

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2007

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD) Stephen McLean, Vice-Chair (UCSB), Ignacio Navarette (UCB), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), David Kay (UCI), Linda Egan (UCD), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Taradas Bandyopadhyay (UCR), Steven Constable (alt-UCSD), Linda Chafetz (UCSF), Peter Digeser (UCSB), Michael Brown (Academic Council Chair), Mary Croughan (Academic Council Vice Chair), Daniel Greenstein (Vice Provost, Academic Affairs), Margaret Heisel (Deputy to the Vice Provost), Paula Murphy (Director, Teaching Learning and Technology Center), Susan Wilbur (Director of Undergraduate Admissions), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. General Announcements and Updates – UCEP Chair Keith Williams

Chair Williams welcomed UCEP members, reviewed the committee's [charge](#), and summarized its role within UC's shared governance structure. UCEP makes recommendations to the Academic Council on a broad range of educational policy issues primarily affecting undergraduate education, in reviews initiated by the Senate, administration, and campuses. The committee is also encouraged to initiate projects and policy reviews.

The UCEP chair attends monthly meetings of the Academic Council as well as meetings of the Academic Assembly; the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which discusses issues relevant to all three segments of California higher education; and the Academic Planning Council (APC), a joint administrative-Senate committee that advises the UC Provost.

UCEP is also authorized to approve UC undergraduate courses as systemwide courses to be listed in divisional catalogs. Last year, UCEP gave its provisional approval to a proposed course being offered to students from multiple campuses at the UC Center in Washington DC (UCDC); however, some of the administrative details are still being worked out.

Academic Council met for the first time in September. There has been some discussion about Regent Blum's [paper](#) outlining a strategic plan for at the University as well as Provost Hume's [response](#). Council shares President Dynes' philosophy that UC should be acting as one University with ten campuses ("The Power of Ten"), and has expressed [opposition](#) to a proposed executive salary "slotting" plan that would appear to stratify campuses. Council is participating in the search for a new UC president through an advisory committee that is forwarding candidate names to the Regents through Council Chair Brown. The Academic Assembly voted to oppose a Regents proposal to ban the acceptance of research funding from the tobacco industry, and at their September meeting, the Regents approved a compromise position that establishes special review and approval procedures for tobacco industry funded research proposals, but does not ban such funding outright.

Chair Williams encouraged members to participate actively in meetings and to send him suggestions for the agenda. Student representatives are also encouraged to speak freely and to bring their issues and ideas to meetings.

II. Proposed Strategic Planning Initiative for Multi-campus and Off-campus Programs – with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Daniel Greenstein, Deputy to the Vice Provost Margaret Heisel, and Teaching, Learning and Technology Center Director Paula Murphy

Report: Guest consultants described a new effort by UCOP to define and address administrative obstacles and inefficiencies involving courses that enroll students from multiple campuses. The effort

is intended to minimize barriers to students wanting to enroll and earn credit in multi-campus courses and to faculty who wish to offer such courses, and to reduce unnecessary paperwork. Organizers are identifying affected programs and will be conducting campus visits and interviews with the directors of those programs and with relevant campus administrators, including registrars and deans. Vice Provost Greenstein said it was important to find solutions now because he expected the number of multi-campus courses to grow over time as UC sought to maximize the power of its ten campuses and streamline its administrative structures.

Margaret Heisel said building and improving UC's capacity to administer multi-campus programs would create new educational and research opportunities for both students and faculty. Problems identified so far include inefficient processes for approving and cross-listing courses offered to students from multiple campuses; barriers to trouble-free student enrollment; confusion over how to determine credit for students from quarter and semester campuses taking the same course; and obstacles to course delivery, particularly involving distance learning technologies. She said the affected programs include those administered at UCOP – EAP, UCDC, the UC Center in Sacramento, and the online course “Arabic without Walls” – as well as a number of locally administered programs enrolling students from multiple campuses.

Paula Murphy distributed slides outlining the project. She added that her office is considering how more multi-campus online courses like Arabic Without Walls can be developed and administered locally, without putting the resource burden on any one campus.

Discussion: UCOP is seeking the faculty's help in defining the problem, forecasting future course demand, and identifying local individuals responsible for program planning. UCEP members agreed that faculty are concerned about impediments to educational access and delivery and would like to be involved in any way possible, although they do not necessarily need to be involved in routine administrative matters. The autonomy of faculty to approve courses and curricula is fundamental to shared governance at UC and is administered locally on each campus, and thus any systemwide policies or procedures for multi-campus enrollment must be consistent with local autonomy. It was noted that organizers should consider initiating a more general conversation about both the future of multi-campus programs, particularly online education, which is a topic of growing concern to many faculty. It was noted that UCOP is not advocating for any particular program or educational approach; rather, it wants to ensure that an infrastructure where such programs can exist is in place. The intent is not to change existing major requirements, but to support greater efficiency and consistency in current practice – for instance, by ensuring that registrars have instant accessibility to uniform information about a course.

Action: Members will forward the names of any additional multi-campus programs they can think of to the UCEP analyst, who will forward them to UCOP. UCOP will share the draft survey instrument with UCEP and update the committee at a later date about progress.

III. Report from the Academic Senate Leadership – Senate Chair Michael Brown, Vice Chair Mary Croughan and Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barceló

Report: Michael Brown welcomed UCEP members and thanked them for their volunteer service to the Senate. He said he hoped the Senate could be a stabilizing force for a University facing a number of challenges and crises. He encouraged UCEP members to communicate with their local committees about systemwide issues, and in turn, to share local concerns with UCEP. He said members should bring local campus perspectives to meetings, but should also try to forge a systemwide perspective, taking into account what is best for UC as a whole. Chair Brown and Vice Chair Croughan are ex-

officio, non-voting members of all systemwide committees and will try to attend UCEP meetings whenever possible.

Chair Brown mentioned a few issues facing the Senate in 2007-08. These include recruiting a new president who has the confidence of the faculty, the Regents, and the general public; increasing operational efficiencies at UCOP, on the campuses, and in the Senate; fostering shared governance relationships between the Senate and administration; implementing new faculty salary scales that maximize the fairness and competitiveness of the scales; and implementing a president's directive to return non-resident tuition to campuses earmarked for graduate student support. The Senate will also discuss a BOARS [proposal](#) to reform freshman eligibility and a review of UC's International Education programs. Chair Brown also noted Council's July 2007 [statement](#) regarding the UC Retirement Plan, UC's efforts in Sacramento, and the need for UC to be an active partner in issues affecting California K-12 education.

Vice Chair Croughan added that the first phase of a four year plan to bring faculty salaries up to market would take effect October 1, with a 2.5% COLA for all general campus faculty and a market adjustment for all on-scale faculty. She said the chair and vice chair also serve as the faculty representatives to the Board of Regents, who continue to show their willingness to listen to the faculty's voice.

Senate Executive Director Bertero-Barceló reported that the goal of the systemwide Senate office is to help the Senate meet its academic and administrative missions. The committee analyst provides high-level professional support and is available to draft agendas, minutes, committee memos and reports, to share institutional knowledge, and to help ensure proper protocol. UCOP requires Senate travelers to submit expense receipts within 21 days. Finally, committee agendas are confidential, and once approved, minutes are posted to the [Senate website](#).

Discussion: One UCEP member expressed concern about the goal of maintaining a single salary scale system when the cost of living and other quality of life issues may vary in different UC campus locations. Another member asked whether it was possible to get accurate data (either from UCOP or individual campuses) about the current student-faculty ratio and if there is a difference between the budgeted/officially reported ratio and the actual situation in classrooms. Another concern is that the student-to-faculty ratio is rising in part because FTE funds intended for new faculty hires are being re-directed to other priorities, including competitive off-scales.

IV. Consent Calendar

1. Draft minutes of June 11, 2007
2. UCSF Division Request for a Variance to Senate Regulation 750.B

Action: UCEP approved the consent calendar.

V. Undergraduate Education Planning Group Mission Statement

Report: In 2006, UCEP recommended that the Academic Planning Council form a joint faculty-administration group to consider various "21st Century challenges" for undergraduate education and make recommendations for long-term systemwide program and enrollment planning around undergraduate education at UC. The group is also a companion to the APC's Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education (PDPE).

The Planning Group met for the first time in June. The membership consists of four administrators and four Senate members, including the 2006-07 UCEP chair and vice chair. The group plans to

appoint ad hoc committees to look at how specific issues – such as research, international education, distance learning, general education, outcome assessment, and service learning – affect undergraduate education, but it is first developing a mission statement to guide its work. Chair Williams asked UCEP members to brainstorm ideas for the mission statement, which he said should articulate the unique, distinctive quality of undergraduate education at UC as a public research university.

Discussion: The statement should convey the idea that UC’s mission is the “search for truth,” and its greatest product is an education, not merely job training or a degree. The University does not simply teach students a certain set of skills, but gives them the ability to think and engage the world as complete citizens in a rapidly changing, increasingly diverse world. The University is concerned with the transformation of the individual. Its mission includes giving students the ability to improve their quality of life and the quality of life of others. UC students are part of a community of active research scholars at the top of their fields. UC faculty have higher expectations for students, and in turn, are themselves required to demonstrate the highest standards of excellence.

It was also noted that no metric or mission statement can sufficiently quantify UC’s excellence or success. The mission statement should be general enough that it doesn’t conflict with other statements. Also noted was concern about the possible application of “No Child Left Behind”-style outcome assessment models to UC and other public universities.

Action: Chair Williams will incorporate the suggestions into the draft and circulate it to UCEP, once it has been discussed and amended by the Academic Planning Council.

VI. Update: Joint UCEP/CCGA Report on the Role of Graduate Students in Instruction

Report: Chair Williams reviewed the status of the joint UCEP-CCGA report *The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction*, which has been released for a second round of [systemwide review](#). If approved by Council, the Assembly will vote on the proposed regulation changes. Chair Williams encouraged members to become familiar with the document in case their division looks to them for information.

The revised set of recommendations attempts to maintain the primary goal of the original document, but also responds to previous concerns by maximizing the flexibility of individual campuses to implement the recommendations within the context of local practices. UCEP and CCGA retained their recommendation to eliminate the distinction between lower and upper division courses in Senate Regulation 750 and APM 410.4a. The report recommends applying policies and procedures for graduate student instruction beyond the Teaching Assistant level uniformly across all undergraduate courses, and it suggests minimums for faculty involvement in student instructor mentoring and training. The report recommends revisions to the TA Conditions for Employment to more accurately reflect the way the title is applied on campuses, and suggests that the use of GSIs in large-enrollment lower or upper division classes take place only under unusual circumstances. All proposed policies and regulations are intended to apply to both regular-term and summer instruction.

VII. Systemwide review of UCOPE’s Proposed Amendment to SR 636 – Capping enrollment of ELWR courses

UCEP reviewed the University Committee on Preparatory Education’s (UCOPE) [proposed amendment](#) to Senate Regulation 636, mandating a systemwide cap of 20 students on the enrollment of entry-level writing requirement (ELWR) courses. UCOPE bases its arguments for the cap on studies citing the specific pedagogical importance of small classes to writing instruction, national class size standards, and the low projected cost of implementation. UCEP discussed the issue in July

2004, July 2005, and in April 2007. During an [informal review](#) in 2004-05, UCEP accepted UCOPE's arguments and submitted a recommendation to Council that campuses voluntarily adhere to UCOPE's proposed standard of 15 to 20 students. UCEP also noted its concern that new funding be provided to the campuses to support implementation. Subsequently, Council endorsed UCOPE's recommended cap, and in July 2007, the two committees were asked to propose a regulation codifying a cap of 20 students. In April 2007, however, UCEP decided to oppose that effort not only because the committee felt its original recommendation had become a proposed mandate, but also because there was no new evidence that additional resources had become available or that UCOP was willing to fund implementation. Despite losing UCEP's support, UCOPE decided to go forward to Council with its proposed modifications to SR 636.

Discussion: Some UCEP members felt the lack of a clear and certain funding source remained a concern and wanted the committee to stand by its April 2007 position. It was noted that the regulation will effectively force two or three campuses whose ELWR class sizes are most out of compliance, to absorb most of the projected costs unless additional funding is forthcoming. Other members wanted to submit a provisional endorsement, made on the condition that additional funding from UCOP or other non-campus sources would be provided to the campuses needing it.

There were varying opinions about the available information concerning the demonstrable benefits of smaller class size for ELWR courses. Several UCEP members were unconvinced by what they viewed as mostly anecdotal evidence for the educational value of shrinking the size of ELWR classes over other kinds of classes. There is a general sense in UCEP that all instructional areas naturally benefit from smaller classes, but it is unclear based on the available data that instituting a mandate in the Senate regulations for the ELWR courses will have the desired effect on student writing.

There were other dissenting views expressed. A minority of the committee felt that experts in the field had presented a compelling case that writing instruction classes are unique in terms of the time and effort necessary to give students individualized feedback, and the cap would have a direct impact on student writing. The minority requested that UCEP submit a provisional endorsement of SR 636, made on the condition that additional funding from UCOP or other non-campus sources would be provided to the campuses needing it. One member said UCEP should be basing its decision on the educational policy merits of the issue only, rather than budget matters that were out its purview and control.

Action: UCEP decided to write a letter opposing the part of the UCOPE regulation relating to the 20 student cap based on two issues of concern: the indefiniteness of funding and the general question of whether mandates should be imposed on campuses for writing class size only without regard to other academic areas. The committee supported the other parts of UCOPE's revision.

VIII. Streamlining Articulation and Transfer Preparation Paths Initiatives

– with Director of Undergraduate Admissions Susan Wilbur

Report: Undergraduate Admissions Director Susan Wilbur joined UCEP to discuss the implementation of Senate Resolution [477](#) (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process), [California Senate Bill 652](#), and *UC Transfer Preparation Paths*. The goal of these projects is to provide better information to California Community College students about systemwide and campus-specific transfer requirements for various majors.

Director Wilbur circulated final *Transfer Path* documents for the chemistry major, which is now posted to <http://www.uctransfer.org/>, along with biology, history, and psychology. The project will expand to include the 20 highest demand transfer majors by July 2008. She said the drafts are

developed with the help of campus faculty and departments, UCOP articulation and admissions staff, and CCC counselors. In addition (at the request of UCEP and BOARS) divisional Senate chairs have designated a local committee to coordinate a final Senate review and sign-off before new Paths are posted, a process that will begin immediately. Director Wilbur noted that transfer to UC is very complex and the Paths documents are only part of the solution. UCOP is also planning to develop an interactive web tool for students to facilitate transfer preparation.

Chair Williams added that one component of the “streamlining” legislation [supported by UC](#) was a request for UC to identify and eliminate gaps in major preparation articulation where one campus requires a particular course but one or more others do not. UCEP suggested last year that the existence of these gaps could be communicated to departments in a letter co-signed by UCEP and UCOP, which alerted departments about the differences in campus requirements for particular majors, and requested that the department review the missing articulation. Director Wilbur thanked UCEP members for their help and said there was little more the committee needed to do at this stage. She will return to UCEP in the spring to present a progress report.

IX. Proposal to Establish a School of Public Health at UC Davis

In accordance with its role as a [Compendium](#) committee, UCEP was asked to review the proposed establishment of a new school of public health at UC Davis. CCGA and UCPB also participate in the review, with CCGA acting as the lead review committee.

Action: Discussion was postponed until November. Chair Williams asked members to review the main proposal, focusing on its relevance to undergraduate education.

X. BOARS’ Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy

Action: Discussion of the item was postponed until November.

BOARS recently posted a [Q&A document](#) about the proposal that includes relevant data.

XI. Remote and Online Instruction and Residency Requirements

CCGA proposed two new regulations last year addressing distance learning and residency requirements for graduate education. CCGA has since decided that it might be appropriate to broaden the discussion to include undergraduate education, and approached UCEP concerning interest in discussing the issues in more detail. A subcommittee formed that includes faculty from CCGA, UCEP, and the Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy Committee (ITTP). The subcommittee held one teleconference in late September. Chair Williams said online instruction and other forms of distance learning are quickly evolving and growing in popularity. The subcommittee is considering a number of topics, including whether standards for distance learning should be set at the systemwide level, whether those standards should provide either general or specific guidelines about the structure of those types of courses or in some way limit them, and whether distance/online learning should count for residency. The subcommittee agreed that if guidelines or regulations are set at the systemwide level they should define only minimal levels of quality rather than mandating specific rules to the campuses. CCGA’s chair has drafted a new Regulation 763, which says that instruction delivered via electronic means should be of “no lesser quality than that of face-to-face instruction”, and also calls for student-faculty interaction proportional to the course credit hours. In addition, a new Regulation 611 attempts to define “on campus” residency in the context of remote delivery of courses. The regulations avoid endorsement or non-endorsement of distance learning.

UCEP members agreed that the committee should be closely involved in any discussion about the role of online and distance learning in undergraduate education. Education delivered via electronic means can be of high quality, but there are also risks. The interactive, face-to-face teaching component is essential to undergraduate education at UC, although one could argue that the in-person interactions in a large lecture hall are no more valuable than an online chat room. One member noted that systemwide committees should make sure that their work does not conflict with any existing divisional regulations. It was also noted that some campuses have chosen to severely restrict online learning while others have embraced it. The UCSD representative said that a UCSD committee had produced a document about online and distance learning. He will forward that report to UCEP.

Action: Chair Williams asked UCEP members to raise these issues at their next Undergraduate Council meeting. He will report back to the subcommittee about UCEP's discussion and vice versa.

XII. Priority Setting and Future UCEP Agenda Items

UCEP discussed additional possible agenda topics, priorities, and projects for 2007-08. In addition to possible topics listed in the minutes from the previous meeting, there were a few additional suggestions. Chair Williams will poll members regarding priorities for topics via email and further discussion will occur at the next meeting.

- Best practices around program review: streamlining and ensuring the effectiveness of the process
- Best practices around academic integrity, faculty authority and responsibility for assigning punitive grades
- Examination of real student-faculty ratios at different campuses

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Keith Williams

Distributions:

1. Flow chart of Academic Senate Governance Structure
2. Proposed Strategic Planning Initiative: Multi-campus and Off-campus Instructional Programs
3. Revised draft SR 763 and SR 611