I. Updates

The Chair announced changes to the agenda. A preliminary report from the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) was discussed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) this past Friday and there is significant pressure from the Regents to stop using the SAT and ACT for UC admissions. ICAS is planning its annual Legislative Day for early March. Chair Serences reported that there is growing support to allow students to use preferred names on diplomas and other documents. UCEP may send Council a letter asking that preferred names be used on diplomas for 2020. Members are asked to find out about campus efforts to use preferred names. The committee will discuss the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 544 today, including concerns about the ambiguity of part D.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The December meeting minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Senate
- Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Chair Bhavnani reported that the search for a new vice president for research is well underway. The Public Policy Institute for California (PPIC) issued a report in response to a request for more data from the Senate about Area D, which is part of the A-G requirements. Several years ago, the Assembly passed a three part proposal for Area D to revise its name, add related courses and to require three sciences to be eligible for UC. After this action by the Assembly, Provost Brown expressed concern that requiring three sciences would discourage some students from applying to UC and that some schools are unable to offer three sciences. The PPIC report provides data related to this issue and Chair Bhavnani noted that the Next Generation Science Standards, to be issued in the near future, will require students to take three sciences. The Assembly may reconsider its approval of this requirement.

On Friday, BOARS discussed and provided feedback on the STTF’s draft report, but Chair Bhavnani cannot share its content at this point. The report is to be finalized in time for the January 29th Academic Council meeting. After it is approved by Council, it will be sent out for a 45 day systemwide review by the Senate and then sent to the president who will take it to the Regents in May. UCEP will have time to discuss it on March 2nd. Chair Bhavnani indicated that the Working Group on Comprehensive Access has completed its report and the president will eventually issue a statement on it. The policy on Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act is being reconsidered based on comments from the Native American Council and other groups.

IV. Student Fees Beyond Tuition

A UCI faculty member developed an online tool needed for quizzes and tests which students had to pay for and he reportedly kept the money from its sales. In response, UCI created a task force which produced a set of recommendations about limiting fees students must pay for various instructional materials.
Faculty are encouraged to evaluate whether additional fees are justified. One question is whether students who take online courses are required to pay for proctoring.

Discussion: The UCI representative explained that faculty who author textbooks for their lectures were alarmed that the task force might recommend that faculty should not be allowed to profit from sales of the texts. However, the final report does not include this recommendation. UCI students pay for proctoring when they use an off-campus site but not for proctoring on the campus. Bulk negotiation for learning management systems may be difficult because of different faculty needs. A member suggested that books should not be included in the definition of materials. One idea is to flag the need for an evaluation if students have to pay more than a certain dollar amount. The recommendation that a “no-cost equivalent should be made available” puts faculty at risk being sued.

The UCM representative indicated that he weighs the cost of textbooks for his students and found a low-cost option. Members agree, however, that the burden to limit the cost of instructional materials should not be on faculty. A suggestion is to establish a financial conflict of interest policy for costs over a certain threshold for a course. UCD’s administration is negotiating costs of textbooks. Director Greenspan provided a link to system guidance on fees. The UCB representative commented that only one textbook is available for a particular course. Faculty might be asked to justify the use of costly materials and a campus committee could assess whether the textbook chosen is the best option. There is a question about infringing on a faculty member’s academic freedom by weighing in on the textbooks selected. The committee is also concerned about discouraging the development of new and excellent teaching materials for undergraduates. The analyst will share information about open source textbooks.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

- Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning

Campuses revised their enrollment targets for fall 2020 in order to achieve the growth required by the legislature and UCOP has asked them to increase the number of students by 60 to 90. Campuses wanted flexibility in how to add the FTE, such as by adjusting freshman transfer targets, and the president will soon announce the final enrollment targets. Rather than simply distributing $10M in state funding to the campuses, the provost issued an RFP for baccalaureate degree completion programs. A couple of chancellors are interested in developing a systemwide degree completion proposal and $5M has been set aside for this. The RFP language is broad enough to allow for programs that will enable anyone to complete their degrees but the first priority is to serve people who have not completed their UC degrees and the second is to serve California residents. The RFP requires the program to be self-sustaining after the grant period. UCOP estimates there are about 50K people who left UC before completing their degrees. Other states have model degree completion programs. The legislation allows this funding to be used for professional degree certificates which might be done through Extension. Director Greenspan shared that the Regents will receive a presentation on graduate students, noting that the state does not provide funds to UC for graduate student enrollment.

Discussion: The RFP has been discussed at UCM but there is little momentum at that campus in part because faculty did not express interest in creating a new academic program.

VI. Consultation with Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

- Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator, ILTI

The revision of SR 544 aims to address several central issues. Since campus Committees on Courses of Instruction approve online courses, the courses should be able to offer more than unit credit and this point will be in the preamble. To give students increased access to needed courses, they should be considered in good standing until there is a reason to drop them. The type of credit received currently varies and UCEP has previously discussed that it would be challenging to standardize the credit awarded across the campuses. The Cross Campus Enrollment System provides information about equivalent courses, and using the course outline may help develop more information about course equivalence and credit
provided. The regulation currently stipulates that students are responsible for determining the type of
credit they will receive.

Discussion: The good standing issue as it relates to payment of student fees is an administrative matter
and Chair Serences noted that the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has been asked for a definition of
good standing. Over time, the types of credit that have been awarded for online courses will be available
in a database. At UCSC and UCSD students have to find out about the credit they will receive before
taking a course. It seems problematic to encourage students to take the course before knowing the type of
credit to be granted. The proposed revision to 544D seems vague and open-ended because it is not clear
who is responsible for the work involved. Vice Chair Potter pointed out that SR 544 applies not just to
ILTI courses but to all courses and that the current system works well. Coordinator Osmundson will
provide UCEP with an explanation of what the goal for SR 544 D is for further discussion.

VII. Systemwide Review: UC Washington D.C. Center

UCEP will discuss the report on the review of the Washington D.C. Center in February but the UCSD
representative provided an overview. The Center’s impact and potential is viewed positively but it has
undergone growing pains related to its remoteness and specialized nature. The program was consolidated
in 2010 and there has been ongoing consolidation of multiple programs into a single center, and some
issues are related to centralization versus autonomy and redundancy. Most suggestions in the report are
related to organization. A review in 2016 suggested changes in the reporting structure and these are
ongoing. Several issues are related to the reporting relationship to UCOP and the time difference makes
use of centralized facilities difficult. The financial support from UCOP is substantial. Issues related to
geographical distance may have to be dealt with.

The Center still has elements of different campus programs. The program is not at a big enough scale to
pay for itself or average out in terms of costs in part because the Center manages its building and tenants
(a unique situation). The information technology functions are provided in-house and on-site, causing
complications and stress for staff. The report does not suggest that there is a major need for additional
resources although the staffing has not increased since 2016. Campus relationships with the Center vary
and it was noted that UCLA has an administrator. Chair Serences reminded the reviewers to focus on any
undergraduate education issues raised by the report such as if accessibility varies by campus.

VIII. Update on Principles for Working with Students who are Incarcerated or Formerly
Incarcerated

The UCD representative reported that an outline and overview of the issues related to working with
students who are or have been incarcerated have been drafted. The representative is looking into how
many of these students already have a high school degree or higher. One focus is on why working with
this population might be beneficial for Californians such as savings of public funds, reducing recidivism
and educating a diverse population. The representative is also investigating existing programs within UC
and California Community College programs that may serve as a pipeline to four year degree programs.

Some of the challenges with this work include the preparation of students, screening for admissions,
access, and transfers. The average stay in prison is 18 months and an issue for in prison programs is that
punitive responses to an inmate’s behavior will disrupt participation. Lockdowns will prevent students
from attending courses. Policies on readmission, mid-quarter transfers, transfer of credits upon release
and resolution of incompletes if access is cut off mid-term are other challenges. UCEP should discuss
whether the course rigor and content of in prison programs should be the same as on campus offerings.
Programs in the State of New York emphasize the importance of equivalence. Access to advising
resources, career counseling, and the unique aspects of advising for this population require consideration.
The representative will reach out to individuals within UC already working with this population for input.
on the draft principles after UCEP’s review. The principles will also eventually be shared with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and submitted to Council.

IX. Teaching Evaluation Task Force

Chair Serences explained that a Task Force was established by the Senate last spring to look at teaching evaluations at UC. The analyst will give members access to the Box folder with several campus reports which should not be distributed until further notice and the members have received the report from the Centers on Teaching and Learning (CTL). Campuses use different types of questionnaires for student course evaluations. One recommendation is that a second form of evaluation should be provided. Student course evaluations have been found to be biased. The CTL and campus reports note the need for a cultural shift so the focus is on the student experience. There is agreement that the current system is problematic but viable alternatives are not clear. Members are asked to get feedback on the reports from the divisions.

Discussion: UCI requires faculty to include a statement on teaching which does not seem to make a difference in the personnel review and granting of tenure. UCI has also attempted to use peer reviews but reviewers have reportedly been unwilling to express negative opinions about their colleagues who may later be in a position to weigh in on a personnel action. UCR’s Committee on Academic Personnel carefully considers the teaching evaluations and negative evaluations will impact tenure. At UCD, the peer reviews are usually positive. It was noted that the return rate of student evaluations is low. UCD’s Undergraduate Council reviewed the Davis report and is concerned about individuals who are not faculty evaluating faculty, especially if it could lead to negative outcomes for personnel reviews.

At UCSF, a significant number of students in the larger core courses are inclined to provide negative feedback which is demoralizing to faculty, so there is an effort to find better ways to work with students. At UCM, the Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning provides faculty with an opportunity to get a second form of evaluation, and participating faculty have found it helpful. One effort to improve student evaluations involved training for students on how to prepare them. The Centers could help faculty find ways to complement aspects of evaluations that are not working well. The UCM faculty voluntarily invite the Center to evaluate their courses, involving students in the process that utilizes a rubric.

The UCI representative expressed concern about allocating resources to training students on how to do evaluations. Student evaluations are completed by those who are most motivated or who most dislike the faculty member. The analyst explained that Immediate Past Chair May asked committees to look at inappropriate comments on student course evaluations after hearing from female colleagues about offensive comments. The report is broad and Chair Serences suggested that the task force should probably focus on the bias issue. An idea considered at UCD is to look at how well students perform in subsequent courses. Assessment of this type could provide an alternative validation of the evaluations, especially for populations subject to bias. The assessment would look at basic questions or standards for mastery or retention of certain core themes or information across the courses.

X. New Business

There was no New Business.

XI. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:10 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Serences
I. Overview

Benefits to California: Adult education in prison reduces recidivism by close to half. Every $1 spent on adult education in prison reduces taxpayer costs by $5 (Davis et. al 2014).

Benefits to individuals, families, communities: (TBA)

II. Recent Developments in College Offerings to Incarcerated Persons in California

In 2014, the enactment of SB 1391 allowed California community colleges to offer in-person courses to incarcerated students not only in local jails, as had been the case, but also in state prisons. It also changed the formula for funding these courses to eliminate earlier disincentives. SB 1391 explicitly decreed (emphasis added):

On or before March 1, 2015, the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall enter into an interagency agreement to expand access to community college courses that lead to degrees or certificates that result in enhanced workforce skills or transfer to a four-year university.

Prior to this bill, nearly all incarcerated persons in California engaged in college coursework did so through paper- and video-based correspondence courses.

After the passage of SB 1391, access to in-person community college credit and degree programs jumped from one state prison in 2014 to 34 of the 35 state prisons (Mukamal and Silbert 2018). Between Spring 2016 and Spring 2018, the number of in-person community college courses offered increased from 49 to 209. More than 95 percent of in-person courses now offer transferrable credit and are part of a sequence leading to a degree (California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor 2018).

Amid this rapid expansion of offerings by and enrollment in California’s community colleges, only one California university, CSU Los Angeles, offers 4-year degree programs inside a California state prison--California State Prison Los Angeles County, a maximum security prison for men in Lancaster (Rancano 2020). Thus, it follows that several years after this legislation expanding access to community college degrees, the California State University and University of California are examining their own educational policies as they pertain to access to 4-year degrees for incarcerated persons. Encouraged by the success of the CSULA program, CDCR currently is negotiating a memorandum of understanding with the CSU system to bring 4-year degree programs to more state prisons. The Governor’s budget proposes funding for this purpose.

To further assist inmates with finding gainful employment and prepare them to enter the workforce, the Department [of Corrections and Rehabilitation] is expanding post-secondary educational opportunities to inmates who have completed an associate’s degree. The Department is planning to partner with the California State University system to establish
bachelor’s degree programs at several prisons, including Valley State Prison in Chowchilla. The Budget includes $1.8 million General Fund in 2020-21 and $4.5 million ongoing for tuition, books, materials, training, and equipment for students participating in the program. (Newsom 2020)

III. Demand: Parsing the numbers

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDRC) reports that between Spring 2016 and Spring 2018, the number of students enrolled in college courses for credit, increased from 1,145 to 7,523 (California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office 2018). These numbers of Course retention rates during this period were at least as high as for on-campus courses, with higher pass rates for in-person college courses than for on-campus courses. It is notable that between 2015 and 2017, the number of incarcerated students enrolled in the video- and paper-based correspondence college courses declined by more than 10 percent, even as enrollment in in-person college courses skyrocketed (Mukamal and Silbert 2018).

The CDRC estimates that about 700,000 people are incarcerated in California. In 2014, 22,000 (about 4 percent of the total)\(^1\) incarcerated persons had a high-school equivalency making them eligible for college coursework (Mukamal, Silbert, and Taylor 2015), a number which likely has grown with the state’s correctional population and the increasing state emphasis on access to education within California prisons and jails.

The bottom line is that the current enrollment of 7,523 persons is a small fraction of the roughly 30,000 incarcerated people eligible for college coursework, with a growing fraction of those already holding associates degrees and ready for matriculation in a 4-year degree program. If supply is available and funding continues, it would not be surprising to see several thousand incarcerated persons matriculated into 4-year degree programs within the next 5 to 10 years. CDRC’s Director of Rehabilitative Programs estimates that there are already more than 1,000 inmates who have earned associates degrees and are waiting for an opportunity to enroll in a 4-year degree program, some who have earned multiple associates degrees in the interim (Rancano 2020).

IV. Challenges

Preparation and screening. The fraction of the prison population with high-school equivalency and an associates degree is growing quickly. The challenge of gathering and screening applications, especially under the current paper-only systems described by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s report (2018), is likely to require significant expertise and staff hours, disproportionate to the resources required for online applications from better-served populations.

Access. Some of the biggest barriers to enrollment and retention noted by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s report (2018) include access to textbooks, access to basic supplies like pen and

\(^1\) Mukamal, Silbert, and Taylor (2015) report data from CDCR indicating 22,000 incarcerated persons holding a high-school equivalency in 2014, which is nearly 4 percent of 589,000, the total number of incarcerated persons in California in 2014 as reported by the U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016).
paper, access to computers and internet to complete schoolwork, and access to library services for research. The cost of textbooks and library staff is a significant and unexpected costs for community colleges noted in the Chancellor’s report.

The Governor’s budget tries to address some of the issues by increasing the availability of computers and other information technology:

Finding gainful employment is a significant challenge for many ex-offenders. While CDCR currently provides academic and vocational training to thousands of inmates to help prepare them with the skills demanded by employers, these programs lack access to technology, such as laptop computers, that facilitate learning and familiarize inmates with tools they will need to succeed in the modern workplace. The Budget includes $26.9 million General Fund in 2020-21, eventually declining to $18 million ongoing to provide increased access to modern technology for inmates participating in academic and vocational training to address this gap and better prepare inmates for reentry.

However, it is unclear how quickly or fully this transformation will take place. The lack of computer and internet access also limits the use of online course delivery for the foreseeable future.

Transfers. Inmates may need to transfer frequently, due to administrative reassignments or release from the prison system or jail. It is difficult to find data on the average stay in any one location, which varies by institution, but it may vary from 6 to 18 months. The California Community College system partially addressed this problem by adopting an Excused Withdrawal, noting specifically within the policy that incarcerated persons transferred or released would be eligible for this designation, allowing them to drop a course with no penalty to their GDP, good standing, or financial aid. The use and resolution of incompletes is often somewhat haphazard across departments and courses, but methodical treatment may become crucial for this population’s ability to complete a degree in a rigorous 4-year program.

Transfers to UC campuses upon release also can pose special challenges given the lack of financial and social support often faced by formerly incarcerated persons. Bridge programs and ongoing socio-emotional support resources may be particularly important for this population.

V. Summary and Recommendations [preliminary ideas]

1. The University of California Office of the President declares that as part of the UC’s teaching mission, “Undergraduate programs are available to all eligible California high-school graduates and community college transfer students who wish to attend the University of California (UCOP).” It follows that the University of California has a responsibility to provide access to education to all those who seek and are eligible for a UC education, including among the incarcerated population. Qualified incarcerated persons able to pass the admissions screening process should have access to this opportunity regardless of prospects for release.
2. In parallel with partnerships and programs that UC has with community colleges and other institutions to ensure access for non-traditional and underserved students, UC should partner
with community colleges and other programs involved in preparing incarcerated persons to become eligible for 4-year degrees, whether or not released upon matriculation.

3. Courses for incarcerated persons should deliver the same rigor as on-campus courses—the same requirements, means of evaluation, and general standards, including transferability of credits to UC campuses upon release. This is a foundational principle that follows from the notion that we should not make assumptions about the limitations or ambitions of incarcerated students.

4. Once enrolled, UC programs should maximize engagement with students who are incarcerated, much like traditional on-campus students are engaged on a full-time basis. Programs should treat the prison location as an extension of the main campus. This will have some practical implications, in particular challenges relating to the lack of computer or internet access for students that may require coursework and administration all to be carried out on paper, as well in terms of ensuring equal credit for instructors.

5. Instructors and academic programs should integrate incarcerated students engaged in coursework into the intellectual environment of the main campus.

6. UC programs should be particularly attentive to the methodical use and resolution of incompletes amid frequent transfer or sudden release of incarcerated persons.

7. UC campuses should offer bridge programs to aid matriculation and retention of academically qualified formerly incarcerated individuals, especially those recently released.

Issues for continuing discussion

1. Why is the UC getting into this as opposed to letting CSU/CCC provide these opportunities?
   a. Is there something unique about our position as a research-focused university that can provide additional opportunities for incarcerated students?
   b. Or are we in this primarily to augment opportunities, especially given that there are so few obvious geographical pairings of prisons and any university.
   c. Or is it some combination – we are providing opportunities while students are incarcerated so that those who want can transition to a research-focused campus?

Brenda: I think a component has to be the admittedly idealistic one of principle; that UC has a responsibility to provide access to education to all those who seek and are eligible for a UC education. We have to acknowledge that included among the incarcerated students there will be some proportion who will never be released but who nonetheless should have this opportunity.

2. Practical matter: What logistical constraints are imposed by having a highly selective process for admissions. One reason, perhaps, that CCC’s can operate on a larger scale is that most students (or maybe all) with a high school degree or equivalent can enroll. This means that for any given prison, there will be a relatively large cohort of students who qualify for admissions. However, a more selective admissions process may lead to smaller numbers of students at any given prison who are admitted.

3. Do we have opinions on preference for onsite versus online/hybrid, or some mixture of the two?

4. Mid-program and mid-quarter transfers seem to be a huge issue. Do we want to make more specific recommendations regarding related policies to ease re-admission, transfer of credits to UC campuses upon release from incarceration, or resolution of incompletes? Above, we have
written only that programs should pay special attention to the use and resolution of incompleteds occurring during transfers or releases.

5. Do we have any special recommendations for advising? (Access, career counseling, etc.) Felony convictions can rule out licensing or certification in some fields, as noted in the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s report (2018).
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Dear Linda,

The Learning Management System Task Force has met twice and given thorough consideration to the issues you charged it with exploring. It is our shared belief that the Senate needs to formulate and implement both new policy and new procedures to make the various processes by which students are required to pay for their education over and above what they pay to the university for tuition more transparent and more accountable. We have formulated some principles which we think should guide the relevant Senate committees as they draft their policy language, and we hope that the Senate Cabinet will endorse these principles as a guiding framework for that process.

Background:

University instructors are faced with a wide and ever-increasing array of electronic and online adjuncts to the conventional pedagogical tools of blackboard, pen-and-paper and textbook. Many of these tools offer exciting opportunities to engage students with instructional materials in new and effective ways. We must, however, always be aware that many of our students face steep financial challenges in attending UC Irvine. Indeed, our mission of outreach to economically disadvantaged communities demands that we be particularly cautious about imposing undue financial burdens on our students. Above all, we must remember that our students have a right to expect that the tuition fees they have already paid will entitle them to diverse, innovative and thoughtful pedagogical approaches and materials. We must be careful to ensure that students are not asked to pay for educational tools which do not add meaningful value over cheaper or free alternatives or for pedagogical labor for which their instructors are already paid.

Principles:

We propose that the following principles be adopted as Senate policy:

1/ When students are required to pay for educational materials or services, every reasonable effort should be made to ensure that a no-cost equivalent is made available (e.g., a library copy of course materials placed on reserve; pen-and-paper exercises provided for those who cannot afford access to online versions, copies of software tools available on accessible lab computers, etc.).

2/ Students should not be asked to pay for educational materials or services unless the instructor is convinced that these provide significant pedagogical advantages over free or cheaper alternatives. (For example, no student should be asked to access to course materials on a pay-for-use LMS unless it has significant functionality that Canvas cannot provide).

3/ Faculty should not ask students to pay for services which we can reasonably expect instructional staff (faculty, TAs, lecturers, departments etc.) to perform, or which students can reasonably expect to be covered by their existing tuition & fees.

   a. Different course modalities (such as online courses) should not justify imposing additional costs on students for the basic operation of the course. Exam proctoring, for example, is a cost that students can reasonably expect to be covered by their basic tuition fees, whether the course is online or face-to-face.
4/ Faculty, departments and Schools should not require students to pay for services from which they stand to benefit financially or materially—whether directly or indirectly.

5/ When faculty require students to contract with private companies for pedagogical purposes, they must ensure that students’ privacy is protected and that their FERPA rights are not infringed upon.

Procedures:

While it was beyond the scope of our task force’s brief to formulate detailed policy language, we thought it might be useful to provide a sketch of at least one possible way of putting these principles into practice. We are aware that many difficult questions remain unanswered in this sketch.

The basic outline of our proposal is that some faculty committee in each School, with undergraduate and graduate student representatives, be tasked with approving all required expenses other than Course Materials Fees (which go through a separate vetting procedure).

We are mindful, however, that we must not unreasonably burden faculty with new, uncompensated, administrative labor. In order to make this process manageable and effective it will be necessary to implement some thresholds and exceptions. The requirements and practices of different programs and disciplines are so varied, that it is probably impractical to create uniform rules that will work in every School. We propose that for an initial two-year period, each School be encouraged to find a procedural solution that works best in their context while adequately protecting the principles enumerated above. They will report back to CEP and CTLSE at the end of each year on the success of their approach. In two years, the Senate will draw on that information either simply to share “best practices” between the Schools or to formulate more directive procedural guidelines.

In many Schools it may be the case that their Executive Committees would be well-suited to handle this charge; this would obviate the need to form a new committee and seek new faculty representation. Where those committees do not already have student representation they should invite representatives to join them for the relevant meetings.

Each committee should, in principle, review all educational costs imposed on students either by faculty (e.g. textbooks, online services, software packages, i-clickers, etc.) or programs (e.g. costs for placement exams) in their School. In practice, the committee should develop some threshold values below which approval is automatic and above which approval is required, although all faculty should be required to prepare and submit a brief statement of the total costs per student for each course that they teach (including steps taken to offer no-cost alternatives). We would suggest that these threshold values relate both to per-student cost and to total class size. Thus, for example, a committee might determine that if the total cost per student for materials and services (textbooks, i-clickers, online testing services etc.) is above, say, $100 or the projected class enrollment exceeds 100 students, faculty must receive approval of those charges in advance of offering the course. They might further determine that any requirement that students provide information of any kind to a third-party (e.g., any online graded exercises whose results are tracked and recorded by a private company) also requires prior approval in advance of offering the course. Some mechanism should also be established by which students who consider the costs imposed upon them by a particular course to be unreasonable can petition for a review by the committee. The exact nature and level of these thresholds will best be determined by each School to reflect the normal practices of the relevant fields.
Faculty whose courses exceed the threshold limits would be asked to submit a request for approval which briefly outlines the cost per student; the pedagogical advantages of the service over free or lower-cost alternatives; what arrangements, if any, will be made to accommodate students who cannot pay; a copy, if applicable, of any online or other third-party service’s privacy policy; and a declaration that the faculty member has no financial interest in that service.

We propose that the Executive Committees use the principles enumerated above to guide their deliberations on the applications they receive, and that they apply tests of “reasonableness” and what is “customary” in their several fields following their best judgment. We suggest that they try to be particularly aware of potential threats to students’ FERPA interests, and seek guidance from the OVPTL in the case of potentially noncompliant services.

We further propose that each Executive Committee (or other committee charged by the School to review course materials), as part of their annual report to CEP and CTLSE, provide a summary at the end of each academic year listing the different services and materials that their School’s faculty have required students to purchase, and providing a brief commentary indicating emerging issues and highlighting particularly challenging cases.

We hope that these suggestions will help guide the deliberations of future Senate committees as they move to turn these proposals into concrete policy.
January 6, 2020

EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS/PROVOSTS

RE: RFP for Degree and Certificate Completion Programs

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to announce a Request for Proposals (RFP) process in response to the State Budget Act of 2019 appropriating $15 million in one-time funding for the University to “develop or expand degree and certificate completion programs at University of California extension centers.” The funding can be expended over a 5-year period ending in June 30, 2024.

The Council of Chancellors (COC) discussed this appropriation and recommended two approaches: a multi-campus or systemwide effort and individual campus efforts. UCOP is setting aside up to $5 million for the first approach and the remaining $10 million is available to fund two to four campus proposals. Both approaches would require submissions of an RFP through this process. The requirements for the RFP are enclosed, but some of the key points are:

- Awards may extend up to five years, but the proposal should address how the programs would be sustained once this one-time funding is exhausted.
- Since these programs are funded by State General Funds, the emphasis of these programs shall be on serving the needs of the state and serving a broad cross-section of Californians (including those who may not be able to afford unsubsidized Extension programs).
- The proposals should address the target populations for the programs – ideally California residents that represent the diversity of the state and who can contribute to California’s workforce needs. Former UC students who never finished their degrees should be considered for these programs.
- The funds are for programs through UC Extension. The proposals should describe the respective roles of Extension and the academic units responsible for awarding/approving the degrees or certificates (including the Academic Senate).
- While most of the discussion has been about baccalaureate degree completion, proposals that focus on certificates of importance to California workforce needs are eligible for this funding.

Enclosure 4
Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts
January 6, 2020

The deadline for submission of single-campus proposals is February 17, 2020. A Review Committee at UCOP, with Academic Senate representation, will make recommendations to the Provost and the President. We hope to announce awards in April. The systemwide or multi-campus proposal is due May 15, 2020 (we are planning additional discussions with the Chancellors and all of you on that proposal).

If you have any questions about the RFP process, you or your staff can contact Institutional Research and Academic Program (IRAP) Director Todd Greenspan by email at todd.greenspan@ucop.edu.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Brown, Ph.D.
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Enclosure

cc: President Napolitano
Chancellors
Academic Council Chair Bhavnani
Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer and Chief of Staff Nava
Vice President Brown
Associate Vice President Alcocer
University Extension Deans
Director Greenspan
Request for Proposals

The State Budget Act of 2019 includes $15 million in one-time funding for degree and certificate completion programs offered by UC Extension. The Budget Act specifically says that the funds can be expended over a five-year period (2019-20 through 2023-24). The specific language from the Budget Act is appended to this document.

Since these programs are State General Funds, the emphasis of these programs shall be on serving the needs of the state and serving a broad cross-section of Californians (including those who may not be able to afford unsubsidized Extension programs).

The Chancellors discussed and agreed to pursue two general pathways:

- specific campus-based degree and/or certificate completion programs
- a systemwide or multi-campus degree completion program that could leverage cross-campus online course capability.

UCOP is setting aside up to $5 million for a systemwide or multi-campus proposal. Up to $200,000 of that amount is available for statewide market research on the demand for such programs. The other $10 million is available to fund 2 to 4 individual campus proposals (recommended funding levels per proposal is between $1 million and $5 million). Both types of proposals are required to submit a proposal consistent with this RFP.

Due Date

For single-campus proposals, campuses are required to submit proposals by February 17, 2020. For the systemwide or multi-campus proposal, the due date is May 15, 2020.

Form of Submittal

Please email an attachment (Word or PDF file) with all the required elements listed below to Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP) Director Todd Greenspan at todd.greenspan@ucop.edu by the due date.

Required elements for proposals in response to this RFP

Proposals shall include the following elements (numbered and listed in the proposal in the following order):

1. Campus name and unit: Name of the campus and campus academic units that would offer the program. For systemwide or multi-campus proposals, the names of all the participating campuses and academic units.

2. Program type: Bachelor degree completion program, certificate program, or hybrid of both.

3. Program description/business plan: Proposals shall provide a concise description of the program and a business plan (up to 5 pages prefaced by one-half page executive summary).
4. **Target populations, expected enrollments, and diversity goals.** Description of the California populations that would be targeted by the program. Ideally the program would be targeted at:

- Former UC students who never completed their degree
- Former students of CSU and the California Community Colleges who have completed more than a specific number of units but never finished their degree
- Other Californians with college credit who never completed their degrees

In the description of the target populations, the proposal should describe plans for ensuring the diversity of the students who will be enrolling in the program. It should also include planned enrollments by cohort for each year of the proposal.

5. **Total amount requested.** The total funds requested from the state appropriation for the proposal.

6. **Timeline for funding.** Funds are available for the period 2019-20 through 2023-24. The proposal shall detail how much funding is needed in each of these years. Given that these are one-time funds that can expended over a 5-year period, campuses are encourage to develop proposals that taper off the funding such that they would be self-sustaining by 2024-25 if not sooner.

7. **Budget and plan for achieving fiscal sustainability.** The proposals shall include a budget that shows total expenditures and revenues over the over the years covered by the proposal. The budget shall show state funds as a separate component of total revenues. The budget shall show how the program can be self-sustaining at the end of the funding period.

8. **Faculty resources.** The proposal shall detail the number and types of faculty that will be delivering instruction in the program and how those faculty resources will be obtained/deployed.

9. **Involvement of Extension, authority for awarding the degree, and other academic approvals.** The funds are appropriated by the State to UC for programs through UC Extension Centers. Proposals should describe the role of UC Extension in the proposed programs. Degree-awarding program proposals shall indicate how necessary approvals from the Academic Senate for awarding the degree will be obtained and indicate which school/college/department will be awarding the degree. Any other required academic approvals (such as regional accreditation approval) should be described.

10. **Other academic regulations and student services.** Proposals shall describe how relevant academic criteria (such as admissions requirements, residency requirements) will be addressed. In addition, proposals shall describe how student services (advising, counseling, transcripts, financial aid, etc.) will be addressed.

11. **Modes of delivery.** Given that the audience for the programs are likely to be working professionals from around the state, the proposal shall describe how instructional delivery will occur and the extent to which in-person attendance is required. The proposals shall describe the extent to which they will be integrated with existing online programs at the campuses or at UCOP.

12. **Metrics for success.** Proposals shall include a section that describes what milestones the programs expect to achieve during the 5-year window and metrics that will be used for assessing if they those milestones have been achieved. In particular, metrics that would show the extent to which the program is assisting in meeting California workforce needs should be included.
13. **Statements of campus/partner support.** The proposal should, at a minimum, include letters of support from the Chancellor and the EVC/Provost. If appropriate, letters of support from the campus Division of the Academic Senate shall be included or the process for obtaining such approval/support should be included in the proposal.

14. **Statutory requirements.** The statutory language has the following requirements. The proposals shall address all of these requirements (since some duplicate requirements above, the proposal can make reference to other sections in filling out this section):

   (a) Programs supported by this appropriation, at a minimum, shall meet the following conditions:

   (1) Tuition for the programs developed with these funds shall be commensurate with, or less than, the cost of providing the instruction. It is the intent of the Legislature that the cost to students of degree or certificate programs developed with these funds shall not exceed a reasonable proportion of the students’ wage or salary increase anticipated within the first ten years of expected employment following the completion of a degree or certificate.

   (2) The University of California shall not use these funds to contract, directly or indirectly, with non-public, third-party entities, including but not limited to private for-profit and private non-profit institutions.

   (b) The University of California shall submit, 30 days prior to the release of funds provided pursuant to this provision, a plan to the Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee that includes:

   (1) A budget plan and description of how funds will be used for initial planning, curriculum development, outreach, and other start-up costs for the new or expanded programs.

   (2) Types of certificates, degrees and programs the University of California plans to develop or expand, which University of California extension locations will offer these programs, and how these programs meet regional labor market needs and student demand.

   (3) The tuition and fees for each certificate, degree and program.

   (4) The estimated number of students, by extension campus location and home institution that will participate in the program.

   (5) Information on types of financial aid, including state, federal, and institutional financial aid and loans that students in these programs may be eligible to receive.

   (6) A long-term plan that describes how these programs will be self-supported after the initial start-up.

**RFP review**

1. **RFP review committee to be established.** The Provost will establish a committee staffed by IRAP to review and make recommendations to the Provost on whether or not to fund each proposal received in response to this RFP. The committee will include representatives of the UC Academic Senate as well as a mix of campus and UCOP representatives.
APPENDIX A – Legislative Language

(a) Of the funds appropriated in this item, $15,000,000 shall be available on a one-time basis to develop or expand degree and certificate completion programs at University of California extension centers. The amount shall be available for encumbrance or expenditure until June 30, 2024.

(b) Programs supported by this appropriation, at a minimum, shall meet the following conditions:

(3) Tuition for the programs developed with these funds shall be commensurate with, or less than, the cost of providing the instruction. It is the intent of the Legislature that the cost to students of degree or certificate programs developed with these funds shall not exceed a reasonable proportion of the students’ wage or salary increase anticipated within the first ten years of expected employment following the completion of a degree or certificate.

(4) The University of California shall not use these funds to contract, directly or indirectly, with non-public, third-party entities, including but not limited to private for-profit and private non-profit institutions.

(c) The University of California shall submit, 30 days prior to the release of funds provided pursuant to this provision, a plan to the Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee that includes:

(7) A budget plan and description of how funds will be used for initial planning, curriculum development, outreach, and other start-up costs for the new or expanded programs.

(8) Types of certificates, degrees and programs the University of California plans to develop or expand, which University of California extension locations will offer these programs, and how these programs meet regional labor market needs and student demand.

(9) The tuition and fees for each certificate, degree and program.

(10) The estimated number of students, by extension campus location and home institution that will participate in the program.

(11) Information on types of financial aid, including state, federal, and institutional financial aid and loans that students in these programs may be eligible to receive.

(12) A long-term plan that describes how these programs will be self-supported after the initial start-up.

(d) The University of California shall report biennially, beginning on June 30, 2021, to the Department of Finance and relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature regarding all University of California extension programs. The report shall, at a minimum, include:

(1) A description of each extension program and how it meets regional labor market needs and student demand.

(2) A description of current re-entry options and programs, and recommendations on how to improve access and success in these programs.

(3) The completion rates of programs developed.

(4) The total cost of attendance for extension programs.

(5) The number of students and financial aid recipients, by campus and program that complete their degree or program.
(6) Demographics of students served, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, age, and other factors, provided that disaggregating the data by these categories does not yield results that would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

(7) An explanation of the circumstances under which extension students may use federal grants and loans for these programs, pursuant to Title IV of the Higher Education Act.

(8) The estimated number of financial aid recipients, disaggregated by financial award type and the average financial award amount.

(9) A list of contracts with third-party entities used by University of California extension for educational programs, including but not limited to contracts for the development of course materials, administration of the programs, or the provision of instruction. For purposes of this paragraph, “third-party entities” does not include California community colleges, the California State University or the University of California.