

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2013

Attending: John Yoder, Chair (UCD), Charles Smith (UCI), Tim Labor (UCR), David Lea (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Seeta Chaganti (UCD), Troy Carter (UCLA), Cristian Ricci (UCM), Leslie Carver (UCSD), Michael Todd (UCSD), Mona Vakilifathi (Graduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Bob Powell (Chair, Academic Senate), Bill Jacob (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements and Updates

Chair Yoder explained that the committee has three courses to review today. President Yudof recently announced that he will retire and a search committee will be established. This committee will include Regents and there will be a faculty committee that will vet the applications and make recommendations to the Regents. Senate Bills 1052 and 1053 went into effect in January and they require the development of fifty online textbooks. The legislature has committed \$5M to this and an equal amount in matching funds is being sought. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates will appoint a nine member team responsible for creating a request for proposals. The first set of textbooks is to be available by this fall.

At the January Regents meeting, the focus was on online education. The governor and Regents are extremely supportive of online education and want UC to do more. Ten million dollars in funding will be used to support online education. The governor is interested in moving more students through UC and has discussed three year degrees. The president has stated that freshmen may take up to 10% of their courses online. The president encouraged faculty to stay calm with respect to the developments related to online education and keep an open mind. Non-matriculated students are not the main reason for online education and only eight non-matriculated students have enrolled to date. The emphasis is how online courses will enhance the undergraduate experience of UC students, either by increasing quality, accessibility or affordability.

Discussion: If the primary rationale was non-matriculated students, the role of UCOE is not clear. A member asked why addressing the articulation issues will cost \$5M which is a question UCOE's Interim Director can be asked today. The viability of the business model was discussed and there is a question of whether non-matriculated students will pay \$1,400 per class.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination.

WASC will meet this month and is set to vote on revisions to the draft Handbook. The summary UCEP received includes significant edits of the institutional review process in terms of the context and interpretation of the standards that address the competencies. The language for most of this came from Stanford Provost John Etchemendy, who serves on the Commission. It is hoped that the revisions will provide more flexibility for how institutions give evidence that they are paying attention to the competencies. The previous language in the draft guidelines talked about setting levels of proficiency within each of the competencies. This language did not make sense for UC and has been removed. The

campus liaisons that work with WASC think that the revised handbook is an improvement. The proof will be in what the WASC teams look for and evaluate what campuses put forward.

Assistant Director Baxter mentioned that UCM has asked that the experiences of the first institutions to undergo the new accreditation process be evaluated by WASC to determine if the Commission's various goals have been met. UCM requested that the findings of the evaluation be shared publicly and that adjustments be made as necessary. ICAS is concerned that language about general education being struck is a signal that WASC no longer supports general education programs, and UCEP should monitor this. Pilot two institutions, the cohort including UCB, may not be asked to provide graduation and retention data. Institutions in the pilot one group have already submitted this data, and now it is not clear if the reviewers of this group of institutions will see this data. President Wolff has announced his retirement and at least eight commissioners will be rotating off.

Assistant Director Baxter reported on an item that will be discussed at the Regents March meeting. There have been reports to the Regents about Working Smarter and a set of efficiencies in the administration. However, the activities on the academic side of things have not been reported to the Regents in a routine way. There have been reports on the ways budget cuts have been handled by the campuses that reference program closures for example. The Board chair has been asking questions about faculty workload for some time and the governor has asked why faculty cannot teach more courses. This question comes up during times of budget crises when people grasp at straws when looking for solutions.

The provost wants a broader item that is not confined to just workload and faculty responsibilities, but other strategies that have been implemented and the progress made to date. The item will highlight various things campuses have done that show that UC is being more productive given the drastic reduction in state support, and that going forward UC will have to utilize multiple strategies to sustain the university. Although the governor's budget for this year looks good, major state support will not return to where it was three decades ago. This is a politically charged item and the governor is reportedly very interested in this matter. The primary strategies that can be implemented are not things that can be mandated by the Board or president but are instead subject to the local control of the campuses and departments, and it is hoped that this is conveyed to the Regents.

Discussion: There is no need for additional feedback on the review of graduate or professional degree programs at this time. Assistant Director Baxter encouraged the committee members to watch the March Regents meeting. UCEP members should share any examples of curricular innovations with Assistant Director Baxter. According to Vice Chair Jacobs, the president stated that faculty will have to teach more in order to get through the current budget situation. The vice chair was asked by the president to prepare data on student credit hours for the Regents meeting. Student credit hours will have to increase by 10% in order to handle the increased enrollment currently in the pipeline.

IV. UCOE Courses

In December, UCEP tentatively approved two courses for systemwide designation but committee members wanted additional clarifying information from the instructors. This was obtained via email in the interim. A new course has also been submitted for consideration.

Political Science 115: UCEP reviewed this course in December and agreed with the content of the course and its organization. The course is impacted and UCEP questioned how the online course would help increase access to UC students. The instructor indicated that the fees generated by students taking the online course will help provide funding to support additional offerings to UCLA students. The committee approved this course.

Physics: This is a UCI course. The course looked fine but the course description was ambiguous about the mid-term. The instructor clarified that there is no mid-term and that the final would be proctored. UCEP members agreed to approve the course.

Science & Society 25v: Global Climate Change: One reviewer indicated that this appears to be an interesting course, noting that the lecture portion of the course will be pre-recorded but the instructor will use presentations and synchronous discussions by web chat. The second lead reviewer was not persuaded that this would be an effective online course and did not support approving this course. This reviewer wanted more information about how this course would work online. The chair will request such information from the instructor.

Discussion: A member questioned the purpose of approving a course for systemwide designation if the mission statement of UCOE is changing. It is not clear whether a course is systemwide simply because it is online or because it offers unique content not available at another UC campus. Currently there is no criterion to evaluate a course for its uniqueness. Some members thought that systemwide courses should have unique aspects, others did not. The playing field has shifted and UCEP should review its procedures for approving courses for systemwide designation. Chair Yoder indicated that in 2011 Council approved UCEP's process for approving and listing systemwide courses. The request that comes to UCEP should address why a course should be systemwide, with an explanation of how the course will improve the quality of a typical UC student's education. If an instructor can justify the quality, affordability or accessibility a course should receive systemwide approval. UCEP should expect to receive comprehensive information in the course packets. The information provided for UCB's Chemistry 1A course approved by UCEP at an earlier meeting is a good example of what UCEP should receive. The supplemental questions asked by UCB do provide more of the information UCEP would like to see. Chair Yoder invited members to send ideas about the additional questions it would be reasonable to ask of faculty.

A member recommended that the role of UCOE should be clarified before UCEP approves any more systemwide courses. Vice Chair Jacobs reported that the Senate leadership has talked with the provost about what happened at the January Regents meeting. Chair Powell and Vice Chair Jacobs have encouraged the provost to give a significant portion of the \$10M to the campuses. An RFP will be issued for courses that will be part of a systemwide catalog of courses that facilitate time to degree issues and efficiencies. A major portion of the catalog will be courses developed at the campus level, and UCOE will be a piece of this. There will be a conference on online education on April 13 and a follow up meeting with the provost a few weeks later. UCEP members would like online education to be implemented thoughtfully at UC. A member anticipates that in the future there will be just a few unique systemwide courses and many online courses. The rationale behind UCOE drove the types of courses that were developed but the governor is focused on courses entry level courses that become bottlenecks. UC should evaluate the status of its online courses and learn from the mistake that have been made. One member suggested that UCOP should put the brakes on UCOE and recommends that online instruction should be supplemental to in-class instruction. Hybrid courses or face to face courses that use technology could be the focus of UC's resources. The availability of course management software utilized by one representative has enhanced his teaching.

One issue is whether UCEP wants to have an overarching strategy for what a systemwide course should be. According to Chair Yoder questions include why UCEP needs to approve systemwide courses and what it means to be called a systemwide course. A systemwide course could be a course that is unique on a campus, although these courses will not address efficiency issues by eliminating bottlenecks. The campuses might look at the bottleneck courses. Another approach would be to let the market rule. Using these categories could be a helpful way of thinking about the courses. It was noted that UCEP is struggling with the conflict between the types of courses that fit the intellectual mission versus courses

with an instrumental purpose such as clearing bottlenecks. Chair Powell remarked that it is important to keep in mind key leadership changes that have occurred at UCOE. According to Vice Chair Jacob, the provost may insist on a comprehensive evaluation of UCOE. The role of systemwide courses should be re-evaluated on the basis of academic considerations. The online presence of individual campuses should be recognized and campuses do not need UCEP's approval to offer online courses. It would be helpful if someone in a leadership position at UCOP would make a reassuring statement acknowledging the mistakes that have been made and indicating that the priority is to enhance the experience of UC students.

A member asserted that UCEP should not grant systemwide status to online courses. There is a need to discuss the motivation behind the courses being offered. The 2009 systemwide approval guidelines do not include uniqueness as criteria. This policy could be changed or maintain the current policy and base decisions on whether a course will be effective and appropriate online. Several members agreed that the existing policy should be revised to include uniqueness in the criteria, others did not and pointed out that Gateway courses would fall outside the category of unique courses. Some members are concerned that it will appear to the Regents and governor that faculty are not listening and are being contrary if the criterion for systemwide designation are changed. . Chair Powell recommended not making any changes until after the April meeting. A member pointed out that the review process UCEP has used to date has been very fair and careful. Chair Yoder proposed that UCEP could eventually consider changes to the systemwide approval guidelines. Director Williams notified Chair Yoder that thirty-four online courses are in development.

A motion was made to put a moratorium on approving courses for systemwide designation until the meaning of the systemwide courses was clarified

V. Time to Completion

This item was not discussed.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Keith Williams, Interim Director, UC Online Education*

Director William has a suggestion about how the articulation of online courses will occur. Senate Regulation 544 guarantees unit credit for graduation for courses taken at another campus but additional approvals are needed to apply the credit toward major or GE. This process was put in place several years ago but it has not been frequently used. It is a time-intensive and paper-based process that many people feel is not a good method. There is no desire to take the approval authority away from the faculty in the colleges and departments. Director Williams drafted the document on articulation last year and the topic has been reviewed recently with the new provost. UCOP is proposing a process that is similar to what the community colleges use. The articulation officer at a campus contacts the appropriate people in the departments for a decision about whether that course meets the department's particular requirements. Director Williams explained the possible ways that articulation can be done. One proposal essentially automates the procedures currently used and it may be possible to add this to ASSIST, the system used by the community colleges being redesigned. Students would be able to use ASSIST to determine if an online course offered by another UC campus has already been approved.

General education requirements would be implemented in a similar way. The current process for simultaneous enrollment is cumbersome but rarely used. As the number of students increases, more people will be involved so it would be ideal to automate the process. UCDC and EAP are interested in facilitating this process as well.

Discussion: Chair Yoder asked Director Williams to weigh in on the question of why online courses need systemwide designated. Director Williams stated that this was a Senate decision. A member asked the

director to comment on UCOE's focus shifting from non-matriculated students to matriculated students. Director Williams stated that the focus has not been on non-matriculated students. In the beginning the focus was on creating UC courses for UC students that might be offered to non-matriculated students. At the forefront of all that has been done, the question of whether the course is of UC quality that will benefit UC students has been asked. As a part of the funding arrangement, whether the course could also be offered to non-matriculated students in a way that will generate revenue to support the program and return to the campuses has been considered. Focusing on UC students simplifies the work that needs to be done but in the future, it may still be a feasible mechanism to attract non-matriculated students. The main focus will be on what should be done to help UC students. What has worked in the past may not be scalable when it comes to serving non-matriculated students. The president has asked for revised budget figures that take into account the absence of revenue from non-matriculated students.

In a meeting with the executive vice chancellors, the provost recommended not exchanging any money for the first two years while how well the new system works is determined. A pilot of cross campus enrollment may be conducted next fall for a select few courses. Director Williams asked for UCEP members to review the articulation proposal and identify anything that could be improved. If UCEP decides to stop approving courses, operationally this means that UCOE will not make courses available for cross campus enrollment or offered to non-matriculated students. One outcome, as a result of the discussions with the Regents, is to look at online courses currently offered only during the summer and UCEP should look at these courses to determine if they should be offered online. These courses are very different from the courses being offered by UCOE now. Director Williams indicated that the systemwide designation was used to say that these courses should be listed in a catalog across courses and available to non-matriculated students. Director Williams agreed with a member's comment that there has not been a discussion about whether the systemwide designation is needed for courses serving only UC students. It is timely for the Senate to consider what a systemwide course should be.

VII. OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel Report and Recommendations

- *Diane Harley, Chair, Senate OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel (UCB)*

The Panel began its work last April and it has received very little information about what is occurring with UCOE. A detailed evaluation report was to be made available in August. In November, a report primarily about the student experience was provided. It is not clear when the full report will be available or what will be delivered. The Panel wrote a memo which included a lengthy set of questions. The Panel would like to know more about the budget for UCOE, including the hidden costs to the campuses from their in-kind work. Chair Harley has talked to Vice Chair Jacob about what a new evaluation would look like especially since it is not clear what UCOE is. Faculty at campuses that provided in-kind support described more positive experiences. Chair Harley noted that UCEC received \$400,000 for this evaluation but this was not done through a competitive RFP.

Discussion: There is general agreement that the evaluator may not have been fully aware of what this particular evaluation would entail. This is a complex evaluation and the budget provided may not be enough to support it. UC should ask if it is a good model for UCOE to garner all of the campus resources. Chair Harley reviewed UCEC's description of the evaluation. What should be evaluated needs to be identified. The pedagogical effectiveness of online courses and whether the courses are exorbitantly expensive may be the questions faculty would like answered. Data on the hidden costs involved with producing a course cannot be collected retroactively. Chair Harley is concerned about the use of an incentive for students to complete the survey. The main way UCEP can help is by pressuring UCOE to provide data. According to Chair Harley, UCOE responds to requests data with statements that there is not time to handle the Panel's requests. UCEP should ask if UCOE is the appropriate way to manage online courses at UC. The RFP could state that a faculty member will be required to provide certain data.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:05 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Yoder