

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES OF MEETING
MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2007

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD) Stephen McLean, Vice-Chair (UCSB), Ignacio Navarette (UCB), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Linda Egan (UCD), David Kay (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Taradas Bandyopadhyay (UCR), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Linda Chafetz (UCSF), Peter Digeser (UCSB), Michael Brown (Academic Senate Chair), Cynthia Pineda (Graduate Student-UCLA), Nina Robinson (Director of Policy and External Affairs), Margaret Heisel (Deputy to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. General Announcements and Updates – UCEP Chair Keith Williams

The Office of the President recently hired new vice presidents for the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources (Daniel Dooley) and for the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (Steven Beckwith). In addition, the Regents have initiated a search for a chief financial officer – an entirely new position. The presidential search is ongoing, and a controversial plan to increase the salaries of the chancellors to levels equal to UC’s comparison institutions (about 33% over four years) will be discussed at the January Regents meeting.

At the November Academic Council meeting, Executive Vice President for Business Operations Katie Lapp gave a presentation on the UC budget process. Provost Hume also reported about the restructuring efforts currently underway at the Office of the President. UCOP’s goal is to achieve greater efficiencies in its business and administrative systems and to clarify and improve the relationship between itself and the campuses. The University Committee on Planning and Budget is considering the best markers to illustrate how educational quality at UC may be slipping as a result of funding deficiencies. Finally, the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) is concerned about a plan to expand plutonium pit production at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Many faculty are uneasy about increasing UC’s involvement in nuclear weapons development.

II. Consent Calendar

- UCEP minutes of November 5, 2007

Action: UCEP approved the draft of the minutes with a few minor changes.

III. Standards for Remote and Online Instruction

Issue: A CCGA/UCEP/ITTP subcommittee discussing remote and online instruction and its relationship to UC residency requirements wants to initiate a broader discussion about distance learning, online pedagogy, residency, and “UC quality,” through a “dialectic” memo that will be circulated to divisional chairs and systemwide committees for informal input and comment. The outcome of the review may or may not result in proposed legislation related to distance learning and residency.

The memo asks for feedback on several questions, including whether standards for remote and online instruction should be set at the systemwide level; how “UC quality” should be conceived in such instruction – particularly in terms of faculty-student-peer interaction, assessment methods, and the pedagogical differences between real-time and archival instructional delivery;

whether there should be different standards for undergraduate and graduate education; and finally, how issues of residency and fair access to technology should be conceived.

The number of online and distance learning courses offered at UC is expected to increase. Some of these courses are intended for students at any of the ten UC campuses. Senate Regulation 544 gives students the right to enroll simultaneously in a course or courses offered on other UC campuses. Courses like “Arabic without Walls,” for instance, offer a means to share the language resources of the UC system more widely through technology, giving interested students on all campuses access to a broader range of educational opportunities.

Discussion: UCEP members noted that face-to-face teaching and peer-learning are both essential components of a “UC quality” education and part of what makes the University a university. The memo’s questions about student-faculty and student-peer interaction are similar in terms of what one might want and expect from a course. Although some benefits of face-to-face instruction are intangible, that kind of interaction is vital to the educational process. There is a role for technology in fostering communication and learning, but at the same time UC does not want to devolve into a primarily online provider like some for-profit colleges. One member asked if online programs in their role as “money- makers” were multiplying at the expense of UC’s educational mission and excellence.

Senate approval is the *de facto* mark of a “UC quality course,” whether it is offered in a classroom or online. A “UC quality education” evolves over the period of 2 to 4 years and is determined by the overall curriculum a student takes. There was general agreement that online instruction at UC should be limited in scope. Some members felt the number of online courses UC allows a student to take should be limited by mandate to ensure face-to-face interactions are not minimized by online instruction. Others felt the systemwide Senate could develop recommended guidelines, but it should be up to the campuses to decide details like how many units students are permitted to earn online or at a distance. The way online courses function with respect to UC quality may be discipline-specific, so there could be wide differences within a campus in what is possible or desirable. Some members did not see a need for different rules for in-person and distance learning, but one reason to establish guidelines is a possible lack of sufficient expertise on courses committees about online pedagogy and its benefits/potential pitfalls. One goal should be to limit opportunities for dishonesty.

The issues of residency and online learning pedagogy should be considered separately. Whatever a campus decides is an acceptable course should also count toward the residency requirements, but residency may involve more factors than the unit value of courses taken.

UCEP considered the assessment process as it relates to distance learning. There was a suggestion that campus evaluation models be reviewed. It would be useful to refer to studies or data illustrating the effectiveness of online and distance learning relative to normal course formats. A UCSB CEP review of online assessment mechanisms did not reveal widely different outcomes between online and face-to-face courses except in completion rates, which were lower for online courses. The subcommittee should also consider how to respond to questions about why UC limits online courses while other institutions embrace them.

Regarding fair access to technology, there was discussion about whether minimum computer equipment and software should be available. Instructors should ensure that course materials are

accessible through multiple platforms. There was also a question about whether faculty own the intellectual property of an online course and whether UC owns a share.

Regarding obstacles impeding the implementation of simultaneous and multi campus course enrollment beyond a case-by-case basis, UCEP felt it should address the academic issues and let the registrars and UCOP administrators deal with the administrative details of implementation.

Action: UCEP members will research local campus policies regarding online learning. UCEP will discuss the dialectic again in February.

IV. Part-Time Enrollment Policy

– *With Nina Robinson, Director of Policy and External Affairs*

Issue: At a recent Academic Planning Council meeting, it was suggested that the Senate reconsider its part-time enrollment policies, including the possibility of increasing the use of part-time enrollment as a means to broaden access to UC. Current policy allows students to enroll part-time under exceptional circumstances only. The Senate last reviewed the issue in 2002. At that time, BOARS and others strongly opposed changing policy to increase the number of part-time students.

Nina Robinson said UC is engaged in a new cycle of long-range enrollment planning. The number of California high school graduates is projected to decline beginning in 2009 and remain lower for the next 8 to 10 years. As a result, the University's enrollment-based funding may suffer, so UC is considering strategies for increasing enrollment that will maintain funding growth. Some believe UC's part-time enrollment policy is an obstacle to increasing enrollment of both freshmen and transfers, and that UC should be more flexible. Many potential freshmen fear they won't be able to make full-time enrollment work, and attend another institution. Potential transfers who have already built part-time enrollment into their lives choose other colleges over UC. Director Robinson said any move to increase part-time enrollment would be gradual and the effects would be closely monitored. She said more flexibility might be built into the financial aid structure, as UC financial aid is contingent on full-time status.

Discussion: There was a question about why UC needs to grow when classrooms are already overcrowded, which has likely led to an erosion of educational quality. Director Robinson said economic realities are forcing UC to make difficult choices. UC needs new revenue sources because funds provided to hire new faculty FTE is growth money. When UC asks the state for more money, the state asks UC to educate more students in return. There was a question about how increasing part-time enrollment will benefit underrepresented minority groups, especially considering a BOARS-referenced study about the importance of full-time enrollment to the success of students, particularly URM students. Director Robinson said UC is working to get updated data, but she believes more URMs could be helped by a change in policy. Admissions standards would not be different for part-time students.

There were also questions about how changing policy would affect faculty teaching schedules and impacted majors, and what the consequences were of *not* making the change.

Members noted that the issue relates to the earlier discussion of online and distance learning. Part-time students will probably not be as integrated into campus life as full-time students. There were concerns that the intangible benefits of a UC education would be diluted if part-time enrollment was carried too far. At the same time, UC could offer students a better part-time

education than they would get elsewhere. UC might look into possible hybrid models that would allow students to enroll part-time for a limited number of quarters.

Action: UCOP will develop more specific ideas for future Senate discussion and reaction.

V. BOARS' Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy

Chair Williams thanked members for the lively and informative e-mail discussion about UCEP's draft memo. He said the committee did not have to reach a consensus about every aspect of the BOARS policy, but he wanted to take a vote on several questions.

UCEP continued to express general support for the principles and goals underlying BOARS' proposal. There was also consensus agreement that it would not be academically justified to continue to require the SAT II and the rule that a student failing to take even one of the 15 a-g requirements is automatically ineligible.

There was a question about the current push to eliminate the SAT II Subject Test, since BOARS had seemingly expressed a preference for the SAT II over the SAT I in 2001. Senate Chair Brown clarified the recent changes to the SAT structure. In 2001, complaints from UC about the SAT I Reasoning Test prompted the College Board to develop another version of the test. SAT II *Writing* was incorporated, in essence, into the new SAT I as an interim measure, a test that BOARS found to be a strong predictor of college performance. In 2005 the new SAT Reasoning Test was introduced. In addition to incorporating the old SAT II *Writing*, it boasted an upgraded math section, and removed the analogies. BOARS now argues that maintaining the SAT II *Subject* Test requirement for eligibility is not academically justified given the minimal influence those test scores have in predicting freshman GPAs at UC, and given many of the changes to the SAT I. Individual programs could opt to still require SAT II subject tests for admission into their major, but it would not be a general requirement for eligibility.

There was a concern that the proposed change in minimum GPA requirements from 3.0 to 2.8 would lower UC academic standards. UCEP concluded that because the current 3.0 is weighted and the proposed 2.8 is unweighted, its influence on the student admission pool in the proposed new system was likely to be substantially equivalent to the current system. The unweighted GPA does not penalize students with less access to AP courses, and strong achievements in AP courses will still be incorporated in the admission process as part of comprehensive review.

Members differed on the question of whether to endorse the proposal as written. Arguments for endorsement centered on the need to broaden the pool, encourage selection of the best students for admission to UC, and increase admission from underrepresented and low-income groups. Arguments against endorsement centered on the importance of maintaining the eligibility guarantee, for the value its transparency has to the public, and because eliminating it could hurt the same populations BOARS was trying to help. UCEP did vote to endorse the BOARS proposal as written by a slim majority (6-5) but a larger number of members (8-3) were in favor of retaining some degree of guarantee above the 4% ELC level but less than the current 12.5%. UCEP suggested a number of options to increase the number of students given a guarantee, but felt that BOARS was ultimately in the best position to suggest the most appropriate method and specific level for the guarantee in a revised proposal.

UCEP noted one inconsistency in item 2 of the ETR policy – ELC students “would be offered admission to at least one campus in the system, provided they complete the required 15 a-g

courses prior to enrolling.” It appeared that completing all 15 a-g courses would still be mandated for ELC students, while the requirement is removed for ETR students.

Action: UCEP will review a revised, final draft over email and submit its final memo to Academic Council by December 6.

VII. Multi-campus Course Enrollment and the UC Center in Washington DC Systemwide Course - *With Deputy to the Vice Provost Margaret Heisel, UCDC Director Bruce Cain, and UCDC Information Systems Manager Rodger Rak*

Margaret Heisel reported that UCOP is finalizing a survey instrument that will be used to gather information from systemwide entities about courses and programs that enroll students from multiple campuses. The goal is to define and address administrative obstacles and inefficiencies impeding multi-campus course enrollment.

Bruce Cain and Rodger Rak joined the meeting by phone to discuss the status of the proposed systemwide quarter/semester hybrid course *California on the Hill*, which UCEP gave provisional approval to last year. UCEP had requested additional information – catalog copy, clarification about how credit units for semester and quarter students will be counted; and detail about in-class and outside class work related to the non-overlapping course sequence structure for the semester students who take extra material not present for the quarter students. UCEP also wanted to clarify the mechanism by which UCEP’s approval of a systemwide course would be communicated to the registrars and how such courses would be listed and numbered in catalogs.

Professor Cain noted two problems: the first relates specifically to *California on the Hill*. The second, more pressing problem is how to efficiently enroll and give credit to UC students in UCDC courses, irrespective of whether the course is quarter, semester, or hybrid. Currently, offering a course to both semester and quarter students involves the administrative burden of finding a host campus that is willing to approve the professor and the course and distribute the grades to the campuses. Moving the course into a systemwide realm would simplify that process and eliminate some confusion for registrars and students. Failing to fix the impediments will cost money and time, and will hinder the development of additional all-UC courses.

When UCEP agreed to accept systemwide course approval as part of its charge in 2003, the committee noted that it did not want to become a courses committee. Instead, it would rely on individual campuses to review the intellectual content of proposed courses. There was a question about whether UCEP should re-think that position. In addition, Professor Cain suggested a new structure that would involve all campuses and registrars sharing the administrative burden, perhaps through a regular rotation of responsibility. It would require adequate compensation for those campuses.

Regarding *California on the Hill*, there is currently a semester and a quarter track for the course. The semester track is taught in collaboration with two other semester universities with programs in D.C., who have worked out a credit arrangement with UC. Professor Cain said hybrid courses like *COTH* will be rare but he wants to keep open the possibility of more. Director Cain requested UCEP’s approval of the course. There was a question about whether semester students might take an extra one credit unit course for either the first or last month. UCDC felt this was unfeasible. In addition, compressing the course into one quarter would make it less attractive to semester students.

Director Cain noted that it would be helpful for UCEP to weigh in on the necessity of the enterprise, although he acknowledged that UCEP's role is not to implement administrative mechanisms. UCEP requested a list of the specific administrative responsibilities, and if possible, a visual representation of the current UCDC course approval process.

Action: UCEP will request more information.

VIII. Report of the Joint ad hoc Committee on International Education

- With Margaret Heisel and (former) Assistant Vice President for Budget Jerry Kissler

Jerry Kissler reported that he and Margaret Heisel interviewed a variety of international education constituencies in a series of campus visits, which helped inform the ad hoc committee's recommendations. Those recommendations include doubling the number of UC students studying abroad from 9,000 per year (20% of undergraduates) to 18,000 (40%); maintaining EAP's immersion experience model; increasing the number of foreign undergraduates in UC classrooms; and increasing opportunities for UC faculty with international interests to go abroad. In addition, the ad hoc committee recommended that UC adopt a new coordinated strategic plan and centralized leadership structure for all of its international education programs. The ad hoc committee identified a number of steps to help increase the number of students participating in study abroad: a broader array of shorter, single semester or single quarter programs; more opportunities for engineering and science students; more assistance for low income students; and more clarity about the credits students can expect. The report recommends increasing students' use of third party providers for study abroad, and notes that UC can use its size to negotiate lower costs with those providers.

The ad hoc committee also asked Mr. Kissler to suggest a new funding model for EAP that would bring it back to financial health and allow UC to increase the number of students studying abroad without using more state and general funds. State money currently funds EAP, which has led to an up and down instability. His recommendation is to move state money to the campuses and to offset the EAP budget with student fees so that EAP can exist as a more stable, self-supporting program. In addition, the cost of studying abroad – including course work and room/board, but excluding travel to and from the country – should be no higher than studying at a UC campus.

One member noted that UCEP should review the report in terms of its implications for academic quality, access, and Senate oversight. Is increasing access to study abroad consistent with maintaining quality if that means less immersion and greater use of third party providers? Moreover, UC students who study through a third party provider are not eligible for UC financial aid. As the recommendations go forward, the Senate must be involved in a substantial way. There was another question about whether UC should leave it to the State Department to decide where UC students can study abroad. Margaret Heisel said EAP has unparalleled expertise in student safety. Some students choose to go to dangerous countries without full information.

There was a question about Gayle Binion's minority report, which criticized some aspects of the ad hoc committee review process— specifically that the committee had inadequate number of in-person meetings and time allotted for deliberation.

Action: UCEP will discuss again at the February meeting.

IX. Special UCEP projects

Student to Faculty Ratio. UCEP is concerned about the effect of rising student-faculty ratios on educational quality and faculty workload. There is a sense that the actual ratio in campus classrooms is much higher than the official 20.7-1, and the committee wants to find meaningful data to demonstrate that. Santa Cruz distributed a recent study on class size at UCSC that looked at the change in class size between 1999 and 2006. The data showed that very large classes (with enrollments of 120 students or more) grew much faster than small or medium sized classes as a percentage of total classes at both the lower and upper division level. UCEP felt these data provided a good marker of educational quality. Another marker to look at might be student satisfaction.

Action: Chair Williams will talk to UCSC about their process. Members will gather similar data from their campus to see if like trends exist systemwide. UCEP will pool the evidence and write a letter to the Academic Council.

Best Practices for the Program Review process.

Action: Chair William will send out a request for each member will give a one to two page summary of the program review practice on their campus.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Keith Williams

Distributions:

1. Updated remote and online instruction dialectic
2. New draft BOARS eligibility memo