

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
MONDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2010

DRAFT

Attending: David Kay, Chair (UCI), Jose Wudka , Vice-Chair (UCR), Constantin Teleman (UCB), John Yoder (UCD), Michael Dennin (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), Begoña Echeverria (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Cynthia Skenazi (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Mark Appelbaum (UCSD) Peter Loomer (UCSF), Jason Chou (Graduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Bob Anderson (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

Chair Kay reported on the monthly call with the provost about the budget and the news is grim. It is likely that the boost in funding this year will be reduced some mid-year although it is unclear by how much. UC will take an increasing hit to its operating budget over the next few years due to post employment benefits. UC needs increased revenue and to work on better advocacy and will need to look at delivery of education. Delivery of education more efficiently and educating more students with the same workforce. The pilot program for online education is accepting applications now. A claim has been made that online education will pay for itself in 7 years. Immediate past chair Harry Powell is attempting to develop short and medium term strategies for dealing with UC's situation. Faculty salary increases have also been discussed but this is in limbo given that there is no money.

Council met on November 22nd. Undergraduate fees and professional school fees were increased. Regents favor having more non-resident students. The Regents expressed the belief that having more international students will enrich the experience of California students. Regent Kieffer would like strategic thinking about undergraduate education and breadth requirements. Meetings of the chairs of five selected disciplines to discuss requirements are occurring and UCEP will receive a report in February. The Assembly met on December 1st. The provost is forming a committee for “rebenching” the budget, the formula for how budgets are allocated to the campuses. Assembly decided to let Council reconsider the faculty salary increases. The workgroup on adopting CSU breadth requirements met. There is a proposal that transfer students would be entitled to a holistic or comprehensive review and students would get credit for completing the GE requirements. This will allow UC to accept students who have completed either IGETC or CSU Breadth.

Discussion: Because this is expensive and requires staff, some UCEP members commented that comprehensive review is not a good idea. The idea would be to accept students who took courses beyond the minimum. It was noted that holistic review is already happening. The focus is on articulation of requirements and not on admissions. Vice Chair Anderson suggested that Bill Jacobs could be invited to a UCEP meeting to discuss the idea. Students in the sciences are discouraged from completing IGETC. Transfer students are not prepared for writing and math and there should be some way to assess their skills in these areas. There is a concern that this will make transferring more complicated. One member suggested that what is needed is more articulation for GE requirements. Every course students take should count for something which will make the process easier for transfer students.

Members reported on meetings of their various subcommittees. Professor Skenazi participated in an EAP meeting. The new director was discussed and the budget was temporarily approved.

Professor Dennin met with the online pilot project advisory body to discuss assessment. The technological platform will play a significant role. What is trying to be accomplished and what will be assessed was discussed. The effectiveness of any course and the elements of the online experience add value will be evaluated. The educational goal that is to be achieved using particular tools should be the focus. The evaluation group will not be the committee that selects the courses that are funded for the pilot.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

III. Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

UCEP does not have to opine on this matter. Chair Kay discussed these programs with the chair of CCGA. There are larger policy issues that UCEP would like to ensure are on the table and a memo describing the issues has been drafted.

Discussion: Members agree with the draft memo.

IV. “Downsizing” and Other Strategies for Cost Reduction

At the last Assembly meeting it was decided that the term downsizing should not be used. UCEP should consider key principles as these discussions go forward. Measures will be taken with which faculty disagree. Principles should be in place that can be used to evaluate or provide feedback when proposals are made.

Discussion: The focus is not on laying off faculty but it could be that they retire or are not replaced, or teach more students with less money. CAPs might reward teaching more than it currently is. As discussed in earlier meetings, a member remarked that there is still denial that quality will be sacrificed. UCEP should think about what can and cannot be cut. Data on the ratio of ladder rank faculty versus other faculty at comparison institutions would be useful to have. If UC started using more lecturers there will be an impact on quality. UCEP could make a request through Chair Simmons to Provost Pitts for this data. Campuses could be asked to develop their own principles since their situations are unique. The cuts should be related to anything that does not have to do with instruction and research, and most campuses have probably cut as much as they can with respect to instruction. Because sections are too large, interactions between students have been cut back. If class sizes are increased there should be enough staff assigned as readers as one way to mitigate the negative consequences. Downsizing measures should be reversible. The UCSD representative asked for any comments about downsizing should be forwarded to the committee chaired by immediate past chair Powell. The budget group led by Provost Pitts is being asked to develop a concrete plan.

UCEP should discuss how non-ladder rank faculty should be used such as where they should and should not be used. Whether use of non-ladder rank faculty depends on the discipline should be considered. The use of Unit 18 lecturers versus Lecturers with Security of Employment is another issue to be examined. The focus should be on how research faculty and their quality are preserved. One question is how much will online instruction free up resources. If large introductory courses are online, some faculty time will be exchanged for Teaching Assistants’ time for instruction which will free up faculty for research and to teach small seminars. How well UC is maximizing and utilizing summer sessions should be evaluated. UC should look at upper division courses taught annually that could be taught every other year. Programs should be asked to identify goals and outcomes and identify the high impact practices in research in order to help determine which classes can be large and which ones should be smaller. The cost of the degree is a factor to keep in mind. The most expensive majors could be capped. It is difficult to make specific recommendations without information about the potential cost savings. Graduate students could be given more responsibilities as a way of reducing faculty time in the classroom and

increasing their experience. However, there could be complications in some areas if graduate students teach. If used in major courses, the graduate students may not understand the relationships between the courses or the curriculum. Courses that do not satisfy any requirements might be eliminated first. One member suggests that a more data driven approach to curriculum design should be used. The General Education requirements could be examined and possibly redesigned to produce cost savings. It is not clear that departments are making decisions about courses in light of what is best for the campus. UCEP could develop a list of suggested best practices that departments might consider.

V. UC Quality Education

The Commission on the Future's Education and Curriculum workgroup attempted to define UC quality. Chair Kay asked members if anything is missing from the definition.

Discussion: Members agreed that the definition is good. It was noted that students may not think about the quality of UC. The goal was to articulate how UC is different from the CSUs. The definition is too vague to apply to a particular course. One thing that is missing is what UC is trying to foster for students. Chair Kay will incorporate the committee's feedback and UCEP will endorse the document during its next meeting.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

Forty applications for the online project have been received and a variety of disciplines are represented.

The undergraduate deans met in November and discussed their disappointment with the recommendations related to undergraduate education that came out of the Commission on the Future. The deans will look at the Boyer report and how the ideas in this report can be implemented.

WASC has solicited UC's input into the accreditation process including how to make the process shorter. One change will be that the proposal and capacity review will be combined. Formal input from the Senate will be sought. The streamlining process will take about two years to complete.

VII. New Business

Regent Kieffer is interested in General Education requirements and the university's philosophy of undergraduate education and would like the Regents to think about these issues. UCEP has been asked by Chair Simmons to endorse a resolution Regent Kieffer could offer the Regents' committee on educational policy. The resolution calls for Divisional chairs' presentations on strategic plans to the Regents would include comments on the philosophy of undergraduate education and campus general education.

Discussion: Vice Chair Anderson indicated that it is not really clear what Regent Kieffer is seeking. The Regent seems to be a friend of the faculty and the Senate wants to maintain this. The Regent is not satisfied with the plans at the nine campuses. The WASC materials may contain statements that could be relevant and samples from these may be shown to the Regent. The divisional chairs present strategic plans every three years. The committee unanimously voted to endorse the resolution.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:10 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: David Kay