

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**TELECONFERENCE MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, JUNE 4, 2012**

**Attending:** Jose Wudka, Chair (UCR), John Yoder, Vice Chair (UCD). Michael Dennin (UCI), Tim Labor (UCR), Tania Israel (UCSB), Tamara Alliston (UCSF), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC), Nicholas Sitar (UCB), Jon Rossini (UCD), Dick Weiss (UCLA), Bob Powell (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Welcome, Announcements, and Updates**

Chair Wudka thanked the members for joining the teleconference. The budget deficit is \$16 billion and there is the Governor's tax initiative that should be voted for. Council became more concerned with the lack of progress in the rebenching process and pressed the administration but UCOP is treading water. This year's Council is well informed so the administration will be asked to set forth how the rebenching will happen before September 1<sup>st</sup> before many members are termed-out. UCAP floated the idea of creating working groups to examine open source of publications and their effects on merit and promotion reviews. Chair Wudka is not sure when these work groups will be established.

Regent Ruiz spoke to Council about diversity and he may have been misinformed about the faculty's interest in maintaining diversity before this meeting. Several Council members had presentations that disabused him of this notion and he left reassured that faculty are concerned about the diversity of students. The Crisis of Competence report was discussed following a piece in the LA Times by the authors which contained more unfounded claims. Council decided to prepare a statement in the event comments are requested. Vice Provost Greenstein and Provost Pitts are leaving and the main supporters of UCOE that will be left will be Keith Williams and Chris Edley. Faculty Advisor Williams will be under increased pressure to maintain the many pronged effort they are trying to move forth and organize by the beginning of the fall. Presumably a new person will replace the vice provost which will be an opportunity for UCEP to put forth comments on how the project should move forward and provide faculty input. It provides UCEP with an opportunity to keep its concerns visible. Faculty Advisor Williams has responded to the Blue Ribbon Panel's memo and this will be discussed later today.

Council approved UCEP's guidelines for systemwide approval. Chair Wudka drafted a cover letter for Council that spelled out the committee's intentions. All references to extension were removed because this was very confusing. The letter also spelled out the possibility of giving exceptions to courses with many non-matriculated students if they provided enough evidence that quality and access were going to be maintained, and with this clarification Council approved the guidelines. Chair Wudka will ask the committee for comments via email later this week.

**Discussion:** Vice Chair Powell reported that a new provost will be in place on July 1<sup>st</sup>. The Regents will meet to approve this appointment. Faculty Advisor Williams has agreed to be the director of UCOE and UCOE has moved back under the leadership of the provost. There is restructuring going on and it is not clear that there will be an immediate recruitment for the vice provost's position. The vice provost is the head of the administrative group that works with WASC and the academic planning council. The new provost was advised about UCOE and that the provost should recover oversight of this program. A member commented that the entire UCOE effort is misguided. Faculty at one campus are moving in a different direction from OP; if OP were to offer online course-development grants to faculty that would be better. The original model of OIPP did provide for grants to faculty.

## II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

## III. SR 610

Some members were unhappy with the residency because it implies physical presence. Council asked UCEP to find an alternate word but there are several things to consider before taking this step. There are graduate students who spend a lot of time off campus and there is never a question about their residency. SR 610 is used as the definition of residency for the purpose of the regulations. Residency could be changed to matriculation, and the last sentence in the proposed language could be removed. Twenty regulations and one certificate would need to be changed if a different word is used.

**Discussion:** If the word residency is changed in SR 610, it may not be too much work to search for and replace the term in the other regulations. It would be nice to use the word matriculation because residency is confusing in terms of physical presence and California residence. A member noted that, before using the word matriculation, there should be confirmation that this word is not used in a different way elsewhere in the regulations. This change would be big as it would allow campuses to define residency. By changing this regulation, the graduate council might be forced to make a change as well. If this will be UCEP's proposal, Chair Wudka will talk to the chair of the graduate council. The members voted to change "residency" to "matriculation." Chair Wudka will advise the chair of CCGA and invite CCGA to endorse or oppose UCEP's proposal.

**Action:** Chair Wudka will talk to the chair of CCGA regarding UCEP's proposal.

## IV. SR 760

Chair Wudka asked whether UCEP wants to work on the regulation, or let the campuses know that it is a requirement of WASC, that UCB has already complied and that UCEP encourages campuses to manage this themselves. It might result in ten separate regulations that are not satisfactory to WASC meaning UCEP will have to do the work anyway.

**Discussion:** WASC approval is campus by campus, therefore there is not a need for a systemwide regulation. Associate Director Baxter stated that the systemwide policy is good but not satisfactory. The proposed regulation is not overly restrictive. A member remarked that when WASC met with UCEP, the existing regulation did not appear to be an issue, so this should be left up to each campus. The proposal is to leave the original wording as it is and notify campuses that they have to specify how units are awarded and provide UCB and UCSD as examples. Campuses should be notified that this work is required by WASC not by UCEP. There were equal votes for and against the proposal during the meeting, calling for further discussion. The proposed wording from the UCSB representative may help. The wording could be changed in "d" to "can be assigned" which makes it a guideline instead of a requirement.

One member thinks that UCEP has something to add to this regulation, so this should be done on a systemwide basis. Another member asked why campuses should not be allowed to decide for themselves. All of UCSC courses are five units and the proposed regulation would not work for this campus. UCEP could provide guidance instead of imposing a restriction. If SR 760 is revised, UCEP should consider providing examples of what campuses can do. The revision process should not be started if campuses are going to be able to do what they would like anyway. For the purposes of accreditation, campuses should come up with a campus policy that is clearer or more extensive than SR 760. UCEP could see how campuses will react. Campus freedom to administer programs is important because campuses are clearly diverse in structure. An alternative to 760 would go through the representatives for informal comments.

Members could ask their campus committees if they prefer uniform guidelines or establishing their own. This makes it clear to campuses that it needs to be done or UCEP will create a systemwide regulation because WASC requires these changes.

Members think that Chair Wudka should send the regulation out with the suggested wording with request to adopt or adapt it and let UCEP know what the campuses are doing. This will enable UCEP to get the wording that is used on each campus. Chair Wudka will write a memo with the suggested wording, distribute it to UCEP members to share with the campuses and then UCEP will have to decide what action to take. It does not make sense for “e” to be one of the suggestions. The divisions may impose equivalent requirements on alternative or traditional courses. A member expressed concern about what would happen if some campuses vote against a systemwide policy. Chair Wudka will draft a memo to send to the campuses. It may be that what is provided by the campuses will not be satisfactory and UCEP will need to act anyway. Chair Wudka will share the memo with the committee and asked members to submit any additional comments to him by the end of the week.

## **V. UC Washington D.C. Center**

A set of courses from the UCDC program has been submitted to the committee for systemwide approval. These are traditional courses only for UC students so this matter is not too complex. However, four UCOE courses have also been submitted to UCEP for evaluation and the UCD representative and UCI representative have agreed to look at the courses. Chair Wudka suggested that a standing subcommittee should conduct initial reviews, followed by a report to the full committee. It is not clear how many more courses will be sent to Chair Wudka. The committee can expect a report on the UCOE courses in the near future. Syllabi and material were sent only for the 180 series so Chair Wudka assumes that this is the only course for which systemwide approval is requested right now. There is a structured course as well as seminars, and the courses accommodate semester and quarter students’ schedules.

**Discussion:** A member noted that the qualifications of the instructor are not provided and believes that UCEP should examine the background of instructors. UCEP does require that the campus approves the instructors and the UCDC courses have been approved by UCI. The campus looks at the instructor, the syllabi and the course outline. For UCDC courses, the campuses create a placeholder course on their catalog and accept the grade from the UCDC students. Instructors are not from the same campus all of the time. Campuses are required by UCEP to approve the instructor and UCEP can tell the campus if the instructor vetting was lacking or absent. The UCDC courses were approved under an umbrella, and basic CVs of individual instructors have not been provided to indicate affiliation with UC. The affiliation within the UC system or the other qualifications that make the faculty member appropriate should be provided. Chair Wudka will request information from UCI about the current instructors. The committee can approve courses 180 a and c, and approval of 180 b and d is pending subject to information on the instructors. The committee voted in favor of this proposal. The systemwide guidelines should make it clear that information about the instructors is required.

## **VI. OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel**

- *Diane Harley, Chair, Blue Ribbon Panel (UCB)*

Chair Wudka reported that the panel has met several times and created a list of questions for UCOE that have been answered after a delay. The questions were mostly aimed at pinning UCOE down about their plans. The pilot project will have a report on August 31<sup>st</sup> from the evaluators. Chair Harley reported receiving a notice this morning that the report will probably not be released in August. It has proved very difficult to figure out what will happen and when. The panel has convened twice and is in touch regularly by email. There was a teleconference with Faculty Advisor Williams and Dr. Yun and the panel on May 4th. UCOE, Faculty Advisor Williams and Dr. Yun have been responsive and made numerous documents

available. The onus is on the panel to wade through the material to determine what is going on. The panel was impressed with Dr. Yun and feels he will conduct a good evaluation if he is provided the resources. It is clear that the UCEC has a limited scope regarding what it is charged to do and what is outlined in the MOU with UCOE.

A document released in July and a roadmap released in August were difficult to navigate. Chair Harley has asked them to be realistic about what can be accomplished. Faculty Advisor Williams responded to questions regarding what can be accomplished with the money they have in hand. The panel has been assured that four of the questions can be answered with the budget in hand. The number of additional things they hope to do with adequate resources is significant. The panel has been told not to expect more documentation because the center is busy. The interim report planned for August will not be forthcoming as planned which Chair Harley finds troubling. The panel encouraged the center to avoid being a cheerleader for UCOE to maintain its objectivity. In a message to Chair Harley, Faculty Advisor Williams indicated that it is too late for the panel to think it will influence the evaluation.

**Discussion:** Chair Wudka is alarmed by the notice that the interim report will not be available in August. Vice Chair Powell agreed with Chair Wudka's suggestion that Council write a letter expressing concerns about the failure to implement the evaluation as planned. One member stated that the evaluation is not as important as knowing how the money is spent and the entire philosophy of how UC is approaching online instruction. Vice Chair Powell emphasized that OIPP is an academic program living in UCOE without any academic oversight and that the evaluation is the only thing that the Senate has. Unless the question of whether the online courses are as effective as traditional courses is answered, it will be difficult to sell this program to faculty, and with the resources provided, UCEC will not be able to answer this question. Chair Harley will draft a memo to UCEP outlining the panel's concerns that will be submitted to Council. Chair Wudka thanked Chair Harley for joining the call today and passed on his thanks to the panel members. Chair Anderson thanked the committee for all of the excellent work it has done this year.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:20 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Jose Wudka