

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, MAY 4, 2009

Attending: Stephen McLean, Chair (UCSB), Taradas Bandyopadhyay, Vice Chair (UCR), Ellen Oliensis (UCB), David Kay (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), David Funder (UCR), Arthur Little (UCLA), Rolf Christoffersen (UCSB)(via teleconference), Stefan Llewellyn-Smith (UCSD), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Joan Etzell (UCSF), Umera Ameen (Undergraduate Student Representative), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Clair Brown (Chair, Educational Effectiveness Task Force), Carol Copperud (Director, Academic Planning, UCOP), Lawrence Pitts (Interim Vice Provost and Senior Vice President), Keith Williams (UCD), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

The ICAS Legislative Day took place in April in Sacramento. ICAS representatives met with two state senators, two assembly people, and others including people in the Governor's office. The message from ICAS was about the importance of the systems to workforce development. The legislators suggested that increased fees are a viable source of revenues. A concern is that increased fees may lead the legislator to conclude that less state funding is needed. The outcome of the upcoming special elections will probably result in the legislature revising the budget.

Academic Council met with the Executive Vice Chancellors from each campus last week and the topics were the budget and collective bargaining. The advisory group co-chaired by Chair Croughan and the UCSB EVC reported on potential budget strategies. Strategies include increased fees, differential fees for certain disciplines, and furloughs and salary cuts. Revenue resulting from differential fees would go back to the general campus, not to those disciplines. UCOP is collecting data for the task force to inform decisions about the most cost effective strategies. A variety of other things have been considered. The Faculty Welfare committee provided a preliminary report on total remuneration and there is evidence that UC's benefit packages are not much better than the comparison eight institutions. Faculty compliance issues and administrative actions were discussed. There are 25 different compliance requirements for faculty. Delaying merit increases, reporting to campus and UC leadership, and removing supervisory authority were the actions identified and Council recommended against suspending supervisory authority. An effort will be made to reduce the number of compliance requirements.

UCPB and UCFW produced documents regarding principles for budget planning. The UCPB paper looks at the nuts and bolts of how the problems are examined and decisions made, while UCFW emphasizes the need to assess alternative paths in UC's future. Ideas include reducing the master plan for UC from 12.5% to 10% of HS graduates and examining the out of state student situation. It is not clear if UC can grow by adding more out of state students while keeping the number of in-state students the same.

President Yudof spoke to Council and reported wanting a Senate task force to examine how UC provides education and to determine if there are alternatives that cost less. The potential alternatives are not clear. Chair McLean will recommend that a UCEP representative should be

on the task force. The Task Force on Students Interned During World War II submitted a recommendation to Council for the temporary suspension of the moratorium against honorary degrees. The recommendation will be presented to the Regents this week. The Student Experience in the Research University annual symposium was on May 1st. Presentations included the various uses of UCUES data and issues like affordability, diversity and evaluating student learning. The data is unique in its scope and the number of students responding to it. SERU would like funding from each campus as well as funds from UCOP to support the project.

Discussion: Possible alternatives to how UC delivers instruction mentioned included increased use of technology, increased use of lecturers, and looking at departments that overlap.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Undergraduate Research Opportunities

Comments from the committee were added to the paper as well as some information from the SERU presentation last month. Elizabeth Berkes from SERU agreed to assist UCEP with the paper. The audience is potential students, families and legislators. UCOP public relations can help with dissemination of the paper.

Discussion: The paper could be posted on divisional senate websites and would be useful for high school counselors. The importance of research to the state should be emphasized and examples of research that benefit the public good should be included. Examples of research that involve undergraduates should be included in the paper and most of the campuses have websites that provide information about available opportunities. Members suggested more changes to the paper. Opportunities available through intercampus exchange should be highlighted. There are programs that engage high school students at campuses. The connection between research and teaching needs to be incorporated into the paper. Members discussed approaches to developing a paper on best practices and how the message to faculty would be framed.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Carol Copperud, Director, Academic Planning*

Director Copperud announced that she has retired from UC and provided an overview of some planning activities that will occur in the future. The Academic Planning Council will begin meeting again, and will oversee the Undergraduate Education Planning Group (UEPG). UEPG looks at the highest priorities that can be addressed as a system. The first priorities identified are assessment and the Educational Effectiveness Task Force (EETF) and the Post Graduate Outcomes Task Force (PGOTF). The report of the EETF is being finalized. The PGOTF will initiate a university-wide alumni survey when it is logistically feasible. AAU has recommended an alumni survey and a pilot has been created with some UC participation. The survey may borrow from the UCUES platform. The reorganization in OP has created a new group, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination which handles the Accountability Framework, and will

connect with UCEP and CCGA. Vice Provost Greenstein is overseeing this unit. The President is interested in providing evidence to the public about UC graduates' capabilities.

Discussion: An official search for Provost is underway and it is unclear if someone will be hired by September. The committee discussed the quality of UC education when compared to institutions outside the state and nation. Vice Provost Greenstein can provide consultation about streamlining the intercampus transfer process. Intercampus transfers for graduate students may be best resolved by the Council of Graduate Deans. Barriers to intercampus transfers need to be removed. There is an existing system used for the summer programs that determines that a student is enrolled in UC. Campus registrars manage transfers differently which is part of the problem. The home campus is responsible for the students' financial aid and receives no revenue for the students' participating in summer programs at other campuses.

V. Student Affairs Issues

Chair McLean explained that no systemwide committee considers student affairs issues. The draft revised bylaw expands UCEP's charge to include various student life issues such as financial aid, housing, mental health, or safety.

Discussion: The committee discussed whether the charge should be expanded. UCEP's involvement in program review was discussed. Members discussed concerns about how narrowly or broadly the charge should be expanded. CCGA considers issues related to student affairs graduate programs and students in professional schools, and it could be similar for UCEP. Changes to the bylaw were suggested.

Action: Chair McLean will finalize the revised bylaw.

VI. Furlough and Salary Cut Guidelines

The president started working on the guidelines in March 2009. It was noted that when salary cuts were instituted in the 1990s there was no Senate input. The guidelines provide more parameters than exist now. The state legislature will likely make additional cuts to the UC budget if the propositions do not pass in May. Around seventy percent of UC's expenditures are for salaries and benefits.

Discussion: Concerns are that the president is being given too much authority and that the guidelines do not address how that authority ends. There should be a more specific sunset clause detailing the duration and how it can be renewed. The president has indicated that any action will include state employees and non-state employees regardless of funding stream. Faculty in grant funded positions may have an additional risk under these guidelines, but whether these faculty are included in the proposal needs to be clarified. Campuses will be required to present a plan that is reviewed to ensure that the consequences will be understood. There may be times when the president does not have time to consult with faculty, in the even of a natural disaster for example. The guidelines will allow campuses to take the steps it prefers. When a furlough ends, the salary remains the same and there is no impact on retirement. Data on how much money can

be saved based on the various strategies is being developed. Faculty will most likely still work on the furlough days. It was noted that cuts to departments will impact disciplines differently.

Action: Chair McLean will draft a memo with UCEP's comments.

VII. Non-Resident Enrollment

Until two years ago, campuses were given general enrollment targets for all undergraduate students. Then, UCOP initiated separate target numbers for resident and non-resident students. UCOP provided MCOI funding for residents only whereas campuses were able to keep any non-resident tuition. Campuses have been unable to meet non-resident tuition goals and have been dealing with loss in revenue. A potential source for added revenue is increasing the number of non-resident students. Ninety-four percent of undergraduates are in-state students, 1% is international students and 4.5% are from out of state. Non-resident tuition is fairly high therefore bringing in more non-resident students could allow UC to grow, however this strategy would lead to privatization. Students with citizenship issues who are California residents pay the non-resident tuition. Non-resident students are likely to be of higher socioeconomic status; however, at least one campus has improved its diversity by increasing non-resident students.

Discussion: Members discussed the importance of educating international students and whether this should be part of UC's vision. How many non-resident students should be admitted and whether growth can be driven with just non-resident tuition are questions. Diversity is valuable but may result in decreased access for Californians. A concern is that this could lead to more decisions being budget driven. There is pressure that is market driven for the non-resident tuition to be different for each campus. The committee agreed to endorse BOARS' recommendations. UCEP's memo will suggest that non-resident enrollment on any campus is limited to 10-15% and that UC should maintain the commitment to taking the top 12.5% from the state.

Action: Chair McLean will draft a letter endorsing the recommendations.

VIII. Undergraduate Education Planning Group's Education Effectiveness Task Force

- *Clair Brown (UCB), Chair, Educational Effectiveness Task Force*

The task force is finalizing its report and Professor Brown handed out a summary of the recommendations. The goal is for campuses to own a faculty-driven, department/content-specific assessment process that provides information for the public about learning outcomes for UC students. It will be very campus-specific therefore comparisons across campuses should not be made. Information about the outcomes will be available online at the department level so the public can look at departments' learning goals, see how they map to the curriculum, and, eventually, see outcomes of UC students' achievements. Although each department is teaching something different, it was agreed that the specific learning goals are imbedded in the content of every major. It is hoped that UCEP will oversee implementation of the process and that campus CEPs will provide leadership to ensure it is faculty-driven. The task force does not want this to be driven by WASC but each department will have one review process that meets what is expected by WASC and ABET, etc. The CEPs and administration should provide support for the process but the process, which is ongoing, will belong to faculty. Feedback from students to the

task force has so far been positive, especially regarding the learning goals for the Humanities. Campus-wide measurements are being explored now that will allow generalized statements about student learning at a campus to be made. Informal feedback from UCEP was requested.

Discussion: One member pointed out that WASC's process is in place to defend the university and faculty's academic freedom from external pressure on higher education to be accountable in ways that standardized testing approaches. While the meaning of measurement is not always clear, Professor Brown indicated that assessment boils down to identifying assignments in upper division courses where mastery of specific skills has been met based on a minimum score. Departments engaged in the task force's pilot have examined their curriculum and started restructuring courses to ensure that students take courses to reach the learning goals. Members discussed grades and it was noted that aligning a course with learning goals will enable faculty to develop and utilize a grading rubric. This will help avoid a situation where a student gets a poor grade because certain content was not mastered but demonstrate mastery of certain skills. Determining what good assessment is will happen over time by individual departments. Humanities faculty need encouragement to look at their curriculum in the context of assessment that is quantitative in nature and think about the value of their majors.

Examples of how departments have established learning goals will help faculty think about their courses and curriculum. Assessment can help identify weaknesses in the courses or curriculum and to improve upon, as well as to identify, UC's strengths. The focus is on improving undergraduate education while providing information to the public. The task force is not stating that it has created scientific measures that can be used across departments because there is no way to control for all factors involved. Eventually learning goals could be utilized in program review. Faculty need assistance from experts and the time to learn how to develop learning goals, and often change their view of assessment after participating in the process. Faculty and student testimonials would be powerful statements to include in the task force report. The aim is for educators to take students beyond where they are but there is no test that measures value added scientifically. Development of scientific measures would require significant resources that are unavailable. The task force is asking faculty to measure mastery, not value added. A question is whether every learning goal can be measured. Work being done at the department level is only one part of what is being done by campuses to demonstrate performance.

IX. Impacted Majors

The paper on impacted majors has been updated. Chair McLean learned that deans can hire lecturers on three-year contracts, but such a contract involves risk.

Discussion: More difficult prerequisites do not necessarily resolve the issue for impacted majors. Questions include why students select a major and whether better advising would result in selection of a different discipline. Members discussed the issue of avoiding a market driven approach to allocation of resources. Students may not have an accurate understanding of a discipline. Impacted majors can cause students to take extra time to graduate because of their inability to take required courses or result in other students not having access to certain courses. The issue of double majors was raised. A growing problem is with students who are closed out of majors and have no where to go, which is an issue that UCEP may want to discuss in 2009-2010.

There are different strategies for how departments manage students who need to change majors after completing prerequisites. The opposite situation is majors that have lost their enrollment and utilize a lot of resources to fund a few students. Underfunding of UC is a factor that leads to impacted majors.

X. SR 764: Credit in Special Study Courses

Discussion: The committee provided feedback on the memo regarding rescinding SR 764.

Action: The memo will be finalized and submitted to Council.

XI. UC Seminar Network

The UC Seminar Network concept was developed by UCORP. The goal is to use technology to offer UC seminars streaming live or archived.

Discussion: The concept paper does not accurately reflect the activities engaged in by faculty in the arts and humanities and consultation with faculty in these disciplines should occur before the concept paper goes forward. The term “seminar” is used differently in the sciences. A concern is that the most popular speakers will go to some UC campuses and not others.

Action: The UCLA alternate and the Chair will draft comments on the concept paper.

XII. Proposed UC Merced Divisional Regulation

The proposed divisional regulation for the Honors Program is straightforward.

Action: UCEP endorsed the proposed regulation.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30
Minutes prepared by Brenda Abrams
Attest: Steve McLean