

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2013

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

I. Announcements and Updates

The chair would like to review some of the issues discussed during the last Council meeting about the Innovative Learning and Technology Initiative and cross campus enrollment. The Moreno report criticizes UCLA's anti-discrimination policies and a good deal of time was spent discussing the composition of the president's task force. Draft letters about composite benefit rates were reviewed and approved last week. The Senate's Executive Director Martha Winnacker reported hearing from divisional chairs about campus processes for approving GE credit and UCEP members are asked to be asked to compile this information. A systemwide review of a sexual harassment prevention policy is underway but UCEP is not required to comment. Chair Labor reported that after checking some divisional catalogs, he found that UCEP is still out of compliance in terms of getting courses approved as systemwide into the divisional catalogs. This is a part of regulation SR 544 that has been problematic for nine years.

Vice Chair Larrabee participated in a portion of the Budget Call during which the UC retirement plan was discussed. A total remuneration study of faculty salaries will be conducted, and this is a concern for UCSF since clinical faculty will not be included. The 2014-15 budget is very similar to the 2013-14 budget. There was a discussion about the need for funding for capital projects. UCB and UCD were able to negotiate special rates for the benefits charged to summer salaries. The vice chair also attended a meeting of the Academic Planning Council which Provost Dorr ran. The Council considered ways that cross campus enrollment can be streamlined especially if there are large numbers of students. Performance indicators were discussed and the provost asked if there are additional ones that UC should utilize. There was also a discussion about the long range enrollment plan and how the Master Plan has been abandoned. Over the next five years every campus proposes to increase their growth only with transfer students and graduate students. The Council reviewed a report about what it costs a student to be educated and a report about what it costs UC to educate a student. Now that the Open Access policy has been passed, the Council is looking at implementation and the question of whether it should become a presidential policy.

Discussion: Members were interested in reviewing the Moreno Report. It was noted that out of state students are not as qualified as California students because the former can manipulate the SATs. Reportedly the president has asked for a task force to analyze what it costs to educate undergraduate students. It is claimed that it costs more to educate a student at UC than it does at any other public university, and the members remarked that there are different costs for educating graduate versus undergraduate students. The committee briefly discussed the Open Access policy and what faculty will have to do in order to comply.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Senate*

The President has tasked the Senate to deal with the Moreno Report about UCLA. A small task force is being established and consultation with a variety of people will be required. The enrollment planning group is having a discussion today about rebenching and on Wednesday about the nature of the guarantee and the referral pool. When the enrollment planning group has completed its work and generated ideas, UCEP will be asked to comment. The Little Hoover Commission has claimed that the Master Plan is broken but Chair Jacob commented that the Master Plan may be broken for the community colleges and the CSUs but that UC still honors it. There is potential funding for Senate Bills 1052 and 1053. Proposals have been submitted to the Hewlett and Gates foundations for a total of \$2M for two years which the state would match with \$1M. The Council ICAS will set up will be able to begin review of open access text books for use by the three segments. Faculty will need to be made aware of these resources and encouraged to use these materials.

Regarding the Associates of Arts and Associates of Science degrees created by SB 1440, Chair Jacob reported that most of the work has been done by the community colleges and CSUs. The community colleges have created between 25 and 30 majors with transfer model curricula and 600 degrees. The degrees are based on the transfer model curricula which include 18 units of direct major based course work and either IGETC or CSU GE Breadth. Students with 60 semester units will complete the degree and once they have the degree a CSU must provide a 60 unit plan to receive a major degree. The CSU degree needs to be sixty units of upper division credit. SB 440 was passed about a year ago and it requires every community college to have a degree in all 25 to 30 transfer model curricula and as many CSUs as possible should honor those degrees. This legislation also added three types of generic degrees. Chair Jacob suggested that the time to degree for transfer students over the past fifteen years should be examined. One example of how well UC is doing is UCSB. In 1995 the 2 year graduate rate at this campus was 28% and in 2010 it was 70%. This demonstrates that UC cares and has made improvements.

Chair Jacob reported that the UCOE communications hub is being discussed by a planning group. The provost has indicated that the number of students who will take advantage of cross campus enrollment should be determined before decisions about the hub are made. The proposals for ILTI are being reviewed. The concept of a mini-hub has been introduced and it is intended to simply facilitate enrollment but it will not have information about the courses.

Discussion: It is not clear that faculty have incentives to write open access textbooks. The bill may provide funds for faculty to write textbooks and a group will review and approve existing textbooks that can be used. Vice President Handel reported that there is a tension between streamlining requirements across UC campuses and making sure that students coming to UC are well-prepared. UC faculty have been brought together to discuss commonalities in twenty majors and while there is similarity across campuses, there are also valuable differences. The success rate data is good and the anxiety is where UC has not required major preparation. Chair Jacob suspects that UC will be pressed to accept more SB 1440 degrees.

A member remarked that there is poor counseling for high school and community college students, and that many students cannot handle the financial burden of attending a UC. UCM has struggled to attract transfer students but as the physical space and the number of majors are, broadened this problem may be relieved. UC will reach out to community colleges that UC has not traditionally reached out to. The SB 1440 degrees are new and UC changed its admissions policy to reflect that requirements have been met. Students should be encouraged to do more than the minimal requirements. Chair Jacob indicated that UC should wait to see what happens with these degrees.

Chair Labor plans for UCEP to discuss the issue of listing courses in the divisional catalogs. Chair Jacob reported that administrative groups at three campuses have lists of courses at other campuses that have been approved for major credit. Chair Jacob asked UCEP members to follow up with their campuses about procedures in place to approve courses at other campuses. Members shared how courses at other UCs are approved at the

department level. Instead of creating a top down process for articulation of UC courses across the campuses, the informal approach used by departments could be replicated. One campus articulation officer indicated that the number of courses is small so contacting other departments about articulating the courses would not be a major burden.

IV. SR 760

Chair Labor shared a revised draft of SR 760 with the committee and requested feedback. The revision reflects that online education will not be treated differently. Divisions should be responsible for refining.

Discussion: UCR is supportive of the proposed revisions. The committee voted in favor of the proposed revision.

Action: The committee approved the proposed revisions.

V. Evaluation of the Online Instruction Pilot Project

- *Diane Harley, Chair, Senate OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel*

Chair Harley would like to know what is expected of the Blue Ribbon Panel so she can advise the members. The evaluation report is currently not in a format that can be digested and the evaluation itself is limited in scope. The bulk of the report is on student satisfaction and the section on the faculty is minimal. Twelve pages of the 1000 page report address faculty issues, and the data provided is very minimal. Faculty on campuses with strong support structures were more satisfied than faculty whose only support was UCOE. The Panel will attempt to extract the summaries of the findings. There is detailed information about the technologies that may be interesting for people who develop courses. The report does not include any data on costs, and only some of the recommendations from the Panel's letter were addressed.

Discussion: Chair Jacob asked Chair Harley to determine what can be learned from the section on faculty so that this data can inform ILTI. Chair Harley will send her request for a Word version of the report to Chair Jacob so he can forward it to the provost. The provost has not commented to Chair Jacob about the report. Chair Harley was encouraged to follow up with UCEC about the availability of data on drop out rates. Some of the ILTI courses will be open to non-matriculated students. One issue that the Panel might be asked about is what kind of information about students an instructor is permitted to collect for an online course.

VI. UCEP Guidelines for Systemwide Course Approvals

Chair Labor revised the draft guidelines for systemwide course approvals, incorporating the committee's feedback from the October meeting.

Discussion: The committee reviewed the guidelines and suggested additional revisions. The spirit of the guidelines is that UCEP does not have to deal with any courses approved by the campuses. There is a concern about UCEP becoming involved in assessing the quality of courses and overstepping established divisional policies. The guidelines need to address courses that are to be systemwide and the use of the catalog should be determined. A member proposed defining systemwide courses as those offered by non-UC entities. The guidelines could be framed so that campuses are supported. The section on assessing quality could apply to UCDC, UC Sacramento and or the labs. UCEP's work may be limited to any courses that have not gone through campus approval processes that are proposing to serve non-matriculated students and that are 100% online. Members agreed that the committee does not need to be involved in granting systemwide approval for online courses that already have been approved by the campuses.

A member reported that UCEAP is offering its own courses which are being approved currently by UCIE, and UCEP members agree that this policy will conflict with UCEAP's procedures. UCEAP's courses will need to come to UCEP for approval. The report will also help identify issues that need to be examined further. The Panel should provide guidance about how ILTI should structure its evaluation. UCEC has indicated that a case study of

one course will be provided in November. The evaluation report does not include a comparison of the online courses versus face to face courses. Objective measurements of learning outcomes are absent. Chair Harley was asked to review the Panel's February 2013 letter and indicate which of the recommendations are still critical. UCEP could ask for a follow up analysis of how students do in subsequent courses. A member commented that the effectiveness of the courses has not been evaluated. The committee discussed the question of what kind of information is permissible to collect.

Action: Chair Labor will revise the guidelines and send them to the committee by November 12th.

VII. Systemwide Course Approval

The UCSC and UCLA representatives reviewed an online course proposed by UCOE, Dance 7. The course is reportedly already listed on the UCOE website.

Discussion: Chair Labor recommended using the existing guidelines to approve the course or not. The plans for cross campus enrollment and non-matriculated students are not described but there are plans in place to protect UC students. A member would like to invite Keith Williams, the interim director of UCOE, to a UCEP meeting to provide an update about ILTI's priorities. The reviewers agreed that the course seems fine and, given the guidelines in place, UCEP should approve it. There is a concern about the heavy use of Skype which is not reliable. A member with a dance background said that this is an acceptable introductory course. One question is will instructors be able to log into a system and validate the match between the student identification and the photo of the student.

Action: A motion to approve this course was made and seconded, and the committee voted to approve the course.

VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

Campuses have submitted preliminary data on long range enrollment planning. The state is not fully funding students so UC is taking non-resident students. The question of whether UC is meeting the Master Plan requirement depends on how the issue is examined. UC will report on the cost of educating students. There has been dwindling support for graduate education and the Senate leadership is involved with discussions about this. The Academic Planning Council is a good forum for sharing and having fruitful discussions about administrative and faculty perspectives on issues. The state has a false notion about what the cost of education is because the resources UC provides are not included in the calculations. Discussions about the community colleges offering BA degrees are ongoing and there may be some fields where this would be appropriate.

Associate Director Baxter reported that Provost Dorr had a positive meeting with the new president of WASC. The provost's past experience with WASC at UCLA was very helpful. The use of standardized assessments was discussed and the case was made for UC to use its own faculty driven learning assessments. Last week the president announced that UC will make \$5M available to support undocumented students and planning is now underway to devise how this program will look. A Regents item for January will be an analysis of graduation rates, and UCEP should review the information that is provided.

Discussions: UC has not made its case for increased funding. Data about why students drop out of UC is not collected uniformly across the campuses.

IX. Senate Regulation 544

Chair Labor is not proposing a change to SR 544. The chair looked in several divisional catalogs and found that systemwide courses are not being advertised in them. This has been an ongoing issue for several years. The hub is being discussed as if it is a catalog. Depending on its design, the hub may conflict with Senate regulations. The committee is asked to comment on questions raised by the UCI divisional chair.

Discussion: A member suggested that ILTI courses will potentially require a different designation than the systemwide course designation. It is not clear if the hub will manipulate a database that does not come from a division. The UCI letter raises questions about online cross campus offerings. The appropriate approval process of courses for credit for major is unclear. The letter notes that there are issues related to instructional credit, campus compensation, intellectual property, and academic freedom. Questions related to instructional credit include whether faculty are given more credit for starting a course and whether instructional credit can be shared. The appropriate guidelines for the sharing of intellectual property need to be identified. Some of the issues related to ownership of the materials are best left to the divisions. UCLA has a faculty-administration group that developed a proposal for policy for online courses which addressed some of the issues in the UCI letter. One member recommends against institutionalizing the allocation of work credit, noting that even within a department it is difficult to determine what constitutes proper credit. It is not clear who can help figure out the intellectual property rights issues, but UCEP could seek the advice of other Senate committees if necessary. UCEP should stay engaged in the ILTI activities and provide input and oversight when possible. A member expressed concerns about the committee not considering some of the issues raised especially since so much is unknown. Chair Labor will notify the UCI divisional chair that UCEP has discussed these issues but that it is difficult to think about solutions without a specific case.

X. New Business

There was no New Business.

XI. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:38 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Tim Labor