

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 2010

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD), David Kay, Vice-Chair (UCI), Ignacio Navarrete (UCB), John Yoder (UCD), David Pan (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Jose Wudka (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Gerardo Aldana (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC) (telephone), James Levin (UCSD), 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

Chair Williams noted that this is the last in-person meeting but there may be emails to committee members in the next few months. Council approved UCEP's letter on days of instruction and one member suggested that there should be examples of how to deal with situations that interrupt days of instruction. The senior managers from UCOP will propose a new allocation scheme for the campus budgets that is more straightforward and transparent. The campuses would keep the fees and pay a tax to OP. The Post Employment Benefits task force may propose changes that would be the equivalent to an as much as a 20% budget reduction from current budgets. The incentives that have made UC jobs attractive are changing.

BOARS presented a report to Council on admissions between 2003 and 2009 looking at changes that occurred during that time as a result of proposition 209. During this period, 77% of ELC designated graduates apply to UC (3.2% of all California high school graduates), and 62% attend UC. With the new admissions policy this will increase to 9% from 4%. Academic qualifications of applicants have improved. More students have taken a-g courses, they have higher GPAs, and standardized test scores are higher. The study found an increase in the number of first generation college students attending UC, with 34% of admitted students being first generation college students from families who have never had someone go to college. There were declines among applicants and admitted students from the schools with the lowest academic performance index. Ninety-three percent of freshman were retained after their first year. Most campuses have shown increases in graduation rates. As a percentage of applicants, California residents declined between 2003 and 2009 to 82.6%. Californians are still 90.2% of all admitted students in 2009-10. The relative admit rate for African Americans was below the rate for other racial and ethnic groups. Three models for comprehensive review were described in the report. The president is advocating for campuses to use holistic review which is more expensive than comprehensive review.

A budget workgroup involves two systemwide committee chairs divisional chairs, Provost Pitts, and OP people involved with the budget. The goal is to stimulate discussions between the faculty and OP about the budget. The workgroup discussed proposals in the Choices report and the provost will collect information about five of the proposals. One of the proposals is to place a moratorium on new construction and Council endorsed this although the vote was very close. While there may be funds for construction through bonds, money is not available for operating expenses. It was noted that faculty are just now starting to understand how grave the budget situation is as deans take actions to save money. Statements have been made that there will need to be fewer faculty in order to deal with the budget. Another proposal deals with indirect cost

recovery (ICR) and suggests that waivers for ICR should be reviewed more closely and funders should be asked to provide more justification for not paying ICR.

The May revise of the state budget includes \$305 million which restores funding and \$51 million for unfunded growth. There are lots of good signs but it is not clear that this funding will be in the final budget. The legislative committee looking at the master plan filed a final report but has proposed a bill that suggests developing a system providing statewide goals for outcomes for higher education which is a point the LAO made in a report this year. There is also a recommendation to look at outcome measures rather than just focusing on access, but there may be consequences that are of concern. Underrepresented minorities who often need additional services or a longer time in order to graduate may be hurt if campuses implement strategies to increase graduation rates of students who are more prepared. Assembly bill 1440 would guarantee a community college student - who completes an associate's degree in his or her field of study - the ability to transfer to the California State University with junior standing. The CSUs are concerned about the bill stating that the CSU cannot require students to make up any course taken as part of preparation for the major. The CSUs will work with the community colleges to determine which courses meet the criteria for some of the degrees. Many feel that this is another example of the legislature creating mandates and failing to consult with the people who should be consulted.

The Council of Vice Chancellors has made a set of recommendations including moving all campuses to a semester system by 2014 although there has been no information put forth that shows there will be budget savings. One reason given in support of this change is that this would make transfers into UC easier. Another recommendation is to implement online courses by 2013 that will satisfy transfer general education core and can be completed anywhere at any time. The UCB senate passed a resolution establishing a committee to investigate OP. UCEP members agreed that the proposal to establish a task force to look into multicampus enrollment and approval for courses requirements should go forward to the Senate office.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with two corrections.

III Choices Report

The report highlights the dilemmas UC is facing with respect to the budget. The committee should look at issues related to undergraduate education.

Discussion: A member commented that the format is not user friendly and the data that is referenced should be included with the text. One local CEP supports the report, agreeing that maintaining the quality of education should be a priority, and that the most important way to achieve this is to maintain the quality of the faculty. The competitiveness of faculty salaries needs to be maintained. Chair Williams called into a recent Planning and Budget committee meeting and there was a discussion about maintaining quality. Unlike in the past, there is now more willingness to state that quality is eroding. A member commented that UC is being criticized for taking out of state and foreign students and not enrolling students from within the state. The committee agreed that UC should be honest about needing the tuition from out of state students. It was noted that none of the possible choices UC has are good.

UC is faced with a strategic choice to not make any changes, increasing fees to make up the shortfall, or making cuts where possible. If the state of California does not fund the university

appropriately, the decrease in quality will be inevitable. The report mentions not supporting students that are not funded by the state, although there is a question about the cost of losing the fees paid by these students. If these students are accepted, the student to faculty ratio will be increased which will cause a reduction of quality. The case needs to be made to the state that UC cannot admit additional students without the necessary resources. Faculty do not have TAs or the time to review writing assignments so the number of these assignments has decreased and this can be seen as a sign of decrease in quality. A member remarked that it would be better to educate fewer students as a way to maintain quality. The committee agreed that the goal should be to maintain quality even at the risk of diminishing access and affordability, and existing resources should be used as effectively as possible. Cost should not be the reason why faculty do things such as reducing the number of assignments or assigning different types of assignments. There are trade-offs that will have unintended consequences.

The report discusses summer sessions, but it is not clear how graduate students would be adversely affected by them. Summer session depends upon a cost effective instructor compensation model and it can only be expanded if there are people willing to teach for minimal compensation. TAs should be using the summer for their studies not for teaching. One campus provided new FTEs but still could not get faculty to teach summer session as a regular quarter. It is not clear that it costs less to teach students during the summer, although these sessions would enable students to graduate on time and allow UC to meet demand. At one time, faculty were paid a decent amount to teach during the summer but this lasted only a couple of years until it was deemed to be too expensive. The budget workgroup has a scenario that proposes continued increases to fees to as high as \$20,000. It was noted that some faculty use the money from the course buy-out to pay graduate students to teach courses.

Action: Chair Williams will draft a letter for the committee to review.

IV. Post Employment Benefits

- *Harry Powell, Senate Chair*
- *Dan Simmons, Senate Vice Chair*

Chair Williams shared slides prepared by the Post Employment Benefits task force with the committee, indicating that it is critical that faculty are informed. The retirement program has assets, however retiree health benefits do not come from these assets but rather from a tax to departments. Currently unfunded liabilities are significant and steps must be taken to address this. A contribution of 17% from the employees and employer would be required to pay for the benefits that accrue to active employees for that year's service. The total contribution is projected to grow to fifty percent in later years if nothing is done now. The Senate has proposed using bonds to pay a portion of the employer contribution. Incurring this debt now through the bonds would mean this funding would not be available for other things in the future. UC faculty salaries are below market in salaries when compared to the comparison eight, but above market in pension and retiree health.

Discussion: Vice Chair Simmons explained the reasons for the contribution holiday and indicated that the Senate began advocating for the restart of contributions at least five years ago. UC's represented staff receive pension and retiree health benefits that represented staff at the comparison eight institutions do not receive. It was also noted that staff retiree at age 59 or 60 whereas faculty retire at age 66 and above, which means staff retiree health benefits are the responsibility of UC until they reach the age to be eligible for Medicare. It is possible that faculty

could have a different pension plan. A new study on total remuneration will soon be available. The committee discussed concerns about focusing on maintaining faculty and not maintaining staff. Another idea the task force is discussing is that new employees will have a different benefit package that is not as good as the current package. A member remarked that the information about post employment benefits must be considered by UCEP and the campus committees from the perspective of the potential impacts on educational policy. Another consideration is which benefit package will be most attractive when recruiting new faculty.

The current retirement plan was designed fifty years ago according to Chair Powell and has effectively allowed faculty to remain at UC for the length of their careers. Faculty at other institutions who have defined contribution plans have had to postpone retirement because of the economic situation. In September the Regents will consider a ramp up of employee contributions to 3.5% and employer contributions to 7.5% in July 2011 and in July 2012 employee contributions will increase to 5% and employer contributions will increase to 10%. Then employer contributions will increase by 2% a year up to 20%. This will be a significant budget cut for the campuses. The medical centers are considering a defined contribution plan but will still need to deal with the unfunded liabilities. How the unfunded liabilities will be distributed to the campuses still needs to be figured out. A retirement plan is desired that encourages faculty to remain at UC while still allowing faculty to retire at a reasonable age so that faculty renewal occurs.

V. Commission on the Future Recommendations

The committee received feedback from the systemwide review of the first set of education and curriculum workgroup and two new recommendations from that workgroup including one related to quality. There may be ongoing reports on quality.

Discussion: One concern is whether a centrally defined measure of quality will be relevant locally. Multiple measures of quality are good but may be too difficult to measure. There is an advantage for students as a result of UC faculty being held to the highest standards and why this is still an advantage to students who will not become researchers should be explained. UC quality needs to be defined so what UC stands for is understood and so that potential UC programs can be evaluated in this context. This can send an important message to the state about the level of quality that UC provides. Students applying to UC may not know or understand what UC will offer them. A UC degree counts differently with an employer than a CSU degree.

VI. Area “d” Admissions Requirements

This proposal has been made previously and has gone to BOARS in the past where it was not supported. The current proposal has been revised. Historically the three areas considered as core sciences are biology, chemistry and physics. The earth, environmental and space sciences have not been considered in the same category because these fields build on the core sciences. High school courses in earth, environmental and space sciences are usually not taught at the level of quality required by UC and are only taught in the 9th grade. Fundamental changes have been proposed to change the language so that these fields are put on equal footing with the core sciences. Some UC faculty were surveyed and the results were that the core sciences were more important preparation for their fields than the earth, environmental and space sciences.

Discussion: To meet the area “d” requirements, two lab sciences courses are needed. One CEP recommended that these courses could be allowed if they provide a sufficient laboratory

component and are rigorous in terms of mathematics and scientific methods. A list of accepted courses that are rigorous should be made available. It should be easier for students to find out about courses with rigorous lab components. These types of courses might encourage more students to study in these fields and increase their interest in the sciences. If they are taught well, they can help students in the three fundamental sciences. A weak link is inadequate resources available to high school advisors. UC could accept the courses on principle but insist that the courses be rigorous. The science courses required could be modified so students can take science courses of interest to them. If the purpose is to prepare students to be scientists in the future, the focus should be on the core sciences. One local committee supports BOARS' position.

A potential problem is the lack of California content standards but the NSF standards could be adopted. UCEP could propose that these courses are added in a few years, after a content standard that is rigorous has been developed. Specific learning outcomes should be in place. A new outside proposal that is more aligned with the area "d" requirements could be needed. It would be useful to have a more specific process to determine if any science course meets the area "d" requirements. The current requirement might be re-worded to state that other sciences could be allowed if they meet designated standards. What qualifies as a lab science should be more specifically defined and BOARS could be charged with developing the specific language.

VII. Early Childhood Educator Training Programs

Members were asked to research what their campuses offer with respect to early childhood educator training programs.

Discussion: Vice Chair Simmons explained that this issue came up as the result of a meeting with Senator Liu who had a bill that would request a review of transfer opportunities in a curriculum focused on early childhood education. The bill is now dead. UCSD has no specific program but there are a few individual courses. UCI has a handful of courses in the Education department and a proposal in development for a certificate program. UCLA has a lot of courses and an early childhood lab but no defined program. UCB has a few individual courses and an early childhood lab. UCM has a variety of courses in psychology. UCR does not have much beyond several extension courses. UCSB has faculty specializing in this and there are undergraduate and graduate level courses. UCD has an early childhood lab and several courses. A member remarked that in light of the research on child development it is surprising that none of the UC campuses has a program in this field.

VIII. Residency

UCRJ has been asked by UCEP to define residency but a response has not been received.

IX. Online Education Project

- *DoQuyen Tran-Taylor, Coordinator, P-20 Programs/Initiatives, Education Partnerships*

Two UCEP members on the online project advisory committee attended a meeting last week. Based on their feedback from a March meeting, the request for proposals was revised. Three separate proposals for separate activities are now outlined in the RFP. The proposals are for faculty developers, course design and development, and research and evaluation. The department chair or dean would need to sign off on a proposed course and a process for senate approval was discussed. There is no funding currently available although UCB Dean Edley stated he hopes to have funding to announce at the July Regents meeting. Two graduate students have conducted a

literature review on the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of online education. There is an OP website for the project: <http://onlineeducation.universityofcalifornia.edu> .

Discussion: A member commented that the scope of the project has been scaled back based on feedback from UCEP and the need to focus was also identified as more details were considered by Academic Planning. Funders were also concerned about the lack of faculty support. Vice Provost Greenstein has advised Chair Williams that the UCEP letter endorsing the project was valuable. In the long term there should be an evaluation of whether taking an online course generates the same interest in a discipline that a traditional course might. The focus on fully online courses was decided upon in order to collect information about the effectiveness and possible benefits. The RFP is asking for proposals that can answer a set of questions the advisory committee developed. However courses that are not fully online will be considered and the RFP should be clarified to make sure that this is clear.

A member remarked that students who have access to the materials online as well as in a podcast do not show up in person for lectures. The courses are to be modular so that a faculty member can reconfigure them to meet different goals. Synthesis and integration of knowledge should be central and the RFP should ask if projects will support this. The courses will be placed in a repository and faculty who leave UC and their UC campus can continue to use the course. Currently the RFP indicates that the evaluation and design team may include individuals not affiliated with UC although the goal is to have internal UC expertise. The policy questions would not be abdicated to individuals not affiliated with UC and that these decisions will remain within UC.

It is not clear that online courses will help alleviate problems with impacted majors. There should be more caution with regard to the statement that online courses will generate revenue. A condition for being involved could be that faculty sign an agreement with respect to copyright belonging to faculty but the campus being able to use the online courses. The committee discussed whether faculty conducting these courses would be reimbursed. There could be ramifications related to workload. Offering remedial courses online instead of sending students to community college for these courses may not be the right approach. It is not productive to use new technology to teach existing courses online the same way they are taught traditionally and the RFP is not looking for innovation. Certain types of courses such as pre-med labs where hands-on experience is important could be excluded. The ability to verify the identity of the student taking the test still needs to be explored. There will still be costs associated with having TAs grade papers.

X. UCEP Priorities for 2010-2011

Members are invited to identify goals for the next academic year.

Discussion: Members suggested the following topics for next year: online education including what online courses are available, evaluation of the courses, considering the appropriate role of online education at UC and what the online world is doing to education; UC quality; post employment benefits from the perspective of educational policy; residency; educational policy ramifications of separations of UC faculty; evaluation of the Arabic Without Walls UC-wide online course; and the elimination of positions at campuses who were dedicated to undergraduate education.

The chair thanked the committee members for their active participation in the meetings and the members thanked Chair Williams for his service with a round of applause.

Meeting Adjourned At: 4 p.m.

Minutes Prepared By: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams