

MONDAY, March 4, 2013

I. Announcements

Consultation with administrators, faculty groups, and students has resulted in the version of the proposal

reviewed by UCEP today and this is the final opportunity for UCEP to provide input. The basic question is what is the appropriate level of financial aid support and the consensus that emerged was that more should be done for middle income students, new funding sources should be generated including corporate funding raising by UCOP. Regardless of how successful fundraising is, UC will rely on tuition for financial aid. Higher tuition will have to be paid by higher income students. Option A is the most generous as it generates that largest amount of financial aid. Option B provides the least amount for the aid programs and the overall tuition levels can remain lower. Both options A and B expect students to borrow a manageable amount. In option B, instead of the assumption that students will repay their loan in ten years, the expectation would be that the loan is repaid in fifteen years. New revenue will always be needed because even if the tuition is not increased, other costs will increase. The 33% return to aid is a proxy but it is not perfect. In the past, it has resulted in over funding the programs but continuing to use it will result in underfunding the program. To avoid this, the amount that will be needed will be calculated and this is reflected in options A and B. Any comments from UCEP have to be submitted in time for the March Council meeting.

Discussion: Some faculty may be uncomfortable with the idea that the high tuition charged to upper income students is utilized for financial aid for lower income students. It was reported that students at one campus are opposed to option B because students would have to borrow more. Input from the campus CEPs will be submitted by March 17th so that UCEP's feedback can be submitted for the March 27th Council meeting. The UCSC representative volunteered to help the chair compile the CEP feedback. The point was made that UCEP should consider how the proposals impact undergraduate education.

IV. Systemwide Course Approvals

Chair Yoder compiled a set of documents which shed light on the meaning of a systemwide course. SR 544 allowed any UC student to take any course at a UC campus, but it places a burden on students who are required to obtain approval from their home campus and the campus offering the course. The Remote and Online Instruction Report provides an idea of what online instruction could be. The report concludes that expanding online education could increase access. UCEP should think about how to facilitate online instruction for students.

Discussion: A collection of best practices about UC online instruction should be available to share with faculty across campuses. UCSF is documenting best practices used at that campus. UCI is working on an analysis of what is and is not working. A critical role that UCOE could play is to share best practices, and it was suggested that UCOP could have a wiki to which users contribute. Several members believe that the systemwide designation should be reserved for courses that are unique. Vice Chair Jacob indicated that the purpose of the systemwide designation is to create the systemwide catalog, and the courses do not just have to be online. A member argued that it would make no sense for students to take courses when the credit will not count toward their major. There is a concern about ruling out courses that might make the system better. It is more important for a systemwide course to be excellent than unique. If a systemwide course proves to be of poor quality, the designation should be removed.

Several members agreed that UCEP should have discussed the criteria for a systemwide courses before discussing online courses. Associate Director Baxter pointed out that Arabic Without Walls was a course that was unavailable at other UC campuses. It was unique but it also addressed capacity in the system. Time to degree, curricular enrichment, and capacity building might be the goals of having systemwide courses. Chair Yoder proposes that the criteria of uniqueness should not be used because it is not clear who will determine that this criteria has been met, and suggests that students will vote with their feet making it clear which courses are the best. A member countered that UCEP should take a stronger hand in defining the rationale for a systemwide course and that the committee should be the arbiter in terms of what is or is not an excellent or unique course. An online option is valuable when students cannot get into the in-person offering at their campus. UCOE's purpose needs to be defined.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Keith Williams, Interim Director, UCOE*

The Executive Vice Chancellors have been asked to identify the right funding model for online instruction. UCOE is currently focused on developing the infrastructure to allow communication across the campuses. The communication hub idea includes building a systemwide online catalog. A call for different representatives to work on the hub went out a week ago, and the group includes representatives from the registrars and technical people like the UCOP chief information officer. The infrastructure that needs to be built to communicate electronically across the campuses will be determined. This process includes building the catalog which includes all systemwide courses whether they are online or not. It would also serve EAP and UCDC. The hub will also include a mechanism for students to enroll in courses, and it will eliminate the paper process students currently have to follow.

Director Williams indicated that the goal of UCOE has always been to offer courses to UC students. There is still the potential to enroll non-matriculated students as a bigger curriculum becomes available. Work has always been done to ensure that UC students are being served well by UCOE and less emphasis is being placed on generating funds by enrolling non-matriculated students. There is still a way to serve this population but this is on hold for the time being. Students are given the typical GPA and SAT score and they are required to affirm that they meet the criteria for a course. Transcripts are not collected. Since only six non-matriculated students are currently enrolled it is not possible to tell how well the system works.

Discussion: An online course that is not part of UCOE could be offered to non-matriculated students. Director Williams reported that UCOE does not operate independently from the campuses, and that courses are developed and managed by departments. The focus is on lower division gateway courses and there are a number of models that fit this. UCOE has been talking about courses that may have systemwide benefits. Models include a course with a central instructor and support for students at each campus or a course developed at one campus that is used by other campuses. Work is being done to develop a “sand box” that contains information about best practices such as information about how to develop a course. The four instructional designers have developed expertise that will be shared with others. An assessment of the man hours involved with developing an online course would provide especially helpful information to the Regents, the legislature and students. Director Williams indicated that faculty have been asked to document their activities but they have been too busy to provide the information. Faculty have received course relief and summer salary which could be used to indicate how much work they have done. The next RFP will have information that can give faculty an idea of the work that will be required.

A member commented that the realignment of the goals of UCOE is a good change. The time required for instruction design might be compelling information for the Regents and governor to have. It was suggested that the incentives provided to faculty should be standardized.

VI. Systemwide Course Approvals

Chair Yoder stated that courses are approved at the local level and the systemwide designation simply means the course is included in a catalog. Chair Yoder indicated that UCEP should not attempt to duplicate the campuses' evaluation of the courses. The goal is to facilitate access. A course with a systemwide designation will be widely advertised.

Discussion: It would be difficult to determine if an online course is excellent the first time it is offered. UCOE should be a clearinghouse for best practices and provide support for course development. It is good that faculty can develop online courses independent from UCOE because of concerns about the contract faculty have to sign for UCOE. UCEP members might focus on ways that UCOE can complement activities at the campuses. Chair Yoder reiterated that the campuses should be allowed to decide about the quality of the courses and UCEP's role is to get the courses listed systemwide so UC students can much more easily select a course. A committee member suggested that courses need to fight for the systemwide designation by demonstrating that it contributes something pedagogically valuable. The committee discussed the question of fairness if courses approved in the future have to meet a higher standard.

A member asked whether an online course could be offered just at one campus and allowed to incubate for some time before becoming systemwide or is it so necessary that the course be systemwide to merit committing the resources to developing the course. UCEP discussions would be different if a course, already known to be an effective online course, were being reviewed. Vice Chair Jacobs indicated that the online courses that have done well will be in the systemwide catalog, as will anything funded with the \$10M and possibly courses that are not online. The rfp will include courses that address capacity, time to degree and enrichment. The courses that address time to degree could be upper level or graduate courses. The administration would agree with UCEP's focus on courses that can serve large numbers of matriculated students across the campuses. Provost Dorr hopes that there will be multi-campus collaboration to develop courses which would reduce the potential duplication of courses. It was proposed that UCEP could consider two paths to approval for a systemwide course and in both cases excellence would be a key component. One path would focus on uniqueness and excellence and the second would focus on access and excellence. In the case of access, excellence could be demonstrated by the fact that a course is homegrown at a certain campus and there are learning outcome measures. UCEP could look at these courses and agree that they should be available systemwide. This approach would not stop the development of another excellent course on the same subject. The uniqueness and excellence path gets to enrichment. Some courses will be considered good because they serve students scattered throughout the state. UCEP would weigh in on courses that are not home grown or that have a multi-campus imperative. In both cases, UCEP will make sure that ability of the course to be offered widely is sufficiently addressed. The specific details of what will be listed in the systemwide catalog have not been identified by UCOP.

A member recommended that UCEP or a similar body should be involved with selecting the courses developed with the \$10M, and the excellence rubric should be used by reviewers. It was noted that a course might be developed at one campus but find its audience at another campus. UCEPs' criteria should be simple but still maintain the quality control. There is concern about problems created in the future when a course is available in multiple offerings without cooperative arrangements among the faculty. Faculty proposing new courses could be required to provide evidence of effectiveness after two years. UCEP could recommend that faculty involved with successful courses be asked to collaborate after several years. Questions could be added to UCEP systemwide course approval guidelines which could include how faculty will deliver the course in a systemwide way and document the course's excellence. This will improve the guidance that UCEP provides to faculty seeking systemwide status of their courses. Temporarily approving courses will reduce the chance that UCEP will inadvertently reject a course that might be interesting. The committee discussed including uniqueness as part of the criteria. Uniqueness suggests that it is a course for which there currently is no systemwide designation although it is a common subject or that it is courses that feature a unique aspect of a particular campus, so language that makes this distinction is needed. The definition of access could be very broad, and include courses that are considered unique in some way as well as limited access to courses that would impact time to degree. Members agree with using the excellence and accessibility criteria and that the temporary approval would be given to all courses. UCEP's workload will increase if the committee has to renew courses every three years along with approving new courses, although the processes can be streamlined. Committee members have concerns about multiple offerings of similar courses and whether the faculty involved should eventually be encouraged or required to collaborate.

Global Climate Change Course: UCEP looked at this matter and had additional questions which have been answered by the instructor. The reviewer indicated that he would not approve this course for pedagogical reasons and would not give credit to his students for taking this course. A member noted that the course involves students videotaping themselves and questioned whether this is legal. Chair Yoder reported that this course has been taught at UCD as well as online in the past and the evaluation was positive, including the feedback from students. A motion to vote on the course was made and seconded. The committee voted to approve the course.

UCEP members agree with the suggestion that a sub-committee of UCEP should review and approve courses.

VII. New Business

The UCEP representative to UCEAP asked UCEP to consider an issue related to EAP. Some countries cost more to go to than others.

Discussion: It is not clear why UCEP has been asked to comment on this matter. There is concern about changing the tuition when students are told that EAP costs the same as their regular tuition. Programs that are reciprocal are cheaper but there are now third-party providers and these cost more. In the past, EAP would raise the cost of EAP for all programs to cover the costs of the more expensive programs. Students should be asked about the proposed increase. UCEP members should bring this matter to their campus committee's for input.

VIII. Executive Session

There was no executive session.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:50 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: John Yoder