

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 2009

Attending: Stephen McLean, Chair (UCSB), John Yoder (UCD), David Kay (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Rolf Christoffersen (UCSB), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Donald Potts (UCSC), Joan Etzell (UCSF), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Chris Edley (Dean, Boalt Law School, UCB), Carol Copperud (Director, Academic Planning, UCOP), Mary Croughan (Academic Council Chair), Harry Powell (Academic Council Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

The Regents unanimously passed the Eligibility Reform Proposal. Implementation of the reforms is being planned and will be reviewed by the Assembly by the end of the year. The President's Blue and Gold Proposal was passed by the Regents. This program will cost \$3 million and the money will come from an increase in return to aide fees. The Regents voted to restart contributions to UCRP. The \$20 million from the state for this is no longer available, meaning UC has the only state employees with no state contribution to retirement. UCEP's letter reinforcing the decision to reduce enrollment was been forwarded to the President with the endorsement of Council. There are \$215 million in cuts to UC's budget, and adding in the increased costs of utilities and health care benefits results in a shortfall of approximately \$450 million for the period 2008-2010. The federal stimulus package may result in \$50 million for UC. A post employment benefits task force will be formed to examine ways to reduce UCRP liabilities in the absence of employer/employee contributions sufficient to increase assets. Contrary to current rumors, faculty furloughs are not on the table for 2008-09.

ACA 7 is an assembly constitutional amendment to roll back Proposition 209 to allow ethnicity and other factors to be considered in admissions. Even if it does not ultimately include changes for admissions, the hope is that the amendment will at least enable UC to conduct targeted outreach.

There are a number of faculty compliance matters coming forward and the need to make changes to APM 15 or 16 to address them is under discussion. A proposal about this will be forthcoming. Any policy must ensure that the penalties for non-compliance with the training should not be worse than the penalties for what the training is intended to prevent.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates' (ICAS) April meeting will be in the Capital Building, providing an opportunity for ICAS and the legislators to hear from one another. The legislators are reportedly impressed that UC, the CSUs, and community colleges are working together. The three segments are not being hit as hard by the budget situation as K-12. ICAS will look at enrollment management across higher education. The CSUs have cut by 10,000, UC by 2,300 (while accepting more transfer students), and the community colleges have 100,000 unfunded students and have stated that they can not be expected to continue to absorb students the other institutions will not take. The international baccalaureate is growing and is headed in the direction of outstripping AP courses.

The Chair will be on the Compendium Task Force which has its first meeting on Wednesday. The Task Force on Online Instruction will begin its work with a meeting in the next few weeks.

Discussion: One question is whether the 2,300 students cut will be off-set by accepting more students from out of state. There has been some discussion about having undergraduates from out of state pay differential fees by campus.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with a correction.

III. Updates from the Office of the President

The Undergraduate Planning Group established two task forces. The postgraduate outcomes task force will make recommendations for tracking UC students after graduation. The task force is considering a survey of alumni which might replicate or build on the UCUES. The learning assessment task force is drafting its report and putting together recommendations to Council for April. The recommendations will be reviewed by UCEP in May. UCEP's involvement in this subject is very important as student learning is a matter of interest to the President.

IV. Undergraduate Research Opportunities

Chair McLean has updated the draft white paper on undergraduate research opportunities at UC. UCEP should consider how the white paper can be used to improve the situation.

Discussion: The audience for the paper includes prospective students and their parents, legislators, and other faculty colleagues. This could be a two-stage process. The first message is to other Senate members and the white paper might be vetted by faculty. The second stage will be to formulate a message to the public. Research does not have to detract from teaching and institutional support can help faculty. Campus offices on instructional development need to be more focused on helping faculty become aware of methods for engaging students in research. Faculty may not be aware of the support available and support for faculty experimenting with teaching should be provided. The white paper should include a recommendation that faculty take advantage of this support. Programs that introduce students to research and demonstrate what it means to be involved with a research university exist, but are focused on science and engineering. Incentives for faculty involvement will be the key to encouraging faculty to work with undergraduates on research. UCEP could suggest that personnel actions recognize involvement of undergraduates in research. The APM provides an opportunity for faculty to note that undergraduates are involved in their research.

A concern is that the quality of the research might be negatively impacted by undergraduate student involvement. Examples of research that was not impacted by undergraduate involvement or was improved by it should be provided. Some types of research may not lend itself to involving others. Faculty may fear that the effort to involve undergraduates will take too much time, so UCEP could try to identify easy ways to do this. The committee discussed whether internships should be included in the white paper. Although internships are not unique to UC and off-campus internships do not create relationships with faculty, UC faculty have relationships

with industry that open doors for students at places where CSU or community college students would not be able to intern. The value of different types of internships varies. It was noted that in the Arts and Humanities, research opportunities can be considered in terms of what is used for the merit and promotion process. Examples include students exhibiting work in a local venue.

Since many UC students are not interested in research, the message should focus on the benefit of going to a research university. The CSUs and community colleges do not have the same caliber of guest speakers and UC students are taught by researchers. Students acquire skills that will help them at work or to solve new problems. Methodology courses teach skills, problem-solving and inquiry. Some campuses have journals that publish articles written by students. Funding could be made available to send students to national and international conferences where their research is highlighted. Strategies to institutionalize this support are required and getting corporate sponsorship for these events is an option. Every campus has a process to select the best student research and there could be systemwide regional forums building on this. One suggestion is to offer a course on how to write grant proposals. Honors programs should have research opportunities and honors students should be invited to research seminars. The difficulty of doing good research should be communicated to increase the appreciation of the challenges.

Action: Members should meet with instructional development/teaching excellence offices at their campuses and find out what activities are taking place to include undergraduates in research, whether faculty receive credit for this, and the best practices for involving students. Chair McLean will add today's feedback comments to the white paper.

V. Impacted Majors

Committee members provided more information about how their campuses are managing impacted majors. There is no clear definition across the campuses of impacted majors.

Discussion: One issue is that not all students can declare a major. There is a bar (such as a minimum GPA greater than 2.0) or prerequisite that prevents more students from being accepted and the bar serves to prevent students who are not cut out for the major from entering the discipline. Students who meet the bar should be successful. Members discussed the issue of students who are not succeeding in their declared major while they are doing well in other disciplines and noted that students need help identifying their talents. Advising is an important tool that can help reduce impacted majors. There are majors that are not named appropriately and students end up in a major that is not right for them or what they want to do. Students may not seek out advisors or may ignore the advice. Whether there should be bars for every major is a question. One campus's rule does not allow a bar unless there is evidence that the program is impacted and it can be shown that a minimum GPA greater than 2.0 is a predictor of success in the program.

FTEs should not automatically flow to where the students are, especially since student interests shift so quickly. Teaching resources or temporary faculty could be used to deal with the increased demand due to the shifting interest. The enrollment management process at the campuses deals with the overall number of students at a campus, not in the majors. At one campus some departments tell the admissions office how many students can come into the

department every year. A potential strategy could be to redirect students in certain majors to other campuses where there is room, similar to the strategy used for admission into UC. This type of intercampus exchange program could be advertised as a positive opportunity for students. Sending students to a different campus before they have demonstrated their capabilities in a course at UC would be a problem. Students might decide to change their major rather than go to a different campus.

Pre-majors or GPA thresholds that are used to keep the number of students down may have a negative impact on underserved students and this is important to keep in mind. Showing that the department is trying to be proactive in addressing the impacted majors and thinking about student success is important. Students could succeed if there were programs or faculty support to help them at critical moments and not let them fail. The philosophy should be that every student admitted should be successful. The number of courses required for some pre-majors can create a problem if the student is not admitted into the major and has to catch up for another major. Departments should not wait until the junior or senior year to tell students they do not qualify for a major. The committee discussed majors at their campuses that are impacted, and changes over time. It is recommended that any bars are regularly reviewed.

Action: Chair McLean will update the draft paper on impacted majors.

VI. Proposed Changes to the “a-g” Course Requirements for Admission to UC

This is a preliminary discussion about upcoming proposals. The first proposal is to expand the “d” requirement to include earth, environmental, and space sciences courses, a proposal that has come up in the past. These courses are included in the requirements now but need to be vetted to ensure that they include enough of fundamental science material to count. The difficulty is these courses often are taught in the ninth grade and do not have the depth to satisfy the requirements for “d.” This proposal was reviewed by BOARS which recommended that the proposal not go forward but Council indicated that it should go under systemwide review.

Discussion: It is not clear when the ‘d’ proposal will be finalized by BOARS and ready for systemwide review. The stumbling block with the earth, environmental, and space sciences courses is the lack of a laboratory component for most. The courses discuss big picture issues, and are oriented toward students not necessarily going to college. In previous reviews by BOARS, the conclusion has been that the courses do not qualify for area “d.” UCEP members are encouraged to get information from their campuses about what has been proposed.

The second discussion is one arising at CSU and involves a possible change to the math requirement. Algebra I is now taught in 8th grade and if three years of math are required, students take geometry in 9th grade and algebra II in 10th grade. This means some students might take no math for two years and then come to college unprepared for math courses. CSU is discussing the addition of a fourth year to the math requirement which would be pre-calculus or a review course that does not add to the students’ knowledge. One solution is to spread the teaching of algebra I over both 8th and 9th grade. Over 90% of UC students take at least four years of math so the problem addressed by this discussion is not a problem for UC, but it is for the CSUs. The CSUs follow UC’s requirements which are set up for increasing complexity. The change proposed by

the CSUs would not satisfy UC's requirements. The CSUs can make the change without impacting UC, and UC will only count the two years as one. Based on the discussion at ICAS and the statistics, it is unlikely that this CSU proposal will be put forward.

VII. SR 764: Credit in Special Study Courses

Some campuses are out of compliance with systemwide regulation 764. UCEP should discuss changing systemwide regulation or doing nothing. SR 764 indicates that no more than 5 credits should be given per quarter for special study courses. The definition of special study courses is a problem and systemwide has a wide variety in this category.

Discussion: Across the campuses, the number of credits given and the course names and numbers vary. Up to 12 credits are given for some courses. One suggestion is to put the committee's concerns into writing. Each campus might be encouraged to come up with its own regulation. Campuses limit the number of special study courses a student can take and most majors will restrict how many special study courses can be taken. The issue is that many campuses are out of compliance with the regulation so the systemwide regulation is not working. The committee discussed whether grades should be given for the units from special study courses. It was decided that this should be left to the individual campuses since faculty would probably not agree with a recommendation to not give grades. Members agreed that it would be problematic for UCEP to establish guidelines for giving grades.

Action: The committee voted to propose abolishing the systemwide regulation. The UCSC representative will draft a letter proposing that SR 764 be rescinded.

VIII. APM 240

The committee has the opportunity to opine on the proposed revisions to APM 240.

Discussion: The reason for the proposed revisions is not clear but may be a result of concerns about sabbaticals. Deans accrue sabbatical leave as a faculty member and as a dean, and the sabbatical accrued as dean is at a higher cost. The proposed limits are not very restrictive. One issue is that recruiting a dean from outside necessitates a higher salary. It was noted that recruiting from outside is necessary because UC does not have a system of developing potential candidates for leadership positions. Department chairs may be the logical place to look for future deans. The direct impact of the revisions on undergraduate educational policy is unclear.

Action: The committee agreed not to opine.

IX. UC Budget Issues

An effort is underway to identify ways to address UC's budget situation and every option is being explored. Documented evidence of the impact of the cuts at the campuses will be helpful.

Discussion: Over-enrollment of students, while done for the right reasons, has not been funded. UC employees should write to legislators as private citizens to persuade them that the future of

the economy is dependent on higher education. The \$20 million promised for the restart of UCRP was eliminated from the state budget at the last minute and the president will be responding to this in writing. It was suggested that the intercampus exchange program could be a source of revenue but is not well advertised. This input will be shared with CCGA. Departments at one campus are threatening to cut a certain type of course and this will have consequences for teaching assistants and graduate student support. The Accountability Framework provides a tool for presenting information about the successes at UC as well as the erosion of the quality.

Action: Members will collect evidence of the impact of budget cuts on the quality of undergraduate education.

X. Transfer Issues

- *Chris Edley, Dean, UC Berkeley Boalt Law School*

Two thirds of CSU students and one-third of UC students begin in the community colleges. The master plan requires that UC enroll a certain number of transfer students. The aim of the CID program is to organize numbering system and description of courses to make it easier for students to understand the requirements for admission into UC. The three segment leaders have appointed someone to monitor this for their systems, and there is help from the K-12 system. A task force will represent faculty and staff from the three segments, and 15 participants will be identified in the next few months. A proposed charter and work plan for the task force have been drafted. There will be a separate academic research team to provide research and ideas to the task force and ensure that research informs any policy recommendations. UC representatives on the task force do not need to be engaged in research in transfer issues since the expertise will be provided by the separate research team. UC's representatives should include administration and faculty. The key work of the task force will be determining what is and is not working, and to make recommendations about new goals for each segment and a strategy for monitoring those goals. It will determine where the segments should be in 4-5 years with respect to the transfer picture. Memorandums of understanding (MOUs) should be developed if appropriate. This work will be completed by the end of summer and work on the budget and admissions practice implications will occur next year. Another goal is to lay the groundwork for a broader shared understanding of what the community college system should look like in the future and how it can be more effective. Different programs have been described but little has been said about programs that do not work. There do not seem to be analytically sophisticated assessments of programs that work. UCEP will provide Dean Edley with feedback on community college transfer issues.

A broader initiative, P-16 (pre-kindergarten through higher education), resulted from conversations from the committee on Planning for Doctoral and Postdoctoral Education several years ago. P-16 involves a systemwide effort for UC to provide greater assistance for transforming K-12 education and the national debate as well. President Yudof is eager to move this forward. The first challenge is to create a proposal that is sensible and has broad buy-in. Dean Edley and Harold Levine, Dean at the UC Davis School of Education are meeting with UC faculty and some external experts and Chair Croughan or a designee are invited to participate in those meetings. The focus will be on policy research and dissemination strategies that ensure that information is provided to policy makers at the local, state and national levels. The lack of

funding for investments is an opportunity for UC to generate ideas about good investments when the budget situation improves.

Discussion: Dean Edley should provide Senate Chair Croughan with a request to identify two faculty members and two alternates for the task force. The committee discussed what is and is not working in terms of transfers. Given the number of entities involved and the differences between the systems, the transfer process is complex. UC's prerequisites need to be more uniform and it is difficult to define majors across campuses. An important goal would be to standardize the systems as much as possible. The Senate has not formally expressed a position about the level of uniformity that should exist across the campuses but there have been discussions about setting up common features for a few majors. It is unclear what has happened with the initiatives that were put forward several years ago by UCEP to UCOP about these common features. The effort was to identify the 20 most common majors and the common set of lower division courses needed to get into upper division. The Course Identification Number initiative is an ongoing effort to determine that one course is identical to another so they can share the same ID number. This work is done on four to five topics each year. Since it has been hard to get Senate faculty to do this time-consuming work, the community college faculty may be asked to do it and bring it to UC for review.

The ASSIST program is another issue because the hardware and software are out of date and there is at least one suggestion on how to address this. A committee member commented that transcripts come to UC on paper making it difficult and time consuming to evaluate grades and courses. There is an electronic system that is too expensive for the community colleges. It is important for the community colleges to standardize the course numbers and definitions across the 110 campuses in that system, which will make it easier for UC to review transcripts. Standardizing what is required across the UC campuses will help potential transfer students.

The Senate has not taken a formal position on the appropriate proportion of transfers versus freshmen, but the Master Plan articulates priorities and the number of transfer students UC needs to accept. One campus has more freshman than transfer students in part because there is only one community college nearby. The last MOU had targets for increases in the transfer rates into UC and the new task force may result in a new MOU with new targets. The Senate may need to discuss whether the targets are systemwide or campus by campus. This becomes complicated when considering the impact on certain majors. The enrollment management group will be closely involved in this and will include representatives from UCEP, BOARS, and UCPB.

XI. New Business

Textbook Affordability:

- *Harry Powell, Academic Senate Vice Chair Harry Powell*

Senate Vice Chair Powell explained that Student Regent Scorza asked the Senate to address the issue of textbook affordability. Two state laws have been passed in response to complaints, from student groups in particular, about the rising cost of textbooks. The laws have two elements. Faculty are urged to submit the list of books needed to the campus book store as early as possible and to determine if the new edition needs to be purchased. Faculty are asked to determine if the

additional materials bundled with the textbooks are valuable. Publishers are required to identify the changes from the previous edition and the cost of the textbooks. Another component is electronic textbooks and new ways of delivering materials that are needed. An emerging model being researched is open textbooks. The textbook would be free but there would be charges for other add-ons. Regent Scorza will be invited to participate in an upcoming UCEP meeting to discuss this matter. Vice Chair Powell mentioned that textbook affordability was discussed at the recent ICAS meeting.

Action: The analyst will send the committee members the CSU report on textbook affordability.

Two-year appointment to UCEP:

UCEP's Chair learned that the appointments to the committee are intended to be for two years. The next step will be to figure out how to retain half the membership when the other half rotates off. Members discussed the need for committee members to be on the local CEP while on UCEP.

Action: Chair McLean will draft a letter to student organizations recommending the appointment of student representatives to UCEP for two years.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:30pm
Minutes prepared by Brenda Abrams
Attest: Steve McLean