

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2009

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD), David Kay, Vice-Chair (UCI), Constantin Teleman (UCB), John Yoder (UCD), Jose Wudka (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Gregg Camfield (UCM) (telephone), Gerardo Aldana (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC) (telephone), James Levin (UCSD), Peter Loomer (UCSF), Matthew Palm (Undergraduate Student Representative), Hilary Baxter (Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Dan Greenstein (Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Do Quyen Tran-Taylor (Coordinator, P-20 Programs/Initiatives, Education Partnerships), Rebecca Landes (Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Kathleen Dettman (Director, Institutional Research), Shelley Dommer (Content Manager, Institutional Research), Harry Powell (Academic Senate Chair), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

After welcoming the members to the committee, Chair Williams provided an overview of the Senate structure and described UCEP chair's involvement in other committees such as the Academic Planning Council and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). The Academic Planning Council is a joint Senate/administration committee chaired by the Interim Provost deals with a variety of matters. ICAS has five representatives each from UC, the CSU, and community college systems. The state legislature appreciates that the three systems work together through ICAS on issues of common concern and benefit. The Chair discussed the plan for future UCEP meetings and encouraged members to participate as much as possible in the meetings and to find alternates when necessary.

During the September Academic Council meeting, the preliminary budget that was presented to the Regents was discussed. The budget proposes differential fees for engineering and business for undergraduates. Council will discuss this in October and decide whether to submit comments to the President. The budget situation makes it necessary to do things more efficiently and in less expensive ways while maintaining quality. Between 2001 and 2007, the state budget increased by approximately 30%, UC's budget increased by only 2%, and the prison budget doubled. The UC Commission on the Future has been formed to look at the future of UC with the assumption that the budget will not be restored to where it was in the past. Chair Williams will be involved with one of the Commission's working groups and will seek advice from UCEP members.

ICAS will be proactive this year to get the attention of the legislature in terms of the dire budget situation for higher education. Next year is the 50th anniversary of the Master Plan and a subcommittee of ICAS has been formed to review it to identify the strong points upon which the three segments agree. Members of the state Assembly and Senate are also participating in a review of the Plan, and the Chair noted that recommendations made in the past were not implemented. Due to term limits, the members of the current legislative committee reviewing the Master Plan do not have in depth knowledge of the Plan but individuals who understand the plan are involved with this effort. ICAS has created the Advocacy Task Force which will develop a more forceful and effective message for the state about how the budget is affecting higher education. There is a plan for faculty and students to participate in Higher Education Day in

Sacramento. Online education was discussed at the ICAS meeting with a focus on open textbooks. Chair Williams has been working with Vice Provost Dan Greenstein for the past several months on online education and UCEP members will be asked to get input from the campuses about this. The administration and president are interested in this topic, and the current question is whether faculty can effectively teach online. Chair Williams participated on the Senate task force on remote and online education and a report will be finalized soon. It was noted that the U.S. Department of Education conducted a meta-analysis of online education and while the scope of courses involved was somewhat limited, the overall findings were positive.

The committee chairs met with Interim Provost Larry Pitts last week who announced that there is a new Education Partnerships unit. Cal Teach will be under this unit but there is very limited funding for this initiative. The future of the initiative, formerly known as the Science and Math Initiative, will be discussed during an upcoming meeting. Chair Williams is on the Cal Teach Executive Committee along with one other Senate representative. Minimal funding has sustained the programs at the campuses. Incentives were given to students in the sciences to encourage them to participate in the Cal Teach curriculum, and students were placed in local elementary, junior high, and high schools to get practical experience in the classroom. Some campuses facilitated activities to encourage students to pursue credentials. There is no money left from the original funds raised specifically to support students or the teachers mentoring and supervising students in the schools. A self-review will be undertaken but programs have been notified that they may be unable to continue. The Executive Committee has submitted a letter to the president requesting continued commitment to and support for Cal Teach. UCOP was responsible for initiating Cal Teach in conjunction with the Governor and conducted some fundraising in the beginning. Other topics discussed were funding for the writing exam and whether using shared review of applications across multiple campuses would save money.

The budget and questions related to economizing will be the focus of UCEP discussions this year. The Senate will be actively involved in looking at the various issues related to the budget to ensure that the faculty voice is heard. The UC Commission on the Future's draft issues raise topics that have not previously been on the table. UCEP should make suggestions about things that the Commission should consider and try to document how quality is changing with systematically collected anecdotal information. The Commission will visit the campuses to get input from faculty, staff and administration. The list of Senate members who will participate on the working groups will be finalized soon. The Commission's reports are to be issued in March.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Harry Powell, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Dan Simmons, Academic Senate Vice Chair*
- *Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director*

ICAS met at the beginning of September and in the coming year it will focus on the 50th anniversary of the Master Plan. The Senate's Vice Chair will co-chair a task force reviewing the Plan. A separate committee with participants from ICAS will also review the Plan and Chairs Powell and Williams will be involved with this. There are a number of advocacy activities underway. Administrators, faculty members, and students will be organized into teams and contact legislators and conduct other activities to get out the message.

Online instruction is becoming an important topic and there is an effort to move UC forward in this direction. The UC Commission on the Future will also be interested in this. Innovative

activities that are already underway on the campuses should be explored. Online instruction will make everything faculty do highly visible to administration and change the style of teaching. The implications of online instruction for how faculty work must be carefully considered and it will be important to think about educational policy. UCEP should provide feedback on how to proceed with respect to protecting faculty from any unreasonable oversight. The product of the UC Commission on the Future's work will need to come back to the Senate for review and input. Intercampus initiatives will be examined by the Commission as models that could prevent a program at a single campus from being closed. UCEP should provide input about whether implementing differential fees is a viable strategy. Vice Chair Simmons would like the Senate to be prepared in advance to respond to the UC Commission on the Future's recommendations and also have alternative recommendations. UCEP members are encouraged to provide guidance to the committee chair, Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons.

There have been discussions about the impact of a natural disaster on days of instruction when business has to be suspended. Chair Powell pointed out that during a natural disaster, electronic communication can be very useful. During a past emergency, some faculty members set up websites where students could get information. This year UCEP will discuss how days of instruction are defined and how electronic communication can be utilized on days that are not normal days of instruction so faculty can provide information to students. Executive Director Winnacker briefly discussed Senate travel policies and approval process. Videoconferencing may be used for some meetings in the future.

Discussion: A follow-up question was asked about online communication in emergencies. There are not explicit procedures on most of the campuses explaining what should be done during these events. During an emergency the chancellor consults with the divisional senate chair who then consults with the chair of the division's educational policy committee. One question is how UCOP can assist the campuses if a system at the campus level breaks down. Chair Powell indicated that online instruction is costly to maintain over the years due to the technical support required. The Senate should be prepared for any type of disruption, and there should be policies in the event of breakdowns in the structure of the Senate itself. UCD is developing policies to address the breakdown in Senate structure. An online course would undergo the same review procedure as other courses. The issue of campuses that are on quarter or semester schedules needs to be considered. There are certain courses that are more likely to be funded and have commonality across the campuses such as language courses and some lower division introductory courses. The distinction between UC's online courses and less costly courses offered by other institutions will need to be made clear. There is a deficit of a million dollars related to administering and grading the writing course, the Subject A Exam.

A committee member commented that UC's message is not getting out to the public and encouraged Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons to make sure this is done more effectively through ICAS. Vice Chair Simmons pointed out the state legislature listens to students so UC needs to work with students on advocacy. The student Regents will participate in the Senate's meetings with the legislators and legislative representative's staff. The three segments in ICAS and the campuses need to have one clear message for the legislators. It is also critical to deliver the message about the importance of UC to the general public for a longer-term impact. The message should also be delivered to students in a way that they can take to their parents and to local government. The fact that California students are not getting into UC needs to be addressed, and this trend will increase in the future as UC admits more out of state students.

III. Online Education Initiative

- *Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*
- *Do Quyen Tran-Taylor, Coordinator P-20 Programs/Initiatives, Education Partnerships*
- *Rebecca Landes, Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

Vice Provost Greenstein provided the committee with an overview of the online education initiative and pilot project. Questions include whether access to education can be extended by increasing the use of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum and whether the use of online instruction will allow students to enroll in classes they cannot otherwise get into because the courses are impacted. Online instruction is also being explored as a means to deliver courses across campuses. The aim of the pilot is to learn by implementing online courses whether there are opportunities that UC is not taking full advantage of. UCOP is proposing to raise dedicated funding that will be distributed as a result of a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to faculty who are interested in developing and delivering online courses. Steps have been taken to consult widely with faculty, and Chair Williams has provided input over the past several months. The Senate's online instruction task force has considered how the Senate would evaluate online instruction. Students might be surveyed to collect information about the types of courses that could be offered online and the types of students who would take them. A series of focus groups with faculty have been conducted to identify faculty concerns and get input on how to shape the initiative. There do not appear to be any Senate policies that would impede the project. The idea is that a joint Administrative/Senate oversight body would be set up under the Academic Planning Council, and there will be consultation with UCEP. The idea of a pre-proposal emerged from the focus groups as a way to tap into ideas that have not been considered. UCEP's input on whether there are issues related to Senate policies is wanted.

Discussion: There was a question about whether faculty workload will be impacted. It will need to be confirmed that the online courses count for the faculty's teaching. Measurements should be made to determine if online courses are equally effective as a traditional course. The goal would be to raise \$10 to \$20 million dollars to implement 20 to 40 courses and create a community among the faculty developing these courses. These faculty will work on issues such as controlling who is taking the exams for online courses. The cost of these types of courses varies and the proposal may overestimate the budget to cover ancillary costs. Whether online education can be tailored to the courses that are the best fit is a question and the RFP process will give some direction with respect to this. UC should not attempt to compete with the non-profit institutions offering online education, and the Vice Provost noted that the selective enrollment UC would offer is not widely available.

The RFP process will help identify a research/evaluation team that will develop the evaluation framework. People would apply to work on the evaluation component through the RFP. Faculty may propose to offer a blend of in person and online interaction. Some type of interaction between faculty and students will probably be incorporated into the courses. A comment was made that some aspects of online education may make it more costly than delivering traditional courses. The Vice Provost pointed out that this is an opportunity to explore the feasibility of online instruction and whether there are advantages in an online community that are not available in person. Online instruction may also offer the opportunity to deliver instruction without negatively effecting quality. Different types of costs should be considered such as how much

faculty time is required for online courses. The impact of online education on the students who lack social capital should be evaluated. Online education may work well for students who are highly motivated but less well for others who benefit from face to face interaction. Issues that need to be examined include maintaining quality, learning outcomes, pedagogy, and cost and revenue. The consensus is to get experience with online education by starting with UC students and then explore distance learning with students outside UC. The question of whether there should be minimum standards for these courses was raised. One concern is about the ability of students who are not prepared for UC overall to participate in online courses, and there should be strong provisions for contact with and support from faculty.

A committee member reported concerns about the potential negative impact of online instruction on UC's image depending on how it is marketed. How the quality of a UC education will be maintained online is a significant question. Several comments were made about the importance of cohorts and that strategies to facilitate peer interaction are needed. The percentage of instruction that should be online should be considered. Carnegie Mellon and Open University have offered to partner with UC and there are other experts in this field who could help faculty formally determine their needs. A firm timeline needs to be established but the next step is to develop and release a pre-proposal and determine the direction of the pilot. UCOP will pursue large scale funding opportunities and at least one foundation has already expressed some interest. The Vice Provost commented that the Arabic Without Walls course has faced administrative difficulties. A member remarked that online instruction could be a significant benefit to students with disabilities. There are different opinions about how courses with labs could incorporate online instruction. Members should meet with their campuses' Committee on Courses to consider whether there are any issues or policies that need to be considered as the initiative moves forward. The Committee on Courses can also advise faculty.

Action: UCEP members were encouraged to discuss this topic with the divisional committees and to think about any Senate policies that would have some bearing on online instruction. Chair Williams will draft a letter for the members to provide to their Committee on Courses to notify them about the online education initiative and to ask them to identify potential policy issues or constraints at their campus.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning Programs and Coordination*

The Academic Planning Analyst reviewed the proposed establishment of differential fees for undergraduate programs in engineering and business. The fee would begin at the equivalent of the start of a student's junior year. There are a number of unresolved issues outlined in the briefing paper prepared by the UCOP budget office. It is not clear how this will be presented to the Regents in November since it is a significant policy step.

Discussion: The differential fees would net UC \$10 million. The proposal may create the precedent for implementing differential fees by campus. At one campus, faculty in the engineering department are concerned that differential fees by major will have a negative impact on diversity. There are also concerns about placing a higher value on some majors compared to others. Another concern is the impact on the mission of UC to provide a public education. Data from the AAU and other public institutions that shows the impact of changing to differential fees should be examined. It was noted that the short timeline for providing input is problematic.

The point has been raised that implementing differential fees for these two majors may cripple any future efforts to raise fees overall. It is still to be decided whether the additional fees will go to the campus general fund directly or to OP and then redistributed to the campuses. The goals of the additional fees are not supported with any data that shows the cost of the courses. UCEP can submit a letter to Council expressing the committee's concerns about the limited opportunity for comment. One concern is that this is a major policy issue that may change how the university is viewed. Other issues include the potential impact on diversity and access. This would be a significant policy change in terms of how UC will deal with the fiscal crisis. There is a need for more data before making a decision.

Action: Chair Williams and the committee analyst will draft a letter to Senate Chair Powell.

V. UC Decision Support System

- *Kathleen Dettman, Director, Institutional Research*
- *Shelley Dommer, Content Manager, Institutional Research*

Institutional Research is a new unit bringing together data from throughout UCOP and collecting data that will be of use to the campuses. IR will be working on a website that makes information more readily available. Data comes primarily from the campuses to OP as well as from some external data sets. The first phase of IR's work will be on payroll and personnel. The second phase, on students, is being launched now. A survey on enrollments, admissions and financial aid will be conducted. There were 250 responses to the survey on payroll and personnel and a common theme was the need for a human resources information system.

Discussion: Institutional Research will eventually make data available to the campuses that will help with assessment. Chair Williams indicated that UCEP would like access to data that shows how things have changed as a result of the budget situation.

VI. Arabic Without Walls

Several years ago the Senate passed Regulation 544 which made a course offered at one campus count at other campuses and the course would be listed in the systemwide courses catalog. This would provide students with access to courses taught elsewhere. Students need to get several levels of approval to get credit. UCEP has authority for final approval of systemwide courses but has not had the opportunity to do this yet. Arabic Without Walls has been approved at UCI. If UCEP believes this course is an appropriate systemwide course a request will be made to Academic Planning to enter the course in campus catalogues.

Discussion: How the course would be listed and how students would be directed to the catalog need to be determined. This could be the test case for how adding a course to the catalog is managed. There will be complicated administrative issues such as whether fees would be shared by the campus offering the course and the student's campus. The issue of approval for credit towards a major needs to be resolved but campuses do have to accept the credit toward graduation. The Language Consortium, based at UCD, is part of a multiple campus effort that developed Arabic Without Walls. The course was started at UCB and then moved to UCI. There was a motion to approve Arabic Without Walls as a systemwide course. A friendly amendment to the motion that UCEP advises that this and all systemwide courses should come with appropriately clear information to students about the implications of enrolling was accepted. UCEP should request a report from the Language Consortium on how this works. The committee on courses will review and approve the course syllabus and UCEP expands it systemwide and

requests that it be added to the systemwide catalog. The UCEP policy for approval and listing of systemwide courses is not an official UC policy but will be sent to anyone interested in creating a systemwide course.

Action: Seven members approved the request to place the course as a systemwide course and one member opposed it. The committee unanimously approved the UCEP policy on systemwide courses.

VII. Education Abroad Program Governing Committee

The EAP report and recommendations will be sent out for systemwide review, therefore the committee does not need to discuss this in depth today. Since the UCD representative to UCEP was on the EAP task force Chair Williams will ask him to be on the Governing Committee.

Action: The UCLA representative volunteered to participate on the Governing Committee. The UCD representative will be asked to participate on the Committee.

VIII. Member Items

This item was not discussed.

IX. New Business

The committee should identify potential goals for UCEP for 2009-2010.

Discussion: The committee briefly discussed monitoring the impact of the budget crisis on quality, which will include determining how quality is defined and determining what has changed. The committee should systematically collect anecdotes so that it becomes useful qualitative data. What has more and less impact on quality should be documented. Members discussed concerns about stating that the quality of a UC education has diminished.

X. Executive Session

There was no executive session.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams