Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Tony Smith, Vice Chair (UCI), Ann Plane (UCSB), Jonathan Wurtele (UCB), Jack Vevea (UCM), Thomas Stahovich (UCR), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD) (telephone), Gabrielle Nevitt (UCD), Barbara Knowlton (UCLA), Jocelyn Banaria (IRAP), Kimberly Peterson (IRAP), Dan Hare (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Pamela Brown (IRAP), Todd Greenspan (IRAP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I.   Announcements

Academic Council discussed the governor's budget proposal, possible changes in UC Care, recent Regents meetings, future sexual assault prevention training, and the expansion of the open access policy for non-Senate members.

Chair Larrabee described the Council discussion about the total remuneration study and different strategies for how to distribute the 3% increase are being considered. Academic Planning Council discussed the five year planning perspectives which UCEP will also review today. The chair would like UCEP to review the international activities policy materials reviewed at Academic Planning Council.The agenda for Assembly included topics previously discussed by Council. President Napolitano and Governor Brown comprise a committee of two which will review UC's budget structure.

The UCLA representative attended the last ICAS meeting. There is newly proposed legislation, SCA 1, which would take away UC's autonomy. The community colleges are planning to offer bachelor's degrees at some campuses. The CCCs have indicated that they will need assistance with the development of these programs. The status of California Open Educational Resources Council was discussed.

Discussion: At the last meeting a decision was made to not use the free text books being developed. An issue with free text books is who will be responsible for updating them. Students express that they dislike online books. Members described serious glitches with online homework systems including that the answers were wrong. The UCR representative is using an eBook with a course and collecting significant data. Faculty at the CCCs and the CSUs are required to use the textbooks.

II.   Consent Calendar

 Action: The minutes were approved.

III.   Consultation with the Office of the President
       •   *Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator, UCOP*

ILTI was funded with $10M for 2013-14 to reach a number goals including broadening UC student access. In the past two years ILTI has issued two requests for proposals. Last year 39 hybrid and fully online courses were funded. ILTI funded the development of two instructional tools at UCB and these will be made available to faculty with ILTI courses and faculty at large. Each campus also received separate funding to offer its own RFPs. This year, ILTI will not fund any hybrid courses. This decision was made in part because the hybrid courses were found to not be as accessible to students. UC has committed to the state to having 150 online courses. Each campus received $150K to support online course development last year. There are no funds specifically dedicated for course evaluation but ILTI is collecting data.

The cross campus enrollment system (CCES) website was launched in November 2013 and it includes information about course descriptions and credit. This year, functionality will be added that allows students to search for courses, an important goal for ILTI. Currently, 88 people have used the CCES. ILTI is collecting

information about why students drop online courses. The students' home campus makes the determination about eligibility. Student request is the number one reason students have dropped courses to date. The completion rate is currently around 80% after the close of the add/drop period.

Discussion: Developing online courses is a huge undertaking for faculty. A member suggests that ILTI is moving in the right direction and is rightly focused on supporting what the campuses are already doing. The chair clarified that the criteria for eligibility checks was not generated by UCEP but by the campuses. The committee is asked if the requirement could be changed to allow more students to take the online courses. Vice Chair Hare indicated that it would be politically beneficial for UC to expand online education. A member emphasized that UC curriculum has always been established at the campus level. Campuses may be able to change the requirements if they are deemed to be unnecessary but some of the requirements are there to protect what a campus values. ILTI has seen more success with smaller niche courses than GE courses being articulated across campuses. The committee discussed the types of courses that might be helpful for ILTI to support.

The committee discussed articulation issues and the need for these decisions to be made at the departmental level. It would be helpful for articulation officers to have comprehensive information about courses that articulate to other UC campuses. Faculty should be asked to indicate how their course articulates. There is a concern about whether there is a long-term market for cross-campus enrollment. Online courses may be important for campuses dealing with large class sizes and this highlights the different needs that campuses have. Campuses have physical space issues. UC should do a better job about reporting how requirements have been standardized for different majors and its efforts to streamline the transfer process. If there are reasons not to articulate, the reasons should be made clear. A member noted that online courses do not necessarily reduce costs for disciplines like engineering because of the need to fund teaching assistants. The importance of student interaction with other students and faculty cannot be forgotten. There are ways in which people learn that online education does not address.

IV.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
   • *Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Chair Hare and Chair Gilly met by teleconference with Lark Park, a higher education consultant to the governor, following the first meeting of "the committee of two." Ms. Park questioned whether there is sufficient emphasis on teaching in the different disciplines, what motivates faculty in their teaching and whether there are incentives to motivate faculty to teach more. The Senate leadership will make an effort to educate the consultant about the peer review system. Ms. Lark also asked if the current cost model provides sufficient access to students and Vice Chair Hare questioned whether there is sufficient capacity for additional access, which he feels limits enrollment at some campuses. The consultant was not aware that there could be capacity issues related to access.

If UC can identify a set of courses that would allow a student to apply to all campuses, then UC will have simplified the transfer process. UC needs to begin thinking more carefully about what can be done with respect to dealing with legislators. Not everyone in Sacramento is a friend to UC and not everyone is willing to listen to arguments about campus or department autonomy. There will be trade-offs in terms of what UC needs to do in order to get legislative votes in favor of bills that are more generous to UC than the governor's. Vice Chair Hare commented that some chancellors may be willing to bargain with the legislature on their own for their campus, but it is not clear that this benefits all campuses equally.

If students only receive unit credit instead of credit for their majors, then students will not want to take the course through cross campus enrollment. Most students also prefer to take classes on their own campuses. However, it is important for UC to experiment with online education in order to obtain information that can be taken to the governor and the legislators who have the idea that online courses are cheaper because they eliminate the need for UC to build buildings. UC is not going to have very useful information based on the small number of online courses available so far.

The five year planning perspectives seem to be more like wish lists than comprehensive plans. Vice Chair Hare

commented that there should be good marketing data to support the demand for self-supporting and professional degree programs. The plans help to look at duplication across the system. There may be a difference between the interests of faculty and those of students.

Discussion: During the discussion about capacity, it was noted that faculty now lecture at night and that night labs are used throughout the week. A member stressed that campus specific efforts are very successful but the insistence on cross campus enrollment is problematic. Even the Regents fail to understand this. UCEP should be prepared to address plans for increased articulation and plans for increased transfer uniformity. Vice Chair Hare suggests that any reasons not to articulate should be made public. There is an effort to make the case the online courses are not necessarily cheaper just because no lecture hall is required. It was noted that large online class in a residential setting are very different from courses like those offered by Coursera. The legislature is more focused on access than on quality, which is something UC needs to acknowledge. Both the governor and lieutenant governor want UC to be more efficient in terms of the number of students trained per dollar.

With respect to the five year planning perspectives, it is not clear whether it is UCEP's role think about duplication issues. There may be duplication issues that UCEP should comment on but the committee's charge may be limited to considering the quality of a program. If campuses offer programs that are not popular with students or that cost too much, they will eliminate those programs. The planning perspectives do not offer much information for UCEP to evaluate.

V.   Standardization of the Awarding of Advanced Placement Credit Across the UC System

Chair Larrabee invited Vice Chair Hare to comment on how the awarding of AP credit varies across the UC campuses. If this variation is necessary, steps should be taken to inform high school students and explain the reasons for the variation. The committee has discussed having some type of policy that states how AP credit can be used. The chair commented on the aspects of introductory writing courses that students miss out on when they are given AP credit and skip these courses. This matter came to UCEP from the Committee on Preparatory Education. The analyst reported that UCOPE intends to ask campuses to provide more details about how AP credit is used.

Discussion: Reportedly, a concern at UCSB is that the AP excuses students from writing but students are not given an equivalent experience. On the other hand, the writing program could not possibly staff all the sections that would be needed to accommodate all the students now exempted because of AP. Some students are being excluded from signing up for courses because they have AP credit. Different campuses could track what happens with their students with specific AP classes to find out if they do worse after placing out (e.g. not getting into graduate school).

Vice Chair Hare stated that the governor's office is concerned about finding alternative ways to provide students credit so that they can move through the system faster. UC has always had credit by examination which allows someone to challenge a course. The legislature is interested in anything that will help students complete their degrees faster. It is possible that campuses are using AP credit to substitute for requirements and make space for more students. Some of the Regents agree that UC has reached its limit in terms of time to degree based upon the heterogeneous backgrounds of UC students.

There has been vigorous debate at UCSD about the use of AP credit this year, where it is viewed as a positive thing as it relates to time to degree. At least one campus, UCSB, uses AP credit to excuse students from upper division writing classes if students receive a score of five on the language and literature or composition exam. There was general agreement that AP credit should not be used for upper division credit. Parents definitely count on the use of AP credit to place students out of freshman classes in order to save money on tuition. UCEP will not take any steps on this matter until UCOPE has more data and revises its memo.

VI.   Five Year Planning Perspectives
   •   *Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning IRAP*

- *Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP*
- *Jocelyn Banaria, Analyst, Academic Planning, IRAP*

Chair Larrabee reported that the five year planning perspectives do not provide much information for the committee to consider. According to Director Greenspan, what is asked for in the perspectives has been scaled back and suggested that UCEP may want to look at discontinuations. There were a number of name changes proposed. Campuses may not want to document anything about discontinuing a program if the necessary groundwork has not been laid or to avoid sending a negative message. Unless a program is the last of its kind, the proposal to close it may not even come before UCEP.

Discussion: A member suggested that the plans could have information about successful cross-campus collaborations. The current plans focus primarily on graduate level programs except for UCM which is still in growth mode. One concern is that creating a large number of masters programs will take away for undergraduate teaching. Faculty may be pressured to teach certain courses. IRAP will follow up with the campuses about the proposed name changes to make sure the programs are not actually being discontinued. The provost has proposed that if a program has had zero enrollment, it can be removed from the catalog. This is the type of decision that UCEP may want to review.

Action: UCEP will not comment on the current five year perspectives.

VII. Undergraduate Completions Conference
- *Pam Brown, Vice President for Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP), UCOP*

VP Brown provided UCEP with an overview of the Undergraduate Completions Conference which took place at the start of January. Campuses provided background information about their practices in advance of the conference. One goal is to improve the completion rates for Pell Grant recipients. The overarching goal was for campuses to be able to identify current practices or strategies they should be using. President Napolitano started the conference and Provost Dorr made the closing remarks. IRAP is reporting back to the campuses about the participants. IRAP is also in the process of putting a packet together with a summary of the conference which will be sent initially to the undergraduate deans and eventually to the conference participants. VP Brown felt it was important for campuses to assess what has been happening and indicated that there will be a focus on the STEM fields. This focus may have a big impact because of the number of students in the STEM fields. Some campuses including UCD are rethinking their curriculum. Another strategy is to use summer session. One break out session focused on sense of community.

Discussion: Summer orientation at UCSC includes a report from a student who participated in the program as opposed to hearing from an administrator. A goal is for each campus to be able to utilize the information that has been collected but there may be some activities that involve collaboration across the campuses. A member remarked that the Senate faculty did not seem to be well represented at the conference and it will be important for them to be engaged going forward. Some of the discussions focused on issues such as what the course offerings should be and who will teach them. The provost has asked campuses to submit their plans and IRAP is planning its next steps. The UCSB representative mentioned attending a conference that focused on making what faculty do more intellectually engaging.

It was suggested that IRAP examine the five and three year completion rates and that the data should be broken down by department. If engineering is excluded, the completion rates will actually look much better. The more nuanced the data is the better. The summary data highlights the areas where campuses can improve. A member expressed concern that students are being rushed through UC and graduate without the skills needed to compete with other graduates. There is a need to distinguish between completion being delayed because students could not get into classes versus delays caused because students change their majors, for example. Chair Larrabee commented that the conference was informative. IRAP is looking into systemwide licenses for databases that will help the system look at information about completion rates more readily.

VIII.   New Business

The Senate's Executive Assistant updated committee on the travel reimbursement form.

The UCD representative suggested that UCEP look at the issue of student academic integrity violations.

IX.   Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 3 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Tracy Larrabee