

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2011**

**Attending:** Jose Wudka, Chair (UCR), Michael Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM) (telephone), (UCSD) (telephone), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Tania Israel (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC), Janet Smarr (UCSD), Jon Rossini (UCD), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Keith Williams (Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Introductions and Announcements**

Chair Wudka explained how topics are sent to UCEP for discussion and comment. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) held a meeting which the president of WASC attended. ICAS was not eager to have student participation on the committee, but suggested that the Student Association could form a parallel committee that would meet regularly with ICAS. Council has some interest in determining if UC should ask about sexual orientation but no decision has been made. At the September Council meeting, a salary pay equity report was discussed and the Chair will share the report with UCEP. Five proposed revisions to the APM were discussed but only one was relevant to UCEP. APM 530 defines residency and the revision provides a new definition of what a non-resident is and how to deal with non-national students. The revisions would require Chancellors to review every TA and other appointments for non-residents. This is not quite in the scope of UCEP's charge but based on comments from other Council members, there will be a request for clarification.

The online instruction pilot project has been previously discussed by UCEP. It is a pilot developed by UCOP. There will be 26 courses rolled out in the first wave and research will be conducted on the effectiveness of this set of courses. To support the activities of the UCOE a seven million dollar loan was provided from UCOP and a business plan developed. Participating UC students cannot be burdened with additional charges so the plan is to enroll seven thousand non-UC students over the course of a few years to meet the loan obligation. A marketing study has been conducted. A second set of courses is going to be rolled out before the first set is evaluated. UCEP requested an independent evaluation of the project and Council approved of convening a blue ribbon panel.

WASC is changing its guidelines and UCEP has concerns about the changes. WASC will try to describe what abilities students should have when acquiring a bachelors or masters degree. As a starting point, the Lumina Foundation's degree qualifications profile may be used. Some aspects of the implementation of the new process seem to require a large campus effort which is counter to WASC's claim that this is to decrease the burden on the campuses. The president of WASC will join UCEP in November. UCEP should consider how UC should respond to the changes (UC could simply comply with the changes). Refusing to be accredited by WASC would have serious political implications as well as implications for student access to federal funds. President Yudof is on the board of Lumina. UCEP will provide a summary of concerns for the next Council meeting.

Issues related to transfers include smoothing the transfer process and the C-ID system which has common course numbering for UC and CSU courses. Each CSU will have at least two model curriculum in place this year and if students pass the courses they will complete UC in two years. Another matter UCEP will discuss is clarifying the Compendium process for closing a degree that is the last of its kind.

**Discussion:** Concern was expressed about the amount of time faculty have spent complaining about the online instruction pilot project. Chair Wudka stated that these types of courses become a problem when they are designed to generate significant revenue from non-UC students. It is important to make sure that the quality of the courses is maintained as they are scaled up.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**1. UCEP 2010-2011 Annual Report**

**Action:** The Annual Report was approved with one correction.

### III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Executive Director Winnacker brought the regrets of Senate Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Powell who had other appointments which unfortunately conflicted with the UCEP meeting. Executive Director Winnacker indicated that the Chair and Vice Chair typically spend an hour with committees. The Executive Director and analyst are resources to help members solve any practical problems encountered during Senate travel. Specific Senate travel procedures were reviewed.

### IV. Copyright Recommendations for UC

UCEP has the opportunity to provide comments on the copyright recommendations for UC faculty. Chair Wudka indicated that there are differences in how risk management is handled across the campuses.

**Discussion:** There should be a notification process to inform faculty about changes on the Copyright and Fair Use website. How to use materials that came with old textbooks needs to be understood by faculty. Adopting a standard training mechanism may not be an effective way to educate faculty about the issues. A training system should require that people pay attention because the implications to UC are enormous but the system should be more user-friendly. It would be good to have a system that can adapt to changes in the laws. UCEP will ask whether the group that developed this report will help UC faculty retain and protect their copyright. If faculty could retain copyright for everything they create and provide the materials to students for free, there would be significant savings for them. Fair use is being eroded so UC should defend and advocate for it. The recommendation about establishing guidelines could be modified to state that UC should protect fair use. A uniform risk management system that everyone buys into may be desirable to eliminate the variation across the campuses. It would be helpful to have guidance for faculty to gain knowledge and have support. Chair Wudka will contact the chair of the University Committee on Libraries to start a robust conversation about these issues.

**Action:** The analyst and chair will draft a memo with UCEP's comments.

### V. Online Education Pilot Project

- *Keith Williams, Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

Vice Provost Greenstein and Boalt Law School Dean Edley were the primary individuals promoting the online instruction pilot project. Seventy proposals were submitted by faculty, a number of faculty were convened to review the proposals, and an advisory committee was established. Proposals were submitted to a number of foundations, which expressed little interest or constrained their funding in manners to which UC did not agree.

The pilot will be evaluated by a group at UC Santa Barbara. The Senate will convene a blue ribbon panel to evaluate this evaluation, this panel will include people from UC due primarily to the logistical issues related to the uncertainty of how long it will be needed. Most of the courses within this project will involve students only at one campus but a few will involve two campuses. The project looked at three learning management systems and found them lacking. The current intention is to implement a Sakai-Moodle hybrid.

Keith Williams, Faculty Advisor to the Vice Provost Greenstein joined the committee to provide an overview of the project. Twenty five courses are currently under development. The courses represent an array of disciplines which will allow the project to see what does and does not work well. A number of courses span multiple campuses. Faculty will use online tools in a variety of ways which varies from videotaping a course to be shown later and made available online to short lectures on targeted topics or videos imbedded in learning activities. The assessment of course effectiveness will look at a variety of ways the courses work including success in meeting learning objectives, comparisons with traditional courses, comparison of grades in follow-on courses, and qualitative information from questionnaires and focus groups. Pilot tests of questionnaires were conducted with students in courses offered at UCB over the summer. Six courses are planned to start in January across four campuses, and the process for implementation includes securing Senate campus course committees' approval. The remaining courses will be offered in the summer and fall of 2012. Course designers are helping faculty develop their web-based set of activities, and information technology and media staff are also collaborating to encourage the success of the courses.

Two regulations were drafted by immediate past Senate Chair Simmons and immediate past UCEP Chair Kay.

There are both substantive and minor differences between them. But the regulations were delegated to UCEP for further discussion. Goals of the regulations include reaffirming that the Senate is in charge of approving courses and to simplify and organize Senate Regulation 544. Whether large numbers of non-UC students are admitted into these courses because there is space needs to be determined and guidance to address this is needed. The definition of concurrent should be considered by UCEP since its current use implies that UC Extension is somehow involved.

**Discussion:** UCEP originally supported the pilot project on the condition that it would be supported with strictly external funding. Multiple campus courses are currently being offered by each campus so the students do not have to worry about getting credit for a course taken at another campus. BOARS is looking at situations where high school students take these courses and whether they will get credit.

Discussions about the revenue generating model are ongoing. One goal is to have a revenue sharing model which would allow for funds to be returned to the campuses once the loan is paid off. Members identified concerns related to which campus will get credit for students taking courses at another campus, how Teaching Assistants will be paid and how the funds will be distributed to the campuses. The Committee on Planning and Budget met with individuals in UCOP to discuss the funding model for UC students although in order to repay the loans the focus is on non-UC students. Currently there are no rules governing admission of non-UC students into UC courses except for students in UC Extension. The online project is not intended to be a degree pathway and this will need to be made very clear, along with the fact that pre-approval will be required before admission to UC is considered. A member noted that Stanford offered a free online course on artificial intelligence which reached an enrollment of over one hundred thousand students. Allocation of resources must be carefully considered.

According to the Chair, the distinction between the regulations is that one proposes that a course is the same regardless of the mode of delivery whereas the other addresses online courses specifically. Irvine has defined regular, hybrid and online fairly specifically for their faculty. Bylaw 170 states that UCEP has the authority to approve systemwide courses. There needs to be a place where systemwide courses are defined and regulated. In version 2 of the regulation section 1 article 2 does this, but section b is not clear, and it is not clear if section f is needed. What is meant by non-UC students should be defined. "Extension" could be replaced with "non-UC student" in Senate Regulations 790 through 814.

The Registrars would not be able to manage the processing of transcripts of non-UC students enrolling in courses that have pre-requisites. The approach used with C-ID which articulates sequences could be applied to how online courses are articulated. Students could complete a sequence of year long sequential courses although this may not work for all courses. The UCI representative and UCEP chair will look closely at SR 850 and 860 to see if they can be revised or adopted to apply to systemwide online courses. How non-UC students will be enrolled into online courses and given credit without going through some campus' extension program needs to be figured out.

## **VI. WASC Guidelines**

Former Senate chair Michael Brown informed Chair Wudka about the changes that WASC is proposing. WASC is concerned about potential mandates, complaints about problems with for-profits, burdens implied in the previous review process, and students who attend different institutions and are unable to determine if they are getting what they need. Lumina's degree qualification profile (DQP) is proposed to measure the quality of education in associates, bachelors and masters degree programs. The Lumina Foundation felt that there should be a more nuanced way to define what it means to receive these degrees than the score on a standardized test. WASC was on the verge of adopting the DQP when Chair Brown advised the Commission that this action would not be appropriate. WASC has proposed a number of actions but details about the steps are vague.

**Discussion:** Recommendations from a number of WASC task forces will go to a steering committee and from there to the full Commission. WASC has to straddle the wide gap between for-profits and institutions like UC and Stanford. The benchmarking language is too simplistic. The three outcomes WASC will focus on initially are not measurable and exclude many disciplines. One action UC could take is to opt out, but a strong case would need to be made for doing this. The first step in this could be to make a good faith effort to convince WASC that the proposed changes are not appropriate. WASC could be asked to use the proposed standards for the for-profits, different standards for UC and other research institutions. Having leverage over the for-profits benefits WASC

and UC could acknowledge this. UC has to be accredited by a body that is on a Department of Education list or UC students will not have access to federal aid.

UCEP could propose a way for WASC to improve the for-profit institutions. The handbook revision is done every ten years so no institution has been assessed using the same handbook twice. Therefore there is no evidence of what is and is not working. UC is collecting evidence and using it to make changes, and WASC should not make changes not based on evidence. The changes made as a result of the last revision were costly and burdensome. WASC has been responsive to feedback about changing the institutional review process. UC has already done faculty driven work on assessing learning outcomes but the proposed changes will create an unnecessary burden. Chair Wudka will prepare and circulate a list of the committee's concerns.

## **VII. Sharepoint**

- *Todd Giedt, Associate Director, Academic Senate*

Associate Director Giedt provided an overview of the UCEP Sharepoint website.

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

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

Assistant Director Baxter was at the Council meeting when the issue with WASC and the Lumina Foundation was discussed with the president, so he is aware of what is happening. The undergraduate deans will bring faculty together to discuss who UC students are and what UC invests in them. Some UCEP representatives will attend this meeting, including Chair Wudka and the Merced representative.

## **IX. Potential Issues for 2011-2012**

Chair Wudka provided an overview of a number of topics that may be discussed by UCEP in the 2011-2012 academic year. These will include transfer students and articulation. Shawn Brick, Associate Admission Director, Transfer Policy, joined the meeting to introduce himself and reported that UCEP will receive data from Student Affairs that will answer some of the committee's questions about transfer students.

## **X. New Business**

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at: 4:00

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Jose Wudka