

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MONDAY, APRIL 5, 2010**

**Attending:** Keith Williams, Chair (UCD), David Kay, Vice-Chair (UCI), Constantin Teleman (UCB), Diana Strazdes (UCD), David Pan (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM) (telephone), Jose Wudka (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Gerardo Aldana (UCSB) (telephone), John Tamkun (UCSC), James Levin (UCSD), Peter Loomer (UCSF), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Harry Powell (Academic Senate Chair), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Announcements**

The Commission on the Future will make decisions about the work groups' recommendations in June. The Academic Council has received a number of budget updates from UCOP. The revenues for the year may be somewhat better than anticipated but UC will have to deal with a deficit of \$230 million for 2009-2010. The state will receive several million dollars in federal stimulus funding. Information about post employment benefits has still not been made public, but there will be presentations at each campus. Four possible strategies are being explored and UCEP will have an opportunity to provide feedback on the options in May.

This month contributions from faculty and staff to the retirement plan will start again but the state is not making the employer contribution. The future accrual of current employees may be changed. The academic council and the Committee on Planning and Budget have recommended a faster ramp up of contributions. Eventually funds will have to go into the retirement plan to deal with the liability. Faculty should attend the campus forums and become informed about the significance of the problems. Changes for future employees will result in benefits that are not as generous as they are for current employees. The plan will continue to be a defined benefits plan, not a defined contribution plan. Certain employees in the medical school may have the defined contribution plan because that is the more common plan in that field. The Senate Chair and Vice Chair have spent time in Sacramento advocating for higher education, and a grassroots effort involving students has been promoted by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates. The Academic Planning Council will meet within in the next few weeks, and topics include having a common calendar by converting to semesters and revisions to the Compendium.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved.

**III. C-ID Project**

- *Michelle L. Pilati, Ph.D., Vice President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Faculty Coordinator, Course Identification Number System, Professor of Psychology, Rio Hondo College*
- *Barbara Love, Assistant Director, Transfer Partnerships Program Articulation Officer, University of California, Santa Cruz, C-ID Advisory Committee*

The C-ID Project started three years ago. The goal is to help community college students have information available to help them make good decisions about the lower division courses they take. The first year was a pilot phase and this year the project is becoming more visible. From the beginning, there has been an effort to determine how to involve UC. Developing common course numbers does not ensure that the content is the same. An earlier effort, CAN, did not provide standards for content, methods of evaluation, or objectives that helped analyze what a course was. C-ID works by giving a course a descriptor that lists the prerequisites, objectives, content, methods of evaluation, and the textbooks that would be used. Faculty from the three segments are involved in developing the descriptors. The descriptors are available online at [www.c-id.net](http://www.c-id.net).

The second component of C-ID addresses the articulation issues based on the descriptor. UC faculty would get a course descriptor and determine whether they would articulate a course that matches that descriptor. Intersegmental faculty also evaluate course outlines against the descriptors. LDTP was a response to legislation that asked the CSUs to establish common pathways for their top majors, and descriptors were developed for the courses that were part of those pathways. C-ID incorporated the work done by the CSU faculty in the LDTP process. Descriptors in agriculture and accounting have been finalized, and a number of descriptors for courses in other disciplines have been drafted and are ready for review. The next step is to seek articulation based on the finalized descriptors, which will provide an opportunity to modify the descriptors as necessary if they do not match UC's needs. The courses that articulate to UC will be assigned a number that is different from the number assigned to courses that transfer to the CSUs. UC faculty will be asked to review the descriptors and agree to articulate to them.

Articulation Officer Love reported that a good deal of time and effort has been put into articulation but the transfer process is still difficult for students. Given the budgetary pressures, it is even more important for students to have information that allows them to meet their general education requirements before transferring to UC so they can graduate in a timely manner. The transfer paths or streamlining did not set up common requirements but did provide information in ASSIST about what was available and required across the campuses. A project that was not implemented was gap analysis which involved identifying courses that some campuses had articulated to and others had not, and asking for specific information about why the campuses had not articulated to those courses. The faculty review process helps to identify key elements that are missing such as a few critical topics or texts that are recommended. Community colleges have changed their courses to address CSU requirements. The descriptors may not provide sufficient detail and information to allow faculty in all disciplines to determine if UC requirements will be met. Disciplines like the sciences and engineering tend to want very detailed information such as weekly topics. C-ID numbers can be expanded when more detail is needed different campuses. Faculty are asked to indicate if the course is sufficient for a student to move on at UC and be flexible whenever possible.

Faculty who can be more intensively involved in the review committees are needed and the online system allows for faculty to review the descriptors. UCOP would like articulation officers to be involved with facilitating the process but the officers need faculty involvement. A letter from the Senate expressing support of the project is being requested and will be used to encourage UC faculty participation. A previous effort to find faculty willing to volunteer through the divisional Senate office was not successful.

**Discussion:** There are courses taught at the community colleges that are not transferable to the CSUs and not to UC. Courses articulated many years ago are not reviewed again unless a change or problem is identified. A problem arises when students do not take the right courses for their major or for general education requirements. There are forty different general education patterns across the campuses. Sufficient information does not get to students early enough to ensure they take community college courses that count for their major which results in them not being admitted to or needing an extra year at UC. Courses may not have a match at UC but will count for transfer or general education credit. Title V dictates the components in the C-ID descriptors that need to be common across the segments. It was noted that the C-ID website requires that faculty log-in which makes it impossible to even see the draft descriptors.

A committee member suggested looking at UC students' grades in different majors to get an idea of how well courses at the community colleges or CSUs have prepared students for UC. Faculty interest in the project may be increased if data suggests transfer students are at least as well prepared as UC's own students. The goal is for enough faculty to be available so that any one faculty member would only be asked to review one or two descriptors thereby reducing the burden. Another idea would be to piggyback articulation with the development of learning outcomes during the accreditation process in light of faculty workloads. During the accreditation process at one campus, divisional deans were responsible for working with the department chairs to develop outcomes during faculty meetings, resulting in significant faculty participation. Committee members commented that faculty are stressed, overworked as a result of

unfunded mandates like accreditation, and need to understand how they benefit from participating in the C-ID project. Non-senate lecturers are able to participate in the reviews, and one possibility would be to invite emeritus faculty to participate in the review groups. The major advisers who decide what courses will be accepted would be more appropriate than the lecturers who teach the courses and the articulation officers normally do contact the advisers. Involving departments whose work would be tracked by the dean or associate vice chancellor responsible for coordinating preparation for WASC would be helpful.

One approach could be to require departments attempting to restrict enrollment of transfer students, on the basis that the students will not be prepared, to analyze the articulation agreements and specifically identify what the students must have. Local committees on educational policy would be forced to determine specific requirements. There is a recommendation to the Commission on the Future calling for full implementation of SR 477, and the gap analysis could be utilized for implementation. A mechanism could be established for faculty to receive credit for service for participating in the C-ID project. If participation in C-ID reviews could be substituted with service on a committee for example this work would be recognized by the faculty member's department chair. This would demonstrate UC's commitment to facilitating transfer, and Chair Powell also commented that legislators consistently ask the segments to improve the transfer process. Department vice chairs in charge of teaching could be given the responsibility for coordinating faculty involvement in reviewing the descriptors. A final suggestion is for faculty who participate to receive summer salary. Members agreed to submit a letter from UCEP endorsing the C-ID project, the strategy of using articulation officers, and suggestions. Articulation officers are well positioned to identify the right faculty to review descriptors and the officers would provide the names to the Senate office. The process for approving to articulate to a course varies across the campuses. ASSIST is used by students but that system is not complete.

#### **IV. Off Campus Course Approval Task Force**

Chair Williams will confer with the Senate office about the course approval process. More information about the process used for the Education Abroad Program would be useful for this discussion.

#### **V. Days of Instruction**

Chair Williams drafted a letter based on UCEP's previous discussion and asked the committee for feedback.

**Discussion:** Members agreed that the letter accurately reflects UCEP's position. In an emergency faculty make decisions about what should be done, but this could result in significant problems. A list of possible options could be made available to provide some guidance to faculty. There has not been a discussion about reducing the number of days of instruction. The letter will be submitted to the Senate Chair.

#### **VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Harry Powell, Chair, Academic Council*

Chair Powell reported on the campus forums on post-employment benefits. Contributions to UCRP will begin on April 15<sup>th</sup> but the ramp up is slow and the contribution starts at 2%. Next year a decision will be made about how much the contribution will be increased. It is expected that health care benefits will be modified. There will be a formal Senate consultation on the president's proposal for changes to the benefits. Chair Powell hopes that in July the Regents will determine the percentage of employee salaries to be contributed. The Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Task Force on Investment and Retirement have been advising the president to look at bonds.

#### **VII. Differential Fees**

The chair drafted a letter based on the committee's previous discussion about differential fees and non-resident tuition.

**Discussion:** One idea would be to set a target percentage of the non-resident tuition that would be kept by the campus but tuition above that target would go to the system. Local committees discussed whether the non-resident tuition should be used for faculty salaries or retirement benefits, but at least one committee concluded the funds should be used for educational purposes.

## **VIII. UC Commission on the Future Recommendations**

Chair Williams provided an overview of the next steps for the UC Commission on the Future and the workgroups' recommendations. The committee should look at the recommendations in the context of educational policy but can also provide other comments. It is possible that controversial ideas will be proposed in the second set of recommendations.

**Discussion:** Committee members provided comments on the workgroup recommendations.

### **Size and Shape Recommendations**

*Recommendation 1:* Members discussed challenges related to attracting out-of-state or international students. The efforts that will be used to make sure that all campuses are competitive in their ability to attract non-resident students should be clarified. The perception that campuses will direct more resources on attracting non-resident students than on California students needs to be avoided. Some campuses may not have the infrastructure in place for outreach to students who might be attracted to specific programs at those campuses and the cost of building the infrastructure needs to be compared to the potential revenue. It will be important to have a mechanism to direct non-resident students to a campus that has the capacity to serve them when their preferred campus cannot. The committee agreed that non-resident students add to the diversity at UC campuses, and recruiting these students increases publicity for UC. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation. It was also noted that UC should first focus on increasing the diversity of students from within the state.

*Recommendation 2:* UCEP members did not support full implementation of SR477 but agrees that the transfer process should be improved and that faculty should be actively involved. It is unclear to UCEP how the process outlined by SR 477 has been implemented and whether campuses have been notified that courses have been approved by four campuses. Community college students need to be given more information about UC requirements. It is not clear that the consultation process with departments has occurred at all UC campuses. Faculty should be educated about why standardization and streamlining is important and potentially result in cost savings. The focus could initially be to provide information on the majors that require the most credits. When a lack of common requirements is identified, departments across the systems should not be forced to standardize. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

*Recommendation 3:* The ASSIST website should be updated and the content expanded to include information about more degrees to ensure it is serving the students as effectively as possible. It is important for different requirements among UC campuses to be clear. Improving ASSIST should be a priority given that the budget situation will result in less advising support for potential transfer students. Beyond expanding the website, the priority should be to engage faculty and administration in determining ways to improve transfers. The committee agrees with this recommendation.

*Recommendation 4:* The character of the mission of the university would be changed if UC adopts the practical degrees especially since there is not a research function associated with most of them. These degrees are appropriate for the CSUs to consider. Of particular concern to the committee was the proposal to give degrees to train nursing faculty. UC should not give away the controls around the training given to a student expected to have a basis in scientific process and research as faculty. The committee agrees with this recommendation.

*Recommendation 5:* With respect to promoting efficiencies, in addition to making sure administration is efficient, members agree that the Senate should also look at ways to promote efficiencies. The committee agrees with this recommendation.

## Education and Curriculum Recommendations

### *Recommendation 1:*

1.1 UC should have a greater presence in K-12 education to reduce the number of students who are underprepared when they enter UC. UCEP did not agree with the proposal to more strictly limit the maximum number of units allowed over the course of undergraduate study for students who are making normal progress and doing well. The increased need for students to work in light of the higher student fees should be taken into consideration. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

1.2 The Commission should consider potential negative impact on students who are not in the three year program and therefore are not given priority enrollment into courses. The committee discussed questions related to three year degree programs including who will teach the summer courses and how these will be funded. Pressuring students to opt for a three year program should be avoided. Students would pay a reduced cost during the summer compared to what is paid in the regular academic year. Whether students receive financial aid would depend on how the program is structured by the campus. It might be a problem for parents if graduate students and lecturers without security of employment teach the summer programs. The committee discussed concerns about faculty who have more teaching responsibility and faculty with primarily research responsibilities. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

1.3 UCEP members are concerned about decreasing the teaching by ladder rank faculty. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

1.4 The option to increase class size is not feasible for campuses that currently lack physical space. Large class sizes at present have been criticized. It is important to identify and implement strategies that have the least harmful short and long term impacts. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: It was noted that the Extension program at one campus has a significant number of online courses and twenty thousand online students. The committee agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: No specific comments on this recommendation. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 4: Committee members expressed concerns that the systemwide planning framework would lead to UCOP dictating what campuses can do. A framework that recommends or is informative might be valuable, while a framework that is more restrictive would not be favorable. Academic planning should involve faculty in the process, and each campus should have the opportunity to chart its own course while taking into consideration the system's goals. UCEP members are concerned about UCOP making decisions to be shut down a program while the committee recognizes that it is good for a campus to know what exists before starting a new program. UCEP could recommend that it is good to encourage collaboration among campuses. Members disagreed with any movement toward a central planning model. The committee disagrees with this recommendation.

Preliminary Recommendation: Members did not offer any specific comments on this preliminary recommendation. The committee agrees with the preliminary recommendation.

### Access and Affordability:

The committee noted that the first 3 recommendations basically address the status quo. A comment was made that the Access and Affordability work group should have been the centerpiece of all the recommendations given the focus on student fee increases and UC's budget. Potential solutions for middle class families related to affordability are not offered and the committee agreed to recommend exploration of creative solutions to help this group.

Recommendation 1: No specific comments.

Recommendation 2: The Education Abroad Program is the type of program that should be financially independent so that equal opportunity would exist for the students regardless of their financial standing.

Recommendation 3: There was a lack of information about opening pathways for graduate students to complete their research or education at different campuses. Mechanisms to do this should be simplified. Access to the availability of UC resources should be streamlined for graduate students.

Recommendation 4: Members expressed concerns about potential political controversy associated with funding for undocumented California high school graduates. Undocumented students are covered by AB 540 have spent at least five years in the California public school system and have been paying student fees. Students are supportive of this. It was suggested that the focus could be on re-establishing fairness in UC financial aid eligibility or getting the state to fund higher education.

Recommendation 5: The committee agreed that it makes sense for parents and students to know in advance what the fees will be over the course of several years.

**Action:** Chair Williams will draft the committee's preliminary comments.

#### **IX. Post-Employment Benefits Task Force**

This topic was not discussed.

#### **X. UCOP Online Project**

Based on feedback from UCEP, Academic Planning has revised the prospectus for the online project. Chair Williams has drafted a letter proposing that Academic Council endorse the project. Faculty offering online courses would also help in the development of ways to assess the courses. Some details still need to be refined but UCEP is asked to endorse the letter.

**Discussion:** One unresolved issue is who will own the intellectual property rights to the course content.

Meeting Adjourned At: 4 p.m.

Minutes Prepared By: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams