

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2008

Attending: Stephen McLean, Chair (UCSB), Robert Hendel (UCB), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), David Kay (UCI), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Arthur Little (UCLA), John Yoder (UCD), Daniel Straus (UCR), Rolf Christoffersen (UCSB), Umera Ameen (Undergraduate Student Representative), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Mary Croughan (Academic Council Chair), Harry Powell (Academic Council Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome and Announcements

The current budget situation was a major topic at the Academic Council's October meeting. The budget deficit is now about \$150 million, and another cut is expected mid year. The Office of the President will request a budget for next year that reflects the actual amount needed to educate students, approximately \$900 million more than the budget for 2008-2009. Fees will also be a factor and there will be an increase between 10% and 15%. Business expenses are being cut at UCOP and campuses are making cuts as well. President Yudof has stated that the educational delivery system may need to be modified because the cost of instruction is high.

UCEP will review the new business plan for the Education Abroad Program. In addition to Achieve, Inc., there is a similar effort with the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). UCEP's role in these initiatives is not clear at this point. BOARS has 2007 CPEC data that is consistent with the 2003 data used to create the models for the Entitled to Review (ETR) category. The ETR category is predicted to increase the number of applications by 13%. The Regents have received presentations on the Eligibility Reform Proposal but have not voted. Although the Academic Assembly voted on the 2.8 unweighted grade point average for the ETR category, there is continued discussion about this.

II. Consent Calendar

UCEP minutes from October 6, 2008.

Action: UCEP approved the minutes with several corrections.

III. Proposed Revisions to APMs

There are seven proposed revisions and a proposed new APM.

Discussion: Members were concerned that there was no explanation for why the revision of APM 230-17 is specific to mathematics. The committee endorsed the other revisions and the proposed new APM.

Action: The Chair will draft a statement expressing concern about the revision of APM 230-17 and endorsing the other revisions.

IV. Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Compliance

There is a new policy regarding compliance with the state law requiring sexual harassment prevention training for supervisors.

Discussion: Members discussed the rate of compliance with the state law at different campuses and their experience with the online training. In-person training is preferable. A new version of the online training has been reviewed by Senate leadership. UCEP agreed that the policy should not punish the faculty member's department and removal of the teaching assistants would be problematic for the chair and department. Freezing the faculty member's salary or delaying merit increases would be more effective. The online training should be more meaningful to increase compliance.

Action: UCEP's Chair will draft a statement with the committee's feedback.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Information and Strategic Services and Carol Copperud, Director, Academic Planning

Academic Affairs has been restructured and five new centralized units have been established to handle functions across UCOP. The new units are budget, business resource center, institutional research, communications, and issues management and policies analysis coordination. There is a focus on how UCOP works with the new units. Senate Chair Croughan is part of a small group working on how Student Affairs and Academic Advancement will evolve. The Office of Research and Graduate Studies and the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources are reviewing their activities and the organizational implications. Academic Affairs and Senate leadership are evaluating how best to support committees of the Academic Senate. A directory is being developed to clarify consultants' responsibilities. The identification of needs is ongoing even in cost cutting times.

The development of the accountability framework has been planned for the past couple of years. The goal was to use existing data. A life cycle approach was used in development of the data, and chronological data was used to see trends. A first draft was presented to the President in June and the new version completed in September includes the eight comparison institutions. A public edition will be published in May 2009. The framework will continue to be circulated for comments which will be reviewed and integrated if appropriate. This is a comprehensive introduction to accountability and eventually there will be more detailed sub-reports. The framework can be viewed as a planning guide that

will help UC identify trends and make changes, as well as a tool to help recruit students and retain faculty. Data that is available on a yearly basis could be supplemented by one time analysis of a particular issue and anecdotal information to ensure that UC is looking at the whole picture with respect to educational quality.

Director Copperud will be available to attend future UCEP meetings. The upcoming compendium program review of the proposed UC Davis School of Nursing should be conducted as expeditiously as possible. Director Copperud discussed the joint faculty/administrative Undergraduate Education Planning Group established for system planning. The first priority identified was learning assessments and two task forces were set up to examine campus assessment activities and post graduate outcomes. This work is being done to generate evidence of the quality of the University for the public. Director Copperud will report to UCEP on the progress of the task forces and stated that UCEP should be involved in this work. UCEP noted the challenges of identifying worthwhile measurable outcomes and the need to sometimes rely on qualitative data.

VI. Amendments to Senate Bylaws 125.A.4, 128, and 130

The Chair explained the request for the amendments to these UCAF bylaws.

Discussion: UCEP commented that the justification for adding the UCAF chair to Academic Council is not sufficient and that Council should primarily be for the divisions. Committees should become more aware of issues related to academic freedom and bring them before the Academic Council. UCEP also discussed the ramifications of the proposed two year commitment for the UCAF chair.

Action: The Chair will draft a memo stating UCEP's concerns.

VII. Report from the UC Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education

Discussion: Members commented that this report is very thorough and establishes a cooperative process between UC and the California State University system (CSU). The report does not have much to do with undergraduate education but UCEP agreed to endorse the report.

Action: The analyst will draft a memo regarding UCEP's feedback.

VIII. UC Davis School of Nursing

Chair McLean provided background on the UC Davis School of Nursing proposal. UCEP reviewed the original proposal last year and identified several issues. As soon as the proposal is ready it will be distributed to the committee.

Discussion: It was noted that there is a grant to start the School of Nursing. Professor Wiley helped UCEP review the proposal last year and Chair McLean will ask her to be the lead reviewer.

Action: Chair McLean to contact Professor Wiley.

IX. UC Accountability Framework

Anne Machung, Accountability Project Manager and Sam Agronow, Associate Director, Admissions

Accountability Project Manager Anne Machung has worked intensively on the Accountability Framework for the past six months. Different units at UCOP have participated in the data collection based on the area of expertise. Project Manager Machung distributed written responses to UCEP's initial feedback and Associate Director Agronow distributed a brochure about UC StatFinder that generated some of the data in the framework. More data will be added to the version of the framework to be presented to the Regents in May 2009. The framework will evolve over time.

Discussion: Project Manager Machung summarized the responses to UCEP's suggestions and questions. There are limitations to some data sources and other data may not be collected or verifiable. Proxies and extrapolation techniques have to be utilized for some indicators. Data collected by the campuses is not necessarily easy for UCOP to analyze, and UCEP discussed various strategies to address this in the future. One reason is that across campuses and disciplines things like courses are not classified consistently so the data is not comparable. Databases such as TIE would need to be restructured to obtain data for certain indicators proposed by UCEP. Different comparison institutions may be used for certain indicators when the eight institutions currently in the framework are not the most appropriate, and comparison data is not available for certain indicators.

Action: Chair McLean will finalize the committee's comments.

X. Consultation with Academic Senate Office

The Regents will vote on the Eligibility Reform Proposal in January 2009. The proposal better defines the top 12.5% of graduating seniors to be admitted into UC. The changes will result in more qualified students applying to both UC and CSU. UC's budget will be cut again this academic year. The campuses are looking at ways to manage the budget cuts. The Achieve, Inc. initiative involves California, Illinois and Florida. California already has high content standards, so it will have a limited role. Three separate groups are examining the Master Plan and will look at policy issues. At a recent meeting, the focus was on improving primary and secondary education and graduation rates of transfer students.

XI. Member Items

UCEP reviewed the results of the survey to determine priority topics for the year.

Discussion: A member proposed surveying members again and ranking two priority topics, and eliminating topics that are addressed by other systemwide committees. The committee agreed the preparatory education should be removed from the list of potential topics. UCEP discussed the close relationship among some of the topics but agreed to keep them separate.

Action: The analyst will update and redistribute the survey.

XII. New Business

UC Education Abroad Program Business Plan

Professor Michael Cowan, Acting Executive Director

Although UCEP has not reviewed the new draft business plan for the Education Abroad Program (EAP), Professor Michael Cowan, the program's Acting Executive Director was available to provide UCEP with an overview of the plan. President Yudof requested a business plan that is based on a different funding structure and involves cost cutting. Input from the committees and campus administrative offices will be incorporated into the plan. Professor Cowan is interested in UCEP's input on the policy implications related to the EAP. There are costs in terms of the administrative work to manage the agreements with the exchange program. The value of the EAP's course credit arrangements also needs to be determined since it takes staff time for a department to decide if credit will be given. Faculty should decide if the cost involved with supporting the program is worth it.

UC faculty are sent to one half of the study centers to be in residence directors and the other centers utilize local faculty from host institutions. It costs about \$120,000 annually per UC faculty. There is a question about whether this needs to be done to ensure appropriate UC oversight of programs. The proposal recommends reducing the number of faculty sent over for a major cost savings. The EAP is considering consolidating study centers, sharing staff, and other cost cutting measures. Students are charged their campus's registration and education fees, and campuses may have a fee even though students are not using campus services. Students in programs in London, Paris and Rome are charged an additional fee due to the cost of hiring faculty and using third party providers to help with administration. If the EAP has to rely on student fees, it may charge more for certain programs although this may limit access. Fewer exchange students come to UC.

Undergraduate Involvement in Research

Discussion: A member recommended that UCEP should define research opportunities since this is not necessarily clear in some disciplines. The Chair reminded the committee about UC Undergraduate Experience Survey finding about the students' perception about the conflict. UCEP can identify best practices that faculty can use to change student perception.

Meeting adjourned at 4pm
Minutes taken by Brenda Abrams
Attest: Steve McLean