

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

TELECONFERENCE MINUTES

MONDAY, MARCH 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), Gerardo Aldana (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), James Levin (UCSD), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Harry Powell (Academic Senate Chair), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

During the Academic Council meeting in February Chair Williams learned about two big issues coming this spring that will require significant time. One is the Commission on the Future and the other is post employment benefits task force. The retirement system is underfunded and there is concern about how it will grow. Several committees are working on this issue and are at the point of making recommendations. The recommendations will be finalized in March, in April the task force will visit the campuses to share the options, the recommendations will go to the president in May, and it is possible that the recommendations will go to the Regents in July. Retirement contributions from employees will begin in April but there are issues related to how the state will contribute. Vice Chair Simmons reported that he and Senate Chair Powell will possibly hold town hall meetings at the campuses in May. There could be changes to retiree health medical benefits, and potential changes to the retirement plans for future employees.

The first set of recommendations will be made public after the March 23rd Commission on the Future meeting. Workgroup recommendations will be submitted today and UCEP members will get a chance to provide feedback on them later in this meeting. The Commission may forward the recommendations from the workgroups as they are, or may modify them or make additional recommendations. Senate review will occur and responses will probably be due in late May and Council may make official comments in late June. The recommendations will be finalized by the Commission in July and then forwarded to the Regents. A second set of recommendations are due June for review over summer. In April UCEP will discuss the other work groups' recommendations and submit any feedback to Council. The first set of recommendations may result in budgetary savings or generate revenue and the second set are ones that take a longer time to discuss or are viewed as not having a short term pay off. Regent Gould and the president want to show the legislature that UC is making efforts to be efficient with current funds, and identifying effective ways to generate income. Some things may be controversial, and the Senate may not be enthusiastic about other things. The faculty members on the Commission will help formulate recommendations.

The compendium, which outlines how new schools/programs are evaluated by the Senate committees including UCEP, has been updated and re-written by a task force appointed by the Senate. The revised compendium will be reviewed in the next couple of months.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates is continuing its higher education advocacy efforts and has been involved with an evaluation of the master plan. Advocacy across the three segments of higher education culminates with events taking place this week and in April. The goal is to increase awareness of what higher education does and what it needs. Working with

students has proven to be effective. A brochure designed by a subgroup of ICAS that demonstrates why higher education is important and should be a funding priority will be available to legislators and the public. Arguments can be made for how higher education contributes to California's economy. There is a sense that legislators are aware of need/benefit of higher education but action is lacking in part due to an unwillingness to reduce funds for prisons.

The members of a task force for online education initiative have been selected. UCEP's vice chair and the UCR representative have been selected to participate. No funding is available yet so it is unclear when the initiative will move forward. The Commission on the Future recommendations will not advocate broad implementation of online courses but will support exploring issues related to quality, cost, workload, and academic integrity through the pilot. Faculty input on how to evaluate online courses will be important.

UCEP's letter regarding course approval was circulated and there was feedback from some committee members and the Senate Executive Director. Due to questions about whether it needs to be done and whether it needs to be done by a task force, this is on hold. The Commission on the Future's workgroup on size and shape will make a recommendation related to course articulation between campuses, including changes to make it more effective and efficient.

Discussion: UCSB and UCSD have subcommittees looking at ways to save funds; UCR has a comprehensive strategic plan; UCI has five or six task forces; UCSC has a committee looking at funds; and UCB has external consultant that may be focusing on administrative side of things. UCSD has a task force focusing on online and distance education which met with San Diego state faculty to discuss their experience with online education. There will be unique ways of using online education at UC including ways that integrate research. UCSD has a policy against online courses. UCM is looking at how online courses will be approved. Campuses should consider what will be needed to conduct online courses. The online education task force will review responses and determine if any recommendations should be changed. Verification of authenticity could take the form of challenge questions that the person taking the course should be able to answer. Academic planning has looked into the authenticity issue. Chair Williams will check in with the language consortium regarding assessment of Arabic Without Walls. Regarding course approval, the registration issue could be separated from the articulation issue. A clearer sense of what EAP does would be helpful for the committee and someone from EAP could be invited to a future UCEP meeting to explain the approval process.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Differential fees and increased reliance on non-resident tuition

There is strong support from the administration for differential fees by program and by campus, and this will likely be a Commission on the Future recommendation. Chair Williams will draft a letter reflecting UCEP's position for the committee to review in April. The committee is asked to comment on the UCPB letter on differential fees and increased reliance on non-resident tuition.

Discussion: Members of the committee are hearing different things about the plan to go forward with differential fees. One campus discussed this and there is support for possible expansion of lab fees and course fees instead of differential fees by program. One concern is about the potential stratification of majors within a campus as a result of differential fees, and it is not clear where differential fees will go and how they will be used. At another campus, the CEP rejected

differential fees by major for reasons that included not wanting students to make decisions regarding their major based on fees; insignificant revenue generated by the fees; questions about how to administer if a student changes his/her major later. Non-resident tuition may not result in significant revenue.

Regarding differential fees by campus, one possibility is that all campuses would set their fee at the maximum, not wanting to be identified as a lesser institution. Alternatively, UCOP could determine which campuses would have which fees. Differential fees could result in undesirable stratification of the campuses. Student impressions of quality are based on overall impression instead of something truly meaningful. More liberal use of course fees to obtain revenue has not been widely discussed. One campus is adding sections for impacted courses to be administered through university extension and students pay the university extension fee for the course. Another campus has a significant number of impacted courses and priority registration for the majors was implemented to allow majors to finish in four years. Undeclared/undecided, minors, and transfer students would be unable to take these courses which will change the character of the major. To maintain the liberal arts character of the education, course fees should be increased but differential fees should not be implemented. It is problematic for students when departments cancel courses not central to departmental major but are central to an interdisciplinary program.

At one campus, it was estimated that increasing non-resident enrollment would result in \$4-5 million in revenue. Members discussed the problem with UCOP getting the revenue and redistributing it. A campus should keep the money from increased non-resident enrollment as an incentive to invest in recruiting out of state students. It is important to remember that the mandate for UC is to educate California students. A certain percentage of revenue could go to the campus and some could go to OP. The committee was not in full agreement about this issue and Chair Williams will include the various view points in the committee letter.

Action: Chair Williams will draft a letter with the committee's feedback on differential fees by major and by campus.

IV. Education and Curriculum Workgroup Recommendations

The recommendation about quality will not be put forward at this time and it is necessary to identify things related to quality that can be monitored over time. There are tradeoffs associated with the three year degree track for including that students would have less flexibility, summer school would be required, and more advising resources would be needed.

Discussion: It was noted that workload policies should be enforced. The committee discussed incentives for faculty to teach during the summer. Incentives in the form of FTEs given to one campus did not increase the number of faculty teaching during the summer. At another campus, faculty receive a bonus for teaching during the summer. A member commented that increased teaching during the summer will take away from research time. Use of the infrastructure during the summer could result in significant cost savings. To increasing teaching over the summer, the normal teaching load may need to be spread out over the summer.

Meeting adjourned at: 1 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams