UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, April 7, 2008

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD) Stephen McLean, Vice-Chair (UCSB), Ignacio Navarette (UCB), Russ Flegal (UCSC), David Kay (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Taradas Bandyopadhyay (UCR), Linda Chafetz (UCSF), Peter Digeser (UCSB), Cynthia Pineda (Graduate Student, UCLA); Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I.   General Announcements and Updates – *UCEP Chair Keith Williams*

On March 27, the Regents appointed a new UC President, Mark Yudof, who is expected to begin work on June 16. Early concerns about Senate involvement in the presidential search process were resolved, and Senate Chair Brown hopes the Regents and Senate can now formalize a clear process for future searches.

In March, members of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met with legislators, legislative aides, and lobbyists at the state capitol to discuss the state budget situation and the decline in funding for higher education. Many in Sacramento fear that the budget deficit, currently projected at $16 billion, will grow larger, but the three segments are hoping that the Governor's May budget revision will be more favorable to higher education.

ICAS also finalized a new process for approving changes to the IGETC "notes," which detail policies and procedures for implementing the IGETC general education transfer course pattern. An ICAS Task Force is working on "C-ID," a common, cross-segmental numbering system for lower division major preparation courses. But ICAS needs more UC representation on a subcommittee developing course descriptors for similar courses within existing articulation agreements, particularly in the areas of English, History, Political Science, Anthropology, and Philosophy.

Academic Council meetings have also focused on the budget situation. Council believes faculty salaries should remain UC's top budget priority. Council hosted a joint meeting with the campus Chancellors on March 5 to discuss shared governance communication protocols, graduate student support, and long-range planning. UC San Diego Professor of Pathology Henry C. Powell has been elected 2008-09 Senate Vice Chair.

Comments from the informal systemwide Senate review of a proposed UC Undergraduate Mission Statement have been sent to the Undergraduate Education Planning Group (UEPG), which endorsed the idea of a short, concise Mission Statement. The UEPG is also forming task forces to discuss possible frameworks for helping UC programs identify learning objectives and assess educational outcomes. The latter may involve tracking and compiling data on the activities and contributions of UC graduates.

Council will be considering a compromise version of the CCGA/UCEP report on the role of graduate students in university instruction that retains the existing language of Senate Regulation 750, "Persons in Charge of Courses." The committees had originally proposed eliminating the distinction between policies for lower and upper division graduate student instruction so that all undergraduate instruction by graduate students would be subject to Senate approval. Now the document leaves it up to campuses to decide whether to increase Senate oversight of lower division teaching.

II.   Consent Calendar

1. UCEP draft minutes of February 4, 2008
2. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140 – University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

Action: UCEP approved the consent calendar.

III.   Compendium Reviews

1. UC Davis Proposal for a School of Nursing
2. UC Riverside Proposal for a School of Medicine

Issue: UCEP held a preliminary discussion about proposals for a new School of Medicine at UC Riverside and a new School of Nursing at UC Davis.

Discussion: UCR representative Bandyopadhyay noted that 75% of California physicians were trained out of state, so there is a need for additional medical education opportunities in California. The proposed School of Medicine's start-up faculty cohort will consist partly of existing faculty from the UCR/UCLA medical education program. In that program, UCR students receive their first two years of medical training at UCR before moving to UCLA to complete their M.D.

Members noted that a School of Medicine could help advance both the overall profile of Riverside and the undergraduate education enterprise there. There was a concern about the funding model for the School, however, particularly the capital plan's significant reliance on fundraising, which UCR is counting on to supplement a $100 million request from the state. There was also a concern about the potential negative impact on undergraduate education at UCR if resources are diverted into the new School from competing undergraduate areas, and a question about how the plan fits into UC Merced's proposed School of Medicine as well as overall planning efforts for Health Sciences in California.

There were several concerns about the proposed UC Davis School of Nursing. Some members called the School under funded and expressed concern that Davis would not be able to manage instructional workload effectively with only 30 new faculty FTE. The UCLA experience suggests that additional funding likely will be needed for clinical education. The proposal also notes that an undergraduate bachelor's degree program in Nursing Science is planned for the future and will be addressed in more detail at a later data. Some UCEP members wanted to see more details about this piece of the proposal now – specifically a plan for funding and more information regarding how the bachelor's degree will depend upon existing curriculum at UC Davis.

Action: UCEP will review the proposals again at the May meeting.

IV.   UCEP/CCGA/ITTP Dialectic Paper on Remote/Online Instruction

Issue: UCEP reviewed comments received by Academic Council during an informal review of the "Dialectic on the Use of Remote and Online Instruction for the Delivery of University Curriculum," written by a CCGA/UCEP/ITTP subcommittee wanting to initiate a broader discussion about online and distance learning and residency requirements. The subcommittee also suggested new legislation might be needed. The review revealed support for some systemwide Senate role in crafting regulations related to minimum standards for remote and online instruction, as long as such regulation continued to allow for divisional autonomy and diversity.

Discussion: Several members suggested that some entity – e.g., a task force – should collect and review current (disinterested) empirical studies about the quality and effectiveness of online education. The systemwide Senate should not recommend policy before analyzing the existing literature on such a fast moving topic.

The review raised several questions about online learning and residency that do not have clear or agreed-upon answers: Is there a difference between "online" and "distance" learning? Should online courses involving real-time interaction be conceived differently from those employing archived material? Are old concepts of residency still relevant in the technological era? Does the benefit of residency arise from a course being a UC course or is it the result of being physically present on the UC campus? Should different limitations be placed on a student's ability to take an online course offered within the student's own campus, from or on another UC campus, or from another University?

It was noted that proposals for online courses are likely to become more common, but in remaining open to new educational innovations and modalities, UC should not permit the possibility of a correspondence-only degree. A central part of "UC quality" has always been the opportunity for a student to have face-to-face interaction with the instructor and student peers. It was also noted that the value of online learning can be discipline specific, but a substantial portion of a UC education should involve real-time, if not face-to-face interaction. Online courses that do not include significant possibilities for "real time" interaction may be the kind of courses that should be limited. There was a comment that the systemwide Senate should perhaps suggest or require through policy a minimum number of non-online and/or real-time courses (e.g., 80%) for graduation and/or residency. Campuses can always enact more stringent restrictions. At a minimum, the Senate should ask or require campuses to set a policy on the issues if they have not already. There was also some support for the UC Berkeley guidelines, which require an instructor to provide a number of justifications for a proposed course in which 1/3 or more of total effort is online. There was also a concern that online education will become more attractive as a cost saving option for struggling departments in difficult budgetary times. It was noted that UCEP should focus on the educational implications of online learning, not the cost benefits.

V.   BOARS' (Revised) "Proposal to Reform Freshman Eligibility Policy"

Issue: In December, UCEP reviewed a proposal from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to reform freshman eligibility policy. At that time, UCEP suggested alternative modifications to current policy that would be substantially similar to BOARS' proposal, but would retain a transparent guarantee of admission to a larger proportion of students than the 4% currently guaranteed through Eligibility in a Local Context (ELC). UCEP also supported BOARS' proposal to eliminate the SAT II requirement and its proposed modifications to the a-g requirements. BOARS' revised proposal incorporates some of UCEP's December 2007 suggestions – primarily, the suggestion to increase the proportion of students offered a guarantee.

The revised proposal maintains the original Entitled to Review (ETR) construct. Students designated ETR would have an additional admission guarantee if an index of their test scores and honors weighted a-g GPA place them within the top 5% of the state or if their GPA places them within the top 12.5% of their high school class. BOARS projects that expanding ELC from 4% to 12.5% will yield an additional 5% over the statewide eligibility pool, conferring a guarantee of UC admission to about 10% of California high school graduates. Approximately an additional 2.5% from the ETR pool would be offered admission.

Discussion: The overwhelming majority of UCEP members strongly supported the revised proposal. Members felt that BOARS' goals were appropriate and achievable that that BOARS was basing their projections on legitimate, well substantiated data that predict success convincingly. With the new, more explicitly stated guarantee, the proposal has a greater degree of transparency that the original. It allows the University to expand its consideration of the top 12.5% of California high school graduates to incorporate the full context of those students' qualifications and experiences; it opens the UC door to larger numbers of deserving students; and it maintains a predictable guarantee of admission to a high percentage of students. As a result, UC may yield more good students that are now going to other four year institutions. Moreover, the 5% statewide eligibility bar is higher academically compared to the present index. It appears that the students who will receive an admission guarantee under the new system will be of higher quality overall than under the current system, based on models of GPA, SATs, and diversity.

One member expressed reservations about the proposal, noting that it amounts to a bigger overall change to eligibility than the original proposal and that there should be more consideration of unintended consequences and perhaps an analysis of the University of Texas, which employs a similar ELC system. It was also noted that good students at top high schools, who may not be in the top 12.5% of their class could potentially be hurt by the new system, although those students will still be entitled to a comprehensive review. Also, the greater focus on GPA may discourage some students from taking higher level math classes that previously would help in preparation for the SAT II.

Members noted that if passed, the new policy will require some training and education of high school counselors, students, and parents. There should be a careful accounting of where the application fees go.

Action: UCEP will review a draft over email and a final memo will be submitted to Council.

VI.   Information Technology Guidance Committee Report: "Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure"

Issue: UCEP reviewed the Information Technology Guidance Committee Report, "Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure."

Discussion: UCEP was most interested in aspects of the report that relate to instruction at UC, particularly information technology systems and services that enhance the ability of faculty to teach and do research and that enhance educational opportunities for students. As such, UCEP reaffirmed Recommendation 8 and 9, which discuss the role of IT systems that allow faculty to share instructional content, data sets, and analytical tools, and that help leverage instructional technology to improve the student learning experience.

Chair Williams noted that the report does not address the need to teach students information literacy. That important effort is becoming more central and essential to the overall educational effort at the University level and involves several components. At the most basic level, students need to learn how to use computers and other technologies to participate in society as fully informed citizens. Second, with so much information now instantly available, it is important that students learn how to effectively and efficiently access that information and then evaluate it to discern what is and what is not valid and useful. Finally, students need tools that will help them form a sense of ethics about the proper use of information and how to recognize when information is being misused.

It was also noted that the same goals and principles currently being discussed in the context of the UC budget – ensuring quality, accessibility, and affordability – should also apply as goals for the use of information technology in instruction. Unless systems are in place to

ensure platform independent computing, for example, some students could be left out of educational opportunities created by enhanced online technologies.

In general, UCEP agreed that investing in economies of scale to build a more standardized set of IT systems and tools is a worthy goal. However, members also noted several concerns – that UC campuses have different capabilities and such an effort could have a disparate financial impact for the campuses that need to catch-up. In addition, IT standardization efforts should focus more on the business processes – i.e. more uniform registration and accounting systems – rather than on instructional areas such as classroom management systems. There was a comment that instructors may be reluctant to give up homegrown campus systems for a systemwide system they would have less influence over, and that academic freedom should allow instructors to develop systems that will best serve their academic needs. Finally, new technologies develop quickly and too much standardization could slow the adoption of innovative new technologies if campuses become captive to certain systems. Before embarking on a standardization effort, the University should undertake a broad evaluation of the systems currently in use so that the number of faculty, staff, and students who have to learn a new system is minimized. The ITGC should continue to involve a broad range of faculty in deliberations and decision-making.

It was also noted that the report relates to two projects UCEP is currently involved in. The first is an effort by the Office of Academic Affairs to define and address administrative obstacles and inefficiencies involving courses that enroll students from multiple UC campuses. UCEP has endorsed the idea of using technology to help clear the path to students wanting to enroll and earn credit in multi-campus courses and to faculty wishing to offer such courses. The second is the current conversation going on in the Senate about online instruction and distance learning. The ITGC should keep both efforts in mind as it works to implement the recommendations.

Action: UCEP will submit comments to Academic Council.

VII.　UCDC Systemwide Course and Future Systemwide Course Approval

In March, UCEP sent a memo to UCDC summarizing the status of UCEP's deliberations about *California on the Hill* and the remaining issues to resolve around the systemwide course approval process. UCEP also asked UCDC to verify that the Berkeley courses committee had approved both the quarter and semester versions of *California on the Hill* and to send UCEP catalog copy text for both semester and quarter versions of the course.

Chair Williams said the memo probably does not provide sufficient guidance to future individuals wanting to offer a systemwide course. He suggested that UCEP develop a brief step-by-step process guide for systemwide course submission and approval. He proposed that since a semester campus is unlikely to want to approve a quarter course and vice versa, UCEP approve the alternate semester/quarter version, as long as the basic principles for determining UC quality had been followed on the campus. A summary of the system is as follows:

Course Approval: If a proposed systemwide course has a UC-approved instructor, UCEP asks that the course be sent to instructor's campus courses committee for approval. If the proposed instructor is not from a UC campus, UCEP helps find a campus to review and approve the course.

Approval as a Systemwide Course: If a course is already approved by a UC campus, UCEP determines the appropriateness of the course as a systemwide course. These courses will typically be: 1) courses taught at a site not associated with a specific campus, such as UCDC

or UC Sacramento; 2) Courses anchored at a specific campus intended to be multi-campus courses (e.g. Arabic Without Walls).

Designation of Units: The approving campus courses committee sets the unit value of a course based on that campus' term structure. If a course is designed to have different content depending on whether it is taken by quarter or semester students, the approving campus approves units for its term format and, if possible, for both formats. If a campus approves the course for its term format only, UCEP approves the appropriate units for the alternate term format. Quarter course units scales to semester units using a standard conversion formula (one quarter unit = 2/3 semester units) and vice versa.

Listing in Campus Catalogs: *(still to be worked out are systems to enable the listing of systemwide courses in campus and/or systemwide catalogs, to allow students to register and receive credit, and to designate systemwide courses on transcripts.)*

VIII.   Slide Presentation on UC Davis Class Size Data

Issue: Chair Williams presented slides he culled from data provided by UC Davis, which examine changes in the number of classrooms of various sizes as a proportion of the total at Davis between 1999-2000 and 2006-07, relative to campus enrollment, and broken down by instructor type. At Davis, the trend appears to be toward fewer small classes (<30) and more larger classes (120+). The data have to be analyzed carefully, however, as small variations could make the results misleading; for example, a single new 500 student classroom built at Davis increased the number of classes of over 200 students by 25%, and in another year, an unexpected 1000-student enrollment spike created another deviation. Also, putting more students in "very large" classrooms (200+) may decrease the number of "large" (60-200) classes. He said these data are a first look at the situation. Eventually, he would like to refine the protocols and have all the campuses replicate the data so UCEP can have a systemwide look at class size changes over time. Recently, UCOP suggested that the Undergraduate Education Planning Group take charge of the analysis.

Discussion: There was a comment that the most important thing to consider is the number of individual students experiencing various class sizes. The data should illustrate what percentage of a student's undergraduate education consists of sitting in small classes versus large classes. Also, class size could be considered a marker of UC quality. Publicizing the data is risky if they suggest a deterioration of quality, but it is also important for faculty to make a connection, if one exists, between the budget cuts, classroom size, and the reality or potential for quality erosion. Some UCEP members were skeptical that a new UCOP task force would be able to elevate the issue to be an appropriately important priority. It was noted that the data should sample two or three disciplines to discover any differential impact. It would also be useful to incorporate UCUES student experience data into the analysis, if possible. One member noted that some students do not mind large classes. Another said large classes diminish the UG Mission Statement principle that UC students are part of a community of scholars.

Action: A future rendition of the Davis protocol will be discussed at a later meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Keith Williams