to finalize this matter by email.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:35 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee