

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2009

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD), David Kay, Vice-Chair (UCI), Constantin Teleman (UCB), John Yoder (UCD), David Pan (UCI), Jose Wudka (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Gerardo Aldana (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC) (telephone), James Levin (UCSD), Peter Loomer (UCSF), Matthew Palm (Undergraduate Student Representative), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Kate Jeffery (Student Financial Support, Student Affairs), David Alcocer (Student Financial Support, Student Affairs), Hilary Baxter (Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Harry Powell (Academic Senate Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

The Academic Council and the Assembly have a good relationship with the president and have had good discussions with him during recent meetings. The president met with the Assembly and a report on the budget was provided. The state provides \$7788 dollars per student, almost half of the amount provided 15 years ago. The president will propose to the Regents two fees increases for a total of 32% for undergraduates and graduate fees will not go up. The decision to not have furlough days on days of instruction was explained by the president. The president's perception is that proposing a fee increase and allowing furlough on days of instruction would have had a very negative impact. Two thousand people have been laid off in the past year and the furlough program has prevented more layoffs. A standing order passed by the Regents in July formalized and put constraints on the president's emergency powers.

An effort to raise one billion in funds for undergraduate students was announced. A four year plan to decrease enrollment by 2500 students annually is now underway. Whether the plan is implemented over the next few years will depend on the funding from the state. There has been some confusion about claims of hidden funds that could be used to solve the current fiscal crisis. Those funds are allocated for a variety of uses but not yet ready to be dispersed, and are not available for other uses. The plan for employees and the state to start paying into the retirement system is still in place. Some changes may need to be made to ensure the program is fully funded because putting fees into the retirement plan will not solve the problem. The state law prohibits UC from not paying out retirement but there is flexibility with regard to providing health care to retirees. There were 13.3 billion in health care costs associated with the retirement program, primarily due to employees who retire before age 65 and are not yet covered by Medicare. The average retirement age for staff is 59.5 and the average faculty retirement age is 65. Providing incentives for people to work longer is a possibility and several other scenarios are being explored by TFIR and administrative groups. At Academic Council, Chair Powell indicated that letters from Planning and Budget and UCEP were instrumental in getting the proposal for differential fees by major pulled from the Regents November agenda. This idea will be considered by the UC Commission on the Future. UCB's chancellor has decided to increase the number of out of state students and this will have an impact on other campuses. A concern is whether there will not be space for California students.

A final decision about central funding for the Education Abroad Program has not been made. The options include 20% state funding and 80% student fees, 5% state funding and 95% student fees, or

no state funding. UCEP should comment on other issues raised in the EAP Task Force report. EAP should be considered an academic program so the Senate can be involved with decisions about it. The Academic Planning Council, which is comprised of faculty and administrators, met a week ago. The UC Commission on the Future was discussed as well as the question of how quality is defined. The Undergraduate Education Mission Statement was discussed and, since graduate education is not included in that statement, a decision will be made about broadening it or developing a new one. The APC also discussed the online and remote education report and the feedback from faculty about the initiative. Money for the initiative is not available yet. The timing of requesting a pre-proposal was discussed, and the question is whether to wait until funding is in place. The APC also discussed whether campus calendars should be aligned, noting that there are advantages and disadvantages for students with both the semester and quarter systems. Multi-campus or cross campus courses are being discussed as a cost savings strategy.

UC requires 146 days of instruction whereas the average for other AAU institutions is 130. Provost Pitts is open to considering whether reducing the days of instruction would be beneficial, particularly if the intent was to provide study days prior to final examinations in lieu of classroom instruction. Several campuses are considering changing the unit level of courses. Across the campuses there are significant differences in the number of hours used to teach the same course. The community colleges and CSUs are working on the C-ID project to create more direct articulation between the two systems with respect to course content. It is important for UC to be involved in the C-ID project to help reduce the potential that the community colleges and CSUs set up a system that does not match UC's requirements. Chair Williams has been involved with the project for the past two years and would like a member of UCEP to participate on it.

An ICAS subcommittee and a state legislature committee are looking at the master plan, although it is unlikely that any changes will be made to it. Students will be invited to the December ICAS committee meeting to talk about the advocacy effort. UC students will march on Sacramento in March. ICAS wants to unify the various advocacy efforts. Faculty will be asked to meet with legislators they know to advocate for higher education. One proposal is to hold ICAS meetings in Sacramento.

In the past UCEP has been somewhat involved with the Science and Math Initiative now known as Cal Teach. Half of the funding for Cal Teach came from state funds and UCOP provided the other half, but all of the original external funding for this program has been utilized. A Senate member will be involved in the external review the president has asked for. A part time vice provost of educational instruction will have some involvement with Cal Teach. The president's position is that funding for Cal Teach should come from the campuses but the Cal Teach executive committee is arguing for some level of continued support from UCOP. Whether Cal Teach should be at all of the campuses is a question that may be addressed in the external review. Eliminating the program at one or more campuses may eliminate an opportunity for students at that campus to consider a career in teaching.

The UC Commission on the Future is visiting the campuses and getting valuable input. The workgroup membership is still being finalized and will include students. Up to three regents will be on each workgroup. The proposed questions to be considered may be changed based on what the

Commission co-chairs hear on the listening tour and from suggestions of work group members. Before the recommendations go to the Regents they will be vetted by the Senate.

Chair Williams mentioned that UCEP does not need to opine on the proposed revisions to the SMG policies and the revisions to the APM and the committee agreed. Concerns have been expressed about the proposed revision to the UCEP charge. A significant concern is that the revised charge would narrow the focus to only undergraduate educational policy. There are issues related to educational policy that are not specific to undergraduate education or graduate education. The committee agreed that the systemwide review of the proposed revision should be stopped and that a more carefully worded revised charge will be submitted.

Action: UCEP will submit a letter to Council requesting that the systemwide review of the proposed revisions is stopped and the committee will work on a new revised charge.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved the October 5, 2009 meeting minutes.

Action: The committee approved including the students in the listserv.

III. Report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force

The Educational Planning group formed the Educational Effectiveness Task Force and a task force looking at UC graduates. The second task force is on hold until the UCOP survey of graduates is implemented. Comments on the Educational Effectiveness Task Force report are due January 4, 2010. UCEP will have an initial discussion and finalize its comments in December. UC declined to participate in the Voluntary System of Accountability because UC did not want to use the Collegiate Learning Assessment or other similar general tests mandated by VSA. The task force was established to explore alternatives to the CLA. The president made statements a year ago that he is comfortable with the CLA so it might be used as a stop gap measure, but the task force report recommends against use of a generalized test.

Discussion: WASC wants direct evidence of student learning which the CLA does not provide. Standardized ways to measure student learning do not exist because of the complexity of the subject. Two strains of best practices include one related to standardized testing and one related to discipline based assessments. The UEETF report recommends starting assessment at the level of the major or program. Discipline based assessments are a starting point to move toward campus wide measures. Reports about student learning outcomes should be directed towards students. Identifying the particular pieces of student learning and determining how to measure the outcomes requires significant faculty time and expertise is also needed. Assessing and improving curriculum and demonstrating accountability should be addressed separately. Utilization of more standard rubrics could be used to assess programs. Measures already used by outside organizations to rank schools may be acceptable to demonstrate accountability. Data to assess and improve the curriculum could be collected and examined at the same time as the program review. A random sample of students could be asked to rate themselves on the learning outcomes. UCEP members will review the report and provide feedback.

IV. Education Abroad Program Task Force Report

The Governing Committee met last week and the two UCEP members on the committee reported on the issues raised during the discussion. Decisions have been made to close several study centers. The Governing Committee will not be involved in making the decision about the budget, but may be involved in determining how the cuts are distributed. One question that was not addressed is whether differential fees would be charged for some programs. A few programs are being considered for cuts, those where there are not enough students and those that are more expensive because of the nature of the program. UCEP could advocate for the budget option that uses more UCOP funds and for how the fees are structured. An additional problem is whether the EAP-related credits count toward a student's major. An administrative process to handle approving the course for credit towards a major exists but it is not clear where the process breaks down. The Governing Committee will meet again this month.

Discussion: Articulation has always been a problem. UC may need to negotiate things like getting the course syllabi in advance. One idea is to develop a subset of courses that count for the major. A clearinghouse with courses that have been reviewed and approved by UC faculty could be a cost effective way to manage the pre-approval process. It may be difficult for students to get information about the courses from the host university when planning their program abroad. Additional fees for specific programs were implemented this year on an ad hoc basis and these will be increased incrementally over the next few years. The regular UC fees cover the cost of other programs. Financial aid may not cover the additional fees making this a deterrent for low income students who want to participate in EAP. Differential fees were implemented to make up for the decrease of general fund dollars and are used for the additional fees that UC has to cover. Strategies to eliminate the need for differential fees were discussed including charging every student in EAP a flat fee. Two thousand five hundred UC students participate in EAP and about 1500 students from abroad come to UC. The Task Force also recommends moving the EAP office on to a campus.

V. Remote and Online Instruction Task Force Report

Comments in response to the report from the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency are due January 15, 2009.

Discussion: There is a fear that using online instruction might compromise quality. Based on one study, expected savings from the use of online instruction have not materialized. Opinions about online instruction vary significantly. The amount of work required to develop online courses should not be underestimated. One member expressed concerns about including courses with a lab component. Faculty proposals should describe how the online course is on par with in person courses. The point was made that the community colleges and other universities may be offering online courses that are not identified as such and UC may be accepting transfer students who took these courses. Registrars will need to track whether courses are only online or if they are blended online and face to face courses. Methods to confirm that the work is being submitted by the student must be in place. Each campus will have to approve the online courses. The request for proposals process will give UC data to better inform the decisions about online courses. Faculty should be encouraged to explore appropriate ways to use technology. Faculty will be forced to determine what it is they do in the classroom that matters. Online instruction could be a solution for lack of space in

large lectures. The committee discussed the need for UC to develop online education in a way that incorporates the UC culture and style.

Campuses need to ask what the impact online education will have on at risk students. A UCB study found that students who took a course online had lower grades than students who took the same course in person. Online courses are organized in a variety of ways so some are highly interactive and others are passive. Faculty can build a community that gives students the opportunity to interact with their peers. A member asked if there has been a discussion about a cap on the number of online courses that can be that could be counted toward a major or degree. The potential for miscommunication if there is a reliance on electronic communication will require a significant amount of faculty time. It should be clear that online education can be effective under certain conditions. Faculty who are interested in online education may need to learn how to teach online. The startup and ongoing costs are large so there will not likely be cost savings. As UC explores using online education it is important to keep in mind how this will be perceived by the public. One suggestion was to implement online courses during the summer. Faculty at multiple UC campuses could contribute to developing a course taught in a standard way to create buy-in for some high-enrollment or gateway courses. A concern expressed was that offering a course across campuses might result in other faculty who teach that course being eliminated. The use of graduate students in online instruction should be discussed. Online instruction is a way to enable access to classes that are full.

VI. University Student Aid Program

- *Kate Jeffery, Director, Student Financial Support, Student Affairs*
- *David Alcocer, Student Financial Support, Student Affairs*

Most of the money in USAP is from the educational fees. The question discussed was whether to give campuses more flexibility for USAP so the educational fee dollars could be used for other purposes or priorities as long as other specifically raised external funds, such as gifts, replaced those dollars for USAP. Issues include changing USAP guidelines and notifying the Regents. Concerns include compromising UC's ability to communicate about the efforts to find resources for additional financial aid to mitigate the impact of the fee increases and ensuring transparency in campus fundraising. Donors have expectations about how the funding is used. The committee decided that the proposal will not be pursued at this time.

Discussion: Donors may indicate which types of students can receive the funds. Restricted funds support students who would not receive USAP funds. The funds raised by the campuses for scholarships supplement the core grant dollars USAP provides. The Blue and Gold Program is a guarantee that the educational fees of low income students will be covered and USAP funds may be used for this. All low income students are provided with a core amount of grant dollars through USAP. USAP funds are the amount spent the previous year plus 33% of the undergraduate new education and registration fee revenue, or 50% of the new graduate academic fee revenue or 33% of the professional fee revenue. When the various fees increase one-third will go into new USAP funds. If the number of students decreases, the dollars in USAP will decrease. Some donors may be willing to give unrestricted scholarship funds that could be used like USAP funding but would not go into USAP. There are limited restrictions on how educational fee money is used.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President

There was no consultation with the Office of the President.

VIII. Education and Curriculum Workgroup Issues

The UCSD representative drafted a survey to collect data about educational quality. It will collect quantitative data and anecdotal information. The survey would be sent to the department chairs, instructional deans, instructional program directors, and possibly others. Google forms allows the same survey to be linked to different URLs so the data from each type of respondent goes into separate spreadsheets. A report on the results would go to the respondents so they learn what other campuses are doing.

Discussion: A member suggested adding a list of things that would have an impact on educational quality to the survey. Last spring UCB conducted interviews about the actions taken to address the budget situation and the UCB representative will share the results with the committee. Another suggestion for the survey was to ask whether the action is permanent or temporary. Respondents will be asked to identify their division.

Input from UCEP for the Education and Curriculum Workgroup would be helpful. The chair asked for feedback about issues the workgroup should consider. This workgroup is actively seeking input and consultation about key issues at the campuses. Traditional boundaries on education may need to change due to UC's new budget situation. Topics will include the academic calendar or how much duplication of departments across the campuses is necessary and appropriate.

Discussion: The committee discussed potential topics for the workgroup. The idea of moving a department from one campus to another has not come up yet but this strategy would not be pursued in the immediate future. An assurance that faculty will not lose their jobs if a department closed is needed. Proposals to create a new department should be closely scrutinized. The cost savings expected by helping students finish in four years instead of five is not clear. Possible changes to summer sessions were discussed and past efforts to provide incentives for faculty to teach in the summer have not been successful. Moving faculty away from research would impact the unique aspect of UC which provides students with the opportunity to study with researchers. Changing to a three year degree was mentioned as a way to create access for more students. Students who are motivated could take a higher course load and finish in three years. A program could be designed that offers three years of courses and a final semester. The committee discussed the value of being at UC for four years. A member commented that some majors are largely unstructured and the general education requirements may comprise most of the credits. There was a suggestion that UC should consider whether students need a minimum of 180 credits and if the number of requirements should be reduced to give students more leeway. One member suggested that there might be a tradeoff between continuing the furlough program and increasing the faculty workload.

IX. Member Items

Member items were not discussed.

X. New Business

There was no new business.

XI. Executive Sessions

There was no executive session.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams