

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA** **ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2012**

**Attending:** Jose Wudka, Chair (UCR), John Yoder, Vice Chair (UCD), Nayan Shah (UCSD), Michael Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Begoña Echeverria (UCR) (telephone), Tania Israel (UCSB), Abbey Alkon (UCSF), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Dick Weiss (UCLA), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Keith Williams (Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination), Shawn Brick (Associate Admission Director, Transfer Policy, Student Affairs), Bob Anderson (Chair, Academic Senate), Bob Powell (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Welcome and Announcements**

Chair Wudka welcomed committee members to the meeting. The vice chair went to an oversight hearing in Sacramento regarding textbook affordability. The state auditor began studying textbook costs in 2007. Vice Provost Greenstein attended the hearing along with representatives of CSU and the community colleges. Textbooks are about 12% of the total cost for students at UC. UC devised a statement in 2009 about strategies to reduce costs. Senator Steinberg wants to put forward an open source textbook bill. The goal is to get fifty textbooks written by faculty from all segments which would be open source and free for UC students unless they want to print them for a cost of twenty dollars. It is unclear what the incentives are for faculty. The institutions would not be required to use the fifty textbooks. A number of groups had online or etextbook approaches they are promoting.

UCEP's letter to WASC was submitted to and approved by Council, forwarded to the WASC Commission and shared with the members of ICAS. Information about the letter will be in the Senate Source. There is a proposition that would force all high schools to offer online a-g classes to their students or the means to access them from other sources, and create a new diploma that would be distinct and different from the high school diploma, but would accredit the student with the necessary credentials to apply to UC. The UCOE hired Blackboard for student services and the contract is for four million dollars for an 18 month period. The goal is to have ten thousand students in the program by 2016-2017. Members of the Blue Ribbon panel have been contacted and many have accepted positions on the panel.

The state budget has a line item for contributions to UCRP. The six percent tuition increase proposed by the president which is two percent less than what was previously proposed; interest from endowments will be used to make up the difference until corporate fund-raising fills the gap. The UCSF chancellor's statements to the Regents have been misinterpreted. The chair indicated that today's meeting is focused on two main topics, transfer students and the online instruction project. The transfer student data report does not completely clarify how well UC is doing.

**Discussion:** UC Press could be asked to publish textbooks written by UC faculty. Flatworld has a number of models that reduce textbook costs. Faculty who write textbooks could be encouraged to explore alternatives to traditional publishers. Students indicate that they want hardcopies of books so they can write in them. UCOE believe the estimated enrollment is accurate. There was a discussion about how UCOE has moved forward before the pilot year has been completed. The UCSF representative indicated that the campus does not want to leave the system but is interested in identifying more revenue sources. According to the UCSF chancellor, increasing the number of graduate students will not offset a significant portion of costs. People at UCSF are exploring more public-private partnerships. UCB is exploring the same options for additional revenue.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved.

### **III. UC Education Abroad Program Strategic Plan**

- *Jean-Xavier Guinard, Associate Vice-Provost & Executive Director, UC Education Abroad Program*

EAP started in the 1960s and grew enormously. In the chair's experience, students have problems getting credit for courses taken abroad. Director Guinard made a presentation to the Regents which was well received. EAP is operating based on the new business model based on retaining student fees. The program erased its deficit last year and is now generating a surplus. State funding will be cut in half over the next few years and eliminated by 2015-2016. Last year EAP had record enrollment of 4,800 but this year it has gone down to 4,600. Students are starting to think twice about studying abroad because they want to graduate sooner.

Last year, EAP started developing a strategic plan after talking to a number of stakeholders. The plan includes primary and secondary initiatives, as well as director's initiatives. There will be a systemwide program meeting and a meeting with the advisory group to review the plan. The plan has three components that reflect UCEAP's vision: study abroad for all, academic excellence and best business practices. Director Guinard indicated that UCEAP could assist with advocacy for EAP and for study abroad in general as a part of the undergraduate experience. Any feedback regarding the strategic plan is welcomed. The new funding model has impacted EAP's relationship with the campuses. There is now competition between EAP and other campus programs, and a good balance between the two is desired. EAP has a good working relationship with the University Committee on International Education.

**Discussion:** EAP has considered admitting non-enrolled students such as alumni or students from other institutions and the Director reported that this is still on the table especially if enrollment of UC students declines. A member commented that students are concerned about getting credit at their home institution for EAP courses. Students need advisors so they can receive appropriate articulation to UC courses. An effective advising environment should be developed to encourage faculty to give credit for the courses. EAP has hired staff to oversee academic integration and academic oversight, both of which will increase faculty involvement. On some campuses there are faculty liaisons, and EAP understands the need to engage faculty more. The council of campus directors are the faculty assigned to look at EAP programs. A member suggested that instead of promoting EAP as a whole, certain areas of excellence at different institutions could be targeted to facilitate academic integration.

A member expressed concerns that enrolling non-UC students alongside UC students will negatively impact the quality of the program. The academic excellence aspect the director discussed today should be included more prominently in the strategic plan. EAP is considering making online courses available to UC students while they are studying abroad so they can take care of required courses. A public service component might be created that includes online courses. To make EAP available to everyone, it will be necessary to subsidize some students which will make the program even more expensive. Chair Wudka will forward any comments members have to Director Guinard.

### **IV. ICAS White Papers**

ICAS developed white papers regarding Educational Standards and Accountability and C-ID: Common Course Numbering. The papers are intended for the legislature which is why some of the content will be obvious to faculty. The paper on Educational Standards and Accountability explains how this is maintained by all of the segments of higher education. The paper on intersegmental transfer illustrates what UC is doing to facilitate this. Twenty percent of transfer students graduate in two years, 50% graduate after three years and 30% require four years at UC. The legislature wants higher throughput. The C-ID project has developed course descriptors to help students more easily identify the courses they need for transfer. The ASSIST website provides information for students about the requirements.

**Discussion:** Associate Director Brick reported that UC has recently signed a contract with a vendor to work on

the ASSIST site. UC has so far not agreed to make decisions based on ASSIST but it will be used by the CSUs. The descriptors for the C-ID courses are more vague than the course outline of record. UC, unlike the CSUs, have articulation agreements with all of the community colleges. The outside vendor will help modernize the ASSIST Program. The associate degrees would obviate the need for articulation agreements. On average, transfer students do well but there are students who do not know what they want to study, which delays their time at the CCC and/or the UC. No system will change the decision-making of all students. The transfer articulation guarantee is being used by UCD and eight other CCC campuses. It is a contract between individual students and the campus, which guarantees admission if the student meets certain requirements.

The ways that ASSIST or other databases can help students should be strengthened in the white paper. The white paper on C-ID shows the legislature that the segments are actively working on helping transfer students. If advising was better at the community colleges students would be informed about the requirements. There are very different needs for students in the Humanities compared to students in the STEM disciplines. Course content in engineering changes in response to changes in the field, and there are so many changes that there are no equivalent courses in the community colleges. Full articulation is not possible and is not desirable as it would undercut UC's mission to create new knowledge. UC needs to keep articulating what it is doing in terms of innovation. UC can help students get as much done as possible at the community colleges so they are prepared to transfer.

## V. Last Degree of its Kind

The issue of phasing out degrees that are the last of their kind was raised by a committee member. The Compendium differentiates between the title and the discipline but it does not clarify what needs to be done when the title of a program is unique. The Compendium is not clear about the procedures required to discontinue a program with a title unique in the UC system.

**Discussion:** At UCD, the discussion about eliminating the arts and textiles program is ongoing. The content of the program should be the focus of decisions to eliminate a program. One section the Compendium describes eliminating a title unique to a campus and in another section it describes eliminating a program that is unique in the system. Associate Director Baxter indicated that there needs to be joint agreement between the administration and the Senate about what the procedures are. UCEP does not have the power to forbid the dean from taking actions that would result in the elimination of a program. The community studies program at UCSC is being threatened. Chair Wudka will talk to the Senate chair about UCEP's concerns.

## VI. SciGETC

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy*

IGETC was designed to facilitate transfer of community college students into UC. It was changed after students failed to meet all of the requirements. Students in the Humanities were able to meet the requirements but IGETC was not positive for students in the STEM disciplines who ended up with too many units. SciGETC was an amendment to IGETC to fill in the year long sequence for laboratory sciences. Chair Wudka has concerns about SciGETC because of what students are advised to take. The warnings about what students should take are not strong enough. Associate Director Brick reports that IGETC is still valuable. When students complete the IGETC pattern they are not required to take any courses again once at UC or any GE breadth requirements with a few exceptions.

The minimum required for science and math in IGETC is more strenuous in SciGETC. Students are able to complete two of the courses post-transfer. The sense now is the SciGETC is not needed. In most cases, in the sciences, UC does not recommend completion or partial completion of IGETC. The ASSIST website advises students to focus on major preparation. For the associate degrees, the community colleges feel that to issue these degrees under SB 1440, students cannot just use partial IGETC but must have a GE certificate. SciGETC does not hurt anything but does confuse students as it offers another pathway. It may not have an impact on students interested in transferring to UC. UC generally advises students to take a year-long sequence.

**Discussion:** Students are easily confused by the number of transfer preparation paths. UC is trying to come up with general advice to prepare students that applies across the system. According to one member, community college students who transferred to UC report that they were not advised about IGETC by a counselor. SciGETC needs to be strengthened so that it more clearly communicates to students what the requirements are. A question is whether ASSIST is currently providing the information students really need or if the community colleges are not offering the required courses. Students need clearly articulated information about requirements and there should not be a reliance on counselors, especially since the number of counselors per students will be decreasing in the future. A member noted that the community colleges are not all equal, and the challenge for UC is how to push back on the community colleges with a request that students receive the guidance they need. UCM makes specific recommendations by major to help students understand the requirements.

In some majors, even having SciGETC still does not leave room for students to prepare for the major. The point of resurrecting SciGETC for the community colleges is to address the requirements for the associate degrees. Community college students often have to make up for deficiencies in their preparation which creates a challenge for them. Student Affairs could create a list of all the required courses. There is not agreement among the UC campuses about general education requirements. Members discussed the benefits of completing GE requirements at the community college versus completing some of the requirements while at UC.

## **VII. Transfer Student Data Report**

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy*

UCEP's immediate past chair requested an analysis of data on transfer students. It is important for UCEP to keep this issue on the members' radar and to consider if everything is being done to support transfer students. Chair Wudka reviewed the report and identified a number of follow-up questions.

**Discussion:** There was an across the board drop in transfer students in 2011-12 as a result of the way that UCM managed the transfer referral pool. Between 2009-2011, the applications from community colleges to UC increased by 30% and a reason for this may have been a decrease in applications to the CSUs. Data on the number of international students is being tracked, and Associate Director Brick indicated that there has been an increase in international students entering UC through the community colleges. Chair Wudka asked for information about the standard deviation in charts 4, 15, and 16 and Associate Director Brick will discuss this with Institutional Research. An analysis of those community colleges that are not the primary feeder schools has not been conducted, and this information would give UC a better understanding of what help those schools need. Another valuable analysis would be the success rates by sending institutions.

## **VIII. Online Instruction Pilot Project**

- *Keith Williams, Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*

Chair Wudka explained that the former UCEP chair is assisting the Office of the President with the online instruction project. The project is moving forward with the hope of enrolling many students. Advisor Williams was asked to provide UCEP with an update on the project. The discussion document provided to UCEP was the result of an effort to identify everything that needs to be in place by the time non-matriculated students to enroll in online courses. Cross campus enrollment will not be included because of two primary barriers. One barrier is the communication between nine different systems and another is that a mechanism for transferring funds to the home campus when a student takes a course at another campus does not exist. It becomes financially disadvantageous for a campus to bear the costs of serving more than a couple of students from another campus. This is not going to be part of the short term planning. It is hoped that systems put in place to support non-matriculated students will work for matriculated students as well.

There are five individuals working on the online pilot project, including Advisor Williams. The registration function for UCOE will be based at UCR. Instructional designers and media people are working on course development. UCOP signed a contract with Blackboard to provide marketing, recruitment and student services.

They will work on ways by which courses will be marketed to students. The first course is being offered at UCM in math, and there are approximately thirty six students enrolled. A parallel in-person course has one hundred students. Other courses are in various stages of development and some are waiting for approval from the course committee. Courses will not be offered if approval is not received and students are not being recruited until courses are approved. This year there will not be any non-matriculated students enrolled, but they could enroll through concurrent enrollment.

Summer sessions are ready to enroll students. The registration system for UCOE needs to be in place by May in order to enroll students by fall. Blackboard will provide the types of student services typically provided at a campus. UC students will enroll in an online course in the traditional way and the course will look the same on their transcript. Proposals for the second phase of courses have been submitted and are now under review. The courses will appeal to both UC and non-matriculated students. The next round of courses will be developed with more planning so that faculty consider other options. Final decisions will be based on quality, how effective it can be placed on line and the ability to attract UC and non-matriculated students. A demonstration of Proctor U will be provided and other systems that can be used to prevent cheating will be explored. The policy issues arose as the issue of non-matriculated students came up. Processes adopted by a campus may be utilized.

**Discussion:** Chair Wudka indicated that there are issues related to the Americans with Disabilities Act. At UCD, it was estimated that a course could be retrofitted at a cost of \$30,000 to meet ADA requirements. This issue is related primarily to students who are deaf or blind, and Advisor Williams indicated that the course developers are ensuring that ADA requirements are built in. Non-matriculated students may take online courses for any number of reasons even if they will not receive credit. It will cost a student approximately \$1,400 for a four unit online course. There will not be a different fee for in-state versus out of state students. Some campuses have created tags for online courses, while the registrars at other campuses are reporting it is not possible to add a designation. UCI has decided not to flag a course as an online course on the transcript, and once a delivery mode is approved any faculty member can teach the course; at UCI faculty have to resubmit a course if they want to change the mode of delivery. Advisor Williams reported that there is nothing on community college transcripts that indicates if a course is online. The registrar can track the number of online courses at UCI so that the number can be limited, even though there is no tag on a course. A copy of the course is owned by the faculty but given in perpetuity to UC to offer.

UCOP should keep faculty workload in mind when it comes to having to respond to non-matriculated students who pay for and then fail an online UC course. Blackboard will be educated about what kind of student UC is looking for. It is not easy to create a list of the types of students who would not be eligible to enroll in an online course. A language proficiency requirement should be in place. A member commented that the discussion document has three statements about credit that make it unclear when credit will be offered. Advisor Williams indicated that the document needs to be edited to make sure the correct terminology is used regarding credit. Procedures normally followed to prevent students from enrolling in a course for which they are not prepared should apply to online courses. The librarians have stated that the non-matriculated students will not have access to library materials because UC's license does not cover these students. UCOE is beginning to discuss the expectations for what a UCOE transcript looks like and means. Expectations about what courses with non-matriculated students look like need to be clear. How a course with fifty non-UC students and two hundred UC students is designated in comparison to a course with only fifty non-UC students has not been decided. The committee briefly discussed issues related to teaching non-UC student and having a mix of non-UC and UC students in a course. A narrative describing what a typical student should have in order to be successful could be provided. The Senate should provide feedback regarding whether non-matriculated students can opt to take a course for pass/not pass.

Some of the issues related to UCOE are easy to resolve but difficult questions include how UC will consider non-matriculated students. Departments and programs could set the rules within boundaries that UCEP sets. The committee discussed approving a regulation that sunsets at a certain future date. UCOP explored offering the courses through Extension but UC Extension did not agree because it would not keep the revenue. The idea of simply replacing Extension with Online in the existing Extension regulation was discussed again. Members

agree that UC courses, and who takes them, are under the jurisdiction of the Senate and the Senate needs to hold onto this authority. It was proposed that after two or three years, the success of non-matriculated students in online courses should be examined. The goal of a sunset clause is to provide a way to make the courses better. The Senate should not abrogate its authority over academic quality, and faculty and student conduct. UCOE has not discussed how it will examine the issue of enrolling matriculated and non-matriculated students in the same course. If the goal is to make UCOE a source of revenue, access should be limited. The existing regulations could be applied to online courses or, provisionally, the online courses could be treated like Extension courses. A member recommended that faculty should think about what they want to see in five years and disregard the financial pressures now associated with UCOE. In concurrent enrollment, it is a divisional Senate decision to accept a grade. Chair Anderson encouraged the committee to not focus on the projected number of students who transfer to UC after taking a UCOE course.

UCEP could advise that the courses do not count toward GPA or leave this decision to the divisions as the current rules stipulate.

#### **IX. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- *Hilary Baxter, Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*

WASC is expected to discuss and act on the question about external benchmarking of proficiencies. Seven campuses signed on to a letter from Stanford which was not as detailed at UCEP's letter. WASC has acknowledged receipt of the UC letter. Stanford and other institutions are interested in having a conversation about being accreditation. An advisory body issued a draft report in the fall about directions accreditation might go in. Accreditation may be more closely aligned with mission and sector instead of region.

#### **X. Regulations Governing Online Instruction (continued)**

**Discussion:** The type of credit a non-UC student should receive needs to be decided by UCEP. UC could evaluate the degradation of quality after a number of years. A member proposed that a student could receive a refund within a drop period if the student is not qualified. An online screening test using the final exam for the prerequisite course could be used to screen out students. Chair Anderson pointed out that unprepared non-UC students enrolled in online courses may not be taking a slot away from a UC student but will be using resources such as Graduate Student Instructors. The enrollment process for non-matriculated students, what will the grade distribution look like when these students are in a course. There is discretion for faculty to enroll concurrent enrollment students because there is funding attached to them.

A regulation that parallels UC Extension could be drafted based on the concurrent enrollment model. Students would receive unit credit and the grade is not calculated in the GPA if a non-matriculated student tries to transfer into UC. Departments can decide if additional prerequisites are needed but the prerequisites are the same for the corresponding traditional course. This regulation will sunset at the end of three years and UCEP wants studies done so there is evidence of quality. Members should think about data it wants to have tracked as early as possible. Chair Wudka will draft a document outlining the points raised today and some of the straightforward issues. The committee will discuss UCOE again in March and April. Chair Wudka will find out if the discussion document can be distributed to the local CEPs.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Jose Wudka