

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2010

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

I. Announcements

Chair Williams shared a slideshow was compiled for UC advocacy efforts. The slides provide information about inventions by UC faculty. UCEP's letters in response to systemwide review items have been submitted to Council. At the last Council meeting, the president announced that furloughs will end this year. In terms of recruitment and retention, the furloughs cannot continue, but it is not clear what will happen in response to the budget. The governor's office and the legislature have started to show a more realistic understanding of higher education. UC received an increase in the state budget last year and there is optimism that the additional funds will not be taken away. The Asian American community is concerned about the new eligibility policy and a recent report from the Legislative Analyst's Office incorrectly asserts that UC did not coordinate with the CSUs and community colleges when creating the policy. There will be a reduction of 1500 instead of 2300 new freshman slots at UC, and the target for transfer students is 500. Council discussed the incentives given to medical center directors, and the president indicated that UC is contractually required to provide them and that incentives are not provided elsewhere in the UC system. A post employment benefits task force is considering a variety of options and will survey staff, faculty, and administrators in April to gather information about attitudes toward retirement. Benefits will be changed for future hires.

While the Compendium has been updated, UCEP probably will not have any new schools to review in the near future. Differential fees by discipline and campus have been opposed by the Committee on Planning and Budget and Council approved sending UCPB's letter out for systemwide review. The Commission on the Future continues its work and workgroup recommendations will go to the Commission March 23rd to be prioritized, and the goal is to have an official item on the Regents' agenda in May as an action item following a Senate review. A second set of recommendations will come from the workgroups in June and these will also be reviewed by the Senate. A variety of ideas are being considered by the workgroups. UCEP will probably have a draft of the recommendations to discuss in March. UCEP members can share the recommendations being discussed, but should not share the documents provided by Chair Williams. There will be a meeting with the working groups' chairs to identify similarities across the recommendations. The Commission will decide which recommendations to put forward, and the working groups will not be able to weigh in on the decisions. A goal is to send a message to the legislature that UC is trying to use the funds provided by the state more efficiently.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Days of Instruction

- *Harry Powell, Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Powell would like UCEP to help define days of instruction and the definition will go to Council for consideration. Days of instruction became an issue during furlough discussions last year when it became clear that a definition is needed. Chair Powell pointed out that there is a need to consider what would happen in the event of a campus being closed due to an epidemic such as H1N1 or fires. OP needs to be notified when an academic calendar is being changed. The nature of instruction is also changing due to technology. Faculty might set up websites to facilitate communication with students so they can keep up with their education. In the past year, UCB designated three days as reading, recitation and review which was approved by the provost. It should be noted that UC has an unusually long academic year compared to other institutions.

Discussion: The definition of a unit value for a course is related to how days of instruction will be defined. SR 760 defines a unit as three hours of work. Several members commented that a broad definition of days of instruction would be preferable to a narrow definition applied to dissimilar circumstances and it was also noted that faculty need to have flexibility. The committee questioned why days of instruction need to be defined and agreed that any situation that disrupts instruction should be handled on a case by case basis.

Chair Powell commented on the report from the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) about the Master Plan. The report claimed that UC does not coordinate with the CSU and community college systems when in fact coordination occurs through the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). ICAS intends to write a letter to the LAO that will address the inaccurate statement that UC did not communicate with the other systems when reforming the eligibility policy. UCEP and Chair Powell discussed a variety of reasons for the LAO's criticism of UC in recent reports. Chair Williams will draft a letter addressing some of the issues raised in the LAO report which will be submitted to Council.

IV. Unit Values for a Course

This topic was discussed with the item above.

V. Approval Process for Courses

There are issues related to getting approval for courses taken at another campus. This came up with EAP, the Language Consortium, UCDC, and UC Sacramento. There is no smooth and easy way for students to enroll in courses taken elsewhere and the process now uses paper forms. If there is a growth in online courses, the problem will increase with the additional information that will be tracked. Students are responsible for notifying their campus that they have enrolled in a course at another campus. The committee should consider if there is a way to streamline the process and decrease the burden on students. A system to track courses that have been approved to which faculty and students could refer may facilitate the approval process. The EAP process includes pre-approval of the courses and a second approval after the student returns from abroad, and EAP is considering ways to change this. Chair Williams has drafted a letter asking the administration to change the system for the best interests of the students. Articulation Officers should be involved in proposing any changes.

Discussion: A member expressed concern that because registration processes change, there would be a need for ongoing oversight by UCEP but Chair Williams indicated that oversight would be up to the administration. One question to consider is what happens if an approved course is taught by a different faculty member. Students who took the Arabic Without Walls course could be asked about their experience with the enrollment process. There was a question about the need for standardizing the articulation process since this does not involve a large number of students and is generally done on a case by case basis. The committee discussed whether there would actually be cost-savings if a standardized and streamlined process is implemented. Focusing on courses taken during the summer might be a good place to start and would help students avoid having to enroll for a fifth year. UCEP should avoid any suggestion that courses should be standardized across the campuses, and faculty should not be asked to consider what is happening at other campuses when developing a course.

Action: Chair Williams will revise the letter and send it to the committee for comments.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning Analyst, Programs and Coordination, Academic Planning*
- *Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

Vice Provost Greenstein provided an update on the online education initiative. Money to support the initiative is still being sought so the RFP is on hold at this time. A large part of the process is to figure out where online education may or may not be effective. Determining where to focus has been a difficult process, but the initial focus may be on foundation courses and impacted majors. Honing in on specific types of courses eliminates the opportunity to see how online education works with a range of courses. There is a lot of interest in the RFP and feedback has included that campuses should be allowed to look at what is proposed.

Discussion: A draft request for interest has not been released due to concerns about creating expectations that funding is available. A concern at one campus is that delivery of gateway courses online could have a negative impact on the diversity of students. An oversight body that includes Senate representation will be established and cost models are being developed. Surveys of people offering online courses at other institutions are being conducted and the Vice Provost will share a written report with UCEP in the future. Results of the surveys to date show that the economies are different depending on the discipline. An online environment may make it easier to identify the students who are at risk than it is in a large lecture. The right blend of online and in person delivery needs to be determined. Coordination with the campuses will be needed in terms of the staffing required. UCOP can outline a range of reasons for online education that are not related to budget. One question is why this effort needs to be centralized at UCOP when there are already efforts at the campuses to introduce online education. The Senate will need to decide if online courses meet the criteria for the quality of a UC education. A concern that should be addressed is how to prevent students from cheating. The later phases outlined in the initiative will be revised to reflect different outcomes. One model for sustainability is outlined in the prospectus, but there are other possible models including models that generate revenue. There may not be savings from using online courses with smaller classes, with the exception of more specialized courses where it is difficult to find instructors to teach them. Chair Williams discussed the request for UCEP representation on the Advisory Committee for the Online Education Initiative and several members volunteered to be considered to serve.

VII. Budget Situation and Curricular Activity at the Campuses

This item was not discussed.

VIII. Consultation with the Office of Student Affairs

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*

Chair Williams provided the background on UCEP's proposal to revise its bylaw to incorporate student welfare issues. Vice President Sakaki is asked to comment on whether it would be valuable to have a systemwide committee discussing student affairs and what types of issues might be brought to UCEP.

Vice President Sakaki thanked UCEP for the opportunity to join the meeting, indicating that the bringing student affairs issues to UCEP would be valuable. The Vice President meets regularly with the Senate Chair and Vice Chair, and discusses policy issues with the Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs. Student Affairs is looking at a systemwide way to provide health insurance for graduate students and a systemwide committee is exploring this now. There would be significant savings that would go back to the campuses. Three campuses have opted not to participate in the first year having indicated that their existing programs are working well. A systemwide plan for undergraduate health insurance is not being explored right now because it is more complicated and undergraduates are not concerned with things such as dependent care.

UCOP received a grant to implement an alcohol and drug abuse education program and this is the type of issue UCEP could advise Student Affairs. UCEP could provide ideas on how to address mental health issues, and the Vice President mentioned two recent violent incidents involving UC students. Student Affairs is also looking at issues related to student activism, and there is a new policy that students cannot wear masks at protests. Work is also being done on policies for veterans, including the new GI bill, and on policies for youth formerly in the foster care system such as providing housing over holiday breaks. Concerns for LGBT students are also being discussed.

Discussion: One member commented that the procedure to help a troubled student whose friend reports the problem to a faculty member is not clear, and the Vice President commented that the policy to address this exists but may not be well known. Several members of the committee do not believe that student welfare issues need to be discussed at the systemwide level and UCEP may just want to suggest that the campuses have some entity that handles the issues.

IX. Education and Curriculum Workgroup Issues

Chair Williams provided summaries of the issues being discussed by the Education and Curriculum Workgroup. Some issues have been put on the backburner and others will be prioritized.

Discussion: A member questioned whether online courses provide an opportunity for student-faculty interaction. The use of summer school as a means to allow students to get their degree in three years was discussed. Students likely to succeed in a three year program would need to be identified. One idea being considered is creating a ladder rank position that primarily is teaching. A subgroup of the Education and Curriculum Workgroup is discussing how UC quality is defined, including what UC graduates look like. A question is whether quality is invested in the courses or in the degree. Whether things could be done differently at the lower division to save funds that could be used to do more at the upper division is another question.

X. Update on Quality Survey at UCSD

The UCSD representative updated the committee on the quality survey conducted at his campus. Half of the department chairs responded and half of the provosts and deans of instruction responded. Common responses included reduction of classes, sections, and larger class sizes. Substantial budget cuts were dealt with without significantly impacting educational quality. In light of the responses from UCSD, there is a question about whether the survey should be conducted at the other campuses.

Meeting Adjourned At: 4 p.m.

Minutes Prepared By: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams