

# University of California Academic Senate

## University Committee on Educational Policy

Minutes of Meeting  
Monday, May 5, 2008

**Attending:** Keith Williams, Chair (UCD) Stephen McLean, Vice-Chair (UCSB), Taradas Bandyopadhyay (UCR), Linda Chafetz (UCSF), Peter Digeser (UCSB), David Kay (UCI), Ignacio Navarette (UCB), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

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

President-Designate Yudof is expected to begin work in Mid-June, and the Governor's 2008-09 budget revision will be available in Mid-May. At Legislative Day in Sacramento, legislators told faculty they are looking to UC for new ideas about how to enhance the revenue stream and address a state budget deficit currently projected at \$20 billion, but the University does not think it is appropriate to advocate for specific political positions. The Regents will be discussing possible fee increases at their May meeting, and the Student Association says it is willing to support only a modest increase. Academic Council is viewing a suggestion to implement differential non-resident tuition fees as a serious threat to the conception of UC as a "Ten Campus-One University" system.

UCOP administrators are hosting meetings to update interested Senate Committee and Division chairs about the UCOP restructuring. Some Senate committees are concerned that the restructuring could impair the Senate's ability to collect data and carry out its responsibilities.

UC admitted 60,000 students, or 75% of applicants, this year, which included a 16% rise in Latino/Chicano applicants and a 10% increase in African-American applicants. A BOARS Task Force is examining the viability of a proposed system that would allow campuses to share holistic reviews of freshman applications. If BOARS' eligibility reform proposal passes, UC is not likely to implement shared review and eligibility reform simultaneously.

UC has completed [Phase I](#) of its long-range enrollment plan, which projects annual enrollment increases of 2.5% over the next four years, gradually decreasing to .9% by 2021. It was noted that one factor preventing more growth in graduate student enrollment is a lack of corresponding faculty growth. The Senate does not want "low quality" terminal master's programs to be a central element in UC's graduate education growth strategy.

There are eleven professional school proposals currently in the pipeline, four under Senate review— an unprecedented number. UCOP is encouraging the Senate to review proposals not only for quality, but also for economic viability and need in relation to other proposals and existing programs. UCOP plans to implement a more formal and aggressive pre-review process to better address those issues. There are also plans for the Senate and Administration to undertake a joint review and revision of the Compendium, starting next year.

The Undergraduate Education Planning Group approved two task forces –Undergraduate Education Effectiveness, which will look at ways to integrate learning objectives and outcome assessments into the program review process, and Postgraduate Outcomes, which will discuss better ways to track and compile data on the activities and contributions of UC graduates. Rather than participating in [NASULGC](#)'s "Voluntary System of Accountability," which includes an exit exam component, UC is choosing to examine its own systems in this way. There is general opposition to the use of exit exams at UC, particularly one administered by an outside agency, as a reliable and appropriate method of baccalaureate outcome assessment.

Finally, a Council subcommittee is drafting a statement on the importance of UC maintaining its Master Plan authority over professional doctorate degrees in California.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

➤ UCEP draft minutes of April 7, 2008

**Action:** UCEP approved the consent calendar with minor changes to the minutes.

## **III. Request to Academic Council from CCGA, UCEP, and UCCC for a Special Committee of the Senate on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency**

**Issue:** UCEP reviewed a draft memo to Council recommending the formation of a Special Committee to study the issues of remote and online instruction and residency. The recent informal Senate review of the CCGA/UCEP/UCCC “Dialectic on the Use of Remote and Online Instruction for the Delivery of University Curriculum” showed support for a systemwide Senate role in crafting regulations related to minimum standards for remote and online instruction, as long as such regulations allow for continued divisional autonomy. The draft memo requests the Special Committee to review current systemwide policies, collect recent empirical studies about the quality and effectiveness of online education, and develop a white paper with best practices and recommendations to help inform and guide campuses.

**Discussion:** UCEP thought the proposed objectives for the Special Committee were appropriate. Committee members made the following comments: courses committees should evaluate online courses according to the same standards and parameters that define any UC-quality course; the Special Committee should develop a list of traditional course qualities that might be compromised by online and other non-traditional forms of instruction, as well as qualities of non-traditional courses that might enhance traditional course offerings; and the Special Committee should include representatives from the CCGA, UCEP, and UCCC.

**Action:** Chair Williams will share UCEP’s comments with CCGA Chair Schumm.

## **IV. Compendium Reviews**

1. [UC Davis Proposal for a School of Nursing](#)
2. [UC Riverside Proposal for a School of Medicine](#)

**Issue:** UCEP discussed proposals for a new UC Davis School of Nursing and a new UC Riverside School of Medicine.

**UCD School of Nursing:** UCEP’s roster happens to include representatives from the UCLA and UCSF Schools of Nursing, both of whom gave the proposal a close reading. It was noted that the UCSF and UCLA nursing programs operate on different models. The UCSF program does not have an undergraduate component and is focused on producing nursing scholars and educators, while UCLA bases its program on a more interdisciplinary case-based model intended to produce primary care practitioners. The UCD proposal is more like the UCLA model, but aligns well with both of the Moore Foundation goals of addressing the shortage of nurses and of nursing educators in the state of California. In terms of educational policy, the proposal is innovative and ambitious. UCD is committed to building a professional platform for nursing education. Students will be able to access a broad range of science education through the Medical School.

There was concern that Davis will not be able to manage instructional workload effectively with only 30 new faculty FTE. The proposed student-to-faculty ratio of 18.7:1 undergraduate and 8:1 graduate would seem to require 42.2 new faculty based on UCD's enrollment projections. Although it was noted that Davis faculty will be on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, which is premised on the use of outside resources to augment salary and pay for additional clinical instruction, the experience at UCLA suggests that additional FTE funding likely will be needed for clinical nursing education to maintain those ratios. There was a concern that the assumptions made in the funding model are overly optimistic, and that UCD should be more transparent about the 18.7:1 figure by articulating their assumptions about instructional ratios and the difference between clinical and theoretical instruction.

The proposal 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 date. UCEP agreed that including more undergraduate programs in Nursing would help attract the best and the brightest California high school students interested in that field to study at UC. But some UCEP members wanted to see more details about the undergraduate piece of the proposal now – specifically a plan for funding and more information about how the bachelor's degree will depend upon the existing curriculum at UC Davis. UCEP reviewers did not feel the funding model necessarily would have a negative impact on other UCD programs, but there was some uncertainty how the model would play out after five years. If UCD is unable to generate the resources necessary to match the Moore grant, they may have to adjust their undergraduate education goals.

**UCR School of Medicine:** UCEP members noted that the proposed School has very strong support from the California medical establishment, the Riverside community, and the UCR faculty, and addresses an identified State need for increasing resources to care for a growing and aging population. The School's start-up faculty cohort will consist partly of existing faculty from the UCR/UCLA medical education program, so the new School will augment and established and successful enterprise. The School will help advance the overall profile of UC Riverside and will have a positive effect on undergraduate education there by providing research opportunities for undergraduate students doing their capstone experiences or otherwise engaged in research.

There was a concern about the significant reliance on fundraising, which UCR is counting on to supplement a \$100 million request from the State, and the eventual \$25 million in enrollment-driven funds. There is little detail about how the projected \$250 million in fundraising dollars would be apportioned. There was also a concern about the potential negative impact on undergraduate education systemwide or at UCR if resources are diverted into the new School from existing budgets. There was also a question about how the School fits into the context of the broader scope of medical education in the UC system, including the less developed but evolving proposal for a School of Medicine at UC Merced

**Action:** UCEP will send comments to CCGA about both the proposals.

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

**Issue:** UCEP reviewed its draft response to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) revised proposal to reform freshman eligibility policy, which UCEP reviewed in April. The UCB representative also submitted a proposed minority report that was less supportive of some aspects of the proposal than the committee's draft.

**Discussion:** Chair Williams noted that a minority report should be addressed from an individual or individuals on UCEP, not from UCEP as a whole. Campus CEPs have separate local structures to work opinions through.

UCEP members expressed a general consensus of support for the overall intent of the revised proposal and for most of the specific proposed changes, maintaining unanimous support for BOARS' revised approach to completion of a-g courses, and its recommendation to eliminate the SAT II requirement. There was appreciation for BOARS' efforts to address some of UCEP's previous concerns about the guarantee.

One member raised a concern similar to one being expressed in the minority report that the new 12.5% (ELC) / 5% (statewide) guaranteed admission ratio represented too dramatic a change. He presented data indicating that this particular ratio would also lead to an overall deterioration of quality compared to other alternatives, though not compared to the current system, in terms of predicted freshman GPA and SAT scores, which would result in a larger number of unprepared students entering the system. UCEP members disagreed about the meaning of this data. Some members thought there was insufficient evidence showing that average quality would decrease compared to existing policy. It was noted that SATs and GPAs by themselves are not enough to determine quality, the drop in SAT scores is small enough to be within the margin of error, and ultimately each campus is going to determine who is admitted through Comprehensive Review.

In the end, half of UCEP endorsed the BOARS proposal as written, while the other half endorsed all elements of the proposal except the 12.5% / 5% guaranteed admission ratio. The dissenting half felt that extending the ELC eligibility pathway from 4% to 12.5% was too extreme and dramatic a change. They favored reducing the percentage of students given a guarantee through ELC to some amount lower than 12.5%, perhaps to between 8% and 10%, with a possible increase in the statewide guarantee percentage as would be appropriate to keep the total overall guarantee at a level close to 10% in the revised proposal. Implementation should also be phased in over time.

There was also concern that many members of the general public, and even perhaps faculty, staff and administrators within UC itself, will have difficulty understanding the rationale for the proposed changes. BOARS should develop materials that will communicate the reasons for the changes in a straightforward, transparent, and convincing fashion. Since it will likely be several years before ETR can be enacted, BOARS should also update and realign their predictive models each year as more information becomes available from CPEC and elsewhere.

**Action:** UCEP will review a final draft over email, which will be submitted to Council.

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

**Issue:** UCEP reviewed a draft committee response to the Information Technology Guidance Committee Report, "Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure."

**Discussion:** There were suggestions to include the following to the memo: UC should guard against any de facto restriction on academic freedom imposed by adoption of a standardized IT system; and the money spent to expand the cyberinfrastructure should generate an equivalent magnitude of cost savings and/or value to the educational enterprise.

**Action:** UCEP will submit a final memo to Academic Council.

## **VII. Other Systemwide Review Issues**

### **1. On-Campus Marketing of Credit Cards to Students**

**Issue:** UCEP reviewed amendments to current UC policy proposed in response to State Senate Bill AB 262, the College Student Credit Protection Act. The bill asks UC to enact policy regulating the on-campus marketing practices of credit card companies.

**Action:** UCEP will send a brief note in support of the policy.

## **2. Proposed Amendments to Section 102.05 of the Systemwide Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline**

**Issue:** UCEP reviewed a set of amendments to Section 102.05 of the Systemwide Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, which add language about copyright infringement and unauthorized electronic file sharing to policy forbidding abuse of electronic resources.

**Discussion:** UCEP found the changes unproblematic, except for the provision concerning the “suspension of student access to network resources in the event the University receives a copyright notice claiming that infringing material was transmitted over the University’s network,” as well as the provision that “access should be suspended for the period of time (excluding academic exam periods, as specified in the campus calendar) necessary to fully investigate the infringement claim.”

The language should be modified from “access should be suspended” to “access *can* be suspended.” While access to computing equipment and network services is a privilege, it has become an essential part of students’ ability to perform the academic work of a course, in terms of accessing assignments and communicating with instructors. The importance of this access is not limited to exam time. Revoking a student’s network access based on an accusation could amount to a de facto suspension; it could also penalize the instructor who may have to do things by hand for that student. Any investigation or disciplinary action should take these factors into account. If some alternative accommodation is necessary for the student, it should be provided while the investigation is ongoing. A better penalty might be a requirement that improper activities cease and/or some other administrative penalty, such as community service, rather than restricting access to the system.

**Action:** UCEP will submit comments to Academic Council.

## **VIII. Comparison of Program Review Practices**

**Issue:** The committee analyst synthesized campus responses to UCEP’s program review practices survey into a summary document distributed to members at the meeting.

**Discussion:** Chair Williams noted that he wants to send the survey results comparing systemwide practices to campuses, which could help them examine local practices around external reviewers, long-term planning, the program review process for undergraduate interdisciplinary programs, and other areas.

The review process forces departments to talk about issues they don’t usually talk about and helps them comply with WASC requirements for an established program review process. But there was a question about the effectiveness and benefits of the review process in comparison to the time and cost involved and how effective recommendations for change really are. Marginal behavior that does not directly violate policy or cause chaos is usually seen in the context of academic freedom.

**Action:** Members will review the accuracy of the document and return corrections to the analyst.

## **IX. Slide Presentation on UC Davis Class Size Data**

**Issue:** Chair Williams presented slides examining 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, broken down by instructor type, and division level. He also noted possible correlations between class size and FTE. The trend at Davis has involved a 10% decrease in the number of students in small classes, and a similar increase in very large classes. Budget cuts may be impacting these trends, but other factors, including new classroom construction and enrollment changes, may also affect the data. The goal is to refine the protocols and have all campuses replicate the data so UCEP can have a systemwide look at trends over time in class size and the percentage of classes taught by ladder faculty.

**Discussion:** There was a comment that it would be better to track how the “average” student’s undergraduate education consists of small class versus large class learning. The issue is sensitive. If class size is considered a marker of UC quality, some are concerned about sending a message that quality is declining. Internally, faculty and administrators have to know the situation, and it is also important for faculty to express the trends they would like to see in classroom size. One member noted that it is hard to see large classes automatically as a deficiency. A better marker may be student satisfaction and the availability of at least some small classes. Many students enjoy lectures by inspiring faculty in large class settings. There was also a comment about the practice of using new faculty FTE to hire lecturers or to fund off scale salaries.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Keith Williams