WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 1: Manage educational resources more effectively and efficiently to (1) increase the proportion of undergraduate students graduating in four years, (2) create a pathway for undergraduate students to complete degrees in three years, (3) make more effective use of faculty resources, and (4) maintain or improve the undergraduate student experience.

By identifying and eliminating curricular, procedural and policy barriers that impede student progress towards a degree (e.g., improving efficiency in course scheduling, curricular redesign) and implementing programs that encourage a shorter time to degree (e.g., incentives for using AP/IB/honors credits, streamlining degrees or increase use of summer sessions), the University may be able to increase the proportion of students graduating in four years or less. Such strategies should not negatively affect the student experience but, instead, should improve the undergraduate experience by providing students with a clearer and more well-defined path to achieving their degree objectives.

Three specific actions are recommended:

1. Increase the proportion of undergraduate students graduating in four years or less, using a variety of means, including:
    a. Implement more strategic use of degree audit system on campuses, especially to plan and manage course offerings.
    b. Examine curricular programs and teaching policies with a goal of increasing throughput/ time-to-degree while maintaining quality programs. This process should identify and mediate challenges with access to gateway and major courses that delay student progress and implement solutions. In addition, prerequisite and degree requirement courses should be examined in detail to ensure that these courses are offered and that flexible strategies for degree completion are implemented without impacting quality.
    c. Raise average unit loads of term completion to 15 quarter/semester credits[1] for undergraduates while being mindful of student work hours, and consider putting stricter limits on the maximum number of units allowed over the course of undergraduate study.
    d. Implement firmer policies on registration and drop deadlines and other procedures for impacted courses.

2. Create a defined three-year pathway for completion of existing degree requirements for undergraduate students who are willing to accept a pre-defined set of conditions, including:
    a. Required summer session attendance with efforts to ensure courses would be available (e.g., some GE requirements taken in the summer before the start of the freshman year, and additional GE, prerequisites, and major preparation required during subsequent summer sessions).
    b. Full use of AP/IB/honors credits.

---

[1] See Appendix A for Year Average Student Credit Hours. Most campuses are under 15 credits.

     c. Incentives, such as priority enrollment and financial incentives for students/families to sign up for this path (e.g., guarantee a fixed fee level for 3 years, reduced student contribution from summer work).

     d. Develop streamlined major programs with structured course scheduling and less degree flexibility in return for guarantees that classes will be available as scheduled.

     e. Identify entry requirements for students who want to take this option that helps ensure they are both prepared and capable of an accelerated degree program.

     f. Identify the changes to advising and registration procedures that will support a 3-year program.

3. Make more effective use of faculty resources

     a. Ensure that existing policies for faculty workload and course release are regularly being evaluated and followed.

     b. Extend the use made of research grant funding to buy out ladder faculty from instruction. Realize savings by using non-ladder faculty to backfill for instruction.

     c. Identify ways to involve advanced graduate students more effectively in regular and summer session teaching efforts, while ensuring that appropriate mentoring by faculty occurs.[2]

The fourth objective is more general, but most of the implementation steps that facilitate degree completion in three and four years also should be of educational and financial benefit to students in undergraduate degree programs.

4. Maintain or improve the undergraduate degree experience especially in times of resource constraints through actions designed to eliminate unnecessary course-taking (e.g., reducing excessive upper division degree requirements to allow students more curricular freedom, improving advising services and tools so students do not take unnecessary courses).

Rationale:

- Benefit to society. Students graduating quicker can enter the workforce earlier and contribute to the state's social, cultural, and economic development.

- Benefit for students/families. Graduating in fewer terms would mean substantial savings (e.g., campus fees, housing and living expenses, and school loans) for students and their families.

- Benefit to the University.   Examining and streamlining degree requirements provides the University an opportunity to update its educational objectives and better manage its curricular offerings.   The University would make more effective and efficient use of its resources and produce more degrees for the same level of enrollment. There would be opportunities for graduate students to hone their teaching skills and receive additional support. University facilities would be more fully utilized during regular terms and especially summer session.

---

[2] See Academic Senate position in April 2008 document entitled "Proposal for Modified Regulations and Guidelines Governing the Participation of Graduate Students in Delivering University Instruction."
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/ac.gsi.memo.apm.410.05%2008%20.pdf

Impact on Access:

- Improved time to degree will result in more available spaces at the University for additional students. UC will be able to accommodate more students and more students will have access to a UC education. If 5-10% of UC undergraduate students graduated one quarter/semester earlier, this would free up approximately 2,000 to 4,000 undergraduate spaces.[3]

- Students may be more interested in attending UC if they are guaranteed a 3 or 4 year degree and have the opportunity to reduce their total costs. Because summer fees are slightly less than regular term fees, there would be some small savings to the student/family. In addition, the student could enter the workforce more quickly and start earning income. If a UC undergraduate student graduated one quarter/semester earlier, the savings to the student/family is estimated at $8,895 for one quarter and $13,342 for one semester.[4]

- Programs will have to be designed carefully to ensure that qualified students have equitable access to the opportunities for accelerated progress.

Impact on Quality:

- Education quality and student development. With less time on campus in a three year degree, students have less time to develop interpersonal skills, leadership skills, life-coping skills, and skills developed outside the classroom. They also have less time to gain volunteer, research, and work experience, and explore other co-curricular options, such as studying abroad. There will also likely be fewer options available within the curriculum due to scheduling restrictions.

- Campus Experience. With improved access to required courses (e.g., not becoming a year behind in their studies because they cannot register for a required course in a sequence), students may have a more positive educational experience.

Fiscal Implications:

- Reduce the cost per degree to the state and the University by efficient use of campus facilities and instructional personnel. Contributes to affordability for students. Also, summer instructional costs are often lower because of how summer session courses are offered.

- Operating costs: there could be savings because more students would be educated in lower-cost summer sessions and through better use of excess capacity in regular terms. Curricular redesign could reduce the number of overall courses offered for some savings (assuming classroom capacity).

- Facility and maintenance costs: there could be long-term cost savings for the University because summer session courses and more efficient use of capacity would be less costly options than building more traditional capacity in the non-summer terms. On the other hand, some studies have shown that more use of buildings in the summer does not allow "down" time for deferred maintenance and drives up on-going maintenance expenses.

---

[3]Source: UCOP Corporate Student System.

[4] Calculations based on Estimated Average Cost of Attendance (averaging on/off campus living & including fee increase)

Challenges:

- Low participation. In 1994 and 1995, the campuses implemented the "Finish-in-Four" programs. Participation of each campus' freshman class varied from a handful of students to 16 percent. However, with today's higher fees, students and families may be more interested in 3 or 4 year degree paths.

- Negative effect on working students if the average unit loads were raised to 15 quarter/semester credits for undergraduates.

- Faculty buy-out may be negatively perceived as releasing faculty from their instructional responsibilities.

Next Steps for Implementation:

- Implementation methods (short term):
  - Curricular planning and efficiency in course offerings through degree audit systems, gateway courses, and deployment of faculty to courses of greatest demand
  - Curricular redesign to rationalize and streamline degree requirements, especially upper division degree requirements (e.g., UCLA's Challenge 45)
  - Increase student average completed units per term (i.e., policies, advising, and incentives)
  - Better use of summer session and alternative scheduling in regular terms
  - Concurrent enrollment across campuses and across segments
  - Identify and eliminate procedural barriers to appointment of advanced graduate student as instructors of record

- Implementation methods (long term):
  - Consider changes in mix/type of faculty deployed to various courses
  - Alternatives for entry level courses (e.g., math and writing requirements)
  - Create incentives for more outside credit (AP/IB/honors/CCC, etc.)
  - Financial incentives to avoid excess units over the term of study
  - Offer self-supporting programs built on existing strengths to generate revenues to support core activities

Other Options Considered:

- Increased class size.

- Encourage more cross-campus enrollment.

- Programs should regularly demonstrate that their major requirements can be completed, under normal circumstances, within four years (120/180 unit degree).

APPENDIX A

Undergraduate course loads are
under 15 units/term at seven campuses

Year Average Student Credit Hours Undergraduate Academic Year: 2008, Report Date: 02/17/10			
	Lower Div	**Upper Div**	**Campus Average**
Berkeley	14.99	14.84	14.88
Davis	14.62	14.54	14.57
Irvine	15.13	14.83	14.94
Los Angeles	14.83	14.36	14.48
Merced	14.88	14.85	14.87
Riverside	14.87	14.52	14.70
San Diego	15.79	14.69	15.02
Santa Barbara	14.87	14.56	14.69
Santa Cruz	15.43	15.09	15.25

Excludes Self-supporting programs and Education Abroad enrollments.

Excludes summer enrollments.

3 term average except Berkeley and Merced which are on the semester systems.

Averages above 15 are highlighted in grey.

Source—Gateway report "CC350B: Year Average Student Credit Hours & FTE Calculation by Level, General Campus, Academic Year: 2008, Report Date: 02/17/2010"

Year Enter	Number In Entering Class	Graduate in 3-Years	Graduate in 4-Years	Graduate in 5-Years-	Graduate in 6-Years-	Years-to-Degree - Elapsed Time
			University of California **ENTERING FALL FRESHMEN GRADUATING BETWEEN THREE AND SIX YEARS** Universitywide (all campuses combined, unduplicated counts)			
1996	23,822	1.2%	44.1%	73.1%	78.7%	4.4
1997	24,595	1.5%	46.0%	74.4%	79.6%	4.3
1998	26,006	1.7%	47.5%	75.7%	80.4%	4.3
1999	27,172	1.8%	50.3%	77.0%	81.4%	4.3
2000	28,278	2.2%	50.9%	77.0%	81.0%	4.3
2001	30,175	2.5%	53.7%	77.4%	81.4%	N/A
2002	31,171	2.5%	55.8%	78.4%	82.3%	N/A
2003	31,572	2.5%	56.6%	78.4%	N/A	N/A
2004	29,502	2.8%	58.8%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005	31,403	2.9%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Year Enter	Number In Entering Class	NUMBER Graduate in 3-Years	NUMBER Graduate in 4-Years	NUMBER Graduate in 5-Years	NUMBER Graduate in 6-Years	
1996	23,822	288	10,505	17,412	18,747	
1997	24,595	379	11,302	18,290	19,578	
1998	26,006	433	12,365	19,675	20,912	
1999	27,172	480	13,681	20,932	22,107	
2000	28,278	609	14,392	21,760	22,894	
2001	30,175	766	16,207	23,367	24,554	
2002	31,171	775	17,383	24,451	25,647	
2003	31,572	783	17,869	24,754	N/A	
2004	29,502	840	17,337	N/A	N/A	
2005	31,403	905	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Source: Files Prepared for UC StatFinder- http://statfinder.ucop.edu

Prepared by Institutional Research for Academic Planning, sja, 12-16-09

		Persistence Rates			Graduation Rates			
Year	Entering Fall Enrollees	Year 1	Year 2	Year 2	Year 3 Rate	Year 3 # Grads	Year 4	Elapsed years to Degree
2006	11,585	92.5	83.0	52.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005	11,688	92.2	83.4	51.9	81.0	9,467	N/A	N/A
2004	11,254	92.2	82.9	52.5	80.6	9,071	86.2	N/A
2003	10,826	92.1	83.2	50.9	80.0	8,661	85.5	N/A
2002	9,858	91.6	82.1	47.3	78.7	7,758	84.7	N/A
2001	9,358	92.6	82.9	44.9	77.6	7,262	84.5	N/A
2000	8,727	92.4	83.1	43.9	77.2	6,737	83.9	2.5
1999	8,045	91.8	82.4	43.4	75.8	6,098	83.2	2.5
1998	7,689	92.1	82.0	42.0	75.6	5,813	83.3	2.5
1997	7,634	90.7	81.2	39.4	72.9	5,565	80.9	2.5

Table title: **ENTERING UPPER DIVISION FALL CCC TRANSFERS GRADUATING WITHIN TWO TO FOUR YEARS** — Universitywide (all campuses combined, unduplicated counts)

University of California, StatFinder Version 2.04, Created on Friday, March 20, 2009 6:28 PM

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 2: Continue timely exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum, as well as in self-supporting graduate degrees and Extension programs.

Online education is a rapidly maturing phenomenon whose presence is growing in undergraduate, graduate, and extension curricula at UC and peer institutions. If questions related to quality, cost, workload and support can be appropriately answered, it appears to afford potential opportunities to:

- improve UC students' time to degree;
- create some distinctive opportunities with respect to course content, social networking applications, and differing learning opportunities or needs;
- extend UC's reach in academic preparation of university-bound high school and community college students (e.g., through dual-enrollment);
- satisfy unmet need for post-baccalaureate degrees and certificates that prepare students for work in occupations that are in particularly high-demand in California; and
- generate revenues and create workload efficiencies that support the University's educational mission.

By continuing exploration into the use of online instruction in undergraduate, graduate, and extension programs – by studying efficacy, cost, impact on workload, etc., and identifying the infrastructure that is needed for successful deployment – the University positions itself in a leadership role in pedagogical innovation while taking advantage of these intrinsic opportunities. A key consideration will be a thorough evaluation of the quality of online courses. UC excellence is premised on ensuring a high level of educational quality in every course no matter the delivery vehicle.

Accordingly, the working group recommends the expeditious pursuit of the pilot project being coordinated by the Office of the President which, with appropriate Academic Senate oversight and faculty participation, will develop and deliver up to 40 online undergraduate courses, evaluating their quality, learning effectiveness, workload impacts, costs, etc. This recommendation is consistent with that of the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency which suggested the development of a joint task force to explore the benefits and challenges of online instruction.[1]

With dedicated external funding, the pilot initiative will

- build experience in a broad range of disciplines (e.g., arts and humanities, social sciences, physical and biological sciences) and levels within the curriculum (e.g., developmental, lower division gateway, general education, and some upper division);
- explore the efficacy of teaching online courses to students at other campuses and work to streamline administrative impediments to the process;

---

[1] Report of Special Senate Committee on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency, http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/hp2apc_remote-online_110209.pdf

- explore different online modalities for hybrid and fully-online courses to identify those that work best in different UC educational settings;
- be evaluated according to a common framework that ensures consistent and comparable evidence is gathered and brought to bear on issues having to do with whether online education can cost effectively achieve required learning outcomes and/or deliver required academic quality (the Academic Senate should be centrally involved in developing the process for assessment of quality);
- build experience within the Academic Senate with regard to the review and evaluation of online courses and resolve any issues related to residency and online courses;
- provide some opportunity (e.g., through summer sessions or dual enrollment) to assess fully-distant learning options; and
- provide an opportunity to assess policy and procedural actions that may be required to support high-quality online education at UC.

<u>Rationale:</u>

- *Improve students' time to degree* by permitting them to take online a proportion of the courses required in order to graduate. Focusing online education on high-demand major requirement (gateway), general education, and developmental courses promises particular benefits as does (in the longer term) the development or delivery of such courses across campuses. Offering online courses during summer session also allows current students to complete required courses from a distance (e.g., from home, while working, or while away on an internship program). The financial benefit to a student could be considerable. As new faculty hires are curtailed owing to budgetary pressures, greater demand is being made on our ability to deliver needed courses. If online education of appropriate quality can be shown to help provide more efficient access to students in selected areas, that could help meet teaching needs in a way that does not increase faculty workloads.

- *Extend UC's reach and impact in academic preparation* by offering selected online courses as produced for use by UC students, to a wider population as dual enrollment courses (e.g., as AP or community college transfer courses for UC bound high-school and community college students). This may have numerous advantages: improving the size and fairness of the academic pipeline, facilitating community college transfer, and improving time to degree by ensuring that students are well prepared by having taken UC courses.

- *Satisfy unmet needs for post-baccalaureate degrees and certificates.* Evidence[2] from peer institutions nationwide demonstrates that fully-distant online education is not only academically effective in the delivery of specific vocationally or professionally oriented areas, but also possible to deliver in an economical manner that is financially beneficial to the host departments. Nationally, there is evidence of particular success in areas where there happens to be acute need (or at least strong demand) in the state of California, e.g., in Nursing, Business Administration, K-12 teaching and administration, health administration, electrical engineering, etc.

- *Generate revenues and create workload efficiencies that support the University's educational missions.*

---

[2] Current State of Online Education in the US: Opportunities and Challenges, http://groups.ischool.berkeley.edu/onlineeducation/docs/currentstate

Impact on Access:

- *By making high-demand undergraduate courses available online*, enrolled UC students will have greater access to the courses they need to graduate, thereby improving their time to degree and reducing the costs (to them and the state) of their undergraduate education.

- *By making UC credit bearing courses available to university-bound community college students*, UC can help improve community college transfer rates. This may help address concerns regarding availability of lower division gateway courses or transferrable courses.

- *By making post-baccalaureate degrees and certificates available online,* UC can play a greater role in helping the state meet acute workforce needs in key areas while generating revenues that support the University's educational mission.

Impact on Quality:

- *Learning outcomes.* A growing body of research demonstrates that online education can be effective in University level instruction, more so in some areas than in others. This needs to be assessed by UC faculty and against the specific learning objectives that faculty define for UC academic programs as a whole as well as for the particular courses that comprise them. Action #1 (delivering 40 online courses) seeks to address this issue.

Fiscal Implications:

- *Undergraduate courses for enrolled UC students.* Initial modeling based on experiences at UC and at peer institutions is compelling and suggests a number of benefits that may accrue through the greater integration of online learning in the undergraduate curriculum. For example,

  ➢ online courses may be offered more cost effectively than on-the-ground courses in selected areas and with no evident impact on the learning outcomes measured in research studies conducted thus far;

  ➢ online courses may be particularly useful in some large-enrollment foundation or gateway courses, some developmental courses, and in low-demand, highly specialized courses where faculty expertise can be scarce on any given campus (e.g., less commonly taught languages); and

  ➢ relatively large start-up costs may be reduced through reliance on existing capacity that exists in University Extensions or other campuses. Additionally, ongoing operating costs may be offset where online courses are available through dual enrollment to university bound high-school and community college students.

  These hypotheses and these cost models need to be evaluated formally through practical experience, in particular with regard to their impacts on pedagogy and learning effectiveness.

- *UC credit bearing courses for university-bound high-school and community college students.* Here too, it appears this effort could be self-supporting, particularly where it leverages courses developed for UC undergraduates.

Challenges:

These are numerous and many need to be addressed through formal, practical evaluation and assessment.

- *Senate policies and Senate practices.*
  - ➢ Course review and approval
  - ➢ Residency requirements
  - ➢ Cross-campus instruction
- *Faculty concerns, e.g., about academic quality, workload, ongoing institutional support, intellectual property rights.*
- *Start-up and maintenance funding and funding models.*
- *Competition from peer institutions.* While the market for quality online university education appears to be large it is not infinite. Further, it is not geographically or regionally constrained. While opportunities will always exist for UC to integrate some online instruction into its undergraduate curriculum – opportunities associated with post-baccalaureate programs and dual enrollments will be shaped by the existence of offerings at other universities. UC needs to be acutely aware of the quality offerings that are rapidly appearing in this marketplace, e.g., at Stanford's Master's in Electrical Engineering, USC's Master of Arts in Teaching, Harvard Extension's AA and ALB degrees, MIT Open CourseWare, etc.

Next Steps for Implementation:

- Convene a joint Senate-administration task force to further explore and oversee the execution of this recommendation.

Other Options Considered:

- Rely on the exploration of online education to take its own course.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 3: Expand use of self-supporting and part-time programs to expand opportunities for a UC education to existing and potential students, working professionals, and underserved communities.

By leveraging existing resources, including UC Extension, UC may be able to better meet student and workforce needs and generate new revenue through the following actions:

1. Develop more self-supporting professional master's degree programs in high demand disciplines.

   a. Focus on new degrees in disciplines that address current workforce needs, generate sufficient enrollment at higher fee in order to cover all expenses, and result in net distributable revenue back to the campus.
   b. Develop the infrastructure to support degrees for working professionals, either within departments/schools or by collaborating with UC Extension. The latter is allowed within existing Senate regulations and has been developed in specialized areas on some UC campuses.

2. Expand delivery of high demand UC degree courses through UC Extension to non-UC students (e.g., advanced high school students, prospective community college transfer students, or adult students preparing for higher education).

   a. Delivery of UC transferable degree credit courses (or "exact equivalent" courses) through UC Extension is allowed within existing Senate regulations.
   b. Such classes are in high demand in some regions (e.g., Los Angeles).

3. Expand and systematize concurrent enrollment through UC Extension to non-UC students in regular campus courses that have available spaces.

   a. Concurrent enrollment is well established, is allowed within existing Senate regulations, and currently results in net distributable revenue to campus academic programs.
   b. Non-UC students currently identify courses and obtain instructor approval to enroll in campus classes on a space-available basis.
   c. Develop a database of classes with predicable excess capacity that could be marketed to the public; streamline the permission/enrollment process for concurrent enrollment students.

4. Investigate the benefits of offering a part-time, self-supporting bachelor's degree completion program delivered through UC Extension for adult working students who meet current transfer requirements.

   a. Similar to the professional master's degree programs (item 1 above), but with focus at the upper division undergraduate level.
   b. Degree would serve working adults who have not yet completed the BA degree.
      ➢ For example, in Los Angeles county, 26% of the adult population over age 25 (a total of 1.7 million people) has had "some college."

c. Modeled after similar programs at University of Virginia and Harvard University.
  ➢ One or two general, interdisciplinary majors offered
d. Admission criteria would be the same as current transfer requirements.
e. Program would be alternatively scheduled (evenings, weekend, and other) to support part-time enrollment.
f. Develop delivery model that would cover all expenses and would result in net distributable income back to campus academic programs, most likely fees approaching non-resident tuition level.
g. Evaluate potential use for students in their final quarter or semester allowing degree completion through part-time status freeing up other courses they might take to other students.

Rationale:

- *Generate new revenue.* Self-supporting programs have the potential to generate significant revenue for departments, particularly if departments leverage existing infrastructure (e.g., with other departments or UC Extension) to offer and manage the program. Offering UC courses to non-UC students, whether through Extension public programs or concurrent enrollment, would bring new dollars to the University. Bachelor's degree completion programs are in high demand nationally, serve current workforce development needs, and could result in additional revenue streams for UC. These programs also could provide graduate student support if supervised advanced PhD students were permitted to teach in these programs.

- *Improving access to UC education.* Self-supporting programs, completion programs, and delivery of UC courses to non-UC students could all provide qualified students with another avenue to a UC education.

- *Meeting student need.* There is a demand for professional masters programs in certain areas of study. Giving UC students the option to take courses part-time as a "non-UC student" may assist them in eventual degree completion.

- *Improve time to degree.* For UC-bound advanced high school students or CCC transfer students, access to UC courses prior to their matriculation at UC could potentially reduce the required credits they would need to take while on campus.

Impact on Access:

- While the higher fee levels of self-supporting programs can be a barrier to access for some, these programs can be designed to return a portion of the fees to financial aid to ensure students of all means have the opportunity to attend these programs. In addition, to the extent that self-supporting programs generate additional revenues for academic departments, this improves access for students in the regular programs.

Impact on Quality:

- Degree programs and courses offered for UC credit, whether through departments or UC Extension, should continue to adhere to current Academic Senate processes and standards of quality.

Fiscal Implications:

- Potentially significant new revenue from new self-supporting programs and by offering UC courses to non-UC students. Current UC self-supporting programs generate

annually about $100 million. Those programs yield about $25 million per year above program costs. However, most of that revenue comes from the high-cost self-supporting executive MBA programs. To date, most other self-supporting programs are relatively small – generating modest amounts above program costs. Concurrent enrollment programs through UC Extension transfer about $4.5 million annually to academic departments. Additional annual revenue that could be generated beyond existing programs is probably in the $10-$25 million range for the system as a whole; however, more in-depth market analysis would need to be conducted on a program by program basis to estimate the true revenue potential of these new programs.

- Cost of developing a system to track open spaces in classes.

- Create financial incentives for academic departments to develop and launch self-supporting programs.

Challenges:

- Obtaining Academic Senate support for these programs given the following:

  - Uneven understanding and application of existing policy across campuses with regard to self-supporting programs offered in collaboration with Extension.

  - Concerns over teaching staff.

  - Concerns regarding the creation of a "second-tier" program.

- Encouraging some departments to work with Extension to develop self-supporting programs.

- Developing the processes and tools needed to offer UC courses to non-UC students.

- Protracted process for approval of new graduate programs may force campuses to miss time-sensitive opportunities.

Next Steps for Implementation:

- Convene a joint Senate-administration task force to implement and review policies on self-supporting programs.

- Examine best practices from campuses that have been successful with various self-supporting programs.

Other Options Considered:

- None.

APPENDIX 1

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
APPROVED SELF-SUPPORTING PROGRAM FEES – 2009-10
(excludes self-supporting graduate degree programs administered through University Extension)

BERKELEY

Evening-Weekend MBA Program (annual fee):
    $31,528   New and continuing students

Berkeley-Columbia Executive MBA Program (UC portion of program fee):
    $72,480   New students entering Summer 2009
    $70,000   Continuing students who entered Summer 2008

Master of Financial Engineering Program (1-year program fee):
    $50,000   New students entering Spring 2010

LLM Program (1-year program fee, includes health insurance):
    $44,935   New students entering Fall 2009

DAVIS

Working Professional MBA Program – Sacramento Location (course fee):
    $2,808   New students entering in 2009
    $2,676   Continuing students who entered in 2008
    $2,550   Continuing students who entered in 2007
    $2,490   Continuing students who entered in 2006

Working Professional MBA Program – Bay Area Location (course fee):
    $3,570   New students entering in 2009
    $3,399   Continuing students who entered in 2008
    $3,240   Continuing students who entered in 2007
    $3,150   Continuing students who entered in 2006

Master of Advanced Study – Clinical Research (unit fee):
    $481   New and continuing students

IRVINE

Executive MBA (EMBA) Program (2-year program fee):
    $89,500   New students entering Fall 2009
    $86,250   Continuing students who entered Fall 2008

Health Care Executive MBA (HCEMBA) Program (2-year program fee):
    $89,500   New students entering Fall 2009
    $86,250   Continuing students who entered Fall 2008

Fully-employed MBA (FEMBA) Program (3-year program fee):
    $79,500   New students entering Fall 2009 and Spring 2010
    $75,970   Continuing students who entered Fall 2008
    $71,000   Continuing students who entered Fall 2007

Master of Advanced Study in Criminology, Law and Society Program (annual fee):
    $10,836   New and continuing students

Master of Science in Information and Computer Systems (Embedded Systems) Program:
    $26,250   Program fee for students entering Summer 2007

LOS ANGELES

Professional Program for International Dentists (annual fee):
    $61,240   New and continuing students during 2009-10
    $53,482   New and continuing students during 2008-09

Master of Science in Engineering On-line Program (course fee):
    $3,333.33   New and continuing students

LLM Program (annual fee):
    $45,000   New and continuing students

Master of Public Health Program for Health Professionals (annual fee):
    $22,000   New students and continuing students

Educational Leadership (EdD) Program (annual fee):
    $17,823   New students and continuing students

Executive MBA Program (annual fee):
    $53,500   New students entering Fall 2009
    $50,000   Continuing students who entered Fall 2008

Fully-Employed MBA Program (annual fee):
    $33,000   New students entering Fall 2009
    $31,570   Continuing students who entered Fall 2008
    $30,500   Continuing students who entered Fall 2007 or earlier

Global Executive MBA Program (UC portion of annual fee):
    $31,800   New students entering Summer 2009
    $28,050   Continuing students who entered Summer 2008

Master of Financial Engineering Program (program fee):
$50,000   New students entering January 2009

RIVERSIDE

Master of Fine Arts in Writing Program (unit fee)
$460   New and continuing students

Executive MBA (program fee)
$75,000   New students entering Fall 2009 *(fees approved November 17, 2008)*

SAN DIEGO

Rady School of Management FlexMBA Programs
$870   New students entering Fall 2009 and continuing students who entered Fall 2008

SAN FRANCISCO

International Dentist Program (annual fee):
$73,300   New students entering Summer/Fall 2009
$70,420   Continuing students entering Summer/Fall 2008

Masters Entry Program in Nursing (annual fee):
$31,000   New students entering Fall 2009

Master of Advanced Studies in Clinical Research (annual fee):
$18,000   New students entering Fall 2009
$17,500   Continuing students who entered Summer/Fall 2008

Joint UCSF/SFSU Doctorate in Physical Therapy (annual fee):
$21,000   New students entering Fall 2009

Joint UCSF/CSU Fresno Doctorate in Physical Therapy (annual fee):
$21,000   New students entering Fall 2009

Master of Global Health Sciences Program (annual fee):
$31,570   New students entering Fall 2009

Master of Science and Technology Studies in Medicine (annual fee):
$26,500   New students entering Fall 2009

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 4: **Develop a systemwide academic planning framework that incorporates campus goals within the context of priorities identified for the University as a whole.**

Substantial shifts in the state funding model drive a need for academic program plans of individual campuses to be considered in concert with the aims and offerings of the entire system. This priority is not new but has renewed prominence in the current fiscal environment. The goal is not to subsume all campus interests to the collective but rather to balance institutional and system prerogatives effectively. The Academic Senate will have an essential role in this process given its authority over program offerings.

To that end, this recommendation seeks to:

- ensure that as UC makes informed decisions on programs in both the short- and long-term, stays focused on core priorities and optimizes use of assets across the system.

- position the University to meet future disciplinary and workforce demands and to maintain a leadership role in being on the frontier of new disciplines/knowledge.

Specifically, we recommend the following actions as critical components of building an academic planning framework:

1. Develop critical information resources on/relevant to UC academic programs—by campus and for the entire system—and provide assessments about program directions.

2. Evaluate campus program review processes to identify practices that support academic diversity, depth and quality, and to address elements of these processes that work against integration of campus and system planning efforts. The administration should work with the Senate to implement policies that facilitate planning.

3. Create a clear statement of University long-term values with respect to the academic program as well as a robust process for review and revision of this statement over time.

4. Establish and routinely update an integrated set of campus and system academic priorities.

5. Develop collaborations among UC campuses and with CSU and the community colleges to allow students to take courses not readily available at their home campuses.

Rationale:
By setting priorities through coordinated and proactive deliberation, a planning framework would enable University faculty and administrative leaders to make informed choices about the academic program over time. Budget cuts implemented by individual campuses during a year or two may not pose immediate risk to the systemwide academic profile, but the cumulative effect of such decisions over a longer period could be quite harmful. Coordination is needed to leverage resources and prevent long-term erosion, and the essential roles played by both administration and the Senate must be recognized and utilized effectively.

A systemwide academic planning framework would seek to maximize long-term diversity, depth and quality of the program offerings by:

- guiding decisions about which areas/disciplines/programs to grow/expand and which to curtail/contract/close;

- aligning allocation of resources with highest campus and system priorities;

- fostering new, creative collaborations among UC campuses and between the University and other public segments of higher education; and,

- providing a mechanism to coordinate state needs with UC's educational program.

Impact on Access:

- This recommendation does not have direct impact on student access to the University. However, the coordination and leveraging of programs across campuses enabled by a systemwide academic planning framework could enhance the range of programs to which UC students will have access.

Impact on Quality:

- Good planning is essential to creating and maintaining quality academic programs, and this is especially true when budgetary issues threaten quality. Considering system academic priorities in conjunction with campus priorities should help leverage use of limited resources to provide the highest quality possible. To the extent that UC quality is affected by critical thresholds of academic activity occurring in groups of disciplines on a given campus and in a constellation of programs across the system, an academic planning framework would support articulation of these thresholds as well as informed decisions about maintaining them.

Fiscal Implications:

- This recommendation supports efficient allocation of resources towards identified campus and system academic priorities. It would more effectively support the growth, development and excellence of UC's academic program. Cross-campus and cross-system curricular collaborations could reduce overall program costs.

Challenges:

- Striking appropriate balance between campus/system interests

- Allaying concerns about intent/reach of planning framework

- Promoting enrollment across campuses with different calendars (quarter vs. semester)

<u>Next Steps for Implementation:</u>

Convene a joint Senate-administration task force to explore implementation of actions noted above, including the following steps:

- Initiate both a short-term and long-term review of campus academic programs to identify key trends, program gaps, program overlaps, and areas of unnecessary duplication and opportunities for cross-campus collaboration.

- Review policies for program establishment/elimination as noted above and improve efficiency of Senate program review processes at the system and campus levels. (The latter is particularly important to expedite evaluation of self-supporting proposals and multi-campus programs.)

- Identify critical areas for cross-campus collaboration (including at the graduate level as well as in less commonly taught undergraduate "niche" or specialty courses). Support collaboration by convening faculty in given disciplines from across all campuses.

- Explore opportunities for intersegmental collaboration on courses and programs with the California State University and the California Community Colleges.

<u>Other Options Considered:</u>

- Rely on existing mechanisms of campus and systemwide program review.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education and Curriculum

Preliminary Recommendation: The working group seeks UC input on its forthcoming recommendation on quality.

The Education and Curriculum Working Group believes that maintaining the quality of UC undergraduate, graduate, and professional education at the highest levels possible should be a top priority as changes are introduced that might affect the educational process, including ones recommended by the Education and Curriculum work group. Educational quality is a difficult concept to define and measure; only a brief statement on quality will be put forward at this time.

In June, the work group will come forward with more specific recommendations for how different aspects of quality might be interpreted and measured.[1] In the meantime, we felt that quality was important enough to provide a preliminary overview and to invite comments from reviewers (1) on what they consider to be key elements of a quality education at UC and (2) suggesting the types of measures best describing educational quality that could be monitored over time.

Educational quality derives primarily from the background and expertise of faculty and students and from the environment in which learning occurs. In maintaining educational quality at the highest level possible, priority should be given to those aspects of the curriculum and delivery system that best incorporate the unique attributes UC brings to the degree or program. It should be recognized that there are different pathways that lead to a quality UC degree and that the relative importance and relevance of different educational components will best be identified and articulated by the faculty. The working group will continue its effort to identify the common components of a quality UC education and to identify metrics that allow for an ongoing assessment of educational quality. Individual programs should initiate or continue the process of establishing course and program learning objectives and assessment procedures to provide a more direct means of assessing our ability to maintain quality and achieve learning goals.

An example description of elements related to quality is provided in **Appendix A** entitled "Characteristics of Educational Quality at the University of California." Suggestions for additions, deletions, or changes to these characteristics would be welcome. As an example of one type of quantitative information that might be monitored over time, the 2008 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) survey of UC undergraduates found that 53% of seniors reported that they had "Done any research or creative project w/ faculty." Having the opportunity for involvement with research as an undergraduate is often cited as an important aspect of a UC education. Monitoring a measure such as this could be one way of showing how this specific element of overall quality changes over time. Suggestions for the types of measures that students, faculty, administration, and staff would consider important to educational quality are welcome.

---

[1]For example, the current working draft includes this proposed recommendation: "Maintaining the quality of UC undergraduate, graduate, and professional education at the highest level possible should be a top priority when any changes are proposed that might affect the educational process. Identify measures related to educational quality and include in a sub-report of the annual accountability process."

Preliminary action steps:

> ➤ Identify general guidelines for the definition and parameters of education quality at UC. An exemplar reference is the background document entitled "Characteristics of Educational Quality at the University of California." **See Appendix A.**

> ➤ Identify measures that effectively describe factors related to educational quality. Existing reports and surveys -- such as the Accountability Report, UCUES, and the TIE report -- have relevant data that can measure quality. A synthesis of this information showing trends should be a sub-report on educational quality as part of the UC Accountability Report.[2]

> ➤ Endorse the general concept put forward in the report by the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force[3] entitled "UC Way to Educational Effectiveness" that *responsibility for assessing student learning resides with the faculty, and that it should be discipline specific and locally (campus) defined, with Senate oversight and participation.*

> > ➤ Every department and program should establish a process by which learning objectives are identified and outcome assessment is obtained and used as a basis for improving learning.

Rationale:

- Base reference of quality needed to monitor changes. While educational quality is difficult to define and quantify, efforts to maintain quality require baseline reference indicators. The effects of possible changes to the University's structure or operation can be then evaluated.

  > ➤ The determinants of the desired quality for any degree or program at UC will come from the faculty responsible for the curriculum and teaching of the degree.

- The quality of education at UC is manifested in the final outcome -- the background, abilities and accomplishments of graduates. This is achieved through the integrative effects of the variety of the students' educational experiences. Thus, there are multiple pathways to achieve the final standard of quality.

Impact on Access:

- Maintaining top quality faculty and educational programs will ensure that the most qualified and capable students will continue to enroll at UC.

Impact on Quality:

- Monitor and evaluate quality. By identifying factors and measures related to quality we will have a reference against which any changes to the educational system can be evaluated.

---

[2] http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/
[3] http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/hp2lp_ueetf_2.10.10.pdf

Fiscal Implications:

- During the current fiscal challenges, priority should be assigned to curricular and course delivery aspects that faculty believe are the most important contributors to quality in order to maintain the highest level of quality.   If changes that may affect quality are made due to budgetary reasons, there should be an effort to minimize the effect on education quality for the student.

Challenges:

- Educational quality is difficult to define and quantify.

- A general perspective on educational quality provides little guidance for evaluating quality.

- Key contributors of quality will vary considerably between different educational programs, making it difficult to capture all perspectives in concise statements.

APPENDIX A

Characteristics of Educational Quality at the University of California

Issue: How to Define Educational Quality at UC. If we want to preserve educational quality at UC in the face of changes that have or will result from the long-term downward spiral of state funding for higher education, we need to have some way to define quality and to identify metrics and anecdotal information that can help quantify quality. Finding quantitative measures of UC quality is difficult and efforts to identify the best measures of quality should continue.

Fundamental Basis for a UC Quality Education. The quality of education at the University of California is fundamentally derived from two key components: the background and expertise of the faculty and students involved; and the rich research-based environment inherent in the system of ten top-tier public land-grant research institutions.

➤ Determinants of what constitutes desired and acceptable quality for any given degree or program at UC will ultimately come from the faculty responsible for the curriculum and teaching in each degree program.

Characteristics of UC Quality Courses, Majors and Programs. The following are features that contribute to the ability of UC to deliver a university education that meets a high standard of quality in terms of content and delivery. Courses, majors and programs that define UC quality are ones that:

➤ …are developed by UC faculty with quality assurance monitored through the UC Academic Senate course and program review process.

➤ …are delivered under the direction of UC ladder faculty, and include substantial contributions from lecturers, graduate students, and other academic positions filled by individuals who understand and can communicate the unique perspective of the UC research university environment.

➤ … include appropriate and substantive student-instructor and student-student interaction.

➤ … incorporate the recent advances in educational research and methodology, as appropriate to the field of study.

➤ …provide a framework by which students achieve objective standards of knowledge and competence appropriate to the field of study or profession.

➤ …empower students with skills in the acquisition, assimilation, and synthesis of knowledge that will admit nimble adaptation to the ever-changing intellectual environment, and foster intellectual independence, creativity, and entrepreneurship.

➤ …instill interpersonal skills that will contribute to success through collaboration.

➤ …provide a broad basis of familiarity with domestic and international cultures that will enhance students' capacity to operate within and advance American and global society.

➤ …provide a substantive background in the values and history of American democracy.

- ➢ …provide ample opportunity for closely-mentored relationships with faculty and other University-affiliated personnel that allow students to pursue independent research, creative activity, or service to society related to their field of study.

- ➢ …foster the abilities to interpret and organize information critically, effectively and transparently, and to maintain intellectual integrity and high ethical standards and intellectual honesty.

- ➢ … can contribute indirectly to student awareness of, and involvement in, the perspective unique to the culture of a public research university, with special insight for how that perspective enriches their disciplinary and general education.

- ➢ … support achievement of the basic University of California missions related to teaching, research and service.

Ongoing Assessment and Oversight of Quality. To ensure the effectiveness of UC courses, majors and programs are evaluated by a regular review process, and this process is another component leading to a quality education at UC. Key elements to this process are programs and majors that:

- ➢ …include regular evaluation of faculty teaching by students that is a part of the evaluation process for faculty as they advance within the University.

- ➢ … are evaluated regularly through self-assessment followed by an internal and external administrative and peer faculty review process that evaluates the "fitness for purpose" of the content and delivery of instruction.

- ➢ …include a course and program learning assessment process in which faculty develop learning goals, map goals to the curriculum, and assess majors' mastery of the learning goals. Learning goals include skills related to critical thinking, analytical reasoning, written communication, and other discipline-based skills.

Context Contributing to UC Quality. The unique environment created by UC's system of ten top-tier public land-grant research universities contributes to the overall UC educational quality. Important aspects of this environment include the ability to…..

- ➢ …provide students with research opportunities closely mentored by UC faculty.

- ➢ …take advantage of the unique benefits of UC's 10-campus system through cooperation, collaboration, differentiation, administration and specialization among the campuses.

- ➢ …provide a civil and inclusive multicultural environment that conveys and helps to develop the most current knowledge, theories, ideas and perspectives.

- ➢ …provide insights and experiences that are based in both research and practice.

Expected Outcomes of a UC Education. Graduates of UC will have the ability to…..

- ➢ …contribute to society in ways that encourage independent thinking and enhance leadership potential.

- ➢ …make significant and relevant contributions to issues important to California, the nation and the world.

- ➤ …enable them to improve the quality of their lives and the quality of life of others.
- ➤ …facilitate meaningful engagement with others in diverse vocational, living and social environments.
- ➤ …make use of the scope and depth of the liberal-arts education inherent to a public land grant research university.