

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2013

Attending: Tim Labor, Chair (UCR), Tracy Larrabee, Vice Chair (UCSC), Ann Plane (UCSB), Donald Curtis (UCSF), Mary Beth Pudup (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Troy Carter (UCLA), Leslie Carver (UCSD) (telephone), Seeta Chaganti (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Jay Sharping (UCM), Mark Springer (UCR), Andrew Kenney (Graduate Student Representative), Max Huft (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Bill Jacob (Chair, Academic Senate), Mary Gilly (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements and Introductions

Chair Labor welcomed the committee to the new academic year and described the retreat with the Senate leadership on September 24th. The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative is moving forward with a plan to spend \$10M on innovative learning technology and 32 proposals received so far. A second call to submit proposals will be made in October with a mid-November deadline. Some of the carved out money will be spent to develop the hub which is a way of organizing articulation or course information. There was a meeting with the provost on September 25th and the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates met the next day. ICAS discussed SB 52 which requires the development of fifty open source text books. Senate Chair Jacobs reported on Senate Bill 195, a bill that requires postsecondary education to specify and adhere to three goals attached to metrics and SB 1440 which enables CCC and CSUs to collaborate on the creation of associate degrees that will ensure a pathway from the CCCs to the CSUs. ICAS also reviewed a report on transfer data and on the final guidelines for IGETC for STEM majors.

UC passed an open access policy on July 24th that will ensure that future research articles by UC faculty are available to the public at no charge. Chair Labor reviewed UCEP's charge for the committee members. Several topics that UCEP will discuss in the coming months include: Senate Regulation 760; articulation of courses between campuses; and a procedure for approving courses for a systemwide database. The chair also announced that two volunteers are needed to serve on the governing body for the UC Education Abroad Program. The committee voted in favor of adding the student representatives to the UCEP listserv.

Discussion: The UCB representative agreed to serve for one year and the UCD representative agreed to serve the two year appointment on the UCEAP governing committee.

Action: The motion to approve the representatives was approved.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gilly, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Chair Jacob thanked the committee members for their service on UCEP. The new president will be visiting each campus. Chair Jacob indicated that the briefing book prepared by the Senate can be shared with UCEP and noted that the divisional chairs will prepare similar briefings. Chair Jacob will attend the first president's cabinet meeting tomorrow. The president will come to Academic Council this

month and to the December Assembly meeting. The changes to the health care plans are substantial and Chair Jacob encouraged everyone to attend the town hall meetings to learn more. UC Path, the new systemwide payroll system, has been rescheduled to start in July 2014 but this date is not necessarily firm. With respect to composite benefit rates, there are potentially substantial changes to the way grants are charged for benefits. Without the knowledge of UCOP administrators, UCB was able to negotiate its own composite benefit rate that includes a separate rate for summer salary.

The community colleges are interested in offering degrees in nursing and technical fields for which preparation may include a bachelor's degree. The open access policy is being implemented at UCSF, UCLA, and UCI. The governor attended the September Regents meeting and is very focused on undergraduate education. The governor does not support tuition increases because an increase will require the state to fund more Cal Grants. The budget discussions with the governor will focus on how the 5% increase for UC will not address all of UC's funding issues. The budget presented included a 3% pay increase for unrepresented staff for 2014-15. The new total remuneration study will provide the president with a good understanding of faculty salaries including how UC faculty fare against the comparison eight institutions.

IGETC for STEM has been approved by ICAS. Senate Bill 1440, degrees for transfer, requires CSU GE or IGETC. In the STEM fields, adding a full IGETC pattern for a SB 1440 degree is a lot, but IGETC for STEM allows the CCCs and CSUs to deem what meets the requirements. BOARS is also closely monitoring the "1440" degrees. There are thirty transfer model curricula and nine hundred degree paths across the community colleges. Over one thousand students entering the CSUs this year have completed one of these degrees. SB 1440 will result in money being shifted away from remedial courses, and there is also a question of who will teach these students. The common core state standards will have some influence on the type of students UC gets in the next decade. SB 195, which has been signed by the governor, calls for an as-yet unidentified group of people to be established in order to develop metrics for higher education.

The evaluation report of the online instruction program has been provided to the Senate but it will be edited. In response to the ILTI RFP, thirty-two proposals were received and the steering committee thinks that about twenty courses will be funded. The focus of ILTI will be matriculated students. The issue of intellectual property rights is still being discussed, and this may have become a greater concern for some people who reviewed the Coursera contracts. Administrators at several campuses asked for the opportunity to review courses submitted by their faculty first but this was not approved. The resources that campuses will have to contribute have to be negotiated. The same RFP will be reissued with due dates in November and individuals whose proposals have previously been rejected will receive feedback to improve those proposals. Some existing courses may be funded. Some of the \$10M will be spent on the "hub" which will be a database of some sort. It is not clear to Chair Jacob how the hub will interface with the instructor of record.

Discussion: The committee discussed concerns about the plan to spend \$5M on the hub. A member suggested developing courses that help with the highly impacted courses. There is a concern that people who have been involved with questionable budget decisions related to implementation of online education at UC in the past will be deciding how much money should be spent on the hub. Chair Jacob agreed that UCEP could send a letter requesting the opportunity to review plans for the hub before a contract to build it is signed.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

The Academic Planning Council, composed of UCOP administrators and Senate faculty, was reestablished several years ago. Changes will be made to the Compendium section on multicampus research units to bring it in line with the policies in the Academic Personnel Manual. Changes will be made to the five year planning perspectives which have not been collected in three years. A significant issue for UCEP this year will be the long-range enrollment plans and the APC will also examine the plans. Campuses have already submitted data. UCD is starting its review under the WASC redesign, to be followed by UCB in the second group of pilot institutions and UCSC. New rubrics are being developed for use broadly by all institutions for general reviews and there are concerns about some of the rubrics especially among the undergraduate deans. The new WASC president will meet with Provost Dorr next week. Based on feedback from UC, WASC is reconsidering how it will evaluate graduate completion rates. These activities are occurring against the preparations to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. In its redesign, WASC is attempting to create practices that serve a huge range of institutions. UC, Stanford and other research universities feel they are being caught up in accountability measures aimed at seeking bad behavior at institutions nothing like the University.

IV. SR 760

Last year, the campuses were asked if UCEP should propose a systemwide definition or if campuses should develop their own definitions, and expressed a preference to have UCEP develop the definition. UCEP could again ask the campuses if they would like UCEP to develop a standard definition.

Discussion: Since there are differences at the campuses with respect to the types of programs, there should be divisional rules. A systemwide standard definition that can be superseded could be developed later. A member suggested that a definition could be developed for a quarter-unit standard and a second definition developed for a semester-unit standard. WASC was satisfied with the definition at UCB. The unit definition matter could be a moving target and it could be addressed at a later date when it becomes more critical or is challenged. Associate Director Baxter explained that the unit definition came to the attention of WASC because of the emergence of online instruction. It was noted that local campuses and instructors can still deviate from anything that UCEP might say.

Some divisions are reliant on SR 760 and they will be motivated to look carefully at this regulation as their accreditation visits are come up. A member suggested adding a statement to the regulation that online courses have to match the equivalent courses, content-wise, offered in person. After some discussion, the committee agreed that online courses should not be treated differently and should not be defined in the regulation. Since WASC reviews the UC campuses and not the system as a whole, it should be okay for there to be nine different definitions. A member noted that the unit definition is being used to define faculty workload. Since campuses are dealing with this individually, it may be okay for UCEP to table the matter. The committee approved a motion for Chair Labor to draft a systemwide definition for the purposes of advisement.

V. Systemwide Course Approval Guidelines

Vice Chair Larrabee reported that the guidelines developed last year by UCEP were presented to Council in July and Council did not agree with them. The feedback from Council was that there is an existing regulation that allows students to take courses at any UC campus for credit so UCEP's guidelines represent an extra hoop. Chair Labor has developed a draft proposal for UCEP to consider today. UCEP is involved with the approval process because of the non-matriculated students that were to be enrolled in these courses. If campuses want to enroll non-matriculated students, the systemwide

designation should be sought. The intercampus double major would allow some students with a particular class of major to have two different majors from different campuses. This strategy would eliminate the need for articulation of courses for everyone.

Discussion: The committee discussed the idea of intercampus double majors. It is not clear how many students pursue two majors at different campuses, and a member believes this is a solution to a problem that does not exist. There may be challenges related to admissions and enrollment prerogatives at different campuses. Reportedly the UCSB history department has a joint program with Sacramento State that allows graduate students to move back and forth between faculty at both institutions. The double major would empower divisions and departments and will let UC use its catalog more effectively. It was noted that UCEAP is increasingly building its own courses which UCIE will approve.

Chair Labor indicated that the goal is to remove UCEP from this process as much as possible so the committee can focus primarily on courses that involve an external UC entity such as non-matriculated students or course-producing entities that lack campus approval. The impetus for the double major was based on the need to improve articulation by increasing the number of courses available to UC students by including other campuses. No approval of the intercampus courses by UCEP would be needed and any course that articulates is defined as an intercampus course. UCEP's discussions about the guidelines at the end of last year focused on encouraging high articulation value. A separate document will be developed about the concept of intercampus double majors. Double majors can happen by petition already. This would enable two campuses to develop a joint major. It will demonstrate to the governor and legislature UC's commitment to articulation. A member does not think the double major proposal addresses any of the issues that UCEP discussed last year or the governors' and legislators' concerns. The idea is not one that the divisions have been exploring and it is not clear how this fits with the UC culture, with the distinctiveness of the campuses, or with local control of faculty Senate over academic content. The purpose of this document is not to encourage articulation. Committee members agreed that UCEP is not really equipped to deal with articulation issues. For an intercampus course to accept non-matriculated students it would have to be given a systemwide designation. An analysis of what double majors would mean to impacted majors should be conducted. A motion and seconded was made for the chair to revise the document so that systemwide course and intercampus course items are separated. Members will send comments to the chair. Chair Labor asked that the committee members distribute the discussion document on a very limited basis and the second draft can be shared.

The chair asked UCEP to consider creating a subcommittee to approve systemwide courses. There was a motion not to create a subcommittee to review the courses. How the reviews are conducted should be discussed after the guidelines are finalized.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:15 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tim Labor