

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2012**

**Attending:** John Yoder, Chair (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI) (telephone), Tim Labor (UCR), David Lea (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Jeanette Natzle (UCD), Troy Carter (UCLA) (telephone), Cristian Ricci (UCM), James Nieh (UCSD) (telephone), Mona Vakilifathi (Graduate Student Representative) (telephone), Jonathan Ly (Undergraduate Student Representative) (telephone), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Keith Williams (Interim Director, UC Online Education), Bob Powell (Chair, Academic Senate), Bill Jacob (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Senior Policy Analyst)

**I. Welcome, Announcements and Updates**

Chair Yoder welcomed the committee and explained that UCEP will be discussing all issues related to systemwide education policy. There will also be times when more general Academic Senate issues will require feedback based on the faculty perspective. Chair Yoder reminded committee members that the committee discussions are confidential and that notes taken by individuals should reporting. The committee agreed that student representatives should be included in the listserv.

The UCEP chair is a member of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, a committee that includes members from Community Colleges, CA State Colleges and UC. A major agenda topic at the Sept 28<sup>th</sup> meeting was the implications of Proposition 30 for higher education. The three Senate chairs will work together in their personal capacities to draft joint op-eds supporting the ballot measure. Two new bills, SB 1052 and 1053 (Steinberg), which were signed into law, charge ICAS with setting up a repository of electronic textbooks for 50 courses, housed by CSU. The bills allocated \$5 M for this effort, contingent on raising philanthropic matching funds. ICAS is required to establish a board to oversee this task and members are just beginning this work. ICAS members also heard from representatives from the California Department of Education about the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium that will design K-12 assessments that align with the Common Core State Standards to be implemented beginning in 2014-15. Finally, ICAS members will work together to ensure that

changes to the WASC accreditation standards are acceptable and appropriate.,

Chair Yoder has participated on the C-ID committee the last two years. C-ID is a course identification system being developed to ease the transfer and articulation burdens in California's higher educational institutions. C-ID is an intersegmental committee that meets roughly every three months. UCEP needs a volunteer to represent UC interests at these meetings. The next meeting is November 1, 2012 at the Anaheim Doubletree, Sequoia Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, 100 The City Drive, Orange CA. Orange County. Please volunteer for this service, particularly if you are from Southern California.

**Discussion:** A member asked if the committee only responds to issues or if new things can be added to the agenda. Chair Yoder said the committee should be proactive and committee members are invited to propose new agenda items as appropriate. One such issue is the time to degree. Senate Chair Powell reported a student regent's interest in time to degree, with the concern that current data is a lagging indicator and may not reflect the situation subsequent to University budget cuts

The UCSF representative would like to discuss self-sustaining programs, and how these intersect with UCOE. Issues with this include admission standards, faculty time and protection, evaluation, and degree criteria. The Anderson Business School at UCLA is also proposing to become self-sufficient.

The UCB representative reported that faculty are concerned about non-resident admissions to UC, and suggested that UCEP make a strong statement that what has been done is wrong. Concerns include questions about whether non-residents receive extra support or special services because they pay higher tuition. UCEP will engage BOARS in this discussion.

Members agreed that whoever is responsible for making decisions should be invited to speak to the committee about future plans for dealing with UC's budget. Decisions made for financial reasons, instead of from an education perspective, are shaping educational policies. The analyst added that the systemwide committee on Planning and Budget is the primary Senate body that deals with the budget issues, and that UCPB and the Computing and Communications are also monitoring UCOE.

## **II. Consultation with Office of the President**

- *Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*

Assistant Director Baxter explained the role of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in the accreditation of UC and other institutions offering bachelor and graduate degree programs. Last year, WASC began to work on revising its handbook and sought institutional feedback. UCD is the part of the first group in the pilot of the new handbook and has reported problems with the supplemental information requested. WASC's data templates are problematic due to the manner in which UC collects and aggregates data. One issue is that the language on competencies remains in the handbook. WASC's president, Ralph Wolff, met with UCEP and CCGA last year and is willing to meet with the committee again. UC's new Provost, Aimee Dorr, was on the Commission for two years and is sympathetic to UCEP's concerns.

**Discussion:** WASC needs to devise better metrics for institutions like UC. Currently, the Commission does not differentiate the depth or scope of reviews based on institutions' accreditation track record, and members agree that institutional track records should be taken into consideration. Some higher education leaders are proposing that institutions be grouped for review by mission and type instead of by geographic location. There is no accreditation of UC as a whole; each campus is accredited separately and, within the soon-to-be revised WASC framework, decides what its review focus will be. Members remarked that UC faculty are not happy with the added work that WASC requires.

## **III. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- *Keith Williams, Interim Director, UC Online Education*

Director Williams reported that ten online courses have been in offered over the summer terms, four new courses will be offered this fall, and eight other courses will be available again to UC students in the fall. A total of 35 courses are under development and should be available by the end of next summer. This roll out is delayed from what was anticipated when the project was first developed 18 months ago but UCOE will exceed its goal of offering 25 courses in 2012-13. As many as 40 courses may be available to UC students by next summer and a smaller number will be available to non-matriculated students. These courses will either only be offered to the students at the campus offering the course or they will have been approved as a systemwide courses that are available to non-matriculated students. An important part of the roll out is the UCEP approval process.

The evaluation center at UCSB has been working on the evaluation report. The evaluation will cover the first six courses taught in the spring semester and quarter, and the summer courses and the fall winter and spring courses will be included in the final report next June. The evaluators have conducted an analysis of the six courses that were completed in the spring. This will still be a partial report because certain information from the registrars is missing. Twenty-two courses were in the pilot and the evaluation will look broadly across these courses to identify what worked and what did not. According to Director Williams, it is hoped that the evaluation report will be available this week but a draft of the executive summary is positive overall with both students and faculty reporting positive experiences. The evaluators found variation across the six courses and reasonable evidence that certain approaches lead to certain experiences and outcomes. The report describes technology issues related to the learning platform which is based on Sakai.

Students were surveyed at the beginning and end of the courses, and faculty were interviewed three times. With the exception of one class, student involvement was good. Seventy percent of students agreed that they were satisfied with the course overall, 84% of students agreed that the courses had high quality curriculum, and 50% of the students felt that communication was better in person than online. Forty-two percent of the students felt

that they learned better in person than online, 70% said they would recommend the course to other students and 70% also said they would enroll again in a UC online course. The evaluators will work with each of the instructors so they can learn how to improve the course. The individual courses in the evaluation report are not identified, but Director Williams indicated that this information may be disclosed to the Blue Ribbon Panel. The registrars have been concerned about FERPA so the evaluators have not had access to grades yet.

The learning environment developed for UCOE with Sakai has changed, and other options are being considered. A major initiative to be undertaken this year is how to allow for cross campus enrollment. Provost Dorr is interested in enhancing cross campus enrollment in programs beyond UCOE such as EAP so a broader effort is being explored. The funding that will enable cross campus enrollment needs to be identified and may come from UCOP's working smarter initiative. Ways to facilitate students getting approval for a course they have taken at another campus are needed. Currently, under SR 544, students have to do the legwork. Articulation of some of the courses that are similar across campuses so that students receive credit automatically will be the goal. This will help students know whether a course will apply towards their credit. Eight to ten systemwide courses may be available for the spring and UCOE hopes to have all of the spring courses approved by the end of October. The people who have to develop the marketing need lead time to advertise these courses starting in January.

**Discussion:** If a course will only be taught at a local campus, only campus approval is required. To date, there are no online courses being offered by one campus and taken by students at another. A member asked about the UCI course that proposes to teach only non-matriculated students, and Director Williams indicated that early discussions about this always included courses that would have only non-matriculated students. The idea was that courses offered to non-matriculated students should go through the same approval process used for courses for UC students. UCOE pays for the instructors and TAs for the non-matriculated students in a course. Resources were not available at UCD to continue offering a course to UC students but UCOE was able to provide sufficient resources to support non-matriculated students. Director Williams stated that his interpretation of the guidelines developed by UCEP is that the online courses will be approved on a systemwide basis. UCEP can ask for additional information about the two courses reviewed for today. Only one non-matriculated student has been enrolled to date. Media coverage of the courses offered for non-matriculated students is planned. Blackboard and its partners are working on the marketing of UCOE courses. The courses included in the evaluation report had UC students enrolled.

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

- *Bob Powell, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Bill Jacob, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Chair Yoder welcomed Chair Powell and Vice Chair Jacob to the meeting, and mentioned that the committee is interested in knowing more about how UC is handling the budget decisions and how these are impacting educational policy decisions. Vice Chair Jacob, the immediate past chair of BOARS, indicated that the admissions policy included to ensure that a qualified California student is not admitted because of a weaker non-resident student. Provost Pitts was concerned about campuses' adherence to the admissions rule, but to date this seemed to be an issue at only a couple of campuses.

**Discussion:** A member noted that the public does not believe that the new admissions policy is not harming California students. There is no centralized authority in place to oversee the policy. UC should make a statement that non-resident students must be exceptional. One committee member commented that the diversity brought to the campuses by international students is valued. Chair Powell remarked that the budget situation for UC is difficult. Rebenching and enrollment management provide for penalties for campuses that reduce the number of California students. UC should be more honest about moving toward privatization. There are real constraints that campuses face which limit the number of non-resident students that can be enrolled. The Regents have been reluctant to discuss issues such as this. In the past, UC had an agreement with the state on how much funding would be provided for each student. UC gets tuition from unfunded students.

Unlike the community colleges and state universities, UC has maintained the numbers of California residents it enrolls. Most chancellors would agree that limiting enrollment results in a loss of revenue from tuition. If Proposition 30 fails, campuses will be coming up with solutions to their budget problems. Chair Powell remarked that educating California students is still important. Self-supporting program fees are officially approved by the president and reported to the Regents. Fees for a professional program, like a typical law school, are approved by the Regents. The vote on November 6<sup>th</sup> is pivotal to higher education. What is happening at UC is also happening at public institutions in other states. According to Chair Powell, the cost of educating a student has decreased as a result of efficiencies. No public institution has been defunded as quickly as UC has. If Proposition 30 fails, there is an automatic cut to UC.

## V. SR 760

SR 760 is being discussed because of WASC's requirement that UC justifies the amount of credit granted for a course. Last year, CEPs were asked if they would prefer to develop their own policies or if UCEP should craft a systemwide policy.

**Discussion:** WASC approved of UCB's policy which could be a model for other campuses. The UCSC representative pointed out that the reference to the amount of work per week is problematic. The length of a "term" is not defined. A member proposed keeping SR 760 as is and instructing the CEPs to develop their own policies. UCEP can provide a memo with examples. The members agreed that the campuses should create their own policies. An example from a semester system and one from a quarter system should be provided.

## VI. UCOE Copyright Issues

The San Diego division raised questions about the copyright agreement developed by UCOE for the instructors in the UCOE pilot.

**Discussion:** Members support the time limit on how long UC owns a temporary license. This will result in keeping the material fresh. Everyone agreed that there is interest in seeing answers to the questions raised by UCSD.

## VII. Systemwide Course Approvals

UCEP was asked to review and consider courses that would cross campuses, and there are two courses that UCEP will review for approval today. The committee is asked to consider whether the guidelines are sufficient or should be changed. Chair Powell indicated that a contentious issue currently is creating a funding model to support students taking a course offered by another campus. Chair Yoder indicated that the online courses are to be approved by the instructor's campus, and that UCEP may need to just consider whether a course can be approved as a systemwide course.

**Discussion:** A member mentioned that there are online services offering to take courses for students and a way to determine who is taking the course is needed. The point was made that large scale cheating can take place in traditional courses and there is really no way to prevent cheating. There are proctoring services that provide various solutions to prevent cheating. The issue with a home campus accepting the credit received for another campus' systemwide course was discussed. The writing course at UCI being reviewed today is restricted 100% to non-matriculated students, and the rationale for this has not been provided. Committee members agreed that this cannot be a systemwide course if it excludes UC students.

A member pointed out that UCEP has not discussed offering UCOE courses as sections. A member proposed not approving the UCI course and requesting more information about why UC students are excluded. UCEP needs to clarify whether a UCOE course must be a systemwide course. An instructor being paid with state funds but is teaching non-matriculated students is a problem. Vice Chair Jacob suggested that the entire UCI course could be approved as a systemwide course with sections that will have UC students and sections that will have non-

matriculated students. The committee discussed how the instructor is compensated. The campus could remove the restriction on UC students but will still have to provide an estimate of how many non-matriculated students will be enrolled. One member remarked that the UCI course proposes a limit of eighteen students. The committee would like the instructor to provide the rationale for restricting the course to non-matriculated students. Members were not in agreement with making the statement that a systemwide course can be restricted to only non-matriculated students. Past discussions at UCEP have included the idea that some of the online courses would be offered exclusively to non-matriculated students, although it was not understood that these courses would permanently exclude UC students if the courses are of UC quality.

The proposed UCB course has already been offered online as part of an established statistics course. The course will be offered to UC students from any campus as well as to non-matriculated students. It was unclear how much of the course will be synchronous versus asynchronous. The final examine will be in person which will be a barrier for this being a systemwide course. The UCB committee on courses of instruction has a four year sunset clause for approval which allows the committee to ask if the course worked or not and to suggest changes. Members agreed to approve this course.

The committee agreed that the guidelines should not be changed at this time. The supplemental questionnaire used by UCB was very helpful and provided more information than is requested in the guidelines developed by UCEP, and could be used by the campuses in their initial approval of courses. More clarity is needed in the guidelines about target audiences, any issues that might arise related to the target audiences, or how final exams are administered to students not at the campus offering the course. The UCI course could be approved as a UCO course. The UCI representative indicated that he will seek clarification from the instructor without going through the campus committee on courses. A member commented that last year UCEP was concerned about the mix of UC students and non-matriculated students, and the importance of maintaining balance in order to ensure UC quality. The committee has reservations about approving a course that proposes to be for UC students only one semester and for non-matriculated students at another point.

**Action:** The chair will draft a response to the UCI instructor requesting more information.

## **VIII. UCEP's Course Review and Approval**

Chair Yoder asked if a subcommittee is needed to review future course proposals or if members should volunteer to review proposals that interest them.

**Discussion:** Members agreed that the review should be done on a voluntary basis. The chair will ask for two members to review the courses and make a report when the committee meets.

## **IX. New Business**

Chair Yoder announced that a volunteer is needed for a one year term on the UCEAP governing committee.

**Action:** Chair Yoder will email the committee asking for a volunteer.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:50 PM  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: John Yoder