

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2012

Attending: Jose Wudka, Chair (UCR), Michael Dennin (UCI) (telephone), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Tim Labor (UCR), Tania Israel (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF) (telephone), Eileen Zurbruggen (UCSC) (telephone), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Jon Rossini (UCD), Dick Weiss (UCLA), Justin Riordan (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Dan Greenstein (Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination), Keith Williams (Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination), James Postma (Chemistry Professor, CSU Chico) (telephone), Gary Matkin (Dean, UCI Extension), Jane Conoley (Chair, Science and Mathematics Teacher Initiative) (telephone), Robert Blake (Director, UC Language Consortium) (telephone), Bruce Cain (Director, UC Washington D.C. Center) (telephone), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Online Instruction Pilot Project

- *Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*
- *Keith Williams, Faculty Advisor, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*

Chair Wudka asked for an update on the OIPP and feedback on the draft regulations from the vice provost and faculty advisor. Timing is one of UCOP's concerns and regulations will take a long time to put in place. Vice Provost Greenstein thanked the committee for its work on the regulations and appreciates UCEP's effort and understanding of what UCOE wants to accomplish. The Vice Provost agrees with the statement in the regulations that UCOE is not like extension and does not want to do academic programming. UCOE has made the effort to anchor the courses in their respective departments. The main concerns are in two areas that would make it challenging to offer courses to UC students. Most faculty involved with the courses now are interested in helping their own students first and foremost. Vice Provost Greenstein reported that the 50% quota of non-matriculated students and the regulation that ties the quality of the credits to the proportion of non-matriculated students in the course will be challenges for UCOE. The regulation potentially ties the number of times a course can be offered to UC students to the number of non-matriculated students that can enroll, which may result in reduced accessibility for UC students. Preserving the integrity of the experience for the UC student is essential to UCOP, and how this will be done will vary course by course.

UCOE is concerned about whether there is a market for what UC is doing. The vice provost thinks it will take twelve months to know what will happen. When the courses are rolled out in the fall, UCOE will have a better idea of what to expect in terms of non-matriculated student enrollment. The goal is to have 3700 non-matriculated student course enrollments in the fall which is what UCOE needs to stay alive financially. Faculty Advisor Williams indicated that the students Blackboard recruits will be well-qualified. The initial audience includes pre-baccalaureate students (advanced high school students, and students who deferred admissions into UC); students "in training" to degree completion and transfers, and; post baccalaureate students who might include people switching careers, graduate students, and adult learners. The timing, numbers and mix of courses will spread across all three groups to determine what works best. The emphasis is on California residents, and right now, outside of California, there is interest but not as high. If the barrier for non-matriculated students is too high, UCOE will be unable to learn about what does and does not work. Five courses start today and four of the five are fully enrolled.

Discussion: Chair Wudka stated that the language describing the 50% limit needs to be revised so that

it is not as definitive allowing variations due to students enrolling in and dropping courses. UC cannot tell the community colleges to accept the credit from an OIPP course, but UCOE is talking to that system. The credit could be treated the same as when community college students take Extension courses. UCOE will not have the platform to support individuals who want to audit courses or the large number of students enrolled in Stanford's artificial intelligence course, and a concern is that OIPP will fail because it is not able to provide the infrastructure if large numbers of students enroll. Nominal record-checking will add costs that UCOE has to absorb, so students will be asked to self-report their credentials and UCOE will look at how well this works. Students will be asked if they were dismissed or placed on probation at a UC campus.

On May 15th UCOE will look at the capacity of the common learning environment, data from the marketing group, and the current course mix. The load jumped from just over thirty students to five hundred with the new courses that have just started. Four of the twenty-two have college course prerequisites, three have a pre-test, and three others have high school course requirements. The twenty-two courses have only UC students enrolled. It is not clear how international students will be tested at facilities in their countries but it may be the same process used for summer session which entails an additional fee. Proctoring will be done virtually or on site, and this might include the use of testing sites. A webinar is planned for April 13th for a demonstration of three proctoring services. Each has a slightly different approach. The cost of the proctoring will probably be part of the course fee. Individual faculty will be responsible for making arrangements for UC students to take exams in person.

II. Welcome and Announcements

The president endorsed the governor's tax initiative which has now been merged with the "millionaire's tax" initiative. The president asked the Regents to support it but the Regents did not decide one way or another. Council received and supported Bill Jacob's application to be the Senate's vice chair. The UCOE regulations were presented to Council. BOARS will ask UCOE to apply to offer a-g courses online but UCOE might not currently be prepared to meet BOARS' requirements. Chair Wudka requested that Council establish a committee to look at the language in the Compendium regarding ending the last programs of their kind. The committee will include members from UCEP, CCGA and BOARS. The Chair had a conference call with Diane Harley, the chair of the new OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel convened by Council to evaluate OIPP. The panel will provide reports in sync with the reports from the OIPP evaluators. April 24th will be legislature day for ICAS.

Discussion: The student representative reported that OP has changed the plan for the May 17th event. The Regents have decided to make it strictly a lobbying event without any student participation.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

IV. California State University's Online Initiative

- *Jim Postma, Professor of Chemistry, CSU Chico*

Chair Wudka thanked Professor Postma for joining UCEP to describe the new online initiative at CSU. A paper described what was envisioned for CSU online. The general idea has been that while CSU has had online programs, they have emanated from the campuses, not the system. These programs could benefit from centralized advertising and application site. There may be other aspects of CSU programs that might be amenable to online offerings. In particular the target audience is not current CSU students

or CSU eligible students, but those not traditionally served by CSU looking for educational opportunities that are either online or traditional courses. An audience for the near future is students who have accumulated a number of units at a CSU without completing a degree, but could complete it with online courses.

The faculty at current CSU campuses will be used, so the program will not have all the things that comprise a separate campus. Students will be enrolled at a CSU campus. The program is intended to be self-supporting but the business model is just unfolding so it is not yet clear what the cost will be. The primary audience will be non-CSU students.

Discussion: The current courses are in masters programs. Non-CSU students will pay the full cost. CSU believes it can provide a common platform for its own courses as well as the online courses. CSU is currently discussing whether a uniform portal will be used and proposals from various vendors are being submitted today. The CSUs have not specifically discussed compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The first set of courses is current CSU programs offered fully online and at least three quarters are masters programs. Students in the nursing courses offered have already completed the lab requirements. Proctoring companies are being explored. The courses emanate from the campuses and are approved through the traditional course approval processes. WASC has already been involved with the evaluation of CSUs online courses.

The current union contract makes it clear that unless faculty have received extra compensation they own whatever they produce, and extra compensation does not include things like sabbatical. As campuses venture into the online arena, they have come up with various models that are consistent with that agreement. If they were given explicit support to develop a course, an agreement is signed in the beginning that makes clear what the intellectual property rights are, and campuses might have some long term interest in the course content if there is extra support. Chair Wudka thanked Professor Postma for his time and indicated that UCEP might ask him to join the committee again as both OIPP and CSU Online move forward. UCEP members agreed that CSU and UC are dealing with similar challenges. A member pointed out that there are target audiences that would take online courses for continuing education or professional development and not for credit, and UCOE's business model would have been much better if this audience had been the target.

V. UC Extension

- *Gary Matkin, Dean, UCI Extension*

Chair Wudka asked Dean Matkin to discuss UCI Extension's online courses. UCI started summer session online with one course four years ago in an experiment with and under the oversight of the Academic Senate. This year there are thirty-seven online undergraduate courses and it is projected that close to four thousand students will enroll. UC Extension has received approval for these online courses as XI courses and is offering these XI courses. They are designed for non-matriculated students that carry the full credit for a UC course. Students received full subject and degree credit associated with their degree if and when they matriculated. The spring offering was withdrawn due to low enrollment in the fall and winter, and the courses will be offered again in the fall, with increased marketing and support. UCI Extension also wants to cooperate with UCOP to take advantage of marketing activities.

Discussion: UCOE's use of concurrent enrollment causes a challenge for Extension because it is difficult to treat the two different audiences created by mixing UC and non-UC students. The income stream has to cover all of the costs, including the instructors' salaries. The average grade for students in

an online course is not known because UCI Extension has not been able to offer a full XI course with sufficient enrollment. UCI Extension did not conduct extensive marketing but it is not clear if that is the primary reason for the low enrollment. Free content is everywhere and has a short shelf life which is another shortcoming of the UCOE business model and how financial resources have been utilized. UCI Extension will deliver four of the UCOE courses developed by UCI faculty because UCOE did not have the delivery system set up. UCI Extension is willing to let UCOE offer its thirty-seven online courses. UCI Extension is not willing to move from the Moodle platform until there is evidence of how well Sakai works. Dean Matkin has doubts about certain elements of UCOE's plan. UCI Extension gets a number of UC students in the summer, and campuses that offer summer sessions will have competition with UCOE students in the summer. XI courses have to reach a higher bar than regular Extension courses. UCI Extension's analysis found that the \$1400 UCOE plans to charge students is too high.

UCI Extension is not actively pursuing the idea of offering the online courses to matriculated students. Dean Matkin commented that students need to know what they are getting into before they start so the syllabus needs to be clearly explained to them. An early diagnostic and intervention is important, and the students often need tutorial intervention. The differences between matriculated and non-matriculated students need to be understood, and non-matriculated students need to be given the help they really need to meet UCI Extension's standards. The tutorial function may be outsourced or provided by graduate students. Chair Wudka thanked Dean Matkin for taking the time to tell UCEP about the status of the online courses. A member cautioned against the attitude that students who are unqualified will just be allowed to fail, pointing out that accreditation agencies look at pass/fail rates.

VI. UCOE Regulations

Chair Wudka indicated that UCOE is under pressure to make good on the loan. UCEP should make sure that students are protected and that no unnecessary obstacles are put in the way. Chair Wudka asked if UCEP is married to having regulations or if some other approach can be used.

Discussion: A member remarked that UC should think about what UC has to offer and when it is useful to have this online or in person. The focus should be how the intellectual content is delivered. It was suggested that a clear path of authority needs to be in place, whether this is through regulations or not. Executive Director Winnacker indicated that there is a type of agreement that would be something less than regulations. The problem with the regulations is that they will probably have to be revised in five years. It was noted that nothing in the regulations prohibits enrollment of non-matriculated students, and it may be okay for UCEP to wait until a point when the numbers of these students is very significant before creating regulations. Chair Wudka pointed out that UC cannot use the courses as experiments for non-matriculated students. Regulations could be drafted for the first year of the project to avoid the problem of having to revise them in a few years. An interim memo of understanding could state that UCEP has the ability to stop the project if UCOE does anything to violate it. The draft regulations could be called "UCEP Guidelines for Systemwide Courses" instead.

According to Executive Director Winnacker, the existing regulations have been extended into new areas where they apply. A two year agreement could be adopted initially and once it is clear that OIPP is going forward, UCEP could undertake the legislative process to institute new regulations. As a result of funding streams, the executive vice chancellors may eventually decide that funding from the campuses should not be used for OIPP. Members expressed concerns about UCOE offering courses instructed by faculty members who did not develop them. The important distinction is whether the course is under the control of the academic unit or under the control of someone trying to make a profit.

UCEP add a statement to the guidelines which says it supports using new innovative ways in teaching but strenuously objects to things such as taking away the rights of faculty members or departments. Chair Wudka stated that it is important to not do anything that will be deemed obstructionist. The guidelines should make frequent reference to the pertinent regulations.

Action: The UCD representative will draft a statement outlining the committee's concerns. The chair will incorporate the committee's feedback into the draft guidelines.

VII. UC Science and Mathematics Teacher Initiative

- *Jane Conoley, Chair of the SMI Executive Council (UCSB)*

Chair Wudka provided some background information about SMI CalTeach. The current issue is whether the new funding model will be advantageous for the program. The committee is asked to consider how it can help. Campuses will have to compete for funding now.

Discussion: Faculty Advisor Keith Williams joined UCEP to share the history of UCEP's involvement with CalTeach. Faculty Advisor Williams was on the executive board from 2008 until the current academic year. The funding included \$125,000 from the campus and the same amount from the state which has barely supported the programs. The core funding that pays for staffing and for some of the key lecturers is threatened by the new model. Relationships with local schools have been established. Many of the campuses offered stipends to students. Each year the enrollment has increased. The program has been successful overall even though the funding has never been ideal. The number of teaching credentials issued overall is down 20% but the contribution from UC to the STEM fields has risen from 545 to 865 between 2007-2008 and 2009-2010. Chair Conoley stated that the original agreement with UCOP is not being honored. CalTeach has not received a response to its letter to the provost.

The total budget for CalTeach is \$2.5 million and the campuses have leveraged these funds. The majority of students who go through CalTeach end up getting their teaching credentials outside of UC because UC campuses could not accommodate the increased numbers. The Executive Committee would like a statement that this abrupt withdrawal of funds represents an unfunded mandate, that UCOP asked for this program, and that as an instructional program, campuses should not be forced to compete for funds, and if the cut must be made, the program should have a year in order to handle disengaging students from the program. Chair Conoley indicated that the program would be happy to provide data and if programs are found to be doing poorly they should be defunded.

The administration's idea is that SMI will pursue grant funding to support it. When the program started, there was a fund raising function at UCOP but this eventually went away. An outcome of CalTeach has been massive outreach into k-12 classrooms and teachers have been extremely grateful. Test data from participating schools show significant improvements in the STEM fields. In 2009-2010 over 800 UC graduates were certified. Different contexts on each campus need to be taken into consideration. The program proposed an accountability model in order to improve the program. SMI is interested in pursuing several research models, and proposed a MRU approach which was not approved by UCOP. Chair Conoley will send data to help UCEP advocate for the program. UCEP will write a letter to the administration in support of the program. A member cautioned against supporting SMI CalTeach in light of other priorities at UC campuses. The committee agreed that sustaining good teaching at all levels is an important priority and that CalTeach provides a pipeline for good students, and that UCEP should at least support a gradual withdrawal of funding for CalTeach.

Action: The chair will draft a letter in support of SMI CalTeach.

VIII. Arabic Without Walls

- *Robert Blake, Director, UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching*

Chair Wudka asked Director Blake to provide insights on how the systemwide Arabic Without Walls course worked. The program started at UCB at the same time UCSC ended its Arabic course, and the seven students at UCSC were in the first Arabic Without Walls cohort. The online course easily aligned with the campus calendars. Graduate students at some campuses had difficulty because they were required to go through the Graduate Student office instead of through their registrar. Many of the issues lead back to the registrars since it is difficult to get them to work together. Publicity was an issue because there was no mechanism available to let students at other campuses know about Arabic Without Walls so the course was advertised in student newspapers. The online course worked very well in spite of Arabic being one of the most difficult languages to learn, especially in that modality. The system does not have the infrastructure to show how the money flows from the student to the campus teaching the course. SR 544 provides a good framework so it is an issue of how the practical aspects are handled.

Discussion: Students in the online course became proficient with reading and Arabic typing, and slightly less proficient with writing. Arabic is one of the hardest languages to learn and one year of study is just scratching the surface. Faculty Advisor Williams reported that one of the proposed online courses for Wave II was Punjabi but it did not move forward because the enrollment was low. Vice Provost Greenstein has proposed that niche languages with small enrollments could be supported by funding pooled by the campuses. The UC Language Consortium is sunsetting in part as a result of the funding streams. Faculty Advisor Williams indicated that the online project will result in mechanisms that support cross campus enrollment and advertising of systemwide courses.

IX. SR 610 and SR 760

The change to SR 760 change is in response to a Department of Education requirement. SR 610, the residency requirement, is already in the regulations. Chair Wudka borrowed language from UCB for SR 760 which clarifies what happens with lecture/seminar courses. One unit is equivalent to one student instructor contact hour plus two hours of class work or studying. For online courses, justification is required if face to face meeting time is less than one third of the time. The draft regulation may not satisfy WASC. The per-week per-term averages must be stated. Chair Wudka revised SR 610 and there are two versions for the committee to consider. SR 610 only applies to undergraduate students.

Discussion: Members indicated that most of courses are four units with three hours of face time, but this is not the case at one campus. The amount of effort is under counted by some colleges because of the amount of material that has to be covered. Challenge 45 resulted in removing courses from a major at UCLA. DOE will ask regional accreditors to monitor whether faculty are asking for the right amount of work, and WASC will do this by reviewing the syllabus. The face time can be reduced as long as the reading is increased a corresponding amount. The leeway in the UCB regulation should be included in SR 760 that allows for additional work by a student to count for an extra unit. The three hours of work per unit is required. Chair Wudka will revise SR 760 and send it to the committee for feedback. WASC is concerned about face to face time but classes that are fifty minutes instead of a full hour are not a problem. SR 760 should state that all courses need to explicitly define the terms of contact. The committee discussed whether online courses need to be specifically called out. Chair Wudka suggested

using the language from UCB for web-based classes. CEPs should look at what WASC requires to determine if the campus policies address them.

A member strongly supported the version of SR 610 that used physical presence as the default but recommends that the reference to CEPs should be deleted. Other members indicated support for the version that defines residency more broadly. If version number one is instituted, divisions could be encouraged to develop categories of students for which they need exceptions, although it is not clear how many exceptions would actually be sought. Chair Wudka would like to continue the discussion of the two regulations during the May meeting.

X. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Hilary Baxter, Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

There was confusion about the need for a committee to look at the Compendium's language regarding ending the last program. Associate Director Baxter indicated that UCEP's understanding of the Compendium's guidelines for ending unique programs is correct. Ralph Wolff from WASC will meet with Provost Pitts to discuss how things are developing with WASC. Campus liaisons to WASC are concerned about the new requirements for reporting graduation and retention rate data. There are questions about who will be on the review committees that will look at the data.

Discussion: Chair Wudka clarified that the group that will look at the disestablishment language in the Compendium will include a representative from UCPB, UCEP, and CCGA along with individuals from the administration. A member remarked that the agenda for ARC does not include an opportunity for faculty participation, therefore WASC is not listening to all of its constituents.

XI. UC Washington D.C. Center

- *Bruce Cain, Heller Professor of Political Science and Director, UC Washington Center, Washington, D.C.*

Chair Wudka thanked Director Cain for joining the meeting. Director Cain reported that two years ago it was decided to consolidate which resulted in substantial curricular changes, some of which were for the better. A single program was created but there are still varying requirements that UCDC has to accommodate. The first accommodation is for schools that are on the quarter versus semester calendar. "Themed" courses are newly designed, where the curriculum is designed around the intern track. Data shows that the new courses are preferred. A conversation between UCDC's Academic Advisory Committee and UCEP would focus on how to improve the set up that is jerry-rigged now. Whether campuses want to move to a standardized curriculum needs to be discussed.

There is a demand for elective courses from students trying to graduate on time. Courses and instructors for electives have to be vetted and hired by the campuses. This is a layer of bureaucracy that Director Cain would like to see removed if possible. Because UCDC has lost all state money and all costs are covered by fees, there is no discretionary money so the administrative structure needs to be kept as thin as possible. The consensus is that the consolidation was sensible and allowed the program to do curricular innovation.

Discussion: Five sixths of the funding is from different private sources and UCDC will become increasingly reliant on private funding in the future. The goal of UCOP seems to be to completely divest from UCDC so the program is taking every step to sustain itself. In ten years, UCDC will have major infrastructure issues to deal with as more space will be needed. Director Cain would like to begin

thinking about issues that will impact the Center in the longer term including what the center is trying to achieve and how it will support students interested in public service. Students report that UCDC is expensive and the program is trying to uncover how financial aid offices are processing loan packages. UCEP's student representative commented that the cost of living in D.C. is high. Director Cain looks forward to having a representative from UCEP on the Academic Advisory Committee. The AAC usually meets at UCOP but every two years the meeting is held in Washington. Forty percent of Director Cain's salary is paid by UCB. UCDC pays the replacement costs for the courses not being taught at the campuses. Director Cain believes it makes sense for campuses to vet the faculty but this should not require a lot of paperwork. Outside letters should not be required, and faculty could be hired and paid by UCDC.

Committee members agreed that there is nothing UCEP can do about simplifying the process campuses use to vet and hire the faculty. The focus for UCEP should be on whether students are receiving the support they need. The committee discussed the idea of establishing a consortium with other public universities in or near Washington to provide access to elective courses.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 P.M.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Jose Wudka