

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, MAY 3, 2010

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD), David Kay, Vice-Chair (UCI), Ignacio Navarrete (UCB), Diana Strazdes (UCD), David Pan (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM) (telephone), Jose Wudka (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Gerardo Aldana (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC) (telephone), James Levin (UCSD) (telephone), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Matthew Palm (telephone), Hilary Baxter (Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

The Council, ICAS and Assembly have met since the last UCEP meeting. The latest update on the budget has both good and bad news. There will not be as much money as hoped but the governor has indicated he will not sign a budget that does not include his proposals to restore funds for higher education, which would amount to \$305 million in the May revise. Legislators do not think this will be in the final budget. During meetings with members of ICAS, legislators did suggest that higher education would do okay in the budget and that it is a top priority along with public safety.

President Yudof will ask the Senate to use holistic review for the application process to all the campuses. Holistic review is a more time intensive process that includes data not currently available in the comprehensive review that provides more context. The packet is reviewed by two people, making it a more expensive process. The readers are trained so that they tend to have consensus, and a third reader is used if there is a discrepancy. A meeting with the Council of Chancellors and the divisional Senate Chairs in April included discussions about how campuses addressed incidents related to the campus racial climate, aspects related to conflicts of interest that arise when researchers work as consultants to companies, shared governance, and the possible disestablishment of programs. Clear and formal processes needs to be in place when programs are considered for disestablishment, especially as closures may be likely due to the budget. The president has suggested that UCEP should look at duplication of programs across campuses, and it is feasible that this recommendation may be made by the Commission on the Future.

A group meeting monthly with the provost to discuss the budget includes seven Senate faculty members. Four divisional senate chairs and the chairs of UCEP, UCPB, and UCFW are participating. Council discussed differential fees and it does not appear that this proposal will move forward. ICAS had meetings with students and legislators to identify how the state can have a positive impact on higher education. Chair Williams distributed copies of a brochure given to the legislators during the visits. It was important for the legislators to see the three segments working together. The state requests UC involvement with implementing certain legislation whereas the CSUs and community colleges have mandates. Legislators were encouraged to ask faculty for input before bills are written. One state legislator suggested that faculty should have a full-time lobbyist meeting with lawmakers weekly like other constituencies. The community colleges and their students have been actively involved in advocacy efforts for some time. A representative from the Legislative Analysts Office commented that UC should shift its focus from concern about access to concern about achievement.

Discussion: The committee discussed concerns about closing programs. When proposing a new program, a campus must prove that it is not duplicated across the system, although this requirement may not always be followed. There may be a need to look at alternative structures for programs that are weakened. Programs may refer to majors and departments. The president wants to examine programs across all campuses on a systemwide basis to make sure things are being done as effectively as possible. Chair Williams has not heard discussions about the use of capacity data to inform decisions about redundancies or programmatic needs. It was noted that cutting a program may not save money because of the infrastructure already paid for. This point is similar to one made about the tuition that is lost if unfunded students are cut off.

The Commission is trying to sort out the rights of the system versus the rights of the campuses with respect to these decisions. It is not clear who decides this issue but the Senate would have an opportunity to provide input. Small programs that are duplicated at different campuses do add value and contribute to each campus. Looking at duplication of programs as a means to save money is problematic since duplication of programs can be seen as an indicator of student demand. Undergraduate programs are the focus of discussions about cutting duplicated programs. Programs that lack the quality or for which the funding is not available are legitimate reasons for disestablishment. Programs that are central to the liberal arts ideal should not be closed. Graduates have a unique advantage to study at other campuses that emphasize different dimensions of a discipline. Faculty could make a statement in response to the assumptions related to duplication of programs but supporting examination of programs with low enrollment. This statement could be made in response to the Education and Curriculum workgroup recommendations to the Commission on the Future.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections. The C-ID letter was pulled and additional feedback was provided. Chair Williams will revise the letter on C-ID and distribute it by email for further discussion.

Discussion: Members indicated that UCEP's letter should suggest improving the C-ID website interface. Productive ways to think about redundancy and capacity could be incorporated into the articulation pathways. Information about whether the programs are full, impacted or able to accommodate the students could be included in the C-ID database. It was suggested that concerns about the project were voiced by UCEP and that nothing to fundamentally change the program has been identified. UCEP might suggest that the descriptors are more comprehensive.

III. UC Commission on the Future Recommendations

Size and Shape

Recommendation 1: The focus on the diversity of in-state students should be increased.

Recommendation 5: Private institutions do not seem to have the layers of oversight that UC has. There is more autonomy for individual units to do what they want at private institutions. The transparency and oversight does add to the redundancies.

Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 1.1: One member indicated that the number of units assigned to courses should be re-examined with respect to the impact on workload. Increasing the number of units assigned to a course could necessitate increasing the number of units needed to graduate. Problems with a high number of units occur when students change their major. The availability of one, two or

three credit courses can help when students fall a little behind. One campus has only four credit courses which enables students to avoid juggling too many courses. Professional schools require years of instructions and not the credits earned which can create a problem for students who have a number of five credit courses. Some types of courses could have more credits and others could have fewer credits. In facilitating transfers, UC should be careful not undermine the preparation students have received. The controls UC has on entering students should remain in place.

Recommendation 1.2: There is a built in limit to expanding summer session. Faculty could somehow spread out their course load. There is a question about whether this is sustainable.

Recommendation 1.3: The committee supports the idea that faculty resources should be used more effectively but there are concerns about decreasing use of ladder rank faculty. Faculty in disciplines such as the Humanities are not necessarily in the position to buy out their teaching loads due to lack of research funds which would create inequities within a campus. UCEP members did not reach a consensus about this recommendation.

Recommendation 1.4: Departments should be encouraged to review their programs to determine if status quo is appropriate or if some courses could be eliminated.

Recommendation 2: There may be cost efficiencies related to online courses however the higher quality online courses are hybrid courses, which are not the most cost effective. The committee endorses a pilot project with careful evaluation. There should be a real demonstration of quality before wide-scale implementation. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: Self supporting programs should not become a requirement or preferred for allocation of FTEs, in part due to concern over equality across programs. There is a need to be cautious for a variety of reasons. One reason is the need to be flexible when entering markets since markets get flooded and the value disappears. Going into a market can also lead to the quick distortion of the educational mission. Some things are a flash in the pan and not worth the resource allocation. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 4: The committee reiterated concerns about a systemwide framework that would decrease the authority of faculty and campuses to make decisions, and strongly disagrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: As articulated in the UCPB Choices report, UC has decisions to make and anything that negatively impacts UC's quality should be avoided. The UCUES survey is a source of data about students' experience at UC and how much they learn. WASC provides another source of information about learning assessment and outcomes. UCEP strongly endorses the preliminary recommendation and it should be the first recommendation as the other recommendations depend on how quality is defined and an assessment of UC quality. UCUES should be administered to students entering their junior year. The importance of developing strong analytical skills should be emphasized. By holding students to the highest standards, faculty help students develop a strong work ethic. The Commission should look at how the statement on American democracy should be defined. A member suggested that measures of quality that would be meaningful to parents of potential students should be included in the definition of quality. Changes such as the furlough program that may diminish things the public may care and have a long-term impact UC quality and the success of students should be monitored. Not all aspects of quality can be captured in data.

Access and Affordability

Recommendation 5: Students should be discouraged from dropping impacted courses when it is too late for another student to take over their space. Large fee increases for these students would have a punitive effect, but how the increase would apply to transfer students or students pursuing several majors in comparison to students stay beyond four years because they are making minimum progress should be clarified. There may be good and legitimate reasons for students to spend extra time and this should not be penalized. The state is an unreliable partner and cannot guarantee UC multiyear funding making it difficult for UC to guarantee a multiyear fee schedule. Fee guarantees might result in significant cuts to faculty salaries and loss of staff.

A member noted that some private institutions have pre-payment tuition plans which are a variation of this recommendation. The committee discussed concerns about the assumption that pre-payment plans give wealthy families an advantage. Some families would not be able to afford a large fee increase implemented in the middle of the year and these students have limited options in terms of where they can transfer. Tuition for students already enrolled should not be increased mid-stream. The salary level for the subsidy for financial aid could be raised because the cut off right now is too sharp. A member suggested that an entering cohort should have a guaranteed rate of tuition for four years. The state might step in if UC builds significant reserves as a result of the increased fees. Incremental changes in tuition rates could be unfair. The committee conditionally agreed.

Recommendation 6: The fees are tuition and should just be referred to as such. In many cases, tuition is the basis used for securing federal funds and it is difficult to explain what fees are.

Funding Strategies

Recommendation 1: Agree. No additional comments during the meeting.

Recommendation 2: Agree. No additional comments during the meeting.

Recommendation 3: Some granting agencies may not fund indirect costs and researchers need to report the policy to the Office of Research. Grants should not be refused when the funders do not pay indirect costs. UC receives less in indirect costs than the University's comparison institutions. In situations where there is a maximum of direct and indirect that can be applied for, the ability to access revenue should not be limited for faculty in some disciplines while others benefit.

Recommendation 4: In the past there was a systemwide rate but this changed to campus specific rates. The goal is to negotiate higher indirect costs for UC. People with more experience negotiating should be responsible for this.

Recommendation 5: This recommendation states that a multiyear tuition plan should not be misunderstood as a fee guarantee, an inconsistency with the access and affordability recommendation for a multiyear fee schedule that needs to be resolved. The committee discussed the guaranteed fee level proposed in the access and affordability recommendation and agrees that a multiyear analysis is a better idea than guaranteeing a fee. A multiyear guarantee would enable families to plan although it does expose UC to risk if the fees have to be increased. UC should engage in planning that will project for the long-term where the ceiling on fees will be instead of making short term changes. Increases should occur only when absolutely necessary. Fees could be raised to be comparable with private institutions but UC could also offer a graduated financial aid system which would be a shift in how tuition is being charged. UCEP agrees that a more

graduated increase in fees is the preferable option. The committee conditionally agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 6: A referral system specifically for non-resident undergraduates could be used to refer students to a school that is among their top choices. Campuses may not take non-resident students if they cannot keep all the funds.

Recommendation 7: No additional comments during the meeting.

Recommendation 8: The committee remarked that the recommendation is vague. UCEP conditionally agrees that UC should look at alternate faculty compensation plans as long as the faculty is fully consulted before recommended implementation of any particular plan. There should not be excessive mandates to schools or departments related to using grant and contract funds for faculty salaries to avoid changing the grant seeking behavior of faculty.

Recommendation 9: No additional comments during the meeting.

Research Strategies:

Recommendation 1: The committee indicated that the same comments in response to funding strategies recommendation about indirect costs apply to this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: No additional comments during the meeting.

Recommendation 3: UCEP is concerned about the top-down nature of the proposal. Adding these initiatives to the existing MRUs, ORUs and MRPIs will result in the funding for these programs being stretched too thin. This initiative will not necessarily encourage faculty to do their best research. The committee disagrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 4: No additional comments during the meeting. The committee agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: No additional comments during the meeting. The committee agrees with this recommendation.

IV. Compendium

The Compendium was revised after areas that were inefficient or not being followed were identified. Several years ago there were several proposals for new schools, but preliminary plans did not provide sufficient information like a budget. The Compendium had been in place for ten years without review, and it referred to units at UCOP that no longer existed. If the review of the Compendium started now there might be a more specific focus on streamlining.

Discussion: The five year perspective process seems to be clearer in the revised Compendium. It provides a framework for a systemwide planning process. The revisions do not reduce paperwork which is important in light of the reduction of staff at the campuses who would be involved in this work. UC is required by CPEC to conduct reviews of the five year perspective. Analyst Baxter remarked that it is important for the state to know what UC is planning every few years. Five year perspectives will not be requested this year to avoid placing a burden on the campuses. Some campuses report plans for their undergraduate programs.

The section on disestablishing programs should be clarified to address disestablishment of a program that is the last one of its kind across the campuses. UCEP could provide an opinion based on systemwide reasons early in the process but cannot mandate the program is kept place. A single, unique program at one campus is grounds for the system having a stake in decisions

about closures of the last program. Programs should not be considered for closure because a dean indicates there is a better use for the funds. UCEP could become involved when a decision is made to discontinue a program which would be of value. If the question is not related to quality but is related to budget (and budgets are starved), there is little that Senate committees can do. Asking whether similar programs exist at other campuses would be a good role for UCEP. UCEP members agreed to recommend that if there is a proposal to close the last program in the system a report should be submitted to UCEP (or another systemwide committee).

With respect to the procedure for undergraduate programs, the elimination of systemwide programs require systemwide review and review of proposals for dissolution of a program. More systemwide Senate oversight could be recommended. Since a campus does not currently have the ability to weigh in it would be useful to have a mechanism in place for this as well. Members agreed that establishment of new joint graduate/undergraduate program should involve UCEP. There is a question of whether a systemwide Senate committee should be involved when a new undergraduate degree is created and whether proposed undergraduate certificate programs should be part of this process.

V. Area “d” Admissions Requirements

There have been proposals since the early 2000’s to add earth sciences to the admissions requirements. BOARS has recommended against making this change. UCEP will need to discuss this during its June meeting.

Discussion: One campus CEP discussed this proposal and indicated that the courses currently offered at high schools are not rigorous enough.

VI. Early Childhood Educator Training Programs

Chair Williams will ask UCEP members to investigate the availability of courses in early childhood educator training. The committee did not have time to discuss this topic.

VII. Post Employment Benefits and UCPB’s Choices Reports

This item was not discussed.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams