UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
MONDAY, MAY 6, 2013

Attending: John Yoder, Chair (UCD),), Tim Labor, Vice Chair (UCR), Charles Smith (UCI), David Lea (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Jeanette Natzle (UCD), Troy Carter (UCLA), Leslie Carver (UCSD), Mona Vakilifathi (UCSD), Bill Jacob (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Bob Powell (Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I.   **Announcements and Updates**

The main issue discussed by Council has been SB 520 which says that UC students should be allowed to use private online courses if the public courses are impacted. The bill has come out of committee and if it does get passed UC will have to figure out how to accept non-UC courses. Another bill Council has discussed and supports is SB 547 which is similar to SB 520 but does not involve the private providers. This bill requires that fifty online courses be identified that will articulate across the segments if courses are impacted. Because this bill leaves the private providers out, it is preferred by Council. The legislature wants this done by next year.

Discussion: Although the governor has gone on record stating that he does not support SB 520, this does not necessarily mean that he will veto it. There is not much UC can do until the status of these bills is clear.

II.   **Consent Calendar**

Action: The minutes were approved.

III.   **Report on the Innovative Learning Technology May 4, 2013 Meeting**

About forty people attended the Saturday meeting on online education. Chair Yoder, Vice Chair Labor and the UCSC representative to UCEP attended the meeting. The second request for proposals will be issued this year, and a new RFP will be issued each year going forward. This year, the first RFP will be issued in mid-May with a due date in mid-July. The types of courses that should be prioritized were discussed during the Saturday meeting. High demand, undergraduate courses will be strongly encouraged. There was a discussion about multiple offerings and the conclusion was that this would be okay. Cross campus coordination to offer a course will be looked at favorably.

Discussion: The UCSC representative and Vice Chair Labor participated in the session about integrating courses into existing campus structures. This session was focused on the campus infrastructure. There is a question about how to grant credit for majors, not just GE credit. The phrase "use case" is being promoted as a way of framing online instruction, instead of referring to UC's effort as an experiment. ASSIST would be used by a particular major to articulate a particular course. Vice Chair Jacob indicated that proposed amendments of SB 547 include having courses within a segment available to other campuses within that segment and that these courses should not be IGETC approved. If implementation of these bills becomes too complicated, UC may be harmed economically.

The way to determine which courses will help meet the governor's goals, and should be invested in, is for departments to examine trajectories. Faculty members proposing courses will have to have departmental support and there has to be a plan to help students after once the online course is completed. There will be opportunities for a campus to submit a campus-wide proposal. This week, UC has to submit a preliminary financial plan for the $10M and it may be possible for instructors to begin development of their courses in the summer. An explicit factor in deciding who gets the money will be whether the instructor has taken steps toward the articulation of the course. While this places a burden on the faculty members, it also demonstrates a commitment to collaboration. This might not be feasible for instructors to include in their proposals in July, but it could be a question that UCEP asks as part of its proposal process.

Vice Chair Labor reported that a lot of time at the May 4th meeting was spent on evaluation and accountability. UCEP had suggested the normal local review and then a second evaluation for online courses with a shared metric. A concern about evaluation is that a burden is placed on the instructor. The provost suggested that the evaluation is not about online courses per se but instead how does a specific course fit into the UC system. Some attendees at the Saturday meeting objected to in-depth evaluation of the courses but the instructors will be asked to indicate in their proposals how their courses will be evaluated. Vice Chair Jacob noted that the Blue Ribbon Panel's report raised many questions about the evaluation of UCOE and that there is no information about what happened to the students that dropped out of the OIPP courses. Additionally, there is no information about finances such how much time faculty contributed or how many resources were expended by the departments. The provost would like to see measurements of cognitive gains that go beyond whether students are happy with the course or not. The state will require more accountability on the expenditure of resources than is done normally. Vice Chair Jacob commented that there are concerns about the evaluation being too intrusive or too discouraging to instructors.

Chair Yoder suggested that the instructors could be asked to provide a link so that UCEP can see the course or as much of the completed course as possible. This could be helpful for the second review by UCEP but it is probably not feasible for faculty to provide when the course is first proposed. If there is a technological innovation in the teaching, a demonstration may be helpful. The UCSF representative drafted questions to add to the systemwide approval form about increasing access. Instructors could provide something similar to the form used at UCB. UCEP could make a recommendation to CEPs or include specific questions about implementation on the UCEP form to ensure that it is done. Campuses could be told that UCEP had difficulty approving courses because of the internal form used.

A member indicated that there is a need to understand what the impact of being a systemwide course is. UCEP needs to be respectful of the campus approval process and should avoid adding another layer to what should happen at the campus level. It is hoped that the systemwide database will make it easier for students to take a course. The database should list the articulation agreements. UCEP should focus on articulation agreements and access and leave questions about quality and course delivery to the campus. One member suggested that courses that have been developed and proven should be the focus of articulation, and the systemwide designation should be reserved for courses that have been offered successfully before. The focus should be on each campus accommodating its own students before attempting to address cross campus enrollment. When a course receives the systemwide designation it should mean that articulation agreements are in place and that the student is likely to use the course for more than just unit credit. This is more useful than simply listing the course in the systemwide database. The systemwide listing will allow other campuses to decide if a course meets their articulation agreements and will be useful for their own programs. The committee discussed the UCDC and UC Sacramento programs. In the case of these programs, the systemwide designation provided a mechanism for courses created outside of the formal campus structures to have some type of affiliation within those structures for purposes of the articulation of general requirements. The meaning of the systemwide

designation expanded significantly because of UCOE. UCEP may eventually need to develop policies to address the question of whether instructors can collaborate across campuses.

Any campus can propose an online course and the only time UCEP needs to see the course is when it is to be included in the systemwide database. The local undergraduate councils need to know that online courses are being developed. UCEP could ask Council to help define what additional value is added by being designated a systemwide course. It has been suggested that articulation agreements given to departments should include information about the community college articulations already in place for the courses to prompt departments to look at the course. Articulation officers at the May 4th meeting indicated that this would be a viable approach. UCEP can ask for an articulation plan or agreement if it is already in place. Departments could provide emails that indicate that they will consider articulating courses. A clear statement about what it means to be a systemwide course should be included in the criteria document. Members support the idea of a probationary period during which the articulation agreements are expected to be finalized. If an instructor is able to show an articulation agreement, UCEP could approve the course without a probation period. Critical aspects of the course usually considered by articulation officers could be included in the course design. The committee will continue to work on the systemwide criteria and discuss it in June. The criteria will go to Council in June for approval.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:55 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: John Yoder