

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES OF MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2007

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD) Stephen McLean, Vice-Chair (UCSB), Ignacio Navarette (UCB), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), David Kay (UCI), Dorothy Wiley (UCLA), Taradas Bandyopadhyay (UCR), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Linda Chafetz (UCSF), Peter Digeser (UCSB), Cynthia Pineda (Graduate Student-UCLA), Alexandra Ramos (Undergraduate Student-UCLA), Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair (UCD), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. General Announcements and Updates – UCEP Chair Keith Williams

President Dynes spoke at the October Academic Council meeting and continues to promote a view of the University that recognizes the autonomy and uniqueness of each of the ten campuses while maintaining a sense of a single system. The Regents' presidential search committee is revising its search criteria guidelines and has employed the assistance of a search firm. Council also participates in the search through its own advisory committee.

The Monitor Consulting Group was hired to review the University's organizational structure, to make recommendations for reducing costs and increasing efficiency, and to help ensure maintenance of the appropriate relationship between UCOP, The Regents, and the campuses.

Range adjustments and new salary scales took effect for UC faculty on October 1. The adjustments are part of a four-year plan to close the salary gap between UC and its Comparison 8 institutions, restore the relevance and integrity of the UC salary scale system, and bring the majority of faculty back on-scale. The plan calls for three additional years of range and market adjustments, but the uncertain state budget situation could still threaten its full implementation.

Future UCEP agendas topics will include a recently completed review of the University's international education programs, and a report on long-range enrollment planning. Chair Williams suggested that UCEP and local CEPs consider the educational policy issues surrounding part-time enrollment, including the possibility of increasing its use as a means to broaden access to UC.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Draft minutes of October 1, 2007
2. Repeal of Senate Regulation 458

Action: UCEP approved the consent calendar.

III. Undergraduate Education Planning Group Mission Statement

UCEP reviewed a draft Mission Statement intended to guide the work of the Academic Planning Council's Undergraduate Education Planning Group. The joint faculty-administration Planning Group was formed to consider various 21st Century challenges for undergraduate education and make recommendations for long-term systemwide program and enrollment planning. In October, Council also agreed to send out the Mission Statement to Senate divisions for informal review and comment. Chair Williams asked UCEP members to suggest improvements to the Mission

Statement, which should articulate the unique, distinctive quality of undergraduate education at UC as a public research university.

An overriding question was whether the statement's intended audience would include students and parents or whether faculty would be using it more as a benchmark for academic discussions. Some members felt the main body of the Statement should be more concise and also needed more emotionally compelling prose. It was suggested that a three-part approach might be effective. Perhaps a shorter, more concise statement could come at the outset, followed by the main statement and then the expanded 'meaning' section.

The statement sees education as forward looking and progressive, but does it accommodate the more foundational functions of the academy, such as those addressing languages, culture and history? It should say more about the intrinsic value of education – i.e. a means to foster and support a democratic society. It should not compartmentalize education; UC's greatest product is an education, not merely job training or a degree. The Statement should not shy away from promoting the role of teaching as integral to the research university. Finally, UCEP felt the footnote structure helped unpack the language, and since the Statement will most likely be read on the Internet, one could imagine an interactive design that would allow online readers to view the footnotes easily, should they want to go deeper into its meaning.

Action: The suggestions will be forwarded to the Undergraduate Education Planning Group and incorporated into a revised draft.

IV. Revised IGETC Standards (“Notes”)

UCEP was asked to review a revised set of Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) “notes.” The notes serve as a practical manual to help the three segments implement the IGETC course pattern, which allows California community college students to fulfill lower-division general education requirements before transferring to UC or CSU. The notes provide details on the standards, policies, and procedures for IGETC course certification processes. A committee of administrators and faculty from the three segments performed the review of the notes, and their revisions do not change IGETC policy or establish new policy. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) reviewed and endorsed the document.

UCEP endorsed the document, noting that the suggested changes will help streamline and clarify administrative IGETC processes, which will benefit the effective use of IGETC and the general understanding of the implementation guidelines. The revisions should help community colleges administer the policy more easily, which will facilitate a smoother transfer for students. Some UCEP members also requested clarification about how IGETC After Transfer differs from SCIGETC, noting that the summary document might make that clearer. Others wanted to see more data about how well IGETC works - how much it is used, and whether students are still experiencing difficulty in meeting requirements or in understanding requirements.

Action: UCEP will submit comments to Council.

V. Proposal to Establish a School of Public Health at UC Davis

In accordance with its role as a [Compendium](#) committee, UCEP reviewed the proposed establishment of a school of public health at UC Davis. CCGA acts as the lead review committee, and UCPB also participates in the review.

UCEP expressed general support for the proposal. The new school will address a demonstrated need; build upon existing resources at UC Davis; and capitalize on the strengths of UC Davis and other resources in Sacramento. In particular, UCEP expressed strong support for the proposal to establish a minor in public health as well as the proposed school's unique focus on rural education and its practical approach to public health.

UCEP also had some concerns. The main concern was that funding for the school should not come at the expense of other UC budget priorities. UCEP agreed that it should endorse the School only on the condition that funding come through an augmentation of the UC budget, as was stated in the proposal, not in competition for existing resources.

There were also concerns about the proposed undergraduate major in public health. UCEP would urge UC Davis to conduct a thorough viability study that carefully considers what the major will prepare a student for professionally. UCEP members noted that many positions in public health are poorly funded entry-level jobs that are often filled by individuals without college degrees or with backgrounds outside of public health. There was also concern about starting a new undergraduate major in the area in light of UCLA's relatively recent decision to drop its public health major.

Another concern was the School's dependency on distance learning for some aspects of the curriculum. UCEP and CCGA are currently considering implications of growing trends in online education on educational quality. The School should establish standards to ensure that classes are equal in quality to regular course offerings.

There was also concern about how the proposal describes the curriculum for working professionals. It is unclear what proportion of courses will be geared toward the schedules of working professionals vs. full-time students. There was also general concern about the intention to develop "a curriculum parallel to our standard daytime courses that is equal in content and feasible for working professionals" (pg. 29), and that "outside faculty" (pg. 30) would have to be hired to teach courses for working professionals. While UC Davis is requesting new I&R faculty positions, it seems that some sizable proportion of students might be taught by outside faculty. UCEP was primarily concerned about maintaining the overall quality of instruction.

Finally, the proposal notes Davis' expectation that some faculty will transition into the new School from the Department of Public Health Sciences (Pg. 31). UCEP felt UC Davis should clarify whether that department would retain its current status and FTE, and if so, how that was justified in the context of a new School. Would FTE be transferred to the new School, reducing the number of new FTE needed?

Action: UCEP will send its comments directly to CCGA.

VI. Remote and Online Instruction and Residency Requirements

A subcommittee of CCGA, UCEP, and ITTP faculty met twice to discuss the need for new Senate regulations addressing distance learning and its relationship to UC residency requirements. The subcommittee decided not to move forward with new legislation yet, but instead to engage the UC community on the issues in a way that would engender a broader

discussion about the topic of distance learning, online pedagogy, and residency. CCGA's chair is drafting a white paper that will be distributed to divisional committees for input and comment.

Chair Williams noted that Senate records are unclear about the original motivation behind the residency requirements in Senate Regulations 610 and 630A, although a reasonable assumption to make is that UC wanted students to be present in a substantial way at the campus granting the degree. New technologies blur this concept, however, because it is now possible for a student at one campus to take a course at another campus via electronic means, or to take a course at any UC campus from another geographic location altogether. Eventually, new regulations may be able to address some of the subtleties of these new ways to view residency, but a more general discussion is more appropriate at this time.

Discussion: UCEP members noted that the issues of residency and online learning are separate. Whatever a campus decides is an acceptable course should also count for the residency requirements, but residency may involve more factors than the unit value of courses taken, and the issue warrants further discussion. The interactive, face-to-face teaching component is essential to a UC education. A significant part of learning is the experience of participating in the life of the campus and being in a room with other people where instruction and discussion occur, an experience independent of the quality of those courses. A student learns from a number of sources, including interactions between the instructor and other students. There was general agreement that there should be a ceiling on the number of online courses UC allows a student to take to ensure face-to-face interactions are not minimized by online instruction. Students are always able to petition for an exception to the residency rules should circumstances warrant more online instruction.

Action: Chair Williams asked members to research local campus policies regarding online learning. He said WASC also has detailed guidelines for online instruction that it uses as part of the accreditation process. The CCCs also have guidelines, and BOARS has established standards for online high school courses acceptable to satisfy eligibility requirements.

VII. BOARS' Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy

BOARS Chair Mark Rashid joined the meeting to discuss his committee's proposal to reform UC's freshman eligibility policy. He said the distinctive feature of UC's current system of admissions is the pre-filter of "eligibility," which the state guarantees to the top 12.5% of California high school graduates. Students become eligible for a guarantee of admission to at least one UC campus if they take the required "a-g" course pattern; complete a specific pattern of testing (the SAT and SAT II subject test or ACT); and achieve a minimum score on a performance index based on those tests and their GPA. Campuses then conduct a comprehensive review of eligible applications, which students submit separately to their preferred campuses. Eligible students who are not offered admission to the campus of their choice are placed into a referral pool and offered admission to at least one other campus. In recent years, space has limited the referral pool to UC Riverside and UC Merced. In addition, the Eligibility in a Local Context (ELC) program extends eligibility to the top 4% of graduates in each high school, and the Admission by Exception (A by E) policy can be used to admit non-eligible students. A by E is rarely used, however, and ineligible students are unlikely to apply to UC.

The BOARS proposal would replace the eligibility pre-filter with a different pre-filter – Entitled

To Review (ETR) – which does not include a guarantee of admission. Students would gain ETR status by taking either the SAT or ACT and completing 11 of 15 a-g requirements with a 2.8 or better GPA by grade 11. ETR students would then be guaranteed a review at any UC campus to which they apply. The proposal does not mandate changes to local comprehensive review and selection processes or to referral pool mechanisms. The ELC and A by E programs would continue substantially in their present form under ETR. Students admitted to UC are still expected to complete the full set of 15 required a-g courses prior to enrolling, and failure to do so would be grounds for cancellation of admission, although this is not automatic.

As described in the BOARS proposal, many students are ineligible for UC for essentially technical reasons. Last year, these students included approximately 6% of high school graduates who did not take the SAT II, and about 2% who failed to take only one course in the a-g pattern. BOARS' data indicate that many of these students are highly qualified, could otherwise be admitted to UC, and end up attending other excellent colleges. Therefore, the current system excludes some students from UC for reasons that are difficult to justify academically.

Only 6% of students take UC up on the referral guarantee. The guarantee hurts the University, because it forces UC to exclude some students who may be more deserving than other students admitted under the guarantee. It also forces UC to presume that all California high school students have uniform educational opportunities and personal circumstances. ETR will expand the pool of students visible to UC and give many additional deserving students access to a review. It will help simplify eligibility and broaden the expectation, particularly in low API schools, that a UC education is possible. Depending on applicant behavior, ETR may help increase enrolment of qualified underrepresented minority students.

In general, UCEP expressed strong support for the general principles underlying BOARS' efforts to change admissions procedures and for the goals to broaden the eligibility pool, encourage selection of the top students for admission to UC, and increase admission from underrepresented and low-income groups. UCEP also agreed that some of the standards set by the current eligibility construct are arbitrary and bad educational policy. For instance, maintaining the SAT II requirement is not academically justified given the minimal influence those test scores have in predicting freshman GPAs at UC, as detailed in the explanatory question and answer document supplied by BOARS. UCEP reviewed a dot graph projecting the number and characteristics of new students who would be eligible for a review under ETR. Many of these students fall well within the range of the current performance index standards.

UCEP members felt the data presented by BOARS effectively showed possible limitations of the current practices, especially criteria involving the SAT II exams and the absolute requirement of completing the 15 a-g courses. ETR would allow campuses to consider deserving candidates outside the current pool who may not have jumped through all the "hoops" but whose academic qualifications and contributions would enrich the excellence and diversity of the University. UC currently loses the opportunity to compete for many of these students who end up at competing universities. A fundamental assumption in the proposed ETR system is that a comprehensive review of a broader pool of qualified students will result in selection of a set of students for admission to UC that is a more appropriate representation of the "top 12.5%" than occurs using the current admission criteria. UCEP agreed with that perspective.

Some UCEP members expressed concern that eliminating the eligibility guarantee could have a negative impact on public opinion, because students and parents hold the guarantee sacred. Many students and parents appreciate the do-it-yourself simplicity and transparency of the current system because it allows them to clearly understand what they need to achieve for eligibility, even if the specific campus is unknown, while ETR and comprehensive review involve more uncertainty. UCEP ultimately agreed that while these concerns are important, the Senate should base its argument for change not on public opinion, but on sound educational policy and the most predictive measures of student success. The faculty are perhaps the only UC constituency with both the expertise and freedom to focus solely on equity, access, and educational excellence. Some members agreed with BOARS Chair Rashid's position that outcry over the loss of the guarantee to all but the ELC 4% would be somewhat temporary, and after several years the expectation of the guarantee would fade from applicant awareness. Other members rejected this assumption.

There was a difference of opinion in the committee about whether to endorse the proposal as written. The committee was in closer agreement about wanting to suggest possible modifications to the proposal, should BOARS and Academic Council seek a compromise policy. UCEP felt these alternative options should involve, in addition to the elimination of the SAT II requirement, retaining some greater proportion of students offered a guarantee. The committee felt there is value in the transparency of the guarantee, but there might also be better alternative means to provide guarantees. One option would be to maintain current eligibility methods to some proportion of students smaller than 12.5%, but with an enlarged secondary pool of applicants who would be entitled to review but not guaranteed admission, effectively the group currently proposed by BOARS for ETR. Perhaps the first group could be called "Guaranteed Admission Group," and the second, Entitled to Review. Those in the guarantee group not admitted to the campuses of their choice would go into the referred group. Those in ETR not selected by a campus they applied to would not be referred to campuses using comprehensive review. Another option would be to increase the number of students given a guarantee, either by expanding Eligibility in a Local Context and increasing the use of Admission by Exception.

At a minimum, if the proposed regulations are put in place there should be widely published and easily available information showing proportions of applicants typically admitted to each UC based on an easily calculated combination of GPA and SAT-I. This would help maintain a transparent sense of the historical likelihood of admission.

In addition, UCEP felt the University should invest more effort into crafting clear public messages about both the current system and any changes that take place. There was a sense to try to move away from the term "eligibility" to something that is not tied to past language as strongly inviting direct comparison with the current practices. The University also has to make a commitment to campuses to provide resources that will allow them to offset any increase in workload and to help the newly admitted students achieve success.

Action: UCEP will review a draft over email and at the December meeting and submit comments to Academic Council.

VIII. UC Center in Washington DC Systemwide Course

Chair Williams has been following up on the status of the proposed systemwide course UCEP gave its provisional approval to last year. UCEP is waiting for additional information from

UCDC – catalog copy, clarification about how credit units for semester and quarter students will be counted; and detail about in-class and outside class work related to the non-overlapping course sequence structure for the semester students who take extra material not present for the quarter students. UCEP also wanted to clarify the mechanism through which UCEP’s approval of a systemwide course is communicated to the Registrars and how such courses will be listed and numbered in all campus catalogs. There is also the question of how the new UCOP initiative regarding multicampus course impediments interacts with UCEP’s work on this issue.

UCEP members asked how the course would be treated when the instructor changes, assuming the course is intended to be stable. Maybe there should be a catalog for systemwide courses only. UCEP members had questions about the wisdom of the previous UCEP decision to endorse the overlapping course sequence model.

IX. Priority Setting and Future UCEP Agenda Items

UCEP discussed additional agenda topics and priorities for 2007-08.

Student-to-faculty ratio: Chair Williams noted that the official student-to-faculty ratio has risen over the last 20 years from an historical low of 17.6 to 20.7 with the current Compact agreement. The long-term goal of The Regents is to return the ratio to 17.6. There is a perception on campuses that the ratio is much higher than 20.7. Davis calculates it by dividing student credit hours by the number of faculty, less adjuncts and GSRs. Is there a more meaningful way of calculation that focuses on the ground level situation, i.e., class size? What is the appropriate proportion of courses taught by lecturers vs. professors? What is the effect of the situation on undergraduate education? UCSC will distribute a recent related report.

Research contributions to undergraduate education: UC’s research environment has obvious benefits for undergraduate education and teaching, but what are some of the more subtle features that add value, and how can UC publicize those? Can we document student perceptions and satisfaction, perhaps with the help of the [UCUES survey](#)? How can UC leverage resources to do the best possible job in both teaching and research?

Impacted majors: What are best practices for departments to restrict or discourage enrollment in impacted majors?

Program review: What are the best campus practices for streamlining and ensuring the effectiveness of the program review process?

Outcome assessment: How should UC respond to the possible application of “No Child Left Behind”-style outcome assessment models to UC and other public universities?

Action: UCEP members will discuss topics with their local committees.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Keith Williams

Distributions:

1. Eligibility Reform Fact Sheet
2. Entitled to Review: Additional Prospective Applicants

