

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2009

**Attending:** Stephen McLean, Chair (UCSB), Taradas Bandyopadhyay, Vice Chair (UCR), Ellen Oliensis (UCB), David Kay (UCI), Gregg Camfield (UCM), David Funder (UCR), Rolf Christoffersen (UCSB)(via teleconference), Stefan Llewellyn-Smith (UCSD)(via teleconference), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Joan Etzell (UCSF)(via teleconference), Keith Williams (UCD), Hilary Baxter (Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Mary Croughan (Senate Chair), Martha Winnacker (Senate Executive Director), Harry Powell (Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

**I. Announcements**

The budget was discussed at the last Council meeting and the defeat of the initiatives has resulted in significant cuts to UC. The governor's proposed 2009-2010 UC budget is about \$2.5 billion (as compared to ~\$3.3B in 2007-08), with \$520 million in additional cuts. It is proposed that CalGrant will be phased out and students entering in 2009 will not receive this funding. The furlough policy was discussed at length. Furloughs may start with turning paid holidays into unpaid holidays which saves \$130 million, just a quarter of what needs to be saved. Some members of Council wanted to reject the entire furlough policy, considering it too flawed, but Council decided to suggest revisions. Problems with the policy should be reduced by separating natural disasters from fiscal emergencies. The president is interested in having a policy that includes Senate participation in the process. Rather than campuses making across-the-board cuts, UCOP is pushing hard for strategic cuts such as the elimination of programs. UCFW and TFIR are looking at the retirement system and the forecast is dire. To keep the system solvent, the state and employees should be contributing at least 17% because of increasing liability through accumulating years of service every year. The plan is to amortize the 17% over 15 years, meaning that contributions will start small and increase over time. Two-thirds of the contribution will come from non-state funds including grants. TFIR recommends that beginning July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 11.5% more in contributions should be made by the state.

UCOLASC introduced a letter asking Council to support open access. House Bill 801 has been introduced in Congress to end NIH's open access policy. In addition to opposing this bill, UCOLASC wants to lobby NSF and other funding agencies to have similar open access policies. Faculty will be encouraged to publish in open access journals and UCOLASC wants to negotiate with publishers to provide open access. UCOLASC's recommendations were endorsed by Council. UCEP's letter recommending support for UCUES was endorsed. The request to repeal SR 764 was approved and will be sent out for systemwide review and acted upon in the next academic year. The request to include student affairs in its charge was approved and will go out for review as well. The proposed membership of a task force on UC's future includes divisional chairs, UCEP's chair, and other systemwide committees. The task force has not been approved yet and the president would like it to include a broader constituency. A bill introduced by Senator Yee has been introduced that would reduce UC's autonomy. This is a grave threat to the University of California as we know it.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved with one correction.

### **III. Undergraduate Research Opportunities**

The paper has been revised considerably by Elizabeth Berkes from the Student Experience in the Research University project. Changes were primarily made to the beginning and end of the paper. A new section on policy will be removed from this paper because it is not relevant to the parents, students and legislators who comprise the audience. Because the policy section advocates for more detailed and accurate data gathering regarding undergraduate research, it should help build a case for funding the infrastructure for collection of such information. Chair McLean will speak with Lynn Tierney about how to disseminate the paper.

**Discussion:** A member suggested that the UC Communications unit can pull key points for public relations purposes from the white paper. A few additional revisions were suggested. The white paper should eventually be placed on the websites for each campus and undergraduate deans receive the paper. Once finalized, it will be submitted to Council. SERU has asked UCEP to write a letter indicating that it would be helpful to have a system to chronicle the undergraduate participation in research in a quantitative way. One campus is adding information about undergraduate research in response to its accreditation process. The information will be on the biographical bibliography which will be electronic on each campus.

**Action:** Members will email any revisions to Chair McLean and will receive an updated version to review. Chair McLean will draft the letter requested by SERU.

### **IV. Consultation with the Office of the President**

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

The Academic Planning Council will meet in June and will review the Undergraduate Effectiveness Task Force report. UCOP will work on a broad message to the Regents about student success. One piece of this is the work of the Post Graduate Outcomes Task Force which will develop an alumni survey. The mechanics of the project are being handled by the Institutional Research unit. A recommendation will be made that all campuses have a process to communicate what students are learning. The process will also involve looking at the existing data in new ways. Another idea is to make a pool of money available to faculty through an RFP to support looking at existing standardized tests that could be used to measure some outcomes.

### **V. Impacted Majors**

The paper has been updated and UCEP needs to determine what will be done with it.

**Discussion:** A suggested recommendation is that departments try to have common pre-major courses as much as possible to give students more flexibility if they are not succeeding in their first major. Students tend to postpone the courses that would help determine their success in the major. Students select a major based on their experience in high school, instead of exploring other subjects. UCEP discussed the role of counseling and it was noted that student to student counseling can be effective as long as the student counselors are trained. Some of the impacted majors may be impacted because of the lack of counseling. Regular opportunities for faculty counseling should be available. The importance of general education in helping students chose the right major will be emphasized. Departments with impacted majors should develop exit strategies to help students figure out their options and assist them with selecting alternative majors. Freshman seminars might provide opportunities for faculty to advise students although it is not clear how many freshman take them. A suggestion was made that campuses should look at

the G.P.A. requirements for courses and pre-majors and departments should provide the justification for setting the G.P.A related to the prediction of success. It was noted that students may be admitted to UC with a lower G.P.A. than is required for some pre-majors. The effect on diversity should also be considered. The paper in impacted majors will go to Council, and can be useful to the undergraduate education deans/provosts, directors of student affairs, and the CEPs. Divisional Senates will eventually need to establish policies on managing impacted majors. The description of what happens to a major that is impacted is important.

**Action:** Chair McLean will finalize the paper.

#### **IV. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Cooperative Extension Program**

The reviews of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Cooperative Extension Program do not have a significant relationship to undergraduate education, but UCEP has an opportunity to comment on the reports.

**Discussion:** One member noted that the relationship between UC and the DANR and CE Program is not very clear. Some staff in these programs may teach. There may an interface between the research that happens at the campuses and what is happening at farms. As a land grant college, UC should be doing this work. DANR has been successful and has probably contributed millions of dollars to the economy. The programs transfer knowledge from UC researchers to the general public. There is a question about whether DANR and the CE program have line items in the budget or if they compete with other programs for funding. It was noted that there is less funding available for ANR activities. There was general skepticism regarding the wisdom of granting senate status to 'Extension' specialists'.

**Action:** Chair McLean will draft a letter with the committee's comments.

#### **VII. Non-resident Enrollment**

UCEP reviewed the non-resident enrollment materials at a previous meeting and concluded that staying within the 10-15% range would be good. UCFW has expressed dismay over the lack of communication and coordination between UCOP and the campuses and indicated that UC should plan ahead. Bringing in out of state and international students may be a way for a campus to grow. BOARS suggested that non-resident tuition should not be considered a revenue source. A few campuses would like, and can accommodate, growth. The number of high school graduates will level out in the future which means the number of in state students can remain the same and non-residents can be added. Students from out of state will be in higher socioeconomic strata. Out of state students can become in state students but must be able to demonstrate independence from their parents. More faculty FTE may be supported with increased non-resident enrollment and there may be ways to improve ethnic and cultural diversity.

**Discussion:** It is important for in-state students to benefit as a result of increased numbers of out of state students. Benefits include adding to return to aid and enhancing the educational experience by studying with students from outside California. Increasing the number of out of state students requires outreach which now is happening only on a limited basis. It will be easier for some campuses to attract students from out of state than for others. An analysis of how many out of state students would be needed to support the current students who are not funded by the state has not been conducted. The creative budget task force is considering charging non-resident students differential fees but a question is whether the additional funding would be redistributed to the other campuses. UC's non-resident tuition may be the highest in the nation so the demand

may decrease if it is raised. Differential fees for in state students are being considered due to the worsening budget situation. Increasing non-resident students is only worthwhile if they do more than pay for themselves. It was noted that there is an international market for students. The marginal cost of instruction is probably too low and there may be more than 11,000 students for which UC is not receiving funds. The committee agreed that for educational reasons increasing out of state students is a good thing and that the master plan should be maintained.

**Action:** Chair McLean will draft a letter for the committee's review.

## **VIII. UCEP Priorities for 2009-2010**

UCEP should identify topics to focus on in the next academic year.

**Discussion:** The list of topics to focus on next year includes: UC's budget; assessment and accountability, and UCEP's potential facilitation of related efforts; the structure of general education; disaster planning on campuses and at UCOP including reviewing existing policies and identifying best practices for communicating with students; defining what characterizes a UC course; changes to the quality of UC and how these can be mitigated; additional questions for UCUES; and the international baccalaureate.

## **IX. Science and Math Initiative**

- *Keith Williams (UCD), Cal Teach Executive Committee*

SMI started five years ago with a pact between the governor and UC. The program has evolved to be known as Cal Teach but is still known by policy makers as SMI. The goal was to have one thousand teachers that had been to UC. The governor's office provided funding which UC had to match, and each campus was to get \$250,000. Approximately \$4 million in external funds were raised by OP to provide for non-instructional activities and these have been expended. There are questions about how SMI will be funded in the future. President Yudof wants OP to be minimally involved in the future and for campuses to lead activity at the local level. There is concern about the disinvestment by OP. Issues have arisen as the program transitioned to the campuses. The president has been advised that the program is important to faculty. Intel withdrew funding when OP was no longer directing the project. The expectation was that OP would be involved in external fundraising. The Cal Teach Executive Committee has written a letter to the president that will also be signed by UCEP and submitted to Council. Campuses may be forced to compete with one another for the external funds. With OP's lack of involvement there is concern that this is an example of start and starve.

**Discussion:** Data shows that 50% of science and math teachers in California are from out of state so Cal Teach is important to the state. But at at least one campus, momentum of Cal Teach programs is being impacted due to concerns that the funding is not permanent. Some concern was expressed about the wisdom of moving toward a four-year certification program, but part of the Cal Teach program is to offer participants classroom experience beginning in the first year. Research shows that increased classroom experience leads to improved future retention.

**Action:** The committee voted for the UCEP chair to sign the letter to the president.

## **X. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Harry Powell, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The dimensions of the budget crisis are only now becoming clear. The Senate is deeply involved in looking at the crisis but at the same time, faculty need to look at the situation from the

perspective of citizens of California. ICAS is becoming more important and working as ambassadors of higher education. It will be a key vehicle for work being done by the Senate. It is the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the master plan which gives ICAS the opportunity to look at the pros and cons of the plan. A celebration is being planned that would focus on the first 50 years of the master plan and the future. The event will also include examining initiatives in other countries. All campuses will be included. UC's relationship with the CSUs and community colleges is an advantage. Vice Chair Powell reported on ICAS-Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) meeting. One topic was the international baccalaureate degree. The CSUs have decided to accept the score of four in foreign languages, math and theater arts whereas UC expects scores of five, six or seven. UC has not been asked to change what is expected. The international baccalaureate may replace Advanced Placement.

## **XI. New Business**

UCEP reviewed the memo on UCORP's concept paper on the seminar network. The memo addresses concerns about the exclusion of the Arts and Humanities.

**Discussion:** The committee discussed the tone of the memo and suggested that the feedback should not call for a complete revision of the concept paper.

**Action:** Chair McLean will draft a memo.

The committee thanked Chair McLean for his service as chair. Chair McLean thanked the members for their collegiality, active participation and contributions during the year.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:30

Minutes prepared by Brenda Abrams

Attest: Steve McLean