

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

## MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2013

**Attending:** John Yoder, Chair (UCD), Tim Labor, Vice Chair (UCR), David Lea (UCSB) (telephone), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Troy Carter (UCLA), Leslie Carver (UCSD), Seeta Chaganti (UCD), Mona Vakilifathi (Graduate Student Representative) (telephone), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Bill Jacob (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Monica Lin (Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs), Nancy Purcille (Transfer Articulation Coordinator, Student Affairs), Michael Trevino (Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs), Shawn Brick (Associate Admissions Director, Transfer Policy, Student Affairs), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

**I. Announcements**

Chair Yoder announced the UCSB representative will be awarded an AAAS membership today, which was met with applause by the committee. Several guests will join UCEP this afternoon to discuss articulation. The May Regents meeting featured a presentation by Provost Dorr in response to the academic performance indicators recommended by the governor with the proposed budget increase to UC. The provost provided good information on UC's performance on these indicators which is available online. There has been a 27% decrease in funding since 2008 but UC has continued to do well in spite of this. A 1984 poll study faculty workload found that the average faculty member spent approximately 30 hours a week on instruction. The provost did state that UC could enhance the time to degree completion rates and suggested a number of possible approaches including structural ones such as reviewing requirements for degrees or expanding summer course offerings. It was also suggested that more flexibility in advancement and promotion is needed so teaching can receive more recognition.

At last week's Council meeting, issues related to liquidity were discussed. UC has about a \$14M cash flow, most of which is currently in short term savings and the discussions involve moving some of this money into long-term savings. The proposed open access policy was also discussed and this will be sent out for a systemwide review. Council discussed a federal bill that would add a level of political review to NSF peer review process and a UCSD proposal to add adjunct professors and health sciences clinicians to the Senate. The next RFP for the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative will be issued in June with a September due date for proposals. The initiative will allocate \$4-\$5.5M for classes, \$1.2M to campuses for support, \$3 million for the cross campus hub and \$500,000 for evaluation. The goal is to have 150 new online courses in three years. Courses will need to have two years' of support from the departments and to demonstrate that they have been offered at two or more campuses. The proposal will have to comment on articulation.

**Discussion:** A member remarked that the provost's presentation did not address the public perception about UC and suggested that UC should be more proactive. The provost's presentation did not speak to the intangibles that faculty do such as mentoring students. It is wrong to state that if UC does not improve it is failing. UCEP should discuss the need for new communication strategies with the Senate leadership. Associate Director Baxter commented that there is some room for improvement in graduation rates at certain UC campuses. UC is losing students and students are not applying because they do not think they will get in. It was noted that the proposed time line for the ILTI RFP will not allow for UCEP or campus committees to review the courses.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved with corrections.

### III. Early Opening of the Admissions Application

- *Michael Trevino, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*

Director Trevino distributed a discussion paper previously shared with BOARS. The proposal is to open the application cycle earlier so students can begin putting together their applications on August 1<sup>st</sup> instead of the current date of October 1<sup>st</sup>. Director Trevino wanted to alert UCEP that this change will require faculty to update majors or offerings by July 15<sup>th</sup> rather than September 1<sup>st</sup> to indicate whether they are available in the application process. BOARS has reviewed and unanimously approved of this proposal. This change will give applicants more time to prepare their applications. The change would be implemented in 2014-2015.

**Discussion:** UC does not use CommonApp and a member remarked that this might lead some potential applicants to not apply to UC. It would be helpful if UC's ApplyUC system could provide allow for imports from CommonApp but Director Trevino indicated that there would be programming costs to make these changes. Director Trevino also reported that the campuses are not interested in changing their statement prompts. A member commented that as long as faculty are notified, the new deadline should be fine but pointed out that the registrars will need time for programming. UC offers summer outreach programs for disadvantaged students to help with applications. UCEP members agreed that the proposal is reasonable.

### IV. ASSIST

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director, Transfer Policy, UCOP*

ASSIST is the official repository in the state for articulation information. The system is co-managed and co-funded by the CSUs, CCCs, and UC. ASSIST has existed for 25 years and has generally been a successful system. The information includes UC transferability, how courses fit into the IGETC pattern, and the agreements between the CCCs and four-year institutions. Information from ASSIST is loaded into the UC application. Following a competitive bid process, the upgrades to ASSIST were outsourced to a vendor. One of the most important pieces for this project is to provide real data in ASSIST. Seventy-five percent of the agreements can be supported using the new course attributes, 25% of the agreements will need some modifications and it is currently unclear how to accommodate the remaining 2-3% in the new system. There are nuances communicated now in the text-based version of ASSIST that the next generation of the system will not accommodate in the same way. In the fall, students will look at the live prototypes and Senate committees will have the opportunity to review the system as well. A go live date of December 2014 is planned.

Associate Director Brick indicated that it is possible for ASSIST to contain UC to UC articulation agreements, an idea UCEP has discussed with relationship to online courses. ASSIST already contains CSU to CSU information. A question will be how one UC campus will treat another UC campus's course in its general education pattern or major preparation patterns. The system will be able to handle this information, but there will be an issue of workload at the campuses in terms decision-making about each course.

**Discussion:** Members asked how faculty developing an online course can work through articulation issues. Associate Director Brick indicated that he will need to speak to the articulation officers so they are prepared to support UC faculty since they are not used to being the sending institution, and noted that policies need to be developed to support new processes. An enhancement to ASSIST will include a "workflow" feature that will support the articulation between UC campuses. C-ID is another form of articulation based in the community colleges. C-ID provides information about similar courses and the CSUs will indicate which of these courses articulate to their system. At this time, UC has not agreed to articulate to the C-ID numbers and instead, campuses want to see individual course outlines for all instances of these courses rather than relying on the C-ID process to approve the courses. UC has been reluctant to rely on the C-ID information for articulation. Campuses make decisions about how courses fit their individual major pattern or individual GE pattern and decisions related to IGETC are made at UCOP. Right now there are no systemwide courses in ASSIST, which includes UCDC. There is a question about whether there should be a separate listing for the systemwide courses or

if the systemwide courses should be part of each campus listing. Associate Director Brick mentioned that the CSUs will be interested in seeing how UC manages articulation between UC campuses. Delivery type is currently not included in ASSIST. UCEP members suggested that a search function in ASSIST would be very useful so that faculty will be able to more easily identify courses that will articulate.

## **V. Consultation with the Office of the President**

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

Assistant Director Baxter provided an additional report about the May Regents. Chair Lansing asked for an update on the May agenda items in six months, and this time frame is still to be confirmed. Chair Powell and Vice Chair Jacob partnered on the preparation of the Regents agenda item.

There is a new effort at UC partly related to the redesign of WASC's accreditation reviews. Campus staff that work with faculty on assessment for WASC and other purposes have always informally consulted with one another. In light of the new redesign and the need to demonstrate the five competencies from the standards, these individuals have agreed to consult more deliberately and share resources. The group has met twice and Assistant Director Baxter believes this could be a helpful effort. Their first focus may be updating a summary prepared by UCEP in 2008 on program review practices, and Assistant Director Baxter will update UCEP next fall.

Several years ago, the Spellings Commission examined accreditation and proposed a new approach to accountability and quality assurance. The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) led the effort for a voluntary system of accountability (VSA) and an accountability template was developed. UC decided not to participate in the VSA because it required that institutions use a standardized test such as the CLA to assess student learning outcomes. While UC did not formally participate in the VSA, the campuses developed profiles modeled on the VSA template. The APLU and AASCU have determined that not all of their members participated and that not all participating members used the standardized tests for student learning outcomes. The two associations plan to reconsider what the student learning outcomes section requires to help increase participation in the VSA. UC has not agreed to participate and reiterated that it is the prerogative of the faculty to set the student learning outcomes and how those outcomes are assessed.

The head of the community colleges has contacted President Yudof about forming a group to study whether the community colleges should offer baccalaureate degrees. Assistant Director Baxter pointed out that there is a supposition that it is a good idea for baccalaureate degrees to be offered by community colleges. The community colleges are discussing this idea because the state is not producing enough of these degrees. UC is getting caught up in the same discussions about accountability and consumer protection that are really aimed at the institutions not doing well by their students in terms of completion rates and the debt students incur. The undergraduate deans are skeptical about whether the WASC redesign will result in less time and money being spent.

**Discussion:** The first campus that the WASC redesign will impact is UCSC. Regarding the group studying baccalaureate degrees offered by community colleges, a member commented that the question should be which institutions are best positioned to teach students to be the most competent in the specific things that the state needs. It is becoming more difficult for WASC to review the array of different institutions it accredits.

## **VI. Systemwide Course Criteria**

The systemwide criteria document was discussed at Council and UCEP should finalize the document today. One issue for the committee to discuss is quality. The campuses should be focused on educational quality and UCEP may need to ensure that the right questions are being asked.

**Discussion:** A member expressed support for local jurisdiction over issues of quality. The criteria indicate that non-matriculated students will need to satisfy prerequisites and it was noted that faculty have discretion in this area. It is not clear what will happen to the systemwide status of a course if a department decides not to pay for a second offering. There is a regulation in place that requires that a course is removed from a listing after it has not been taught for several years. Campuses should be encouraged to ask certain questions for courses to be offered online. UCEP could suggest that local CEPs look at questions being asked at other campuses, and a member suggests the guidelines include a link to the UCB questions. The criteria will ask for faculty to show campus approval of the course for online delivery. Members discussed whether examples or resources should be provided in the criteria and it was decided that this information can be provided in response to requests for guidance. The committee discussed whether courses should be approved every five years. If a course goes back for review at the local level or if it changes the articulation agreement, UCEP should receive a notification. Chair Yoder will finish editing the document.

## **VII. Articulation**

- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*
- *Nancy Purcille, Transfer Articulation Coordinator, UCOP*

Associate Director Lin joined the meeting to provide the committee with background information about articulation. Associate Director Lin's unit oversees systemwide policies, programs and services as they relate to articulation for the transition of students from one educational segment to another. The primary transfer pathway focused on at UCOP is the transition from the community colleges to UC. The work that transfer articulation analysts do lays the groundwork for all other levels and complexities of articulation. Community college courses need to establish the baseline of transferability before UC can establish the transferability at the level of a specific course to fulfill a course requirement or before UC can establish the transferability and articulation of a particular major course requirement or with breadth requirements that might be specific to a particular UC campus. UC has about 45,000 transferable course agreements (TCAs) from 112 community colleges that are currently approved and listed on the ASSIST database, and nearly three thousand of these have been reviewed by the transfer in the past academic year. UC has over 111,000 community college to UC agreements listed on ASSIST which are based off of the baseline TCAs. There are 21,000 courses certified for IGETC in ASSIST. The team works closely with the CSUs to maintain IGETC and also manages intercampus work on UC to UC campus articulation agreements.

A community college course is examined to see if it is comparable to a specific UC campus course at the lower division level or, if there is not a specific UC course, to determine if it is comparable in purpose, scope, depth and rigor to a UC level course. This is general UC transferability. Once approved for the TCA, a course can be reviewed by campuses for campus-specific major preparation, to satisfy a specific program requirement, to satisfy campus specific general education, or whether it can be reviewed for IGETC. June, July and August are the primary TCA review months and a smaller review is conducted in October. The team anticipates a significant increase in the number of TCAs this year because of changes in legislation that affected the community colleges as well as C-ID and other factors. Generally, the community college articulation officer will submit a course to UC via ASSIST. Last year, over 700 community college courses were reviewed for IGETC. Coordinator Purcille commented that information about a course in the campus catalogs will be static, whereas ASSIST has the most current information. UC has just launched its new transfer articulation website. It provides information for community college articulation officers about what UC is looking for.

**Discussion:** It was noted that when a UC faculty member is asked by a student to approve a course, this triggers the automatic approval of the course for the entire department and it is then difficult to remove that approval. A request to articulate a course is submitted to the articulation officer who contacts the department. The department then contacts the appropriate faculty member for the final review. If faculty have questions or concerns, the articulation officers are valuable resources. Coordinator Purcille reviewed the systemwide course criteria document and encouraged UCEP to include the campus articulation officers in discussions about campus to campus articulation. It is not clear what the mechanism will be for the UC to UC articulation. The articulation officers also review applications for admission so there

are resource issues. A key to facilitating the articulation agreements is communication. Associate Director Brick reported that within the past several years, UC has been able to establish articulation agreements between each UC campus and all of the community colleges for at least the top twenty majors. IGETC satisfies the breadth pattern at some campuses and not others. Students are becoming more aware of resources available to help them with transferring including ASSIST. The student transfer admission adviser has been created and it provides generic feedback for student to help them plan for the two years they are at the community college.

UCEP discussed the expectation that a course will articulate to every campus for every major. For the proposed criteria to suggest that systemwide status be granted to a course that can establish articulation to one or two other campuses raises the question of whether there is enough similarity across the degree programs and major requirements to put the course into ASSIST with a note that it will work across all of the campuses. Associate Director Lin does not think it is realistic that there will be enough similarity. The criteria could also include whether the course satisfies minimum eligibility requirements which would be helpful for community college students to know. UCEP's draft criteria raise concerns about the resource issue. If a campus is under-resourced when it comes to articulation, it could piggyback on the work another campus has done, but who will do that initial work is one question. It will be difficult for the articulation officers to prioritize the work involved with articulating between UCs given all of the work they must do with the community colleges. There is a concern about students from California community colleges displacing UC students. Lawmakers have the notion that online courses will magically solve all of the problems related to the underfunding of education. UCEP members agreed that the systemwide criteria document should not send the message that majors are equal across all the UC campuses and that there should not be any pressure to accept a course from another campus. Associate Director Lin and Coordinator Purcille will provide written feedback to UCEP about the proposed criteria.

### **VIII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership**

- *Bill Jacob, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The May revise was released and overall there is no change to what UC will receive. A series of stable increases is still in place with the continued insistence by the governor that there is no tuition increase over the next several years. Half of the core instructional funding comes from the state and the other half from tuition. The governor has not given up on the performance measures which he recently discussed with the provost. The restructuring is part of the plan to avoid a tuition increase next year. The size of the surplus in the governor's budget is also controversial and UC is arguing that some of the surplus could be used for infrastructure or to pay down some of the debt. Increases to the fees for professional school programs will need to be approved by the Regents in July. For the first time in two decades, the governor has provided funds for UCRP. The president is considering a 3% pay raise for non-represented staff and an increase of 2% or more for faculty in either July or October 1<sup>st</sup>. The Senate has proposed a 4% increase on January 1<sup>st</sup>.

Vice Chair Jacob reported that SB 520 passed out of the Senate with a 28 to 0 vote and will next go to the Assembly. The bill references a California Virtual Campus which is simply a listing of online courses. The bill states that the intellectual property rights will belong to the campuses. Senate Bill 547 did not move out of the finance committee. The Senate's letter has stated that all language in SB 520 referring to private providers must be removed or the Senate will continue to oppose this bill. Vice Chair Jacob indicated that opposing SB 520 is a priority when it comes to bills UC would like the governor to veto. Vice Chair Jacob made it clear that UC does not want its online courses to automatically be accepted by the CSUs and community colleges. UC has provided feedback which may result in language that will be added to the bill.

With respect to the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative, intellectual property issues are being discussed with the Office of General Counsel. The proposals may be due by November 1<sup>st</sup> so a report can be made to the legislature about how many online courses are being developed. The presidential search is ongoing. There are discussions about composite benefits and whether the funds will be moved into the short term investment pool or into UCRP, and the Senate is encouraging that the funds be added to UCRP.

**Discussion:** The morning discussion about the need to change public opinion was continued.

**IX. New Business**

The analyst suggested that UCEP submit a letter to Council requesting the final report from UCOE on the OIPP evaluation. Vice Chair Jacob agreed that it is timely to make this request, especially as UCOP moves forward with ILTI.

**X. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: John Yoder