

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2011**

**Attending:** Jose Wudka, Chair (UCR), Nayan Shah (UCSD), Michael Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Tania Israel (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Keith Williams (Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination), Do Queyn Tran-Taylor (Coordinator, P-20 Programs/Initiatives, Education Partnerships), Shawn Brick (Associate Admission Director, Transfer Policy, Student Affairs), Ralph Wolff (President of the Senior College Commission of WASC), Sharon Salinger (Undergraduate Dean at UCI), Anna DiStefano (Chair of the Redesign Steering Committee and of the Commission's Policy and Planning Committee), Jon Yun (Site Director, UC Educational Evaluation Center–UCSB), Bob Anderson (Chair, Academic Senate), Bob Powell (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Announcements**

UCEP will be joined by the President of WASC and in the afternoon by the evaluator of the online instruction pilot project. Chair Wudka provided an overview of WASC's resolution. The new format of the review will be approved by February 2012 and will start in 2013. Institutions will define how undergraduate students' proficiency will be defined. WASC voted to use the degree quality profile in a pilot from 2012 to 2014. The new institutional review process will be online by fall 2013. Institutions scheduled for a CPR visit in 2013 will have the option to use the previous or new format. The commission is still concerned about how institutions can demonstrate effective learning without external validation. The commission will continue to study the issue and will accept input from institutions until January 15, 2012 and act in February 2012.

**Discussion:** A member remarked that the constituency that faculty care about are the students, not the general public. WASC claims that the reason for using the DQP is that it provides a common language but a member stated that the language in the degree qualifications profile is too vague and will be a challenge to implement. Associate Director Baxter commented that WASC is under pressure from the Department of Education, and that there are other institutions that are willing to accept external validation.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved.

**III. Campus Climate Survey**

- *Jan Corlett, Chief of Staff, Academic Affairs*

Chief of Staff Corlett reported that there have been a number of studies on diversity in the past. The study group on diversity had four separate groups which were pooled and this group was charged with providing an annual report to the Regents. Little is known about climate or other populations at UC. A campus climate culture and inclusion group was formed at the systemwide level by the president and at each campus. The systemwide committee has a representative from each campus including undergraduate students and six community members. Subgroups were formed to address specific issues such as what structures are in place, LGBT issues, safety and engagement and a metrics group. There is no vocabulary to discuss campus climate and no data. UCUES was never intended to be a climate survey but it is mined heavily for proxy data related to climate.

Sue Rankin from Penn State is a national expert on climate and UC contracted with her to conduct a systemwide study of UC including UCOP and the labs. Each campus will have a project team to work on the study. The study will have some core indicators across the system and campuses will have the ability to customize the tool.

It is a census survey, not a sample. The goal is to have a 30% response rate. UC will own this tool. Action plans will be developed and implemented. The surveys will be hosted on Professor Rankin's servers, there will be no tags on them and individuals will also be able to complete the survey on paper. The decision to invest in this survey now is based on a couple of issues. The survey will help UC understand the impact of the budget situation.

**Discussion:** A concern is that the individuals likely to respond will be people with complaints. Professor Rankin will meet with people at the campuses to discuss potential problems. There will be a two week window when the survey will be launched and when this occurs will be decided by each campus. All of the surveys currently used across the system have been given to Professor Rankin. The data and action plans will be made public. The consultant's contract is \$600,000 which is coming from the president's initiative budget. The campuses will incur some costs related to communications. Academic Affairs will try to have the project approved by one institutional review board.

#### **IV. WASC guidelines**

- *Ralph Wolff, President, Senior College Commission of WASC*
- *Sharon Salinger, Undergraduate Dean at UCI, WASC Commissioner*
- *Anna DiStefano, Chair of the Redesign Steering Committee and of the Commission's Policy and Planning Committee*

Chair Wudka asked President Wolff to provide a brief overview of the WASC guidelines. Dean Salinger reported that a year ago, UC and other institutions were complaining about the accreditation and reaccreditation processes. WASC is responsible for accrediting a vast range of institutions. The problem is determining the value of degrees from institutions that are not UC. The Commission is attempting to be more transparent. Ten goals were identified. Questions include how WASC can differentiate between different types of institutions and how standards can be applied appropriately and differentially. Team reports will be posted on the WASC website so that the reasons that institutions are accredited will be available to the public.

There will be one review that combines the currently separate capacity and educational effectiveness reviews. The review will focus on student success and student learning. The key issues that need to be addressed for UC will be the primary focus. WASC's expectations need to be clarified. Most institutions were at the beginning phases of developing student learning outcomes. The Commission and task forces looked at what it means to have a bachelor's degree and at what level of proficiency can students be expected to perform. How a faculty member knows that the students who graduate from a particular program have certain proficiencies and how the revised standards will be aligned with the revised process are additional questions. Things that have not been issues at an institution should be taken care of in an expedited fashion and the review will emphasize areas of concern. WASC wants to evaluate how institutions are establishing proficiency and build on what is already being done. An outside study will be conducted to examine what good benchmarking is. What will be made optional or required will be made clear.

**Discussion:** It was noted that it is unclear what external validation is. Institutions should be able to use some internal reference point to indicate value. Some institutions want to use the CLA or other single metrics to demonstrate value and WASC does not support this. WASC wants to allow institutions to choose multiple ways of validating standards. There is a concern that the value of peer review is being watered down. President Wolff indicated that what the next generation of team reports will look like has not been determined and asked UCEP to identify what should be in the reports about the quality of the graduates from an institution. The peer review process needs to be brought to the front. A member remarked that the committee does not think that the degree quality profile is a good tool and, despite its claims, does not, in fact, provide common language. The relationship between peer review and external benchmarking is important. From one team to another, WASC is trying to insure base level validity. The teams need to be trained and to look at what WASC wants them to look at.

President Wolff reported that he participated in discussions with a variety of people at Lumina and other

institutions, though he was not involved with drafting the language in the profile. WASC is piloting the profile with twenty-six institutions that have agreed to voluntarily participate. The Commission is not committed to the language in the profile and welcomes UCEP's feedback on what does and does not make sense. Lumina would like to see a degree framework that could be applied nationally. WASC has made no commitment to being part of a national pilot. If the profile does not work, WASC is willing to say that an alternative needs to be identified. The Lumina grant was not based solely on the profile but on issues such as completion and assessing student learning. Comments about external validation are due by February 2012. Feedback to WASC on the language in the profile will be transmitted to Lumina. Assessment of learning outcomes and external benchmarking will help address the consumer protection issue. WASC's ability to make judgments about the level of learning is very limited because data is not available. The federal government is concerned about how quality is defined. One member pointed out that the comments made by the guests during the meeting speak to a level of flexibility that is not reflected in the resolution. It was also pointed out that better engagement with faculty is needed.

## **V. WASC Guidelines Debrief**

Chair Wudka proposed that he work with the UCM representative to draft comments in response to the discussion with President Wolff to share with the committee.

**Discussion:** Members agreed to review the chair's memo.

## **VI. Transfer Student Data**

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admission Director, Transfer Policy, Student Affairs*

There was significant activity related to transfer students in the state in 2010-2011. Last year, UCEP requested concrete data that would illustrate how well UC is doing with respect to transfer students. The data provided by Associate Director Brick shows some deficiencies. UC is under pressure to improve the transfer path. The goal is to have 60% of students at the upper division be transfers. One new transfer student per every 2.4 new freshman students is the current rate. More transfer students have been accommodated relative to new freshman students as a whole. Preference is given to community college students when considering transfers to meet UC's role in the Master Plan. A growing portion of students transferring from community college are international students. Higher priority is also given to junior level transfers and campuses look at the community college records, not high school records. The largest group transferring is going into the social sciences and the smallest group is going into engineering programs. The transfer cohort tends to be less diverse than freshman students and transfer students tend to be male. It is not clear why the transfer students are less diverse and UC needs to work on this. The majority of transfer students are coming from 20% of the community colleges. The data on units accumulated prior to transfer is not understood well enough in order to draw conclusions about what it means.

**Discussion:** One member would like to see the correlation between student outcomes and the number of students a community college sends to UC. The data does not show the transfer readiness of students at the community colleges that are not top feeder schools. Enrollment into UC has not kept pace with the demand from the community colleges. In 2010, the CSUs shut its doors to transfer students for the spring term which resulted in increased applications to UC. Chair Anderson is concerned about the number of transfer students being enrolled which decreases the number of freshman students admitted. Upper division students are more expensive to educate. The transfer students may be students who were unable to get into UC as freshman.

## **VII. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

- *Bob Anderson, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Bob Powell, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The governor recently released his plan for pension reform. Current employees will have increased contributions. There will be major changes for employees hired in the future. The current defined benefit plan provides 75% income replacement after 30 years at age 60. The new tier adopted by UC would defer this until age 65 for the same total benefit. The governor is proposing that a defined benefit would provide 25% of the final salary at age

67 after 35 years of service. A defined contribution plan would be instituted and provide another 25% income replacement. The governor is counting on Social Security covering another 25%. This would create concerns related to recruiting and retaining faculty. Social Security is very progressive which makes it difficult to combine with a defined benefit plan. The general feeling is that this proposal will be dead on arrival when it reaches the legislature. It puts UC once again into the middle of discussions about post employment benefits. The governor could propose a constitutional amendment to force the changes on the Regents. The faculty salary equity study is out for systemwide review and this will be on UCEP's agenda on December 5<sup>th</sup>. Whatever happens to undergraduate tuition next year will also happen with graduate tuition.

**Discussion:** The state is reacting in a way that is similar to companies that find retirement benefits too expensive. The issue of competitiveness in financial remuneration is a problem for UC. Getting money for the central budget out of grants means there may be less money in the grant to conduct research. UC is already at the point where it is not competitive because of all the costs charged to grants. There is no good data on the cost of different types of students, but graduate students require more faculty time. Some people are convinced that money is being left on the table because differential tuition is not being charged at some campuses. If the non-resident rate is what it truly costs to educate a student, that amount should be charged to California students with the bill showing line items for the state contribution and return to aid from UC. Tuition minus return to aid is higher than the state contribution per student. The general public does not understand that the state contribution is so low and faculty need information on how to communicate about the budget. The UCB representative to UCEP will draft a model of this bill.

## **VIII. Online Instruction Pilot Project Evaluation**

Dr. Yun provided an overview of the evaluation of the online instruction pilot project. There will be a focus on the process, outcomes and research. The units of analysis include the program/organizational level, the course level, and the individual level of students, faculty, teaching assistants. Questions to be asked include whether appropriate and adequate resources are provided and to what degree are the courses supported by the learning platform. Broad program goals will be measured. Course effectiveness will be assessed in two ways including internal consistency and external comparisons. Internal consistency will look at the alignment between learning outcomes and pedagogical processes and the degree to which outcomes are attained in the ways hypothesized. External comparisons will include comparisons to face to face courses and student performance in future courses. Faculty will be interested in knowing if the online courses prepared the students for courses they take in the future. Student affective outcomes will be measured.

One goal of the research is to generate findings that will inform the broader research community about the impact of online learning efforts. Logic models will be created for the functioning of each of the courses with respect to the intended contents, pedagogical and affective outcomes of the course. The models will allow the evaluation to test the strength of the match between the use of the online tools and the specific learning outcomes those tools were designed to meet. Student data will be collected through surveys, focus groups, interaction/observation, coursework/online forum and course data and future student performance. Faculty and TA data will be collected through surveys, interviews and time logs. Whether students took advantage of the ability to review information more than once will be tracked. Institutional review board approval will be sought for each component of the evaluation.

**Discussion:** Members suggested changes to the research questions. Questions about who online courses are better for will be asked. Dr. Yun indicated that not much is being done now with respect to how the courses will work for non-UC students but the evaluation will look at issues such as the support a UC student receives when enrolled in a course on another campus. The point was made that non-UC students already attend courses at UC Extension. Dr. Yun suggested that there could be a simulation of what the courses would look like when non-UC students are enrolled to create revenue. Seven of the 24 courses will have a face to face component. Faculty will have complete control over what is measured other than the survey. Several members commented that they are teaching students how to use technology for learning instead of social networking. UCOP is beginning to think about policies related to online etiquette.

## **IX. Online Instruction Pilot Project Debrief**

**Discussion:** One member felt reassured about the evaluation following Dr. Yun's presentation. The project has been slowed down due to the need to figure out the mechanism for how non-UC students will pay for the courses. The mechanism for transferring the money to pay for teaching assistants is also not in place. The only people who have been hired are the individuals providing course support at the campuses. There are some cross campus courses but they are being developed as separate courses at each campus and students will enroll through their home campus.

## **X. Senate Regulations 850 and 860**

Two regulations were drafted last year governing how systemwide courses were to be offered and how students would be enrolled in non-traditional settings. The goals of SR 850 is to make clear that the non-academic unit that develops a course does not own it and that UCEP and CCGA are responsible for organizing the courses and making sure that students are aware of them. Chair Wudka is not asking the committee to approve SR 850 or 860 today.

**Discussion:** The UCR representative will follow up on the chair's question about who has responsibility systemwide for courses numbered 300 and above. Bylaw 55 tries to restrict owners of courses to standard departments, schools, and colleges, and to exclude Extension. Some of the Extension deans are trying to develop degrees and bypass the Senate. SR 850 could be further simplified and 812B will be modified to give faculty the right to not enroll students. A member suggested that a new regulation could make the distinction between courses for non-matriculated and matriculated students. Depending on the course, credit can be transferred. Members discussed whether a new document is needed or whether a revised regulation will suffice. A member proposes that UCEP agree to the following principle: There are separate courses for matriculated versus non-matriculated students, with a special case for concurrent enrollment which will be codified, so that enrollment, course numbers etc (processes) are distinct and X courses require additional approval to have the credit transferred. Systemwide courses are a separate issue. The motion to adopt this principle was seconded.

## **XI. New Business**

There was no new business.

## **XII. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 PM  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: Jose Wudka