

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**NOTICE OF TELECONFERENCE**  
**MARCH 3, 2014**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**TELECONFERENCE MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2014**

Attending: Tim Labor, Chair (UCR), Tracy Larrabee, Vice Chair (UCSC), Ann Plane (UCSB), Donald Curtis (UCSF), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Troy Carter (UCLA), Seeta Chaganti (UCD), Tony Smith (UCI), Mary Beth Pudup (UCSC), Jay Sharping (UCM), Mark Springer (UCR), Leslie Carver (UCSD), Andrew Kenney (Graduate Student Representative), Aimee Dorr (Provost and Vice President), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, UCOP), Bill Jacob (Chair, Academic Senate), Mary Gilly (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Ellen Osmundson (Project Coordinator, ILTI), Keith Williams (Interim Director, UCOE), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

**I. Announcements and Updates**

Chair Labor approved changes to today's agenda. The Assembly meeting focused on many of the issues that have been discussed at Council. The Regents heard about problems associated with non-resident supplemental tuition including that it can sometimes be a drain on grants and resources. Chair Jacob discussed Provost Dorr's update to the Regents about online education, which the Regents continue to expect to generate funds. President Napolitano was joined by the chancellors of the CSU and CCC systems to give a joint presentation to the Regents. UC Path, the centrally administered payroll system, was intended to save money but there have now been over two years of development and the rollout is not expected until January 2015 at UCOP. The president announced an efficiency review of UCOP. The campus climate report has been completed and the data will be released at the March Regents meeting. There will be a centrally administered website with links to campus reports. Harry Green shared the recommendations made to the president in response to the Moreno report. The shortage of tier one providers for participants in UC Care at some campuses is reportedly improving, as is Senate involvement with UCFW and the HCTF now closely monitoring the program. UC Cares will not replace Kaiser or Health Net Blue and Gold but the Senate will also monitor this.

During the Assembly meeting, the provost discussed online education. Approximately 27 ILTI courses have been approved and funds currently are earmarked just for undergraduate courses and high demand courses. Pamela Brown, the new vice provost for Institutional Research and Academic Planning, discussed graduation rates and time to degree, and the campuses are currently reviewing their data. UCEP will be able to see this information following the March presentation to the Regents. The president is said to be pleased with the work of the transfer action team and this will be presented to the Regents in May. The UC Accountability Report was presented by Debby Obley. The work on the models for cost of instruction will continue until October. Council approved the UCSF proposal to grant a master's of "x," practitioner oriented degrees. Harry Green presented an issue related to wording in APM 210 that needs to be examined.

Academic Council discussed a proposed change to SB 55 and Council sent the proposal back to the San Diego division with a request for revisions. Patrick Lenz discussed the state budget during the February 28<sup>th</sup> budget call. The budget proposes to add \$44M in addition to what was anticipated which is a recognition of UC's operating costs but it is tied to performance outcome measures. There is no money for enrollment growth. The annual report for the legislature on performance outcome measures looks very good. UC provides 44% of STEM degrees in the state. The total remuneration study is moving forward as planned. A document on enrollment planning principles was prepared by Chair Jacob. Vice Chair Larrabee attended an ICAS meeting on Chair Labor's behalf. The UC, the CSUs and CCCs lobbyists met with ICAS to discuss

their efforts. The first half of the meeting focused on upcoming legislation as well as identifying participants for an April meeting. The lobbyists described the nature of their discussions with the legislators. The free text book initiative is funded in part with money from Hewlett and while UC is not being forced to use these books, the initiative may impact the University in the future. CSU and CCC's are agreeing on major preparation courses and are discussing the specifics about the exact number of units that must come from each system. ICAS has asked UCEP to endorse the LEAP learning outcomes, a matter to be discussed later.

## **II Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved with one correction.

## **III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gilly, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Now that thirty proposals to ILTI have been approved, the budgets are being determined. Forty-six students have used cross campus enrollment for winter quarter/spring semester courses and 15 non-matriculated students have also enrolled. SB 1052 was passed by the legislature two years ago and created the California Open Education Resources Council funded by a \$500K Hewlett grant with matching funds from the state. UC has three members on this Council, which is responsible for identifying five high-demand courses and looking for open source textbooks and supplemental materials to recommend for use in the three segments. There are thousands of open source textbooks available but faculty will need to be encouraged to consider using this materials. ICAS is the governing body managing this project and the CSU is managing the grant and much of the administrative work.

The report on performance outcomes prepared by Debby Obley and Pamela Brown for the legislature shows that UC is doing well but there is some concern that this reporting will be used in a simplistic way. This could impact the way that additional funding comes to UC and the legislature may further meddle with the University's undergraduate mission. Originally the report of the transfer action team was to be presented to the Regents in March but this has been postponed until May in part because the Senate's role in transfer issues was not flushed out in the initial report. Chair Jacob is pleased that the president agreed to postpone the presentation until the information is complete. This year, transfer applications to the CSUs and UC are down but it is not entirely clear why. UCEP should spend time during the committee's April meeting carefully reviewing the report and provide feedback.

**Discussion:** The UCSC registrar has indicated that the term "cross campus enrollment" is being confused with simultaneous enrollment and having two separate policies for the same thing seems unnecessary. Enrolling in another UC has been called simultaneous enrollment for quite some time and cross campus enrollment referred to other segments. Chair Labor asked about the March 15<sup>th</sup> due date for feedback on the hub, and Chair Jacob recommended that UCEP should discuss it thoroughly today and respond as soon as possible. Keith Williams has indicated that the hub is a \$5M project, which is alarming when one considers that UCOE's \$4M contract with Blackboard yielded fewer than 100 non-matriculated students. Chair Jacob reported that the materials do not explain why the large communications hub is needed in light of the mini-hub used to date by 46 students for simultaneous enrollment and the committee members are asked to consider this question during their discussion. A member pointed out that one specific individual has been involved with a process that has been badly flawed and this same individual is responsible for justifying expenses implied in this proposal. Chair Jacob encouraged the committee to step back and ask basic questions such as why this hub is needed.

## **IV. Systemwide Course Approval**

UCEP has been asked to grant systemwide approval for Math 19B at UCSC.

**Discussion:** One of the reviewers indicated that the proposal is thorough, including plans for evaluation and information about how the course has been done in the past. A motion to approve the course was made and seconded.

**Action:** The course was approved.

## **V. New Business**

### **LEAP Outcomes**

Chair Labor sent the committee materials about Liberal Education in America's Promise just before the meeting. Vice Chair Larrabee suggested it would be hard to argue against the LEAP learning outcomes. The one reason not to endorse LEAP might be the evaluation. At UCSC, WASC assessments are pointed at programmatic evaluation so there are program learning outcomes, not campus wide expectations. The other two segments have been asked to opine and the vice chair is concerned that they will be in favor of LEAP, including the assessment.

**Discussion:** Associate Director Baxter reported the LEAP outcomes are good in that they are more flexible and allow for a broader kind of evaluation than the standardized testing approach. A broad endorsement of these things in concept might be fine while Associate Director Baxter is a little hesitant about formal adoption. Individuals involved with assessment at the campuses would appreciate having a statement about student learning. The statement could indicate that using LEAP principles and rubrics could be useful tools in faculty-driven, locally defined and discipline specific assessment. A member asked how LEAP is aligned with the WASC core competencies. Associate Director Baxter indicated that there are rubrics for the each of the five core competencies. The faculty could consider using LEAP materials. Associate Director Baxter suggested that the campus assessment people could be invited to the educational policy committees to discuss LEAP as well as a broader statement about assessment.

A member suggested that UC should do all it can to resist LEAP because it overlaps with existing structures already in place and which are time-consuming. There is no apparent benefit to students or the public and it is not a productive use of faculty or administrator time. The point was made that people will ask why UC is not doing this when Harvard is, and Associate Director Baxter thinks that WASC will question UC. The motion was made to ask the divisions to formally review the LEAP materials and provide comments by May 1st. A response to ICAS is needed by June 5<sup>th</sup>. Campuses could respond by stating they will not participate. The committee agreed to request comments from the divisions.

**Action:** Members will ask the divisions to formally comment on LEAP by May 1<sup>st</sup>.

### **Cross Campus Enrollment**

Chair Labor is not clear why registration reform and the building of computer system should occur conjointly and at this time based on the submitted materials.

**Discussion:** Members agree that the plan for the communications hub is unrealistic. Chair Jacob encouraged UCEP to be straightforward in its response to the proposal. There are concerns about the lack of Senate involvement in the creation of this plan. The proposal calls for the creation of an administrative unit to manage the system which UCEP members find objectionable. A member described the proposal as ill conceived by individuals who have no sense of proportion or about the issues involved. UC should see the thousands of students before this is built.

Chair Jacob has asked UCOE for the enrollment number that would justify creating this system but this has not been provided and UCEP may want to ask about this. One member suggests that UCEP should ask how many students can be handled by the mini hub and what types or resources are currently being directed to the registrars for this. A member objects to using \$5M to develop a centralized structure to support something that is really a campus prerogative. One campus is concerned about the slippage created by UCOE's offering of transcripts. Students have shown transcripts issued by UCOE although only the registrars are supposed to

issue transcripts. UCEAP has had a system for uploading and downloading grades to registrars that would be an alternate model to the proposed hub. Vice Chair Larrabee will draft the memo by next Monday, March 10th with a request for feedback from UCEP members in time to meet the March 14<sup>th</sup> deadline. Members might also check with the administrators at their campuses who received the hub proposal.

**Action:** The vice chair will draft a memo about the cross campus enrollment hub.

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

- *Aimée Dorr, Provost and Vice President, UCOP*
- *Ellen Omundson, Project Coordinator, ILTI*
- *Keith Williams, Interim Director, UCOE*

Chair Labor thanked Provost Dorr for joining the meeting. There were two rounds of ILTI RFPs, peer committees were used to review the proposals and about thirty courses will be funded. Budgets are being finalized now. There was an agreement for the campuses to ask for funding to provide some enhancement for work that aligns with the focus of ILTI. Recently, UCOP decided to bundle together the funding agreements for the courses and course materials, the \$100K for campus enhancements as decided by the EVCs and some support of the anticipated additional costs to a campus opening an online course to other campuses and give the campus a lump sum with a clear statement about what the funds are for. This should make it easier for UCOP and the campuses to manage. There is an agreement with the EVCs that if there is a legitimate need for more funding, it should come from UCOE.

There is a pilot of the “mini-hub” that started with winter quarter and spring semester courses. UCOE found faculty offering 23 courses who were willing to admit some students from different UC campuses. The number of students who enrolled is small as anticipated. ILTI agreed to pay for TAs for non-host campus students. But the enrollment numbers are such that ILTI is paying a lot of money for TAs who do not have much work which Provost Dorr describes as part of the process of determining what works and what does not. There have been efforts to get these courses to count for more than unit credit on different campuses, either for GE or major, based on the campus processes. Since the summer, a group has been working on specifications to put in the request for proposals for the larger hub. Interim Director Williams has compiled a list of policies and regulations which may need to be discussed with UCEP and with the campuses. The goal is to have a good statement about what UC needs so that campuses or outside firms who do this type of work will understand what is needed and can propose new ideas. In some cases, the TA support funded by ILTI allowed a course to be opened to more students from the host campus.

**Discussion:** UCEP’s questions include: Why the system should be formalized now? What would the cost for hub activity be if it was not a new software system? Why is a more technologically based system needed at this point? Why an administrative unit is needed? Interim Director Williams has been in discussion with the registrars for the past year and a big challenge is that the student information systems are different across the campuses. The registrars indicated that it is not feasible to integrate a new system into what is currently used and there is no way to authenticate students at a different campus. Even student identification numbers are not uniform across the campuses. It seemed more straightforward to have one system that interacts with each registrar’s system. The proposed system can enroll a student and then push the information out to the registrars.

The goal is to find a system that enables this to happen as smoothly and seamlessly as possible for students. The new administrative unit will provide the oversight to handle the complexities of the nine different systems and make sure that the data is secure and that FERPA rules are followed. It was felt that it would be cheaper to build a system to do this centrally than to require each campus to do this work. The cross campus enrollment numbers right now are so small that the current paper manual system works, but if these numbers grow there will be problems. Since it will take some time to build the system, the work should begin soon. Provost Dorr indicated that administrative support will be required to keep the hub working but this does not necessarily have to be done by a new unit. The unit will monitor the data structures and check that transfers

are done appropriately, and make sure that any changes made by a campus are incorporated into the new system.

The provost indicated that the estimates have varied from \$3M to \$5M and the cost will be influenced by the decisions UC finalizes. UCEP's past chair David Kay has been involved in the hub discussions and UCEP may want to ask for his perspective on this proposal. At this time, there is no plan to centralize catalog data according to the provost. Instead, the idea is to find a way for the hub to point back to the campus that owns the course. It was noted that the nomenclature used in each campus catalog is different. Provost Dorr indicated that it is hard to know what the long-term organizational impact of the proposed hub might be. The provost hopes it will support the online activities that are motivating its development right now but will also offer the flexibility to allow students to take courses at different campuses during the academic year. Chair Labor asked if the proposed hub is a statement on how divisions should operate together. Provost Dorr noted that President Yudof always said that participating in online education is for the willing and it is not a requirement.

## **V. Executive Session**

No Executive Session was held.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:50

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tim Labor