

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2014

Attending: Tim Labor, Chair (UCR), Tracy Larrabee, Vice Chair (UCSC), Ann Plane (UCSB) (telephone), Donald Curtis (UCSF), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Troy Carter (UCLA), Seeta Chaganti (UCD), Tony Smith (UCI) (telephone), Mary Beth Pudup (UCSC), Jay Sharping (UCM), Mark Springer (UCR), Leslie Carver (UCSD) (telephone), Ross Frank (Chair, UCOPE), Hilary Baxter (Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, UCOP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements

Academic Planning Council discussed the self supporting graduate degree programs (SSGDP) and has revised some of the policy. Most of the meeting was focused on what defines a self supporting graduate degree program. The enrollment principles document for long range planning has not been released publicly yet but Chair Labor reports that it looks good. The indirect cost policy was reviewed. This is an attempt to compile the campus policies in one place which will not change the policies. The open access policy was discussed with Chris Kelty, one aspect of which is the role of the Academic Planning Council with respect to policies such as this one. The Council discussed a draft framework for an international activities policy. A report prepared for the legislature on performance outcomes discusses graduate rates. UC compares favorably to other institutions at six years.

At Council, Chair Labor learned that a proposed UCI professional degree supplemental tuition program was placed on the Regents agenda but was pulled after it was determined that it had not gone through the division. The climate survey has now been released and members are encouraged to review it. Peter Krapp is one of the UC representatives on the California Open Education Resources Council (COERC) and a survey of faculty is planned. Resources will eventually be linked to the ICAS website and the goal is that the open source textbooks will hopefully be articulated across the segments. The Committee on Academic Freedom forwarded a toolkit for responding to Freedom of Information Act/Public Records Act requests. Chair Labor pointed out that there is a policy regarding email, including the retention and disposal of emails. UCORP submitted a letter to Council advocating for more research funding for the multi-campus research programs and initiatives. Proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 55 were discussed.

WASC responded to the UCI letter which will be shared with the committee; the response from WASC did not deal with the separation of graduate and undergraduate education. The issues with composite benefits rates remain the same. Council discussed reconstituting the committee on computing and communications to deal with online education although it may be just a task force. Provost Dorr announced that ILTI and UCOE have been combined and campuses will be given more flexibility in terms of how the funding is utilized. A list of all online courses organized by discipline area is being developed but this is not a searchable database. The UCEP memo on the hub was received by Chair Jacob. Chair Labor reminded the committee that comments for ICAS on LEAP are due by May 1st.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

This item was not addressed.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, UCOP*

Campuses are currently submitting their five year planning perspectives and in May UCEP will be able to review the undergraduate programs that are in the pipeline. As a follow up to last May's Regents item on academic performance indicators, the normative graduation rates for students who enter as transfers and freshman are being analyzed. A draft report, prepared by Institutional Research in consultation with campus IR directors and undergraduate deans, may be on the Regents agenda for this May. The Senate leadership was very involved with the development of the last Regents item.

Assistant Director Baxter indicated that WASC's response to the UCI letter states the submission of graduation and retention data every three years is no longer requested and, instead additional data collected for annual reports will be submitted. This is intended to be easier for the campuses to utilize in contrast to the WASC templates. The IPEDS data will be accepted. Some of the liaisons to WASC have asked the Commission to resolve the distinction between two reports required between the major reviews at each campus, an interim report at five years and a report at ten years. The Department of Education requested that WASC check in with the institutions more frequently than eight to ten years. The interim report items are things that have been identified on a WASC review and the mid-cycle review will be more data oriented. The ALOs are concerned about the potential for unnecessary work. Even if the graduation and retention templates are no longer required, there are still concerns. The WASC conference is coming up in two weeks so UC may have some better answers and the new president of WASC, Mary Ellen Petrisko, offered to meet with UC representatives. The Commission president has focused on a recommendation made by a Department of Education advisory council to create a risk-based model where accreditors spend more time and look in greater depth at institutions where there are clearly problems. There seems to be some support for this at the Department of Education and UC is trying to work this into its conversation with WASC.

Assistant Director Baxter explained that the Regents item that was removed from the agenda was for the UCI professional degree supplemental tuition (PDST) proposal for the UCI Master's of Science in Biomedical and Translational Science program. Some people at the campus wanted to initiate professional degree supplemental tuition for this program. There has been a lot of political reticence on the part of the president to move forward with professional degree supplemental tuition proposals or any tuition increases. This is problematic because many campuses have professional programs with built in tuition increases. For programs that are new, the former president did approve professional degree supplemental tuition for four programs. The president did not want to move forward with the UCI proposal in March. The criterion for what constitutes a professional degree program is unclear. The criteria seemed more straightforward when business, medical, and law programs established PDST years ago but the lines have been blurred now with programs like social welfare or MFAs at UCLA wanting to charge PDST. There are existing guidelines at the campuses that spell out what programs need to be reviewed by the Senate. At this time it is not known if the UCI proposal will be on the Regents' agenda for May.

Discussion: One issue related to WASC is that not all UC campuses are AAU. It was noted that professional degrees are proliferating at other institutions and that UC is behind. Another member commented that in engineering, the MSs and BSs are professional degrees in many engineering fields and the graduates going into practice are required to register and have certification. These particular programs are not cash cows and adding supplemental fees to these programs is not realistic. Some professional degree program graduates do not have high incomes, such as graduates from civil engineering programs who are employed by CalTrans. There is a disconnect between what constitutes a professional degree and the expectations of that profession. Currently there is not agreement about whether the addition of professional supplemental tuition to an existing program requires an advanced review by the Senate. Sharon Salinger has commented that, based on the graduation rates seen at other institutions, UC is doing well. It is important to not burden UC when the risk is low. The committee discussed the five year planning perspectives.

V. Eligibility of Undocumented Students for Internships and Stipends

Chair Labor indicated that UCEP was given the opportunity to review information prepared about the eligibility of undocumented students for internships and stipends.

Discussion: Members commented that the eligibility issues must be very confusing for students. One unclear aspect of the information is when work is done for credit versus for pay.

VI. Executive Session: Evaluation of the Online Instruction Pilot Project

No minutes were taken during Executive Session.

VII. President's Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

The committee is asked to provide comments in response to this revised policy. Chair Labor indicated that the definition of teachers is not specific enough.

Discussion: It is not clear if teaching assistant is equated with teacher. One question is whether providing a link is the same as providing a copy of the material. It might have been more helpful if the policy discussed how materials are actually used. Proper attribution can become a tricky matter. The electronic media is not addressed in this policy. Members discussed their use of electronic images and how fair use is defined. The committee agreed not to comment on this policy. Publishers of textbooks invest a lot in the images.

VIII. AP Credit

- *Ross Frank, Chair; UCOPE*

UCOPE has identified an issue that may fall under UCEP's purview to address. UCOPE surveyed the campuses to see if there is uniformity in following Senate regulations in terms of the writing requirement. The regulation requires campuses to count SAT, AP and other tests towards the satisfaction of the Entry Level Writing Requirement even if the students have failed the AWPE. It was not surprising to find out that the responding campuses are using the AP guideline that a score of 3 or better will satisfy the ELWR. UCOPE was concerned about the divergence of how campuses use the scores above 3 to exclude students from some or all of their writing requirements subsequent to the basic writing requirement. It is not problematic that in some cases, higher scores would exempt students from some of the lower division writing requirements. But some of the six campuses go further than this. UCSD exempts students from the ELWR requirement but none of the writing requirements and a different campus appears to exempt all college writing courses due to the higher score. UCOPE decided to forward these survey results to UCEP and propose working together to further investigate this matter. Chair Labor asked if this should be sent to the divisions but Chair Frank suggests more research should be done prior to that. There may be some principles about what the AP, SAT and other exams should be used for in terms of replacing other college courses.

Discussion: The survey did not make it clear whether students who would benefit from college writing courses subsequent to the basic writing courses should be receiving them or whether the large divergence across the campuses is a problem. Permitting students to submit high AP scores for writing courses is a way to manage the absence of resources and to manage demand. Individual campuses may have perfectly good reasons for doing what they do but they may need to look at the practices from a systemwide view. UCB has embedded the basic writing requirement into the courses freshman have to take. UCSB and UCI have extensive writing systems that are nationally recognized whereas each of UCSD's colleges have different approaches.

Chair Labor asked if UC should have a systemwide writing requirement which members agreed would not be a popular idea. A member asserted that divisions should be able to craft these requirements for themselves. Perhaps general guidelines could be developed in order to bring some standard across the campuses which other members indicate is the ELWR. UCOPE would ask divisions to provide the justification for how they use these

exams to place out of courses other than the ELWR courses. Writing center directors and writing professionals within UC are discussing how UC is teaching writing, but not the issue of placement and Chair Frank suggested this group could be asked to consider the matter. The main concern is really when students are allowed to place out of more advanced courses which makes a strong statement about UC's role in writing instruction and teaching language and writing related issues. High school AP courses were not intended to get students placed out of upper division work. Members were reminded that courses may have the same number but they may have different content. UCEP should weigh in on the important distinction between upper division and lower division courses.

Campuses have different standards for what score is used to exempt students. Chair Frank does not know exactly which individuals at the campuses completed the survey. A key question is to what extent resources available for writing programs contribute to decisions to give credit for these exams. Some campuses may have made these decisions many years ago so the campuses should be asked if they have recently looked at this matter. A member suggested that UCEP simply monitor this situation to avoid burdening the campuses by asking them to look into this. Chair Labor asked if it is possible for a campus that accepts an AP requirement for upper division to not accept a CalState or community college writing requirement for that same upper division. Members agreed that this is a fair question to ask. The committee was reminded to keep the local context in mind when questioning how the AP is used. Chair Frank indicated that UCOPE will be happy to partner with UCEP if there is a decision to investigate this further. Reportedly at UCSC there is a big push to admit international students and there needs to be a solution when they do not satisfy the ELWR requirement. Smaller classes with more instructors would help these students succeed and this intensive support is remedial because English is not the first language of these students being highly sought by the University. To help its budget, UCB is enrolling more and more international students but after years of eliminating remedial programs, the campus is now hiring English as a Second Language teachers, setting up special programs and offering sensitivity training for faculty dealing with international students. The costs of these extra resources that are not available to California students at UC will probably prevent the campus from actually making any money on these students. These students are real paying customers and UC must respond to them differently from the way it treats California students who pay less.

IX. Unit Requirements

Senate Regulation 900.B allows each school or college to establish minimum standards of progress towards completion of the degree. The maximum number of credits a student can have for minimum progress is 15 units. Chair Labor indicated that the problem is related to the minimum being too low. Systemwide, 15 units is the minimum. At UCR minimum progress and expected progress are set to be the same which is stating that students are not expected to graduate in four years. UCEP was asked to consider removing Senate regulation 900.B or changing the maximum to an average of 18 units per quarter for a total of 216 units.

Discussion: Financial aid is tied to a certain number of credits and students are aware of the limit requirements. UCEP members are concerned about changing a systemwide policy. Chair Labor will ask the UCR representative to clarify the specific questions. It was noted that there may be a culture at UCR that anything above the 12 units is the norm. UCEP may suggest that more counseling would be helpful. A member expressed concern that UC is adding requirements to the degrees. Students may be more focused on getting straight As than on getting out in a timely manner since the better grades will be what gets a student into graduate school.

X. New Business

The UCEP representative to UCEAP governing body gave an update on the program. The program is doing very well right now. The governing body has discussed the issue of the credit students receive when they go abroad. Campuses have various levels of pre-vetting and pre-approval and UCEAP is beginning to create a list at each campus of the pre-approved courses. This will eliminate the need for students going through a special approval to get these courses to count. The cost of going abroad and the difficulty of getting credit for the courses are factors in low enrollment. The goal is to increase exposure of the program and increase enrollment. UCEP may want to write a letter to the divisions asking that the appropriate staff are in place to support the program. One

issue is that students have to find a faculty member to sign off on a course, and students will shop around in a department until they find one who will accept a course. It is problematic that students still have to get a paper form signed and this should be an electronic process at the very least. The representative will probably have another update for UCEP before the end of this year.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:25 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Tim Labor