

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES OF MEETING – MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2008

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD) Stephen McLean, Vice-Chair (UCSB), Ignacio Navarette (UCB), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), David Kay (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Taradas Bandyopadhyay (UCR), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Linda Chafetz (UCSF), Peter Digeser (UCSB), Alexandra Ramos (Undergraduate Student-UCLA), Margaret Heisel (Deputy to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs), Paula Murphy (Director, Teaching, Learning, and Technology Center), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. General Announcements and Updates – UCEP Chair Keith Williams

To help address a \$14.5 billion deficit, the governor has proposed a 10% after “compact” funding cut to UC in his 2008-09 state budget, which represents a 3.4% net reduction over 2007-08 funding. The uncertain budget situation threatens a planned 2.5% increase in new student enrollments, as well as implementation of the next phase of the faculty salary scales plan. The effect on student fees is also unclear. UCOP is encouraging faculty and others to send messages in support of UC to legislators through a new [UC for California](#) budget advocacy website.

The Office of the President restructuring continues. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) sent a special team to UCOP in fall 2007. WASC’s final [Report](#), which Academic Council endorsed, criticizes some of the University’s management and governance practices and makes recommendations for improvements.

In January, the Academic Assembly endorsed a resolution expressing concern about plans to expand plutonium “pit” production at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The resolution also notes that UC should re-examine its involvement in LANL if pit production rises above current levels or if the University is unable to determine the number of pits being produced.

Chair Williams is on an ICAS steering committee discussing “C-ID,” a pilot project that is attempting to develop a common, cross-segmental numbering system for lower division major preparation courses. Faculty from UC, CSU, and CCC are meeting to identify common elements and develop course descriptors for courses within existing articulation agreements. More UC faculty representation is needed, however, and UCEP members were encouraged to raise the topic with their local undergraduate councils.

Finally, many early concerns about Senate involvement in the UC presidential search process have been resolved, and BOARS is expected to submit a revised version of its freshman eligibility policy proposal to Council by March. Chair Williams said UCEP will hold its next in-person meeting April 7, but asked committee members to hold the morning of March 3 for a potential conference call.

II. Consent Calendar

- UCEP minutes of December 3, 2007

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

III. The California Science and Math Initiative: Status and Funding Concerns

The [California Science and Math Initiative](#) (SMI) is a three-year old statewide program that seeks to train 1000 new science and math teachers annually to meet California's educational and workforce needs. SMI was developed to address the teacher shortage and the fact that many California science and math teachers do not have a degree in the subject they are teaching. SMI allows UC students to earn a science or math degree and a teaching credential in four years with a fifth-year internship and two summer teacher-training institutes. UCOP sees the program as a success; there are now 660 students involved systemwide. The initiative is campus-based, but a joint faculty-administration steering committee also provides systemwide oversight.

State and campus money funds SMI, with additional funding provided by private corporate sponsorship and grants, some of which is used for student stipends and support of faculty mentors. SMI program directors are concerned, however, that current funding is inadequate to meet the growth of the program. Chair Williams said the steering committee is preparing to submit a memo to Provost Hume expressing concern that private monies are running out without adequate fundraising efforts in place to replace them, potentially leaving academic programs and students with fewer funds than promised.

IV. Undergraduate Education Planning Group

The Undergraduate Education Planning Group (UEPG) formed last spring to advise the Academic Planning Council about the future of undergraduate education has proposed the creation of two working groups. The first will develop procedures for identifying and articulating the educational objectives of UC academic programs and methods for evaluating the success of those programs; the second group will identify procedures aimed at gathering information about UC graduates that will allow UC to measure educational effectiveness.

UC and other universities are under pressure from government agencies and accrediting organizations to set more explicit educational objectives and measure learning outcomes. UC declined to participate in exit testing but has agreed to monitor some indicators of learning outcomes. Beginning this spring at UC Berkeley, departments under review will be asked to identify specific academic goals and metrics to measure those goals – information that will become part of the department self-study. Berkeley is also developing a boilerplate, which the UEPG may use as the basis for a systemwide framework made available but not be mandated to campuses as a tool to integrate into their program review process.

Discussion: UCEP members noted that outside pressures for outcome assessment were intrusive and inappropriate. One member noted that relying solely on objective, goal-oriented measures could weaken higher education. (“Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.”) But another remarked that external norms could provide a measure of accountability for students and that faculty should also be sensitive to the need to teach not just what they want, but also what students need. In any case, UC faculty should develop the outcome assessment methods themselves to prevent imposition from the outside. Members also supported the proposed charge of the second working group and suggested polling graduates to find out what they consider most valuable at UC in preparing them for their life and careers.

V. UC Santa Cruz Undergraduate Honors Legislation

In accordance with [Senate Regulation 640B](#), UCEP reviewed a proposed amendment to UCSC Regulation 11, which would establish a quarterly Dean's Honors List and a category of undergraduate University Honors using traditional Latin designations. UCSC is the only

undergraduate UC campus without a campus-wide honors program or a Dean's Honors List, and the regulation is modeled on similar policies already in place at other UC campuses.

Discussion: It was noted that there has been a gradual evolution away from the alternative education tradition at Santa Cruz. UCSC first allowed students to receive a GPA in 1998, and required it only four years ago. One member expressed concern that UCSC was requiring only 47-52 of the 70 completed units eligible for University Honors to be graded, a lower percentage than some other quarter campuses. It was also noted that UCSC requires some courses that are offered *only* on a pass/not pass basis. In general, UCEP members felt that the amendment was appropriate and consistent with what other UC campuses were doing, and that Santa Cruz faculty should be allowed to maintain the unique, distinctive character of UCSC academic programs to the extent they see fit. UCSC should also be encouraged to monitor closely how the regulation is working.

Action: UCEP will submit comments to Academic Council in support of the amendment.

VI. Proposed UC Riverside School of Public Policy

Report: In accordance with [the Compendium](#), UCEP reviewed a proposal from UC Riverside to establish a new School of Public Policy (SPP). UCR representative Bandyopadhyay noted that the SPP will give Riverside students skills to pursue successful careers in local, state, and national governments and non-profit organizations. The SPP will offer a Master's, Ph.D., and Ph.D. Minor, and will have two distinctive themes: regional policy, and the intersection of social policy and environmental policy. The SPP will help UCR attract more graduate students and build interdisciplinary synergies, and will play to the academic strengths of Riverside's existing Schools, institutes and programs. Chair Williams noted that the SPP has no undergraduate component, so there are few specific issues for UCEP to address except the potential effect of the School on undergraduate education.

Discussion: UCEP members felt the goals of the SPP were appropriate and well-considered, and the new interdisciplinary relationships would be beneficial for Riverside faculty, but there were also questions about the effect the new FTE could have on competing areas, and whether core undergraduate programs could be undermined if resources were inadvertently siphoned to the new cross-disciplinary efforts. UCEP members noted that while they had no objection to the proposal itself, they were concerned about the potential FTE drain on future undergraduate education at UCR and on the ability of existing programs to adequately educate their undergraduates if both FTE and existing faculty were redirected exclusively to the new School.

More generally, there were concerns that UC is making decisions around graduate and professional school education without considering the potential effects on undergraduate education. The rush to grow graduate education, build high-level multi-campus and multi-disciplinary initiatives, and emphasize new moneymaking professional schools, do not necessarily synergize well with undergraduate education. While it is not productive to pit graduate and undergraduate education against each other, undergraduate education can get lost in the academic shuffle.

Neither the legislature nor all UC constituencies seem to fully understand the importance of undergraduate education to the UC mission. UC should do more to communicate the harmful effects of the budget cuts on undergraduate education. There was also a suggestion to ask UCR to allow undergraduates to take courses in the new School.

Action: UCEP will submit comments to CCGA.

VII. Multi-campus Educational Programs - *With Deputy to the Vice Provost Margaret Heisel, and Teaching, Learning, and Technology Center Director Paula Murphy*

Report: Margaret Heisel summarized UCOP's efforts to identify and address administrative obstacles and inefficiencies involving academic programs and courses that enroll students from multiple campuses. Building and improving UC's capacity to administer these programs, which are expected to grow as UC seeks to maximize "the power of ten," will create new educational and research opportunities for students and faculty. Currently, however, certain administrative obstacles discourage development of new programs, consume unnecessary time and resources, and inhibit student enrollment. UCOP recently visited campuses and surveyed program directors, relevant administrators, and registrars to identify affected programs, which include EAP, UCDC, UC Sacramento, and the Language Consortium course "Arabic without Walls" – as well as a number of locally administered programs, and the proposed School of Global Health.

Problems identified so far include inadequate or inefficient processes for vetting, approving, publicizing, and cross-listing courses offered to students from multiple campuses; difficulties validating and approving instructors of record, including "local experts"; uncertainty about funding; barriers to trouble-free student enrollment and credit; confusion about how to determine credit for students on different academic calendars taking the same course; and obstacles to course delivery. Campus constituencies met together on January 31 and made suggestions for solutions. These included a new centralized administrative mechanism for approval of courses and instructors of record, perhaps through a systemwide oversight group; a new central website for listing courses, and more standardization of online catalogs.

Discussion: Programs like UCDC and the Language Consortium are treasures for UC. Not all UC campuses have the capacity to offer every kind of course, so systemwide programs are a great opportunity to maximize resources for the benefit of campuses and programs with fewer resources. It was noted that UCEP's bylaw changed in 2003 to give it the authority to approve systemwide courses. At that time, UCEP opined that it did not want to become a courses committee and decided to rely on individual campuses to review the intellectual content of proposed courses. UC faculty would want any systemwide courses committee to be comparable to a campus course committee that has experience with standards and approving courses.

There was a question about why campuses would relinquish their ability to offer a course to a systemwide entity and concern that UCOP's effort could encourage the growth of distance learning and a "UC without walls." There was a comment that multi-campus efforts should be limited to unique, extraordinary opportunities like UCDC, EAP, and some languages. Hurdles to approving "local experts" as instructors can be a good thing because teaching quality varies greatly. Margaret Heisel noted that UCOP is not planning to expand beyond these few examples now. They only want to create mechanisms to solve current problems and also smooth the way for more opportunities in the future.

There was a suggestion to keep the vetting process for multi-campus programs and courses at the local level and then have relevant departments set up "dummy" courses designated for "UCDC credit," for example. The dummy course could accept and pre-approve for major credit any course that had been vetted on a UC campus. There was support for UCOP to establish a clearinghouse for links and web pages that could be disseminated to campuses.

Action: UCOP will sketch out ideas more and then bring them back to UCEP.

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

- With Margaret Heisel

UCEP continued its discussion of the Joint ad hoc Committee on International Education report. The primary concern was that the ad hoc committee's recommendation to double the number of UC students studying abroad from 9,000 per year (20% of undergraduates) to 18,000 (40%) would be inconsistent with maintaining UCEAP's current quality. Members noted that the report did not include a quality assessment of EAP. While the current quality of EAP is presumably very high, such an assessment would have been useful as a point of reference. In addition, it was troubling for some members that the report began by articulating a goal of increasing quantity, not maintaining or increasing quality. The quality of the student experience, rather than the numbers of students having that experience, should be UC's primary goal. Further, EAP was founded on the idea of the immersion experience, which has been key to its academic excellence. However, some of the strategies proposed in the report to increase the numbers of students studying abroad may result in more short-term experiences of limited quality and less immersion.

The report also recommends increasing the use of third party providers for UC study abroad. UCEP members felt that broadening student options would certainly help increase the number of students studying abroad and add value to the educational experience of many students, but there was also reluctance to endorse the recommendation outright out of concern that some third party providers, particularly private, for-profit organizations, would not be able to match EAP's quality and depth. Decisions about formally integrating third party providers into UC's overall international education strategy should be made carefully on a case-by-case basis. UC should also be wary of using public money (i.e., financial aid) to support third party providers and remain cognizant of the potential conflicts of interest.

Margaret Heisel noted that increasing numbers of UC students are using third party providers in order to have experiences in countries not covered by EAP or to for the flexibility of shorter-term experiences. It is true that these programs do not include UC quality control or vetting by UC faculty. But by formalizing its relationship with these programs, UC could also vet their quality more closely. UCEP members agreed, but noted that providing oversight of those providers could also be difficult and costly. Another way for UC to expand the number of students studying abroad could be to join with other universities in consortia.

UCEP supported the goal of encouraging the participation of a larger and broader population of UC students in study abroad. More science and engineering students in particular should be encouraged to go abroad, perhaps earlier in their careers when they could tackle fundamentals they would have a more difficult time with later. More graduate and professional students could also be steered to specialized study abroad programs.

UCEP felt there is a substantial benefit to the presence of international students on UC campuses, and supported the ad hoc committee's recommendation to re-examine reciprocity agreements and other ways to increase the number of foreign students in UC classrooms (Recommendation #7). Members also supported the recommendations to strengthen the study abroad advising function (#5). Advising in particular is essential and must be better supported. UCEP suggested that a work group be formed to develop a framework for a better EAP advising function, which could be available as a model for departments to follow.

Members noted that the report's recommendations for cost reductions and streamlining are admirable, but they also seem to conflict with simultaneous proposals for the establishment of a new bureaucracy. UCEP was concerned that a new administrative structure and vice provost will

cost a lot but add little value. There were also concerns that the lines of authority and the role of the Senate going forward were unclear. As the recommendations go forward, the Senate must be involved in a substantial way. Finally, UCEP commended former Academic Council Chair Gayle Binion, whose minority report criticized some aspects of the ad hoc committee review process, for remaining a genuinely independent voice on that committee.

In short, UCEP strongly supported the general principles of education abroad and the mission of UCEAP. UCEP also supported increasing the numbers of students studying abroad as long as current quality is maintained. Increasing access to study abroad could be inconsistent with maintaining quality, however, if that meant less immersion and greater use of other providers.

Action: UCEP will submit its views to Council.

IX. EAP Travel Restrictions Policy

The University Committee on Academic Freedom sent a memo to Council questioning UC's prohibition on study abroad through UCEAP to countries with a US State Department travel advisory. In addition, California State Senate resolution SR 18 recommends that UCEAP revise its policies to allow students to study in some countries with less severe travel advisories, such as Israel and the Philippines.

Regarding SR 18, UCEP agreed that the legislation intrudes inappropriately into UC's academic decision-making, particularly because the Academic Senate is now actively discussing the issue. There was general opposition to UCAF's suggestion that UC rescind the current EAP travel restriction policy, mainly due to concerns over student safety and University liability. Student welfare, safety, and security are serious and legitimate concerns in certain regions of the world. The UCEAP policy has served UC well as a baseline. It is a clear policy that protects students and reassures parents. It also protects the University from liability risks and gives UC a way to break contracts when unforeseen circumstances lead to political instability in a country. Moreover, the University does not prohibit UC students from traveling to and studying in areas under a State Department advisory; it only precludes them from using EAP and UC financial aid to do that. UC students may still use other universities and third party providers to go to many restricted areas. UC accepts credit from Hebrew University of Jerusalem, for instance.

On the other hand, some members questioned whether State Department policy should guide decisions about where UC students can and cannot study abroad. There was a concern that government advisories can be politicized and subjective, and in some cases, do not apply to entire countries. While certain regions of Israel and the Philippines, for example, are indeed dangerous, other parts are not; however, the UC ban applies to those entire countries. UCEP felt there may be room for more distinction between severe and less severe risk. There was support for investigating a new approach to policy that does not impose a blanket prohibition on EAP students going to some countries where the restrictions are confined to certain portions of the country. If there is a more objective method of determining true risk levels that does not threaten the University's liability, it should be pursued.

UCAF's second concern, about the relationship between UC and the study abroad industry and possible inappropriate perks, is appropriate if students are being advised to go abroad for reasons that are not based on academic quality. University representatives should have to disclose activities that result in material gain in a Conflict of Interest declaration.

Action: UCEP will submit comments.

X. Preliminary Proposals for Three New Schools

UCEP reviewed preliminary proposals for three new schools. Members noted that the proposals should address the effects on undergraduate education on those campuses as well as the broader implications for undergraduate and graduate education at other campuses to ensure those programs are not disadvantaged. There was a suggestion for an [economic impact report](#) detailing where additional funding for clinical education at the professional schools will draw from.

UC Merced School of Medicine: The new School will help raise the campus's profile and reputation, but there were concerns that Merced as an undergraduate campus is still struggling with enrollment issues. Anything that could detract from the evolution of UCM into a solid undergraduate campus would not be in its best interest. The School is not planned to begin enrolling students until 2013, but they may consider holding off a year or two to make sure the undergraduate schools achieve a sufficient level of maturity. There was a question about whether Merced regional hospitals have the kind facilities that would sustain a UC medical school.

Irvine School of Nursing: The School will be important to address the nursing shortage in California. There have very few opportunities for undergraduate students interested in Nursing at UC; they have had to study at private institutions, the CCCs and CSU.

UCSF School of Global Health: UCEP supported the important and growing area of global health studies. The School plays into the Power of Ten concept; and it will allow UC to compete for funding from previously untapped venues such as the Gates Foundation. Possible downsides include the impact of diverting FTE to the School from traditional majors and having large proportion of the division's faculty and students working overseas off-campus.

Action: UCEP will submit comments to Academic Council.

XI. Other Issues

Program Review Practices Survey: UCEP reviewed and made suggestions for improving a template questionnaire that will help committee members assemble and compare best campus practices for programs reviews.

Action: A revised survey will be circulated over email. UCEP members will be asked to complete by mid-March.

Class Size and Student to Faculty Ratio: Chair Williams has asked UC Davis to set up a data protocol similar to the model used by UCSC looking at changes in class size over time alongside indicators of student satisfaction and quality.

Action: The Davis protocol will be distributed to UCEP members, who will be asked to begin looking for the appropriate person on campus to locate the data.

Regents Diversity Study: **Action:** UCEP will discuss the Regents Diversity Task Force reports over email and at a March 3 conference call.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Keith Williams

Distributions:

1. PowerPoint presentation: Multi-Campus and Off-Campus Instructional Programs
2. Multi-Campus Programs Folder Packet
3. Trends in Class Size and Type of Instructor, 1999-2007