

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2014

Attending: Tracy Larrabee, Chair (UCSC), Tony Smith, Vice Chair (UCI), Ann Plane (UCSB), Donald Curtis (UCSF), John Tamkun (UCSC), Jonathan Wurtele (UCB), Jack Vevea (UCM), Thomas Stahovich (UCR), Simon Penny (UCI), Geoffrey Cook (UCSD), Gabrielle Nevitt (UCD), Robby Boparai (Undergraduate Student Representative), Jocelyn Banaria (Analyst, Institutional Research and Academic Planning), Michael Trevino (Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs), Mary Gilly (Chair, Academic Senate), Dan Hare (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Larrabee welcomed the members and explained the confidential nature of UCEP discussions. Members were reminded to not share documents or specifics about the committee's deliberations unless instructed to by the chair. Some of the topics UCEP will consider in the coming year will be of interest to some members of the public. The committee voted to add the student representative to the UCEP listserv.

The chair explained that two UCEP members participate on the UC Education Abroad Program's governing committee. The UCSB representative has agreed to serve on this body and last year's UCD representative will serve the final year of her two year term. Chair Larrabee described some of the other meetings the UCEP chair or vice chair attend. The chair shared her impressions of President Napolitano with the committee and the analyst forwarded recent statements from the president about her freshman year at UC. Today, UCEP will have a preliminary discussion about the meaning of a UC degree and members should have this conversation with their campus undergraduate committees.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Vice Chair*
- *Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director*

Chair Gilly thanked the UCEP members for their service this year. A web chat with President Napolitano and all faculty is scheduled for October 14th and UCEP members are encouraged to share the word and to participate. The president has referred to herself as the CEO of the University and is an advocate in spite of not having been a member of the faculty. President Napolitano has announced a number of initiatives with tight timelines, but she does seem to be developing a better understanding about the importance of consultation with the Senate. Chair Gilly announced that the Senate leadership will meet twice a month with the president. Dan Dooley, the Senior Vice President for External Relations, will be stepping down and Nelson Peacock has been hired to serve as Senior Vice President of Government Relations and Julie Henderson will serve as the Senior Vice President of Communications and Stakeholder Relations. The president also plans to bring in a senior adviser on innovation and entrepreneurship.

The provost announced to Council that the third request for proposals for online courses has been released, with a November deadline. The request is for fully online courses (i.e. not hybrids) that are open to cross campus enrollment. The Senate leadership is on a steering committee for ILTI. Chair Gilly reported that a steering committee is making decisions about non-resident student tuition. The idea of professional development for doctoral students is being discussed by the steering committee. Other issues include diversifying the doctoral applicant pool and providing other types of support such as housing and family friendly policies. Best practices

from the campuses have been shared. These ideas will be discussed briefly with the Regents. The president has initiated a strategic operational review of resources at UCOP which is not aimed at reducing staff.

A new total remuneration study of campus faculty (excluding health sciences faculty) has been completed. The study replicates the 2009 study so that comparisons can be made. Chair Gilly remarked that some of the Regents have commented that UC faculty salaries are low but that the benefit package makes up the difference but the results of this study refute that claim. The only data from the comparison eight institutions is the average salary by rank and step. The comp eight data is not disaggregated to allow for campus specific comparisons. The study has taken two years to complete and UC had to pay the consultants to get the data back. Vice Chair Hare indicated that the Senate may want to think of recommendations to address the salary lag that could be made to the Regents when the study is presented. The cost of UC Care will be increasing rather significantly because many of the individuals in the program are older and require more services. The need for this type of increase is not unusual but anyone facing an increase may want to consider a health savings account plan as a way to deal with it.

The report from the sexual assault task force was discussed at the September Regents meeting. The first phase focused on students but Chair Gilly noted that the task force had no Senate representatives. One issue raised by a student survivor who spoke to the Regents is the need for faculty sensitivity training. Faculty need to know that students are to be referred to a confidential office. It is not yet clear whether this training will be folded into the two-hour state mandated sexual harassment prevention training. The student survivor also asked for academic accommodations that should be made by faculty for victims. Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Sheryl Vacca has reassured Chair Gilly that the Senate will be involved in the next phases. Students have also called for increased funding for mental health services.

Regent Blum has questioned whether UC has received its fair share of the funds from proposition 30 which the Regents supported. Last spring, the president rescinded guideline 13 that prevented UC's direct investment into faculty startups. The office of the chief investment officer has created UC Venture which will allocate over \$250M over the next five years to invest in faculty startups. Immediate past chair Jacob outlined a number of concerns in a memo to President Napolitano over the summer including faculty conflict of interest. Faculty are allowed 39 days a year for consulting but this limit is not realistic when working on a start up. The president has established an Innovation Council comprised of 18 venture capitalists. Of the five workgroups, those focused on creating a culture of entrepreneurship and creating rewards for faculty through promotion and tenure will include Senate representation. There is a concern that UC will start hiring people whose research focus have startup potential.

Chair Gilly noted that Regent Keiffer has repeatedly asked for a presentation about the meaning of a UC degree. The president reviewed the Senate's ideas and has asked that the Senate postpone further work on this topic until she speaks to Regent Keiffer. The president is suggesting having a special breakfast for those Regents interested in this topic. An idea being considered is to provide the Regents with a presentation about what the classroom experience is currently like for students. Some have the perspective that the increased use of technology in the classroom makes the student faculty ratio less important.

Discussion: Chair Larrabee expressed concern about the decision to make online education the primary focus of the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (formerly just UCCC) after UCEP has dedicated significant amounts of time and energy into the initiative at UC. UCEP should continue to be invited to opine, even on the highly technical matters related to online education. Chair Gilly and Vice Chair Hare agreed that UCEP should continue to be involved with ILTI and that a member of UCEP should be an ex officio member of UCACC. UCEP should continue to provide feedback on issues such as cross campus enrollment and other issues related to educational policy. A member noted that the RFP included a list of preferred courses but the list was not vetted with UCEP. Chair Gilly indicated that the list was developed during the summer. Students participate in the reviews of the proposals.

It is not clear how much progress the campuses have made toward establishing the confidential office for

reporting sexual assaults. Following the incident in May, students at UCSB have been instructed to say something if they notice something wrong. Members discussed the question from Regent Keiffer about the meaning of a UC degree and potential responses. Chair Larrabee hopes that UCEP will write a short document about the value of a UC education. It was noted that campuses are trying to differentiate themselves, so the question about the meaning of a degree may well vary by campus. The analyst will forward UCEP's white papers on UC quality and undergraduate research to the committee.

III. Highlights from 2013-2014

Chair Larrabee provided members with a brief review of UCEP's involvement with UC's online education effort over the past two years. Existing regulations allows students to take a course at another UC campus for unit credit at the very least. However, there is no regulation that says the courses have to be used for anything beyond units, so articulation remains an issue. It was noted that there are systemwide courses that UCEP will continue to review such as the one on today's agenda.

UCEP also spent time discussing the evaluation of the online project. The evaluation report itself will never be publicly available but UCEP's feedback about the evaluation is posted on UCEP's website. UCEP reviewed a proposal for a very expensive online registration system. It is not clear that the registrars were consulted about the proposed design. The committee has also discussed issues related to the Western Accreditation of School and Colleges. The report of the Transfer Action Team was reviewed and UCEP will monitor implementation of the team's recommendations. UCEP talked about AP credit which is a controversial subject at some campuses. Chair Larrabee invited members to suggest topics for the agendas.

Discussion: It was noted that students from non-accredited schools cannot apply to medical school. WASC accreditation can also have an impact on a number of student loan programs. A member commented that although UCEP spent a good deal of time focusing on online education, the committee pushed back against the administration on many important issues. The committee discussed the usual process for drafting UCEP memos and Chair Larrabee plans to ask members to help writing documents.

IV. Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Degree Programs

As a Compendium committee, UCEP will review proposed programs. UCSC started a "3+3" degree program which will allow a student to attain a JD and a BA in six years. The idea is that students finish the degree requirements at UCSC except for the required number of units and then go to Hastings. Chair Larrabee remarked that according to the Compendium, only CCGA needs to sign off on this type of program. Members are asked to consider whether UCEP should review hybrid programs.

Discussion: This is a matter of concern in part due to UC's residency requirements. UCEP members agreed that this committee should review proposed hybrid programs. UCSC does not anticipate that a large number of students will enroll in its joint program with Hastings. Hastings does not answer to CCGA and the Compendium indicates that UCEP is not required to review the program proposal. The UCSC program provides a pathway for a small, select group of qualified students. There might be a systemwide push for more of these hybrid programs to provide students for self-funded graduate programs. Chair Larrabee commented that it is problematic that CCGA did not review the UCSC proposal for its Hastings program. Some type of oversight is needed going forward.

The Compendium may focus on the CCGA approval because the assumption is that the undergraduate degree is not being changed. One concern is that this model will be used because of the pressure related to time to degree and to streamline and create three year degrees. UCEP should argue that it should be consulted about these programs. It was reported that UCSD has a number of similar programs. Members agree that UCEP has an interest in degree programs that impact undergraduate programs. The motion was made to send a letter to Senate Chair Gilly that the Compendium should be reconfigured to include UCEP in the review of hybrid programs. UCEP does not have to propose wording to correct this. A member commented that campuses might develop

informal joint programs which are not monitored. There was a discussion about self-supporting programs and the effort to enroll undergraduates in them. Chair Larrabee clarified that UCEP has not been asked to comment on the UCSC program with Hastings. A systemwide residency requirement would be needed to prevent problems with hybrid programs, especially those with entities that are not affiliated with UC. The purpose of UCEP's review is to raise questions about unintended consequences of a campus decision, not necessarily to veto a proposal. A member suggested that some type of residency requirement is needed for joint programs. A general rule about the number of units taken out of residency might be a rule that UCEP proposes. UCEP's memo will focus on the process. The UCI representative agreed to help draft the committee's memo.

V. Systemwide Course Approval

UCEP is asked to grant systemwide approval for a course involving UC's natural reserve system. Chair Larrabee invited members to share their comments and questions about the proposal. The goal is to start the course in Spring 2015.

Discussion: One question about the program is about future plans to include faculty from different UC campuses. It would seem that a systemwide program would take advantage of systemwide resources. A member also questioned how UCEAP can be the administrative home for this project when UCSB is the administrative home to the UCEAP office. The proposer should clarify how the students will be packaged in terms of their financial aid, as the UCEAP office reportedly does not handle this at present. A student's home campus handles the financial aid package needed for EAP. UCEP should ask if it is a systemwide program or if it is a UCSC program that draws students from other campuses. Financial aid offices will need to pay attention to the students enrolling in this course so their packages are put together and advising provided in a timely manner. This will involve interacting with nine financial aid offices.

There was also some confusion about the prerequisites for the systemwide version of the course, because these should be UCSC courses. Another member agreed that the prerequisites should be cleaned up so that students can easily identify the courses at their home campuses. The course will be seven weeks and 19 units but the number of units is not explicitly justified. Nor is it clear if the proposed course will be for 19 or 20 units. Although the head of the reserves is thought to be a faculty member at UCD, UCEP's UCD representative reports that there has been no news at the campus about this proposed course. The committee's concerns about the involvement of other campuses should be emphasized in UCEP's feedback. The UCSB College of Creative Studies (CCS) will be the host for the art and science course. Even UCSB students have difficulty taking courses from CCS because CCS does not give letter grades. The memo will note that the lack of letter grades may be problematic for the purposes of articulation. UCEP's memo will state that this looks like a great program UCEP would like to see succeed but that members found some elements of the proposal to be confusing. The members agreed the vote on this program can eventually be handled over email. The members also agreed to ask the division to revise the proposal for clarity.

The committee agreed that if this is a course just for UCSC and UCSB, it does not need UCEP's systemwide approval. The memo should note the lack of clarity about the need for UCEP's approval but indicate that the review did generate a number of questions. Chair Larrabee also shared that the proposer was at one point advised by the Provost that UCEP's approval was not required.

Action: The chair, UCSB and analyst will draft a memo with the committee's feedback.

VI. Compendium Reviews

The chair asked for the committee's feedback UCLA's pre-proposal for reconstitution to establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and to redefine the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture. A link to the Compendium has been provided.

Discussion: Members noted that UCEP does not have to second-guess the need for the planned reorganization.

The committee might ask if the reorganization will impact current undergraduates but there was agreement that the proposal contained no red flags. The memo from UCEP should state that the committee read with interest the pre-proposal and looks forward to receiving the complete proposal in the future.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft the committee's memo.

VII. International Students at UC

- *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs*

The enrollment of international students at UC has garnered an increasing amount of attention. The number of international students at each campus varies widely, and the percentage of undergraduate students alone may reach the double digits at some UC campuses. Some people think that the admission of high quality international students means that high quality California students are being denied. UCEP members should also ask the question of whether enrolling international students really is the best thing for UC. Decisions made related to funding streams and rebenching have compelled campuses to increase the enrollment of international students. Decisions such as these may have unintended consequences from an educational point of view. This is a hot-button issue for the Senate leadership and today will be just an initial discussion for UCEP.

Discussion: From the CEP perspective questions include whether the large presence of international students has altered the experience of native students in lectures or session or impacted the native freshman or transfer student's educational path or experience. One member is aware of how the increase in international students has impacted things such as English as a Second Language or early career writing structures as well as TA structures within particular majors. At one campus, about 40% of the students in the economics major are international students. A member shared that a Russian LGBT study abroad student was encouraged to apply for asylum when he was in the U.S. and in response, Russia may have demanded its study abroad program participants return to Russia. Members speculated about the need to anticipate an international incident that leads to large numbers of UC's international students leaving the University.

The information available to UCEP right now is primarily anecdotal. People who complain have alleged that all of the international students are flunking out of UC, which is untrue. The data that is available illustrates that the international students are not academically failing but there is no documentation about any impact on the students who are not foreign. The dramatic increase in the numbers of international students at most campuses began about three years ago and some data on their performance is available now. This data shows that some of the international students are struggling but many are doing just as well or better than anyone else. The chair commented that the Senate leadership is looking to UCEP to provide a thoughtful campus-wide position on international students. The particular issues of concern to UCEP are related to the non-international students and the impact.

Members of the state legislature and even of UC's own Board of Regents have reportedly perpetuated the falsehood that UC is accused of not admitting some California students because of the international students the campuses are enrolling. There is a suggestion that it is a one to one trade off which one UCEP member argues is not correct. It was noted that some issues related to international students are slightly different from the issues related to non-California resident students who are from the U.S. Director Trevino from Admissions reported that data is available on the overall number of international students with a breakdown by campus. Systemwide the number of freshman admitted to UC for fall 2013 who were international applicants was just under 3,800. By way of background, it was noted that BOARS passed a policy requiring that the non-resident students should compare favorably to native students and each campus reports on this annually. The international students have higher GPAs and higher SAT scores than California residents. The average first year GPA for the international students once at UC is higher than the GPA for the California students.

The California resident enrollment targets are set first and UC is currently educating about six thousand more California students than the state provides funding for. It is fair to say that funds from UC and from the non-resident students is revenue that helps fund these additional six thousand California natives. The funds from out

of state tuition go into the general fund and the campuses use these funds in a variety of ways. UCEP would like to see data that illustrates the annual increases in native California students beside the increase in international students. According to Director Trevino, UC has enrolled more qualified students than the Master Plan requires and BOARS has readjusted the formula used by the statewide index for the guarantee as a result.

A member inquired about efforts to diversify the international student population and Director Trevino suggested it may be possible to survey the admissions directors. The initial request for data to Director Trevino includes data on the current composition of the undergraduate student body and the steps campuses are taking to broaden its diversity. It was also suggested that data on the majors pursued by international students should be reviewed. If the majors selected by international students are impacted, native California students may be displaced. Chair Larrabee proposed that UCEP members should talk to people at their campuses about what UCEP should be monitoring and who should be engaged in this discussion. The committee will create a list of the types of data it would like to see. Members were cautioned against just looking at data and should instead speak to student representatives and vice chancellors to find out what is really involved from the people closest to this issue. A member reported that the Student Association has found that there are significant numbers of academic integrity violations committed by international students. Best practices that have been developed could be shared across the campuses. The UCD representative indicated that the campus does not have enough large lecture halls to accommodate increased enrollment.

VIII. Meaning of a UC Degree

UCEP is encouraged to have a discussion about the meaning of a UC degree although no action is required at the moment. UC is moving more towards specialization than toward a more general, liberal arts education. Chair Larrabee encouraged members to discuss this question by starting with what this means at their campuses.

Discussion: A member reminded the committee that UCEP produced a paper on UC quality which the new members might want to review. It will be important to provide evidence to support statements about what UC offers students. Potential audiences for the paper include taxpayers, the governor, and the Regents but Chair Larrabee suggests it will be most useful for current and future members of UCEP. Members agreed to aim for brevity. UCEP should keep in mind that there are things that UC should be able to do and what UC can really provide to students.

IX. UCEP Goals and Priorities for 2014-2015

The members were invited to recommend topics for future UCEP meetings.

Discussion: A member proposed discussing a faculty who received a \$25 gift card from a student for writing a letter of recommendation. Another member suggested discussing harassment of faculty by students, an issue of potential interest to the Committee on Faculty Welfare. It is very likely that some segments of the faculty suffer from more harassment than do others. One campus developed a policy on disruptive behavior. Vice Chair Smith recommended that UCEP may need to discuss any changes that result from the community college system as it begins to offer four year degrees for the first time. It is not clear if these four year degrees will diminish UC's transfer student population. Enrollment management is another agenda item and UCEP will receive a presentation on the basics of budget in November.

X. New Business

A January conference on undergraduate completions is being planned by IRAP and invitations to Senate members will be forthcoming. A consulting firm is working with UCI on predictive analytics and UCEP may want to consider the future impact of this type of data.

XI. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:35 pm

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tracy Larrabee