

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2008

**Attending:** Stephen McLean, Chair (UCSB), Taradas Bandyopadhyay, Vice-Chair (UCR), Robert Hendel (UCB), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), David Kay (UCI), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Joan Etzell (UCSF), John Yoder (UCD), Rolf Christoffersen (UCSB), Umera Ameen (Undergraduate Student Representative), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Mary Croughan (Academic Council Chair), Harry Powell (Academic Council Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Todd Giedt (Academic Senate Associate Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. General Announcements and Updates – UCEP Chair Stephen McLean**

Chair McLean welcomed UCEP members and reviewed the committee's charge. UCEP makes recommendations to Academic Council on an array of educational policy issues primarily affecting undergraduate education, in reviews initiated by the Senate, administration and campuses. For some issues the committee may decide that it does not have an opinion. He encouraged the student representatives to actively participate and provide their insights during discussions.

Chair McLean announced that there will be six more UCEP meetings and that in the past the January and July meetings were canceled. The committee agreed to cancel the January and July meetings. The Chair noted that there is less turnover on UCEP this year since four to five members were on the committee before. Chair McLean pointed out that a two year commitment to UCEP is ideal. Typically the representatives serve only one year making it difficult sometimes to finish a project that requires more than a year. A future agenda item will be a discussion about changing the commitment to two years and members will be asked to talk to their divisions about this. The Chair remarked that there are no UCOP consultants at this meeting. Due to the UCOP restructure, many people have left resulting in a loss of institutional memory. The committee was reminded that it has the right to go into executive session at any time. Members were also strongly encouraged to bring issues from the campuses to the attention of UCEP.

Chair McLean provided an overview of the range of issues that will come before UCEP this year, including the Compendium reviews of new programs and the update of the Compendium process itself. He explained that there will be systemwide reviews of issues by the divisions and the committees of the systemwide Academic Senate. The committee will be reactive in many cases, but the Chair hopes that UCEP will proactively identify and champion issues of importance to education.

Chair McLean updated UCEP on the status of the Assembly Eligibility Reform proposal. This proposal was passed by the Assembly and it has been presented to the Regents in detail. President Yudof supports the proposal and it appears that it will be passed in November. If accepted it would take effect in 2012. The public will need to be educated since the perception of the changes is very different from the actual proposal.

## Academic Council

The Chair explained that as UCEP Chair he is part of Academic Council, the executive committee for the Senate Assembly. Council consists of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate, Division chairs and the chair of UCEP and six other systemwide committees. The Council is the conduit for the Senate to the assembly and ultimately to UCOP and the regents.

The following are topics discussed at the September 24 Academic council meeting:

Regarding the budget situation, UC is level-funded this year although health insurance costs have gone up somewhere between 8 to 10%. Faculty salary increases are not likely to happen and contributions to UCRP will re-start in July 2009. President Yudof is committed to keeping UCRP solvent.

The review of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources is happening this year and UCEP will be involved with this process. Last year UCEP discussed the Education Abroad Program (EAP). Due to the costliness of this program, EAP is tasked to produce a strategic business plan by the end of October which UCEP will review. UC does not have a provost right now following Rory Hume's resignation, and there is currently a search for a new chancellor for Davis.

CCGA is regaining its authority over approval of new professional school programs.

## ICAS

Chair McLean participates on the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS). This committee consists of representatives of the Senates for the California State University system, the California Community College system, and UC. The UC representatives are the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate and the chairs of UCEP, BOARS and UCOPE. ICAS focuses on topics of mutual concern to the three systems and they work together on common goals. For example, the three systems unified to fight the budget cuts originally proposed by the state, resulting in improved budget conditions.

The following items were discussed at the September 10 meeting of ICAS:

The master plan is fifty years old and a former state senator is convening a team to revisit the master plan.

Achieve, Inc.'s American Diploma program, an initiative to create national standards for what high school students should know upon graduation was introduced to UC representatives. A plan to upgrade ASSIST, a program that contains articulation information between community colleges, UC and CSU. is being developed. ASSIST is at the Office of the President now but will be transferred back to Irvine. Chair McLean observed that UCEP has been involved with efforts to make transfers from community colleges easier.

## Academic Planning Council

Chair McLean participates on the Academic Planning Council, a joint administrative-Senate that is an advisory body for the provost. This Council will await the new provost to initiate this year's activities.

## II. Consent Calendar

**Action:** The Committee approved the draft June 2, 2008 minutes.

**Action:** The Committee approved the draft 2007-2008 Annual Report.

The UCM Division Request for a Variance to [Senate Regulation 70.B](#) was moved to New Business because of concerns expressed by members.

## III. Consultation with Academic Senate Office

Academic Senate Chair Croughan and Vice Chair Harry Powell joined the meeting to discuss issues facing UC, and rules and guidelines for committee operations. Senate leadership will make an effort to attend some portion of every meeting as their schedules permit.

Eligibility reform is a major issue facing the University, and UCEP has been involved with this for the past several years. The proposal changes the admissions policy for undergraduates. Passed last year by the Academic Assembly, it was put before the Regents in July for discussion. The Regents will vote on the proposal in November or January. The reforms would take effect in 2012.

The University realized about five years ago that it was out of compliance with the Master Plan. The Master Plan requires UC to take the top 12.5% of public high school graduates in the state but for the past five years, UC has admitted 15%. To limit enrollment, UC cut admissions off at 12% by raising the eligibility requirements which left significant numbers of students seriously disadvantaged as a result. BOARS immediately suggested devising eligibility criteria that makes sense. BOARS recommended elimination of the Subject II test, which creates a broader pool of eligible students.

The elimination of the Subject test means that the eligibility index must be adjusted. The proposal changes the guaranteed admission criteria from 4% to 9% in local context and 9% statewide. The eligibility reform will benefit students in rural areas and lower socioeconomic students, and it will put students below the 9% in their graduating class at a disadvantage. The recommendation is to institute an Entitled to Review that requires a 2.8 unweighted GPA as compared to 3.0 weighted GPA used now for eligibility. These GPA values are essentially the same. Public perception is that standards are being lowered and the Regents may require continued use of a 3.0 weighted GPA. The recommendations actually raise the standards for both GPA and SAT I scores. With the exception of eliminating the Subject test, the changes are modest. Of the 12.5% of students, 10% will be from the guaranteed pool. The next 2.5% will come from a pool where broader factors are considered in addition to the SAT and GPA. Chair Croughan noted that high school students and legislators do not understand that guarantee of admission into UC does not mean students are admitted into the colleges to which they applied. There is guaranteed admission into Riverside or Merced, but only 1% of students accept these offers.

To encourage students to be well-prepared for UC, there are 31 major outreach programs based in the Office of the President. The President is evaluating these programs to determine which

will continue, or be expanded or eliminated and he will also look at the campuses' outreach programs. There will be a focus on preparatory education for transfer students from the community colleges as well as K-12.

The state budget is a major issue for UC and the Senate's priorities. The faculty salary plan has been the Senate's first priority for the past three years and the second priority is graduate student support. UC is in year three or four of putting a minimum of \$10 million annually into the campuses to increase scholarships for graduate students. It is not likely that the faculty salary plan will be implemented this year because employee contributions to the retirement program will be restarted and there is an 8% to 11% increase in employee health care costs. In September the Regents approved restarting the UCRP contributions. This is still being figured out since the state must provide the employer contribution but it is likely to be 7% employer and 4% employee. To address the health care costs, the President is exploring whether he can create a stratified system. Although the budget does include \$20 million for the faculty salary plan, the plan costs \$68.5 million dollars for year two. The \$20 million will be used for the employee contribution to the UCRP or health care, or it will be distributed across the campuses for recruitment and retention.

Another major issue is the Compendium, and UCEP will contribute to changing it. Problems with the Compendium process became apparent last year when there were many new schools and programs under review. This year there will be more schools including the proposed School of Global Health. Approximately forty recommendations have been suggested to improve the process. The revised process will be submitted to UCEP for review before December.

Chair Croughan provided some background of the Task Force on Recognizing Students Interned during World War II. The Regents brought this forward as a concern, and other public universities have granted degrees to students. The Senate has been asked to determine the appropriate recognition given the Regents' Standing Order that does not allow honorary degrees. This involves between 500 and 750 individuals who were UC students who were interned. UCEP will discuss appropriate courses of action and the UCEP chair or designee will serve on this committee.

UCEP will review the policy on the rehiring of retired UC employees. This policy went to the Regents for a vote in September before discussion with any other groups. The President promised to act quickly on the new policy because of the public perception of and the media attention on the rehire of UC Berkeley's Chief of Police. The immediate past Senate Chair and current Chair were able to get faculty excluded from this policy so that it applies to staff only. This policy is out for systemwide review and UCEP may not opine though members may discuss it with their divisions. UCEP should consider the implications on the ability of faculty to get their work done if they are unable to rehire retired UC staff.

UCEP will consider issues related to educational policy in the UC accountability framework. The first draft has been distributed and UCEP will provide comments before the end of the year regarding other analyses that should be done or factors that should be considered. A final document will be issued in January and the framework will be done annually. The framework fulfills the accountability issue for the state legislature, therefore certain legislation will not be

enacted. The review by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, currently happening on five campuses, is separate from the UC accountability framework.

Chair Croughan discussed the differences between consultants and guests. The consultants from the Office of the President have been approved by her to attend meetings and are on a standing list. As a result of the restructuring, some expert consultants are gone, and the consultants may change over the course of the year. Guests are invited through Chair Croughan to discuss a particular issue at a specific meeting. The committee decides when consultants should be at the meetings to ensure that members have time for frank conversations. Consultants need to also hear concerns from the committee. The committee can communicate with consultants at any time, and Senate leadership should be included in that communication. UCEP members should communicate back to relevant committees at their campuses about non-confidential issues to provide insight and bring issues from the campuses to UCEP. This is important to keep processes moving forward and ensure consensus. Confidential information in the agenda will be marked as such. Chair Croughan is the only person authorized to speak on behalf of the Senate and all requests from the media should be referred to her.

Vice Chair Powell noted that the Senate's voice is listened to right now. External relations are being taken very seriously under the new president and Senate leadership has been drawn into discussions about how the University presents itself to the public. The Vice Chair commented on the importance of the partnership with the California State University and the community college systems. In light of the current budget difficulties, UC and these systems must advocate for investment in the entire system of public higher education in the state.

Chair Croughan remarked that the President is respectful of the Senate and is a full participant in shared governance. President Yudof communicates with the Chair, seeks input and understands the advisory role of the Senate. His decision-making is very data driven, and the committee is encouraged to provide data and rationale as it submits items for consideration. The Regents are very supportive of the President, and President Yudof has been clear with the Regents about their role.

#### **IV. Undergraduate Education Planning Group's Educational Effectiveness Task Force**

Chair McLean provided background information about the Undergraduate Education Planning Group's Educational Effectiveness Task Force. The Planning Group came out of the Academic Planning Council and former UCEP Chair Keith Williams is Chair of the planning group. The two task forces recommended by the Planning Group have been constituted. The purpose of the Educational Effectiveness Task Force is to develop assessment strategies. UC is not using the testing strategy adopted by many other universities in the country but needs to devise an alternative. UCEP is not directly represented but will be kept informed through Chair Williams and former Academic Senate Chair Michael Brown. At least one member of the task force should be invited to participate in UCEP's meetings to provide updates and receive feedback from the members. UCEP can share ideas and best practices on assessment strategies from the campuses that undergo the WASC review. This information can also be used in the Program Review Panel process.

The second task force is the Postgraduate Outcomes Task Force, charged with determining how to evaluate the longer term impacts of a UC undergraduate education. This task force will develop survey instruments to assess how graduates are doing.

**Discussion:** A member indicated that WASC requires tangible measurable objectives. The state of Virginia enacted a statewide requirement that exit testing be conducted. Resisting objective assessment is not in UC's best interest. It was noted that faculty participation on the Postgraduate Outcomes Task Force is important but the membership is now limited to one faculty member and one department chair. Postgraduate outcomes are the counterpart of the assessment of undergraduate education. A factor to consider is what UC students do with their undergraduate education in the future. There should be substantial faculty input on the Postgraduate Outcomes Task Force.

Assessment practices vary across campuses and across disciplines. In some cases the faculty does not know how to objectively measure whether students receive what is needed. WASC looks for tangible things that can be retained and archived to demonstrate achievement of significant performance. UC needs training on objective measurements.

**Action:** Chair McLean will contact Chair Williams to find out when he or some other task force member can attend a UCEP meeting. UCEP will submit a memo requesting more Senate representation on the Postgraduate Outcomes Task Force.

## **V. Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Revising the Compendium**

The Senate's Associate Director provided an overview of the Compendium. The Compendium is the rule book for school reviews. Unlike CCGA, which is more heavily involved, UCEP may not be involved with Compendium issues at every meeting. The campus divisions handle undergraduate programs. The five year perspectives review process will be improved. Last year some of the issues raised in the reviews of new schools were not addressed by the Compendium, such as financial and budget issues. There is language that is outdated. The Associate Director will staff and UCEP's Chair will sit on the joint administrative/Senate task force revising the Compendium and meetings should start next month. One issue to consider is a process to determine if establishment of a new school will impact another school, and mechanisms to deal with this need to be in place. Disestablishments are complicated, but the rules in the Compendium inadequately address this. It was noted that, in the current budget climate, new schools must be self-supporting.

## **VI. Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Recognizing Students Interned During WWII**

The Chair indicated that a couple of other universities have acted to confer honorary degrees on students interned during World War II. Due to moratorium on honorary degrees, it is necessary to figure out what recognition can be bestowed on these individuals. A couple of UC schools have addressed this in some manner for some of the people who actually earned a degree. This new recognition will include those individuals who did not earn a degree at UC. This process is

not expected to take very long. UCEP should logically participate in this process so Chair McLean requested inclusion of UCEP.

**Discussion:** A member remarked that the moratorium on honorary degrees should not be changed. The equivalent of a degree should be given, in the form of a certification. The type of recognition will also depend on what stage they were in their education when the internment occurred.

**Action:** Professor Kay volunteered to sit on this task force.

## **VII. Policy on Re-employment of UC Retirees**

This policy came about after UCB rehired the Chief of Police with no interruption of service and with a full salary. The Regents wanted to act on this quickly and introduce a policy. This policy is not intended for faculty, therefore UCEP may not need to opine. The policy is for non-instructional positions.

**Discussion:** There is a policy for faculty issues related to recall which is APM 200-22. The committee had a discussion about to whom this new policy applies and in what situations. Since this policy applies to senior management group or staff with a salary in excess of \$205,000, UCEP decided not to opine but to submit a statement reinforcing that this policy does not apply to faculty.

**Action:** The Chair will draft a statement that UCEP declines to opine as long as this policy does not involve faculty and the teaching mission.

## **VIII. UC Accountability Framework**

The accountability framework should be reviewed during a couple of meetings. The committee should think about what has been included and things that could be added. The framework includes a good deal of interesting information. It is intended to help UC measure how well it is doing in a variety of areas within the system, compared to other institutions, and over time.

**Discussion:** One member's campus reviewed this at the beginning of summer and has already provided feedback. The framework includes data on the faculty/student ratio but the measures are abstract. A more direct measure that reflects an undergraduates' contact with faculty is needed. UCEP has looked at trends in class size at UC Davis but it is difficult to draw clear conclusions. At minimum there should be a distinction between upper and lower division classes. It is an important measure of quality that is not in framework. The class size issue is a delicate one in terms of public perception. UCEP has previously looked at class size in terms of the negative impact of the budget crunch on education. There is a need to distinguish the kinds of courses where class size is an issue (e.g. larger classes can still be very good depending on the subject). The UCOP analyst involved in this could be invited to a meeting so that UCEP can ask what information is possible to add.

Two additional indicators suggested are the long-term changes in credit hours being taught by temporary faculty and a longer-term graph of graduate and professional enrollment. There has

been a small decrease in graduate enrollment over the past ten years and increasing it will help UC maintain its distinction as a research institution. The committee discussed whether it should focus on graduate level education since CCGA works on this and decided it can look at the balance with a primary focus on undergraduate education.

A member observed that research is important to UC, but that the framework has only two measures addressing this. These are self-report measures from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). A more objective measure might be from the TIE system, which classifies the types of classes, if there is a question about whether students worked with a faculty member on independent research projects. Faculty could be asked how many of their papers had undergraduate authors.

Members commented that better questions should be on the UCUES. UCLA administers a senior exit survey to which questions about quality could be added. The University should improve the tracking of how many undergraduates go to another tier one school after UC. Data on what percentage of UC students take the GRE, MCAT and similar tests, and how well they perform would be valuable. There might be data on the number of students who take advantage of intra-campus exchange, a program unique to UC. A member pointed out that the inclusion of SUNY Buffalo is an incongruity. Based on the data for many of the measures, perhaps SUNY Buffalo should not be a comparison institution.

One recommendation is to request that divisions collect the desired data from their departments and make it available systemwide. Establishment of an infrastructure for surveying students with standardized language could be another recommendation.

**Action:** The Chair and analyst will start a draft of the initial recommendations for review at the next meeting.

## **IX. Proposal to Reconstitute the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management at the University of California, Riverside**

This proposed reconstitution was previously reviewed by UCEP. UCEP had questions about some information and details not included in the original proposal. The school would create an umbrella College of Business that can confer undergraduate degrees. The original proposal lacked details about how the undergraduate program would be moved from the humanities division to the business school.

**Discussion:** The UCR representative to UCEP provided some background information. Enrollment at UCR declined after Proposition 13 which led to the decision to attract students by adding a business major. Positive changes from the proposed reorganization would be an increase in the number of business courses and moving undergraduate business under this new umbrella. One potential problem is that lecturers who are inexperienced with university teaching are being hired to teach courses. There are questions about whether the quality of instructors and education is addressed in the proposal and whether the school will go deeply enough into the various concentrations. The study plan appears to be consistent with a business major but the proposal does not clearly indicate how heavily lecturers are used and how well qualified they are.



It states that over 60% of faculty will be academically qualified but UCEP would hope that *all* the lecturers are academically qualified and will be integrated into the program in such a way as to provide coherency. UCR should provide data on the proportion of lecturers used in the major in comparison to comparable schools as well as data about curricula at comparable programs. These issues may be more appropriately monitored at the campus level.

Members asked if reconstitution of the school requires moving faculty to this program and what impact this has on existing schools and undergraduate education. It was noted that even with 10 new hires, the school will not reach the mandated student-faculty ratio of 25:1.

**Action:** The Chair and analyst will draft a memo expressing the committee's concerns and send it to the members via email for feedback.

### **X. Achieve Inc. and the California Alignment Institute Team**

The Chair reported that a scheduled briefing with the acting provost on the Achieve initiative has been postponed to this week. The purpose of the American Diploma initiative is to give high school students a list of what they should know upon graduation. Thirty-five states are participating. The initiative came up at an ICAS meeting, and the California State University and community college systems were already on board. There is a long list of people involved so UCEP will probably not participate directly.

**Discussion:** No one on the committee teaches the disciplines required, introductory English and math. The Chair will suggest someone from his campus to Chair Croughan.

**Action:** Chair McLean will recommend someone from UCSB to Senate Chair Croughan.

### **XI. Member Items**

The Chair briefly reviewed a list of potential items that was developed at UCEP's last meeting of 2007-08 with the committee.

1) Opportunities and best practices for involving students in research: Chair McLean pointed to the 2006 UCUES finding that 82% said it was important to attend an institution with world class researchers *but* 55% felt the emphasis on research detracted from the quality of teaching.

**Discussion:** The use of graduate students in providing university instruction could be a factor in the second statistic. UC has argued that being a research institute is a positive thing but the students' perception is not universally aligned with this position. Information is needed about what opportunities are provided and how these can be improved, and about how faculty can improve this perception and mitigate the negative impact of the research emphasis. The statistic might be different if the students responding had participated in research. Perhaps there should be increased awareness of how involvement as an undergraduate in research leads to positive outcomes for UC students. UCEP might be in a position to suggest additional questions for the survey.

- 2) Remote/online instruction and residency: The UCEP Chair is on a task force addressing this.
- 3) Student to faculty ratio and class size: These issues are impacted by the budget.
- 4) Increased use of lecturers: This is also related to the budget. If this is a problem, should there be guidelines limiting the use of lecturers? The vetting process could be improved. The accountability framework should include a look at the use of lecturers.
- 5) Best practices for impacted majors: Issues include students re-taking classes to obtain a higher GPA in order to get into another department and students dropping into and out of classes.
- 6) Student mental health: The UCLA representative mentioned that this is an issue at that campus. UCEP briefly considered a policy regarding 5150s.
- 7) Preparatory education: This issue relates to the Achieve initiative.

The UCSD representative reported that academic integrity is being addressed at that campus. Procedures are being established to handle this, given the high perception of cheating among students. UCSB has also done a lot of work on this.

The Chair noted that UCEP may not get to all of these topics this year and at the next meeting a decision should be made about which of these issues might be addressed during the coming year.

## **XII. New Business**

The UC Merced request for a Variance to Merced Senate Regulation 70.B. was moved from the consent calendar. Prior to this meeting, one member expressed concerns granting a “W” to a student who drops a course, and recommended that UCM limit the number of times a student can repeat a course after receiving the “W.” The UCM representative responded that this recommendation would be considered by the Undergraduate Council. Chair McLean suggested documenting this concern and recommendation in a memo to Council.

**Discussion:** The committee reviewed vague language in this section of the regulation. Specifically, the committee questioned who would determine if there is “good cause” to drop a course or if there is “educational benefit” to dropping the course. UCEP decided to include a recommendation that UCM carefully consider the administrative issues associated with these vague provisions. The committee also discussed the issue of academic dishonesty and the use of grades to punish a student.

The Chair indicated concerns about the modification to Merced Senate Bylaw II.4.B which would expand the Undergraduate Council membership to include the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education as non-voting ex officio members. Given the workload demands due to committee work, faculty might relinquish responsibility to these ex officio members. Members discussed the need to clarify whether ex officio members can be asked to leave. Whether the vice provost and vice chancellor will count toward a quorum should also be clarified. The memo will include a caution against this modification.

**Action:** The Chair and analyst will draft a memo stating the committees' concerns.

Minutes prepared by Brenda Abrams

Meeting adjourned at 3:50

Attest: Stephen McLean