UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES
MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2012

Attending: Jose Wudka, Chair (UCR), John Yoder, Vice Chair (UCD), Nayan Shah (UCSD), Michael
Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Tania Israel (UCSB), Tamara
Alliston (UCSF), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate
Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and
Coordination), Keith Williams (Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination), Bill
Jacob (Chair, BOARS), Jim Chalfant (Chair, UCPB), Bob Powell (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Martha
Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I.   Announcements

Chair Wudka welcomed everyone to the meeting. The WASC Commission rescinded its intention to use
external benchmarking using competencies. The review process will be simplified. The Commission
wants to have a conversation with its constituents and the Chair has conveyed that UCEP is happy to talk
further. The online pilot is moving along and there was a report to Council about it on February 22nd. The
online learning environment is being developed and one course if being offered at UCM. Twenty-three
other courses will be offered in the next year. Chair Wudka is working closely with the chairs of BOARS
and UCPB on the regulations being developed for online courses. UCOE principals have talked to Fidelis,
a start up that connects servicemen with higher education institutions, and UC is the first institution it will
work with. Council had a very cautious response to this partnership.

UCOLASC submitted a letter objecting to a federal bill that would do something similar to copyright
protection. It would require that any research connected to a federal grant would not be made public and
that anyone wanting access would have to deal with some type of copyright protection. There was
discussion at Council concerning copyright issues connected to awarding lecturers the same rights to
instructional materials that faculty have. Lecturers who develop materials they will have the same rights
as other faculty. At ICAS, it was decided to instruct the IGETC subcommittee to develop a track to
IGECTC that parallels SciGETC.

Discussion: the UCD representative and the undergraduate student representative reported that students
are in Sacramento today to lobby. It is expected that fifteen thousand students will be in the capitol.
UCSA is writing a letter asking faculty to support students lobbying for higher education. The student
representative was asked to forward a copy of the letter to UCEP.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III.   Residency

There was a proposal to modify SR 610. The regulation has nothing to do with the California resident
requirement and the residency requirement does not refer to the physical presence of a student on a
campus. This proposal was reviewed by standing committees and divisions. Many divisions were
completely opposed to removing the physical presence requirement. UCEP could drop the proposed
revisions and leave SR 610 as it is, again propose removing the physical presence requirement, or allow
for exceptions on a case by case basis as suggested by UCSC and CCGA.

Discussion: The responses to the proposed revisions focused on the online instruction project. A member suggested that UCEP could clarify that the divisions may opt to define residency to include physical residency or not. Given the amount of resistance throughout the system, UCEP needs clarification before making any decisions. UCEP could advise everyone it is the committee's interpretation that it is up to each campus to decide how to deal with residency as it relates to any type of course. UCEP could either notify the divisions that UCEP's intention was to clarify that divisions can accept online courses to meet the residency requirement or propose a revision to APM 610 that states this. The first sentence could be revised to make it clear that it is the college that decides residency.

Action: The UCI representative will fine tune the proposed revisions to share with the committee.

IV.   Online Instruction Pilot Project
   - *Keith Williams, Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning Council*

Chair Wudka indicated that two issues include how teaching to non-matriculated students is counted and how to evaluate prerequisites. How basic prerequisites, including English proficiency, will be measured and who will be responsible for this is not known. Also to be determined is what it means to teach a course that has a section with large numbers of nonmatriculated students or is completely populated by such students. Faculty Advisor Williams reported on a visit to UCR last week with Vice Provost Greenstein, the first of many campus visits. It was informative and the interaction with Senate on the campus was positive. A spring course at UCD has over one hundred students, a UCSC course is being offered, three courses are being offered at UCB, and issues with other courses are being resolved. Faculty are making decisions about the use of proctoring services. A trial of Proctor U will be conducted at UCI with a summer school extension pre-calculus course. Enrollments for spring will be UC students and in the summer most of the students will be matriculated but there may be some non-matriculated students as well.

A committee has begun reviewing nineteen wave II submissions which was more narrowly focused on courses that will be useful to UC students at the lower division and for non-matriculated students. Departments have been asked to teach a course more than once a year to allow more non-matriculated students to enroll, which will generate funds for the department supporting the course and to pay back the UCOE loan. Five proposals were endorsed by the committee and faculty will work with instructional designers to help develop the course and budget. These are mostly lower division, high enrollment courses. UCOE is beginning to plan how to add more courses in the longer term, and no new courses will be added anytime in the next six to nine months. There is an effort to identify a lower division curriculum that would make sense for UCOE to offer. This would be a set of courses that will not duplicate any given course but might be a sequence in a specific area. A limited letter of intent may be issued inviting specific departments or faculty to propose a course that might fit within the curriculum. There will be an option for anyone to submit a proposed course at anytime.

Blackboard, hired to provide marketing and support for non-matriculated students, is preparing to release a marketing plan. In the middle of March there will be a presentation to UCOE. Blackboard will hire and UC will help train people to perform the marketing.

Discussion: The only mechanism for concurrent enrollment in 2012-2013 will be the process for simultaneous enrollment currently in place. The executive vice chancellors did not want to let money follow the students and there are issues related to the registration enrollment function and the transactions that have to occur between the different enrollment systems. The hope is that by 2013-14 these issues will be worked out. Non-matriculated students will register through UCM's registrar in a separate system for next fall. UC students will enroll using the regular process. By fall 2013 there should be a mechanism for enrollment though this depends upon people outside of UCOE. A financial agreement with the executive

vice chancellors will be needed. A lot of work will be done this year to get the campus information systems to talk to the learning management systems developed by UCOE, and this may help with cross-campus enrollments. The lower division courses will not be like a planned curriculum such as IGETC.

V.   BOARS Transfer Proposal

UCEP has the opportunity to comment on a proposal from BOARS for transfer student admissions. This is a response to SB 1440 which requires CSUs and CCCs to create a transfer path that will simplify the movement of students from CCCs to CSUs and requests UC to create a similar transfer path. The proposal modifies the standard approach and it creates two more paths for transfer based on a review of the students' program of study at the CCC. UC will determine if students have completed the new transfer curriculum. The proposal only guarantees a review of the file for admission.

Discussion: One concern is who will conduct the comprehensive review and whether the resources are available for this at the departmental level. A campus questioned whether or not a student will have an option to change majors once admitted and there is concern about courses that work for transfers to the CSUs but not the UCs. These issues may not simplify the transfer process. Many of the campus educational policy committees have discussed the proposal. Overall UCEP members support the proposal.

Action: Chair Wudka will draft a memo reflecting the committee's comments.

VI.   UCOE/Systemwide Course Regulations

UCOE provided a series of proposals that have been categorized by level of priority. Chair Wudka has attempted to address priorities one and two. It may be that UCEP will propose guidelines instead of regulations, and the different approval processes need to be clarified. The purpose of SR 850 is to regulate systemwide courses and provides a way to label them. There are few places in the regulations that address systemwide courses. Extension regulations could be adopted but the committee responsible for approving systemwide Extension courses no longer exists (in addition to other problems). UCEP could recommend that it, CCGA or some other committee be made responsible for approving systemwide courses. SR 860 is related to non-matriculated students and it is something about which UCOE will probably be concerned because it limits the number of these students in the courses. Some issues will probably need to be decided by Rules and Jurisdiction. SR 870 aims to address how credit is granted.

Discussion: A member commented that the proposed SR 850 provides a good place to start on a definition of systemwide courses. Members support the proposed language in SR 850 but minor revisions to the definition of concurrent will be made. SR 860 addresses concerns that have been discussed by one campus CEP. The concerns associated with UCOE creating a program of study ia htat this would entitle students to financial aid (this is a concern connected to UCOE's plan to partner with Fidelis);. faculty and the divisions need to have control over what constitutes the program of study. Non-matriculated students may borrow large amounts to take UCOE courses for which they are not prepared. A member proposed the addition of SR 313 to define non-matriculated students. It is important to distinguish between courses with matriculated and non-matriculated students. The percentage of non-matriculated students that can be enrolled in a course is not fixed. Members discussed whether the 50% limit is overly restrictive or if a limit is even necessary. The direct infrastructure costs associated with enrolling non-matriculated students will limit their enrollment. It may eventually be necessary to have a regulation limiting the number of non-matriculated students. The chair of BOARS indicated that there may need to be a set of "x" courses for UCOE that are predominantly non-matriculated students.

Providing a refund to non-matriculated students will not be included in the regulation. An administrative fee would probably be retained for students that drop a course. UCEP could ask for evidence that the

quality of a course does not suffer when the majority of students in a course are non-matriculated. Since the implications of what is proposed are unknown, it is important to have regulations that sunset at some point. UCEP may want to include language about where authority rests for putting together programs of study to ensure that the Senate can exercise control over them. Provisions similar to the way Extension works now should be the focus for UCEP as they stipulate how funds generated by the students is allocated to the unit. Units generating the funds with UCOE courses need to have access to these funds to support the infrastructure.

Having a course or program of study that looks similar to IGETC might be misleading to students, so UCOE needs to be very clear about what students will receive. UCOE is not one of the entities currently with authority to offer degrees. The issue of whether UCOE courses are state supported is important because of education codes. If they are, then CCC and CSU students can enroll in one of these courses in each term at their current CCC or CSU rate. This could have a serious impact on the funding model. The 50% rule could influence the state support definition. The current UC policy on credit hours is too vague for the Department of Education and may need to be adjusted. A change in Chapter 4 of the Senate regulations might be needed and students need to receive the policy and the syllabi in order to be compliant. The UCB credit hour policy satisfies WASC and the Department of Education. Systemwide should make this change independent on UCOE courses. SR 870a applies to matriculated students and sections b and c apply to non-matriculated students. There should be a process to ensure that non-UC students receive credit and are not treated differently from other types of students.

The chair of UCPB suggested that it may be important to define a UC course. SR 850 includes a definition but does not prevent a department from hiring a lecturer to teach a course. The department where the course originated, not UCOE, has the capacity to appoint or hire a person to teach the course. Faculty are being asked by UCOE to sign an agreement to give another faculty person the ability to teach their online courses. It has to be clear that online courses are taught by Senate approved instructors because it has to be a regular course offering, and Rules and Jurisdiction may need to address this. The members had no comments on SR 880.

Action: Members were asked to submit comments to Chair Wudka who will incorporate them into the document. There will be follow up discussions about the regulations with BOARS, UCPB, and Senate leadership.

VII.   Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Hilary Baxter, Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*

Stanford asked UC, USC, CalTech and other institutions to communicate with WASC that the proposed external validation and benchmarking of the five proficiencies articulated for undergraduates should not move forward. A meeting with several WASC representatives, Provost Pitts, Associate Director Baxter, the executive vice chancellors and campus liaisons to WASC was held to discuss the positions in the letters sent to the commission. The meeting was effective but there is still work to be done. The national advisory committee to the Department of Education that oversees accreditation will consider recommendations in the report, including the recommendation to organize accreditation by institutional mission or sector rather than by region.

Meeting adjourned at: 1:20 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Jose Wudka