

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2008**

**Attending:** Stephen McLean, Chair (UCSB), Taradas Bandyopadhyay, Vice Chair (UCR), John Yoder (UCD), David Kay (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Rolf Christoffersen (UCSB), Donald Potts (UCSC), Joan Etzell (UCSF), Carol Copperud (Director, Academic Planning, UCOP), Mary Croughan (Academic Council Chair), Harry Powell (Academic Council Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Welcome and Announcements**

During the last Council meeting, the Eligibility Reform Proposal was discussed and the president will recommend using the 3.0 weighted G.P.A. because it encourages high schools to offer AP and honors courses. The proposal will go to the Regents in January for a vote. UC anticipates another \$66 million in cuts to the budget. Limiting enrollment is now on the table although there are concerns about the consequences. The proposed 2009-2010 budget request reflects what is needed in order to accomplish UC's priorities. The budget includes salary increases for staff and faculty and faculty market adjustments for year two of the salary plan. Registration and educational fees will be increased. The amounts of the employer and employee contributions to the UCRP have still not been decided. An item that attracted Council's attention was UCB's Chancellor suggestion in his vision for the Berkeley campus that there be a differential fee structure that would enable UCB and some other campuses to charge more in fees and services while some campuses might be able to charge less. This will be a topic of future discussions at Council.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The committee approved the minutes of November 3, 2008 with corrections.

**III. UC Education Abroad Program Business Plan**

The modifications to the EAP are complex. One complexity is that it is an academic program run from a systemwide office, allowing a central organization to negotiate with the universities abroad. This also makes it difficult to determine how to fund it since some campuses have larger programs than others. Campus EAP offices have varying budgets and numbers of staff; some emphasize non-EAP programs more.

The real cost of the program is somewhat difficult to determine but the current budget is \$38 million, comprised of general funds and fees. The new plan calls for fees to go to the systemwide EAP, and the campuses and systemwide office will each get a portion of the general fund dollars. It is not required that the money that goes to the campus is used for the EAP, and systemwide EAP will no longer provide funds to support the campus EAP

directly. One of the major expenses is sending faculty to be study center directors. Of the forty centers, only 20 have UC faculty directors. The EAP is trying to save money by cutting staff, eliminating center directors, and reducing instructional expenses. The campuses are involved with recruiting students and, on a case by case basis, vetting the courses.

**Discussion:** UCIE may primarily consider the educational objectives when it reviews the plan. There is a question of whether data suggests that the centers with UC faculty directors are better than those without. EAP students should pay the regular UC fees but there is a \$200 fee to participate in the program which will be increased under the new plan. Fees for the UC Construct, where UC faculty teach the classes, will be higher because the way students are accommodated. It is unclear whether the housing offered through the EAP is more or less expensive than housing students secure independently. The committee noted that the budget is not transparent and the information provided does not allow for the accurate determination of the program's costs at the campuses, UCOP and abroad. The EAP program is about 1% of the funds from the state for about 1% of the students and one UCEP member questioned if domestic programs suffer as a result. It is important for the EAP to be accessible to all students regardless of their background.

UCEP discussed the value of the immersion, exchange, language and culture programs. There are multiple benefits to the UC students and the international students who attend UC. It is expensive to send UC EAP staff overseas to evaluate the courses and programs and negotiate agreements, and the committee questioned whether this process can be streamlined. UC is unique in that students receive credit for EAP courses and a grade that applies to their GPA, but the course crediting process is another expense. Cutting back the language and culture programs would decrease the interest of students in these fields. The required intensive language program is important but costly.

Maintaining the strength of the EAP program should be prioritized, and there should be a solid educational framework for the future when funds are available. UCEP agreed that the immersion, language and culture programs should be protected, and that it is difficult to determine the importance of the course crediting process based on the information provided. If possible, additional cuts should be made at the systemwide EAP before considering any cuts that would impact students and the quality of programs. To provide center directors time for research, they might be funded by EAP 50% and use their sabbatical leave for the other 50%. The committee noted that reliance on third party providers will require increased oversight and supervision of students, and that decentralization of the program will make it difficult to determine if work was done.

**Action:** Chair McLean will draft the committee's comments.

#### **IV. Undergraduate Research Opportunities**

The committee is asked to consider what UCEP can do on the topic of undergraduate research opportunities.

**Discussion:** The committee discussed the different ways that research can be defined and agreed that the definition is dependent on the discipline. Examples include identifying and researching a question, helping in a lab, or creative activities in the fine arts. A wide range of activities should be included in the definition to reach the broadest audience. Research develops a student's abilities to think creatively and independently solve problems. It provides an opportunity to work closely with and be mentored by a faculty member in a small group or one to one, which is different from the experience of taking a course. Since it is not feasible for students in all disciplines to conduct original research, research can be thought of as an activity where students apply formal knowledge to a problem that is new to them. A goal is for students to learn the research methods in their disciplines.

Across disciplines, there might be a requirement for students to apply critical thinking skills to an issue and create a product that is measurable. Not all students have the same experiences or have opportunities for research. There are economic realities that prohibit students from having equal access to faculty members. One member cautioned against focusing on student attainment of a M.S. or Ph.D. when most students do not actually pursue these degrees.

The committee discussed actions that UCEP can take and its goal. Assessments could inquire about the value added by research. The value should be illustrated more clearly especially to students interested in research, as well as to the general public. UCEP could develop a white paper to submit to campus divisions for discussion. Some campuses are working on increasing access to research opportunities, so one of UCEP's goals might be to make these efforts more intentional. Faculty do not have the time to devote to increasing the numbers of undergraduate students involved in research projects. Utilizing groups for mentoring that are led by graduate students is a potentially viable strategy to get around the lack of time. The committee agreed that research should not be compulsory.

**Action:** Chair McLean will draft a set of bullet points.

## **V. Undergraduate Education Planning Group's Educational Effectiveness Task Force**

*Dr. Clair Brown (UCB), Chair, Educational Effectiveness Task Force*

The Educational Effectiveness Task Force (EETF), comprised of faculty and administration, is investigating how undergraduate learning goals are being assessed and the support that can be provided to the campuses. After President Yudof arrived, the EETF began considering the relationship between accountability and assessment. There is a need for measures better than those found in standardized tests like the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). UCB's CEP recommended that each department establish learning goals that were faculty driven, discipline specific, and fit the UCB campus. This activity was mandated and undertaken last year, and resources were provided to assist departments. The budget crisis has impacted what can be done next at UCB and by the EETF. Campuses are at different levels with regard to the use of assessment. Activities

that are bureaucratic and lack impact will be avoided. UC's strategies will encompass but be richer than Western Association of Schools and Colleges and Advancement Via Individual Determination. One goal is to assess the areas covered by the CLA but more comprehensively.

EETF decided that learning goals should be considered outside the context of the major. Although campuses may not see the need for comparisons within the UC system, this might be important for accountability. There are problems with the CLA's attempt to measure value added, which is costly to correctly and meaningfully measure. UC and its constituents are more interested in students' capabilities after graduation, and a postgraduate task force has been set up to research this. The learning goal and assessment processes should be faculty driven, and the administration should provide support. The goal is for ongoing involvement by faculty and students in looking at students' strengths and weaknesses. EETF is figuring out ways to link accountability to assessment, and potential direct measurements of student performance. One question is whether there are direct measures across departments that can be used.

**Discussion:** Value added has to be measured not just in terms of freshman compared to senior year, but many years later. Currently assessment is only focused on the majors. Capstones have prompted departments at UCLA to rethink their pathways. Capstones may be better for liberal arts colleges with smaller student to faculty ratios. It was noted that some faculty may not have been taught how to teach, let alone how to establish learning goals and assess students. The committee discussed the idea of requiring that new faculty learn about the education process. Using grades to indicate that learning goals have been met is problematic because of variation in grading across and within departments. Learning goals may be watered down in order to objectively measure them, but more can be done to teach faculty about quantitative measurements without adding significantly to their workload. CEPs need to buy in and see the investment in assessments as worthwhile. Faculty buy-in can be garnered with the right incentives and by giving examples of successful approaches to assessment across a range of disciplines to help stimulate thinking. Systemwide comparisons across departments and courses would be helpful. EETF will circulate a draft report in the future.

## **VI. Member Items and Discussion of Possible UCEP Focal Points for 2008-09**

The increased use of lecturers and the best practices for impacted majors were ranked almost equally by members in the second survey. Best practices for impacted majors entails identifying practical suggestions and approaches to address majors in high demand, short of hiring more faculty.

**Discussion:** There was a brief discussion about the issue of impacted majors and next steps. It was noted that closing a program was the solution to one impacted program.

**Action:** Members will identify impacted majors at their campuses and how they are handled.

## **VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

*Mary Croughan, Senate Chair, Harry Powell, Senate Vice Chair, and Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director*

Senate leadership made no announcements.

## **VIII. UC Davis Proposed New School of Nursing**

The proposed new School of Nursing at UC Davis will enroll the first baccalaureate students as freshman for the 2011-2012 year and the first four-year cycle will be completed in 2014-2015. The students in the master's program will be enrolled in 2010-2011. The level of benefactor support will allow UCD to recruit faculty before having to admit students. The school will have a generic bachelor of science program and the nursing curriculum will begin in year two of the four year program, meaning transfer students may be in the program for five years. The master's program is a fee for service program and the revenue stream from the fees allows the program to sustain itself. The program will produce advanced practice nurses (nurse practitioners), although the acute need in California is for bedside nurses. UCD is creating well articulated pathways into the Ph.D. program which will produce doctorally prepared nurses who can become future faculty.

There will be a total of 200 students in the master's program and 25 to 50 of these will be in the pre-licensure program. A potential concern is that the master's entry program will attempt to teach about 22 months' worth of courses in a 12 month period. It is difficult to rapidly prepare a student with an undergraduate degree in a field other than nursing. The committee discussed whether the budget was developed in anticipation of cuts and the potential rationale for the number of FTEs in development/grant writing, marketing and communications. This model may be an attempt to sustain the school without state funding in the future. UCD's plans will be scaled back if resources are not forthcoming. The committee agreed that the proposal is good although there are a few questions.

**Action:** The Chair and UCLA representative will draft the committee's response.

## **IX. Achieve, Inc. Initiative**

This item was not discussed.

## **X. New Business**

One member proposed canceling the March 2009 meeting. This will be considered later when the amount of work required of the committee is known.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50  
Minutes taken by Brenda Abrams

Attest: Steve McLean