

University of California Academic Senate University Committee on Educational Policy

Minutes of Teleconference Meeting
Monday, June 2, 2008

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

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

The Governor's May budget revision restored approximately \$98.5 million to UC, erasing some cuts that had been proposed in January. The restoration has been attributed in part to lobbying efforts by the California business community. Concerns remain, however, because the May revision still leaves UC more than \$300 million short of the operating budget proposed by the Regents last fall. UCOP estimates that campuses will have to make cuts of between 3 and 7%.

Administrators hosted a series of meetings to brief Senate committee and division chairs about the UCOP restructuring. There are concerns that the reorganization may result in the loss of institutional memory at UCOP and could impair the Senate's ability to collect data and carry out its responsibilities. Council has asked Senate committees to comment on the kind of analytical expertise they would like to have available after the reorganization is complete as well as their priorities for the data they want collected, maintained, and analyzed.

At its two-day meeting in May, Academic Council voted to endorse a compromise version of BOARS' eligibility reform proposal. Council expressed a general consensus of support for Entitled to Review, for eliminating the strict SAT subject test requirement, and for BOARS' goals to broaden geographic representation at UC. The major change to what BOARS put forward is the specific eligibility guarantee construct, which Council modified from 12.5% within-school /5% statewide to 9% in-school/ 9% statewide. If accepted, the proposal would take effect for the fall 2012 freshman admissions cycle. It also institutes a regular cycle of evaluation in which BOARS would analyze and assess the impacts of the policy, and may, on that basis, put forward a revised recommendation. The Assembly will vote on the proposal on June 11. If approved there, it will move to the Board of Regents for final review and approval. Chair Williams asked members to talk with their campus Assembly representatives about the BOARS proposal to help ensure an informed vote.

Chair Williams encouraged UCEP members to suggest names of faculty who might be interested in serving on Council's proposed Special Committee on Remote and Online Instruction, and on Academic Planning Council's Task Forces on Undergraduate Education Effectiveness and Postgraduate Outcomes.

Finally, Council has been discussing its support for the "Power of Ten" concept and a philosophy in which all ten campuses are supported in efforts to achieve the same standard of excellence.

II. Consent Calendar

- UCEP draft minutes of May 5, 2008

Action: UCEP approved the minutes with one change.

III. Compendium Reviews

1. UC Davis Proposal for a School of Nursing

Issue: UCEP reviewed its final draft response to the proposed UC Davis School of Nursing, which was developed with the assistance of members Dorothy Wiley and Linda Chafetz.

Discussion: A few minor wording changes were suggested.

Action: UCEP will submit final comments to CCGA.

2. **Five-Year Perspectives for 2008-2013**

Issue: UCEP reviewed a five-year perspective of proposed degree programs and schools for 2008-2013 that are in various stages of evaluation on the campuses.

Discussion: Members noted the following missing, incorrect, and outdated information:

- There is an undergraduate program in Applied Linguistics proposed for fall 2009 at UCLA, which is currently at the department review stage.
- The undergraduate program in Electrical Engineering and Sociology listed under UCSD should be corrected to read “Electrical Engineering and Society.”
- The Earth Surface Sciences graduate program at UCSB is no longer an active proposal.
- The UCB graduate program in Public Health/Nursing concurrent with UCSF leads to an M.P.H/M.S. degree, not an M.P.H/L.S. degree.
- The UCSC graduate program in Bimolecular Engineering has been approved and is accepting students. UCI programs in Business Administration, Business Information Management, Nursing Science, and Epidemiology are also either accepting students or taking applications for fall 2009.
- There was a question about the affiliation of the UC Davis’ proposed Family Nurse Practitioner/ Physician Assistant M.H.S. and Health Services in Family Nurse Practitioner MPAS, and whether those programs are still active in the context of the proposed UCD School of Nursing.

UCEP was surprised at the number of errors and noted that UCOP should re-consider its data gathering processes. The committee thought there might a benefit to some kind of automated process for obtaining and updating the data.

Action: UCEP will send comments to Council.

IV. Comparison of Program Review Practices

Issue: UCEP reviewed a summary of campus responses to UCEP’s program review practices survey.

Discussion: Chair Williams noted that the survey results could help campuses examine local program review practices. It could help planning agencies identify best practices around learning assessments and outcomes.

Action: Members will review the accuracy of the document and return corrections to the analyst. Chair Williams will submit the data as information and a potential resource to the Academic Planning Office and the Academic Council.

V. Proposed Amendment to California State Law re: Involuntary Psychiatric (5150) Holds for College and University Students

Issue: A proposed amendment to state law would require hospitals that have admitted students for psychiatric holds to inform campus housing officials about the timing of their release. The amendment was recommended originally by the Student Mental Health Work Group, which was formed in the wake of the Virginia Tech massacre to study UC-wide student mental health services and needs.

Discussion: It was noted that the concerns of the Work Group are understandable. It should be applauded for many of its excellent recommendations for increasing resources to and awareness of student mental health issues. There were also major concerns center about the specific proposal to change state law and the ambiguity about how it will be applied on campuses.

UCEP's major concerns centered on the specific proposal to change state law to allow campus-housing officials access to information that is deemed protected under federal legislation. In addition, the proposal is unclear about how the procedure would be applied on campuses.

There were concerns that it would expand the power of the state to breach the confidentiality and privacy of residential students by informing campus parties about circumstances that may create a stigma or additional difficulties for a student. There are other options that would not threaten civil liberties. Moreover, it was unclear why it would be acceptable to apply such a law or policy to students and not to faculty or staff. If a faculty member were admitted under a 5150, their MSO would not be notified.

A "5150" is a 72 hour period of detained observation that can be initiated on the basis of the patient being a danger to the self or others or in the case of grave disability. For insurance purposes, an individual often cannot obtain psychiatric treatment at a hospital without a 5150, and people are not released from hospitals if they are considered dangerous.

It appears that the proposed legislation would allow a campus housing official to be notified when a student with campus housing was being released from a 5150 hold. But it is unclear what, specifically, that official would do with the information and how it might affect the student's rights to privacy and ability to re-integrate into campus life. There was concern about implementing a law that does not provide more clarity about how the information will be used, particularly where there is not a specific threat to other people. More information is needed about the scope of this amendment. Privacy and safety have to be protected but also contextualized within a larger framework of mental health reform and care.

Action: UCEP will submit comments to Academic Council recommending not going forward with the law until questions can be clarified and the proposal discussed more fully.

V. UCEP Priorities for 2008-09

UCEP identified a few possible topics for discussion and action in 2008-09.

- Systemwide trends toward greater use of Lecturers and possible new policies or limits
- Best practices for Impacted Majors

- Student faculty ratio and class size
- Identifying opportunities and best practices for involving students in research
- Part Time Enrollment
- Student Mental Health

VI. UC Davis Class Size Data

Chair Williams presented new data examining changes in the number of classrooms of various sizes as a proportion of the total at Davis, and the types of instructors teaching those classes, between 1999-2000 and 2006-07, relative to campus enrollment, broken down by instructor type, and division level.

Chair Williams expressed thanks to UCEP members and the committee analyst for their hard work and participation. UCEP members thanked Chair Williams for his excellent and dedicated service as chair.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Keith Williams