

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

TELECONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2015

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Tony Smith, Vice Chair (UCI), Thomas Stahovich (UCR), Phill Conrad (UCSB), Gabrielle Nevitt (UCD), Barbara Knowlton (UCLA), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Simon Penny (UCI), John Tamkun (UCSC), Jack Vevea (UCM), John Stankas (Secretary, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, San Bernardino Valley College), Mary Gilly (Chair, Academic Senate), Dan Hare (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Aimee Dorr (Provost and Executive Vice President), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements

Academic Council's recent meeting included updates on the transfer pathway streamlining activities, the faculty salary equity studies which are available online, the May budget revise, and the Natural Sciences Competency statement including the responses from BOARS and UCEP. The revision of APM 210.1.d was also discussed. The Academic Planning Council reviewed information in the five year planning perspectives about the programs to be developed in the future, and reportedly the provosts have found it helpful to see what is going on at the other campuses.

The provost had a special budget call to discuss the Governor's May revise and people are generally pleased with the outcome of the Committee of Two's negotiations. This committee will cease but it is hoped that communication between the Governor's office and UCOP will be ongoing. Part of the budget agreement that will impact the pensions for new faculty (and recruitment and retention efforts) is a cap on the amount that will be considered for funding and this will be supplemented by a defined contribution program. This is a concern to faculty but this agreement has already made with the state.

The budget deal includes several new educational requirements although many are things that UC already is or will be doing. In the future, the state wants UC to have one transfer student for every new native freshman and, while not there yet, UC is currently moving in this direction. Campuses are committed to developing three year degree programs. The student regent made it clear that students are not interested in three year degrees but UC is required to make it at least possible. Only 3% of UC students currently receive three year degrees.

Next year, UCEP may need to discuss something like UCLA's Challenge 45. Basically this calls for examination of degree program requirements with the goal of reducing the number of upper division units. No one will be forced to reduce the units to 45. At UCLA, most programs did examine their requirements and decrease them to 45. There is also an idea that summer classes can help students graduate more easily in four years. UCEP may want to investigate situations where summer classes have been relegated to extension and used more for enrichment rather than for mainline educational activities.

Vice Chair Smith's report on ICAS, noting a discussion about transfer issues. The legislative day seemed to suggest that the three segments are aligned. ICAS agenda items move forward slowly. It was apparent that UC has lots of friends in the legislature but not in the governor's office.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Budget Framework

- *Aimee Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, UCOP*
- *Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Gilly first thanked the committee for becoming involved with the streamlining transfer initiative and commented that the members' help was a key to the success of this phase. The involvement of the UCEP and BOARS members at their campuses made a difference. UCD, UCI, UCM, UCR, and UCSC have signed on to the ten majors. A good deal of progress has been made although there are a few issues left to iron out at UCB, UCLA, UCSB and UCSD. This has been a difficult process and the Senate's plan for the fall meetings will be improved based on the lessons learned this time around.

The majors to be examined in the fall will be: Business Administration, History, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Film, Communication, English/Literature, Psychology, Computer Science, Political Science, and Philosophy. The appropriate people to attend these meetings have been identified and invitations are being sent out now. It is hoped that there is 100% representation across all the campuses in the October meetings. As challenging as it is to bring together 90 faculty members, this work is important to do for the transfer students and it is very much in UCs best interest as well. We do not want to make it difficult for the best qualified transferred students to join UC. UC is competing with the CSUs especially for students who will be the first in their family to attend college.

The state's long term funding framework for UC includes new revenue mainly through the 4% base budget increase in each of the four upcoming fiscal years. The budget includes nearly \$500M in onetime funding to help pay down UCRP liability, deferred maintenance, and capital intensive energy efficiency projects. In return there will be no tuition increase for the next two years for California students, and then in resident tuition can increase pegged to inflation. Non-resident supplemental tuition can rise by 8% annually as authorized by the Regents for the President which is in sharp contrast to what the legislature might have wanted. Professional degree supplemental tuition will increase for everyone except for law school students. Chair Gilly described the pension changes in the budget deal and reported that the Senate is not happy about the plan. There will be an effort to explore how this can be reframed in a way that shows the benefits to faculty more clearly.

Of particular interest to UCEP are the programmatic changes called for in the budget. Provost Dorr joined the committee for this discussion and commented that there are several ways of looking at the programmatic elements. The EVCs and vice chancellors for planning and budget will meet this Thursday and are very interested in knowing what specifically applies to individual versus multiple campuses. The Provost reviewed for UCEP a slide deck prepared for the Regents about the expected programmatic changes. The work on transfer pathways for major preparation is being undertaken now by the Senate. Half of the majors have been completed and Vice Chair Hare will lead the effort to streamline the requirements for another eleven majors next fall. This work is to be completed over the next two

academic years which will be followed by a period of implementation work by the campus and UCOP administration.

UC is asked to utilize the Common Identification Numbering System (C-ID) currently used by the CCCs and CSUs. The President will ask the Senate to use this system and if it is endorsed, there will also be mostly administrative work associated with ensuring its correct implementation. C-ID would not replace campus numbers but add to campus numbers the common ID which also should facilitate transfers from the community colleges to UC as well as facilitate comparability for online courses across the UCs.

There are a variety of activities in the framework that are fundamentally about getting a higher percentage of undergraduates to earn the BA and to do so in a shorter period of time. UCs graduation rates are outstanding so improving upon them will take extra effort. But it will be better for the students financially if they do it in a shorter time and it benefits the state by opening spaces for new students as UC educates them more rapidly. Provost Dorr explained that there is a pilot at three campuses designed to increase the use of summer session to get ahead. Three different pricing models will be experimented with next summer with the goal of increasing the number of students.

The May revise includes specific details about things such as flipped classrooms which the Provost stated will need to be worked out. The President will ask the Senate to look at current policies for the kind of credit granted to students for AP courses taken in high school or by passing the College Board's College Level Examination Program. Apparently some campuses already go above the minimum of unit credit by granting pre-major or GE credit. This data will be cataloged and then the Senate will decide how to proceed.

Chair Gilly asked Provost Dorr about the timeline for beginning work on these programmatic changes at the campuses. The Provost indicated that work on some activities really needs to begin by the summer at the latest and Senate involvement is clearly required in many areas. The Senate should be prepared to be involved in a timely way. Provost Dorr indicated that one question is how to collect the information that is needed about the current range of practices in a timely manner. Many of the practices to be examined are local practices so UCEP will have to figure out how to facilitate the work.

Provost Dorr cautioned against trying to impose anything upon the campuses. Chair Larrabee suggested an informal approach such as sharing best practices. Provost Dorr agreed that the involvement of UCEP members willing to help would be a valuable asset to the efforts discussed today. A good deal of coordination with the Senate and campuses will be required and who does what will need to be made explicit. The work on streamlining major preparation demonstrated the usefulness of communicating with multiple stakeholders who play various roles and facilitate getting the work done. The Provost explained that the governor's staff visited several UC campuses where they learned about specific programs and some of this information ended up in the May revise language.

Discussion: A member reported being told at his campus that only staff were responsible for the work on streamlining transfers. The involvement of faculty who make decisions about undergraduate curriculum will be key to the success of the October meetings. Vice Chair Hare clarified that on some campuses, the faculty invited to the recent meetings who had decision-making authority delegated participation to the

staff which turned out to be a mistake. The staff were appropriately reluctant to speak for faculty which delayed the negotiations and the study of the potential pathways themselves.

Any ideas about communicating the message in the most appropriate and effective way are welcome. There is a question of how to get the message out about what needs to be done and by whom. Provost Dorr feels that it is a challenge to orchestrate the changes decided upon by the Senate faculty that staff are then responsible for implementing. For example, the major preparation pathways the Senate decides upon will have to be used by the staff that handle transfer admissions and the new information will have to be reflected on websites and so on. It was noted that this budget framework for UC has been endorsed by the Regents but it still has to be approved by the legislature.

IV. California Community College Bachelor's Degree

- *John Stankas, Ph.D. (Faculty Chair of Chemistry; San Bernardino Valley College District; Assembly President; Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Secretary, Accreditation Chair)*

Dr. Stankas is joining UCEP as an officer of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and he has been charged with shepherding the Bachelors degree pilot program the legislature deemed the CCCs needed to implement. The Senate was originally opposed to SB 850 but once it passed, the CCCs decided it must be engaged in a process of defining that Bachelors degree for its system. The top level goal is to have fifteen pilot colleges offering Bachelors degrees by 2022. The CCC's chancellors have already approved the pilot program but the CCC Senate wants these degrees to be meaningful.

UCEP was provided with six framing questions developed by Dr. Stankas' work group. Dr. Stankas would like some feedback about the right direction in which to move. CCC has always thought of lower division in terms of what the UCs and CSUs need. What should be thought about for students who may aspire to transfer a UC is a consideration. Some independent conversations have happened with UCLA about public health but Dr. Stankas would like to have a discussion at the systemwide level with UCEP.

Discussion: A member understood that SB 850 called for the creation of Bachelors degrees by the CCCs that do not overlap with the CSUs or UCs. However there are some areas such as dental hygiene, health information management or respiratory therapy where students may move on to public health or other programs in a Masters or Ph.D. granting institution. Vice Chair Smith indicated that these questions seem to go beyond UCEP's jurisdiction and that these issues should be discussed with UC graduate councils.

A UCEP member did recommend that the upper division courses should include the new developments and current information that would not be available in the lower division classes. Dr. Stankas clarified that he hoped to receive insight from the systemwide perspective by reaching out to UC faculty. It was noted that at some UC campuses, only Ph.D. students can teach upper division courses but practices and standards vary across the campuses. Chair Larrabee invited Dr. Stankas to send questions to UCEP in the future for feedback. It was suggested that the CCCs take a look at how the UC majors prepare their students for insight into what is required. A member emphasized that the graduate councils at the campus level and systemwide would be the appropriate bodies to consult. Dr. Stankas thanked UCEP members for their time and willingness to discuss this topic. The CSU system and campuses will also be consulted. It would be good for UCEP to give the CCCs guidance to help them maintain a high standard of quality.

V. Member Items/Campus Report

Irvine: The campus CEP is about to review its extension and summer sessions. The review occurs every ten years and there have been major changes in the nature of these programs. In particular, UCI has taken the lead with online education, and first extension and then summer session have played very large roles. The member would like ideas about ways to use this review to start a larger conversation across the system about extension, summer session and online education.

Santa Barbara: The representative reported on two questions raised by the chair at the May meeting. The educational policy committee agreed that online proctoring is an issue and the online system for proctoring is not a good solution. In May, members were also asked to report on the “major declaration” or “major qualification.” The representative indicated that there are multiple policies at UCSB related to this question.

Discussion: The UCLA and UCSC committees discussed the proctoring matter and both indicated expressed a preference for in person proctoring. UCEP is not enthusiastic about online proctoring solutions. For the major qualifications question, there are various approaches to doing this at Santa Barbara. Some majors allow students to enroll without any questions asked of them whereas other majors require that students are pre-majors for a certain amount of time and meet the pre-major qualifications before going on.

Santa Cruz: The member is curious about how other campuses set the targets for majors. Currently the campus does not have resource based planning. The UCSC representative would like UCEP to discuss this matter next year.

VI. New Business

Chair Larrabee thanked the committee members for their service, particularly Vice Chair Smith for his service and the UCLA representative for stepping in to attend an ICAS meeting.

Meeting adjourned at: 11:45 a.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee