May 19, 2011  

TO: Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair  
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian  
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)  
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology  
Peter Chung (AGSM), Planning and Budget (P&B)  
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions  
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee  
Christine Gailey (Women’s Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)  
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)  
Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education  
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare (FW)  
David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee  
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council/CCGA Representative  
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)  
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative  
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences) CNAS Executive Committee  
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)  
Richard L. Smith (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee  
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee  
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee  
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative  
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)

FR: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, May 23, 2011

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, May 23, 2011 at 1:10 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in 220 University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th></th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Approval of the <strong>May 23, 2011</strong> Agenda and May 9, 2011 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>II.</td>
<td><strong>CHANCELLOR WHITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>III.</td>
<td><strong>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:05</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Issues under review – no new items</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Discussion</strong></td>
<td>IV.</td>
<td><strong>UC online Education Project Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05 – 2:35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss and formulate points for discussion at Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Discussion</strong></td>
<td>V.</td>
<td><strong>OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL &amp; COMMITTEE BUSINESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35 – 3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2011

PRESENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Peter Chung (AGSM), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
Richard L. Smith (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative

_________

ABSENT:
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Christine Gailey (Women's Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), CODEO
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)

GUESTS:
Mr. Timothy Ralston, Associate Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning

AGENDA:
The agenda and the minutes were accepted as written.

Presentation by Associate Vice Chancellor Tim Ralston
AVC Ralston gave a presentation on UCR’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). An LRDP is defined as a “physical development and land use plan to meet the academic and institutional objectives for a particular campus or medical center of public higher education.” The LRDP is not a commitment to any specific project or implementation
schedule; rather it is a general guide that discusses future land use patterns and the development of facilities, roads, open space, and infrastructure. The UC Regents have final approval for all LRDPs. UCR’s first LRDP was approved in 1964 and assumed a campus population of 10,000 students. The second LRDP was approved in 1990 and assumed a campus population of 18,000 students. The current LRDP was approved in 2005 and assumes a campus population of 25,000 students by 2015, although UCR has extended the horizon to 2021. The LRDP is being amended to include recent changes to the location for the medical school. AVC Ralston indicated that an LRDP is accompanied by a separate Environmental Quality Report (EIR), which documents the potential environmental impact of implementing the planned campus growth.

**University/Faculty Club:** AVC Ralston also provided the EC with an update on the proposed University/Faculty Club. The proposal is to use the Barn and the surrounding area. The EC members were not pleased with the proposal and Chair Gauvain indicated that she would discuss this matter further with the Chancellor.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:**

Chair Gauvain indicated that CCGA has been working on program review guidelines for Self-Supporting Degree Programs. These guidelines will include protocols on how to handle new SSPs as well as programs that are being converted from state supported to self-supporting.

Council also discussed the online education project that is being launched by the Office of the President and one major issue for the Senate is how course approvals will be handled. To date, the President’s office has not been very successful in generating funds to support the development of online courses.

Finally, Chair Gauvain indicated that the Chancellor will be attending the May 23rd Executive Council meeting.

In response to a question regarding what happened at the CBAC meetings, Chair Gauvain indicated that there were two days of interviews with the various unit heads regarding their proposals to cut the budgets in their units. CBAC and P&B are independently reviewing the proposals and both groups will attend one day presentations at the end of May at which time each Unit head will have 15 minutes to describe the nature of the proposed cut, its impact on the campus, and how it contributes to the strategic plan. The goal is to prepare independent recommendations from CBAC and P&B for the Chancellor by the end of May, after which the Chancellor will make his budget decisions, which will likely occur in early June. Another concern raised was the announcement by the EVC and Provost for the search for the VP of Undergraduate Education to replace VPUE David Fairris. Chair Gauvain indicated that she was meeting with EVC and Provost Rabenstein and will discuss this issue with him.

The issue of undergraduate enrollment also came up and the members discussed the potential loss of revenue that will occur if UCR falls short of its enrollment target.
Proposed Changes to Regulation 6 – Campus Graduation Requirement: The Executive Council reviewed the proposal and endorsed it for onward submission to the Division.

Other Executive Council & Committee Business:
Prof. Paulo Chagas, Chair of the Academic Computing & Information Technology committee indicated that the Library Committee will be meeting on May 13, 2011.

Prof. Steve Clark, Chair of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee indicated that his committee met with the Associate Deans for undergraduate students in each college, and the Chairs of the Executive Committees, CEP, and Preparatory Education to finalize the proposal for the admissions criteria for undergraduate students. He was optimistic that the proposal will be forwarded to the Division for formal approval.

Prof. Morris Maduro, Chair of the Graduate Council indicated that the Graduate Council is in the process of articulating processes for transmitting graduate programs and program changes through the Senate. The process will include a flow chart to assist faculty in how graduate issues are channeled through the Senate Office.

Prof. David Parker, Chair of CNAS Executive Committee indicated that his college was in the process of instituting budget cuts and that some pink-slips were sent out last week.

Prof. Jay Farrell, Chair of BCOE Executive Committee indicated that his college will be supplying “photo rosters” of students in their courses to instructors through iLearn.

Prof. Melanie Sperling, Chair of GSOE Executive Committee indicated that they are still in the process of searching for a Dean.

Prof. Jose Wudka, Chair of Educational Policy indicated that his committee has finalized the guidelines for discontinuing programs. The guidelines will only have details on undergraduate programs because graduate programs are covered by the Compendium. The Committee is also dealing with procedures for evaluating learning outcomes for breadth requirements. Finally, the committee is creating some guidelines for online courses for the Committee on Courses to use on a temporary basis until more formal guidelines come from systemwide. The goal is to ensure that the Senate keeps control of courses and course approvals.

Prof. Dan Hare, Chair of Faculty Welfare indicated that his committee evaluated a proposal to establish a first-grade class at the campus Child Development Center (CDC) starting September, 2011. The proposal was presented to Faculty Welfare as a partial solution to a recruiting and retention issue, namely, concerns about the quality of schools near the campus for the education of young children of UCR faculty members. Faculty Welfare did not support the proposal because of concerns about the impact of a first-grade class on other childcare programs at CDC and the financial viability of the first-grade proposal. The committee in their memo to the EVC and Provost suggested that an alternative proposal would be to create primary education opportunities, perhaps a charter school, for children of UCR faculty and Staff.
Meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Selwyn Ehlers
Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Executive Council - (A/I or I)</th>
<th>Division Due Date</th>
<th>Systemwide Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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I. Project Description

UC Online Education will develop a coherent online pathway augmenting constrained on-ground routes to student success while extending access to the baccalaureate experience delivered by this highly selective public university system. In the first of the project’s two overlapping phases, UCOE develops and delivers credit-bearing undergraduate instruction, and through research-based assessment, evaluates the effectiveness of 40 high-enrollment, quarter-length or semester-length courses. These are primarily the core courses required for community college students who transfer to a four-year degree program and for entry into high-demand BA and BS majors at UC and other leading universities. They are also the courses offered in high school as Advanced Placement for college credit. In its second phase, the project will extend its course offerings emphasizing pathways that enable any high-potential high school or community college student to prepare for success in a selective BA/BS-level program. At the same time, the project will become a financially self-sustaining enterprise by offering courses on a revenue-generating basis to non-UC students for transferable credit, eventually perhaps enrolling some into selectively admitted streams that confer a higher status upon successful students through some form of special certification.

For UC, this is more than a project. It is an obligation. As a public institution, UC can and should lead in this arena because access and excellence are at the core of what this university as an institution does. Within California, the project’s impact will be felt as it increases the breadth of pathways leading to UC from high schools and community colleges, boosting the number of Californians able to benefit from UC’s stellar education while expanding pipelines for non-resident and international students as well. Additionally, the project will decrease time to degree for many of UC’s enrolled undergraduates and enhance affordability because more courses will be available anywhere, anytime.

Key features

- Forty full-credit courses that the project seeks to develop initially; many are the “gateway” courses, so-called because without them it is impossible in any credible university to proceed to a baccalaureate degree in any of the high-demand areas of major concentration. The courses would be developed with a modular design to facilitate adaptation to quarter or semester terms.
- A learning environment that dynamically generates information able to guide teaching, learning and the continuous improvement of online instruction.
- An evaluation framework designed and implemented by experts in learning outcomes assessment enables UCOE to assess the effectiveness of online instruction in different disciplines and with different student populations, and to measure the impacts on learning outcomes of different tools, modalities, and approaches. The framework also continuously generates data needed to improve online course content, tools, and teaching approaches in support of student success. Some of the assessment tools used to produce this data may be applicable to standard classroom courses.
- A nimble organizational model that leverages capacity where it exists within UC while contracting from outside that which is not readily or optimally available within. For example, UCOE is likely to select an

---

1 A list of courses is available from the request to UC academic faculty for letters of intent to participate in the project (issued October 29, 2010) see http://groups.ischool.berkeley.edu/onlineeducation/sites/default/files/RFLOI.pdf
An external entity to work as service provider and development partner in the structuring of its learning environment.

- An approach designed to build to scale from the outset, so that UCOE may transition quickly to a model that sustains itself financially.

At this time, the project is emerging from a detailed planning phase and is moving towards production. It is

- Defining in implementation-level detail its course design principles and approaches; the features of its learning environment, including a plan that sequences its development and its evaluation and assessment protocol;
- Commissioning its first detailed market research to verify assumptions about student demand and price sensitivity and to inform the development of its marketing and student recruitment plans;
- Working with selected faculty to articulate learning objectives for the courses they have proposed, the activities that will be needed to achieve those objectives, and the assessments that will be used to measure student and faculty progress in accomplishing them; and
- Seeking funds from external agencies (a grant of $750,000 has been awarded by Educause Next Generation Learning Challenge; an application is pending with the National Science Foundation for $1.3 million in support of research and evaluation).

Contingent upon available funding, UCOE will begin course development in April 2011, moving to construction of up to 20 courses in FY 2011/12, while offering the first credit-bearing courses to UC undergraduates possibly as early as July (summer session) 2011 with more coming on stream in successive quarters (October 2011, and January and April 2012, respectively). A further 20 courses will be developed in FY 2012/13 integrating lessons learned during 2011/12. Thereafter, courses will be refreshed on a staggered three-year basis.

While the project focuses in 2011/12 on UC undergraduates to hone its approach to the delivery of effective online education, it will also be paving the way for the open enrollment of non-UC students beginning October 2012. Critical here will be the development and implementation of student recruitment and marketing plans able to meet enrollment targets, and the initial design and development of a suite of services that ensure the success of students who take UCOE courses for transferable credit. Downstream, the project aspires to create a program of lower division courses for non-UC students who meet a high eligibility standard. By conferring some appropriate certification for students who complete this program, such an approach may be compelling enough to increase student enrollments and the number of courses taken annually by non-UC students.

II. Cost-Revenue Model and Financial Forecast

The pro forma submitted in Appendix A sets out a conservative financial forecast which projects profitability by 2014/15, assuming funding sufficient for implementation is agreed in spring 2011. It focuses exclusively on non-UC students who register on an open enrollment basis and pay at a rate based on the number of course credit hours (units). It assumes no selectively admitted pathway for non-UC students who are shown accordingly to take on average only one four-credit course per year.

UC students who take courses outside of summer sessions are not included in the model since their participation will be revenue neutral for UCOE. Thus, UC students will not pay tuition in addition to that paid to the University as an enrolled undergraduate. Costs for the online infrastructure, course development, and the administrative, business, and student services associated with instruction of non-UC students will be borne entirely by course fees paid by non-UC students.

According to the pro forma, UCOE revenues will exceed expenditures in 2014/15 when 5,400 non-UC students enroll in an average of one four-unit course per year. While detailed market research awaits approval of the loan-funding request, the following data points help to put this break-even enrollment target into perspective:
• UC extensions currently enroll over 57,000 students in online courses each year – 5,000 for UC degree credit;
• In 2010 UC summer sessions enrolled over 76,000 students in three and four-credit courses;
• In 2010 the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) reported that the demand at the University of California is expected to increase from 172,775 students in fall 2008 to 196,448 students in fall 2014, representing an overall 13.7% increase. If state support remains at current levels, at least 19% of students in 2014 will be unfunded and the University will be unable to expand enrollments to accommodate all eligible students;
• CPEC also reported similar trends for the California State University where demand is expected to increase from 362,226 students in fall 2008 to 419,572 in fall 2015 representing an overall 15.8% increase and an annual average growth rate of 2%;
• California resident enrollment in for-profit universities has expanded as public higher education is too poorly funded to meet student demand. Currently, it is estimated that over 188,500 California residents participate in degree programs provided by for-profit providers. Characteristically, for-profit universities use online courses as their primary medium of instruction. According to the College Board, in 2010 the average tuition at such programs was $13,935 which is about 20% higher than at UC.

Recognizing the risks inherent in financial forecasting and the continuing fluid nature of online higher education, UCOE has built in to its project plan three features to mitigate financial risk

1) Key milestones in the projects first 15 months will provide early indicators of its progress, an opportunity to course correct or even terminate the project. Milestones include:

   Winter 2012 – early evidence of success generating interest among and enrolling non-UC students, including data on the average cost involved in enrolling a non-UC student

   Spring 2012 – initial data available from evaluation about the educational effectiveness of online courses

   Fall 2012 – evidence of progress meeting initial enrollment

2) UCOE will annually review its financial forecasts as presented here in the pro forma. It will look in particular at the operational scale assumptions, enrolment assumptions, and financial results and adjust accordingly with a view to ensuring that the C3 loan is paid off in a timely fashion. In general, UCOE must show annual meeting-or-exceeding of key pro forma assumptions (see columns A through P of the pro forma) within a 10% range including:

   • Tuition Levels
   • Average seats filled per unique course offering
   • Course starts per year
   • Total Enrolment
   • % of Total Enrolment Attributable to Non-UC Students
   • Net Income
   • Debt Service Coverage

---

4 Ibid.
Such annual review will be scheduled in a way that will minimize disruption in student life if the UCOE programs is ultimately eliminated. The EVP-Chief Financial Officer will maintain sole discretion with regard to continuation of C3 authorization after each annual review.

3) UCOE will continue to raise external funding which will be used to offset the need to draw upon C3 loan authorization.

III. Incentives Supporting Campus and Faculty Participation

For UCOE to succeed, faculty and campuses must participate in a variety of roles, including developing online courses and keeping them current, recruiting non-UC students and teaching (by instructors of record and graduate student instructors).

To stimulate and sustain the level of involvement that is required, the UCOE envisages a number of incentives. While these remain to be worked out in detail with the campus-led governing board, these will at a minimum include the following:

- **Profit sharing.** Net revenues will be distributed to campuses according to a formula developed by the governing board -- taking account potentially of the number of non-UC students a campus enrolls, and the number of faculty and graduate student instructors it provides.

- **Course creation and renewal.** Fees will be paid to academic units (and/or their faculty) for the new courses they contribute ($15,000 per course) and for the existing courses they refresh ($7,000 per course every three years). A royalty fee of up to $2,000 will also be paid each time a course is offered, possibly in a manner that scales to reflect the number of student enrollments and/or faculty involvement in the creation of the current course content. If the UCOE program becomes increasingly financially successful, these fees can be larger.

- **Reimbursement for the costs of instructors.** Fees will be paid to the academic unit that recruits faculty and graduate student instructors. Faculty costs will be paid at a rate that assumes the use of a ladder-rank faculty and Graduate Student Instructors.

Additional benefits will accrue to campuses though these are not easily accounted for as specific cash incentives.
- The common learning environment (CLE) that is being deployed for UCOE is designed by the campus Chief Information Officers and Educational Technology Leaders with a view of the downstream efficiencies that will result from eventual widespread adoption. Additional efficiencies will accrue from the eventual integration with student, library, and other information systems that the CLE will support.
- Campuses may also choose to use UCOE’s lower division and general education courses in any hybrid and fully online degrees and programs they choose to offer and for which they have Senate approval. This will significantly reduce the start-up costs associated with such programs.

IV. Risks and Risk Management

**Risk.** Uncertainty over whether the Senate will approve online instruction as a means of delivering for-credit undergraduate courses.

**Explanation.** Under their delegated authorities, the Academic Senate manages review and approval processes that govern whether courses can be offered for UC-credit (whether to UC or non-UC students). The Academic Senate has repeatedly voiced concerns about whether and to what extent online
instruction delivery will provide a UC quality education.

Mitigation Measures.
1. UCOE uses a rigorous research-based evaluation protocol to gather data bearing on the quality of the online educational experience.
2. UCOE has been planned and developed in close consultation with the Academic Senate.
3. Since thinking about UCOE began in March 2009, divisional senates have made progress in developing and exercising review and approval processes for online courses, and campuses have developed and successfully delivered online courses (mostly in summer sessions). In addition, online education has gained increasing acceptance at selective (peer) institutions.
4. The recent request for Letters of Interest resulted in proposals from more than 70 faculty, indicating a high degree of interest in offering high quality online courses.

Risk. The slow pace of Senate course approvals.

Explanation. Divisional Senates review proposals for new courses on a fixed schedule. Review of new on-ground courses can take from a few months and up to a year. Review of online courses may be more protracted especially at campuses where the relevant Senate review committee has little experience of reviewing or are particularly skeptical about the educational effectiveness of online courses.

Mitigation Measures.
1. Slow review may impede progress but will not undermine the program’s success.
2. UCOE will fund course development and seek Senate approval immediately upon course design completion, thereby speeding the process. We believe that (a) the standing of the Senate faculty who have been selected as course developers; (b) the course developers’ experience as undergraduate teachers with pedagogical innovation, and their familiarity, as UC faculty, with UC educational quality; and (c) the project’s design and the level of interest in it across the University will ensure that the courses created and delivered under its auspices will have the highest possible attention paid to issues of educational quality and effectiveness.
3. UCOE has alerted campus courses committees of impending online course development and asked for guidance on ways to facilitate review.
   a. The report of the Senate’s ad hoc Committee on Remote and Online Instruction published in May 2010 provides guidelines to divisional senates for the review of online courses⁷.

Risk. The difficulty generating the campus-level participation required to build enough courses to meet initial enrollment goals for non-UC students.

Explanation. As indicated in Section III, campus and faculty participation is essential to the project’s success. Without it UCOE can neither develop courses nor offer them for instruction to non-UC students.

Mitigation Measures.
1. Online education promises to address some of the impacts of the University deteriorating budget including faculty workload, overcrowded classes, and curtailed ability to enroll all eligible California students. Additionally, it promises to expand pipelines of highly qualified non-resident students, including international students, whose presence diversifies and enriches the student experience while enhancing revenues.

⁷ A copy of the Academic Senate’s ad hoc Committee on Remote and Online Instruction can be found at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/HP_MGYreRpt_Spec_Cte_Online_Remote_Instruction_FINAL.pdf
2. The UCOE business model builds in financial incentives to encourage faculty and campus-level participation.
3. The project is organized to ensure widespread participation and buy-in by including key stakeholders in planning, advisory, and development roles.
4. The project includes courses taught across two or more campuses to help identify and mitigate issues related to distance-learning and cross-campus registration and grade transfer.

**Risk. Competition from other providers.**

**Explanation.** UC is a relative late-comer to online education. While it develops capacity, students from California and elsewhere are able to avail themselves of a growing range of for-credit course offerings from credible providers.

**Mitigation Measures.**
1. UC has national and international name recognition, and while a growing number of selective universities are offering online education, few are active outside their continuing professional and adult education units in offering transferable credit-bearing courses on an open enrollment basis.
2. The project moves rapidly from initial evaluation and capacity building to enrollment of non-UC students. A key early deliverable is a marketing plan that allows UC as early as fall 2011 to begin marketing credit-bearing courses to non-UC students, thereby asserting itself into an increasingly crowded marketplace.
3. UC starts a major online initiative unencumbered by previous investments in a specific learning management system, making it able to more easily incorporate the advanced technologies that best fit its desired assessment model.

**Risk. Online Education has High Start-up Costs and May Not Succeed Economically.**

**Explanation.** While successes are increasingly more prevalent in the arena of online higher education, a single, well-known failure (University of Illinois’s Global Campus) stands out in stark relief. It acts as a warning to those who seek to launch a new initiative and as a touchstone for any that wish to oppose it.\(^\text{8}\) Illinois allegedly spent and lost at least $16 million in a short period of time on a program that was intended to be financially self-sustaining and more.

**Mitigation Measures.**
1. UCOE is based on careful review of online education initiatives nationally in both the for- and not-for-profit sectors. While analysis of past performances cannot guarantee a future success, it certainly helps identify and then to avoid key risks.
2. UCOE is organized to leverage UC’s considerable capacities, thereby reducing risks ordinarily inherent in startups by incorporating experience.
3. UCOE is designed with three early milestones that permit quick exit at an early stage, thereby reducing downside risk. Those milestones are: (a) early review (March 2012) of the effectiveness of the student recruitment campaign that is initiated to enroll non-UC students including data on average cost of enrolling each non-UC student; (b) formal evaluation of data generated through the instruction of up to 20 online courses during the 2011/12 academic year, and bearing directly on issues of quality, educational effectiveness, student and faculty experience, and cost (expected

\(^8\) Columbia’s Fathom is also frequently mentioned in this light. Yet it was a more publishing than an educational operation insofar as it never sought to offer credit-bearing online instruction. See Taylor Walsh (2011). *Unlocking the Gates. How and Why Leading Universities are Opening Up Access to their Courses* (Princeton, Princeton University Press).
6/12); and (c) evaluation of success meeting first-year enrollment targets for non-UC students (10/12). While program termination would leave a portion of the working capital unpaid by the project, that portion would not likely exceed $3.5 million.

4. UCOE will annually look at the operational scale assumptions, enrolment assumptions, and financial results and adjust accordingly with a view to ensuring that the C3 loan is paid off in a timely fashion (see pages 6-7). Such annual review will be scheduled in a way that will minimize disruption in student life if the UCOE program is ultimately eliminated. The EVP-Chief Financial Officer will maintain sole discretion with regard to continuation of C3 authorization after each annual review.

5. UCOE is actively seeking external support that, where successfully acquired, will reduce the amount of C3 debt-financing required and thus, the project’s downside financial risk for the university.

V. PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

UCOE is based at the Office of the President although its functions are highly distributed as follows:

1. **Executive leadership and coordination** (responsible for strategic and business planning, project and budgetary management, project coordination, and communication)
   - Chair (Christopher Edley, Jr, Dean Berkeley Law School and Senior Policy Advisor to the President (15%, UCB, 15% when fully funded)
   - Director (Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning and Programs, 60%, UCOP)
   - Project Manager (Do Quyen Tran-Taylor, Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, 80%, UCOP, 100% when fully funded)
   - Project Analyst (Artemio Cardenas, contractor, 100%, UCOP)
   - Communications (Susan Sward, contractor, 20%, UCOP, moving 100% when fully funded)
   - Faculty associate and evaluation coordinator (Keith Williams, Senior Lecturer, Neurobiology, Physiology, and Behavior, UCD, and Faculty Associate to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, UCOP, 20%, moving to 20% when fully funded)
   - Legal Counsel (Tina Combs Deputy General Counsel, leads team of counsel contributing 10% total)

In addition, should the loan be approved, the project will hire a business manager initially on a half-time basis from July 1, 2011 and then full time if appropriate from July 1, 2012. The business development manager will act as chief operating officer with principal responsibility for the design and implementation of UCOE’s revenue-generating instructional activities – that is, the instruction offered to non-UC students. The pro forma accounts for a business manager working full time for the project from July 1, 2012.

2. **Educational Technology and Instructional Design** responsible for the development of the project’s course design principles, common learning environment, and instructional design staff
   - Director ETID (Mara Hancock, Director, Educational Technology Services, 30%, UCB, 100% when fully funded)
   - Technology Lead, Learning Environment (Kirk Alexander, Program Manager, Academic Technology Services, 60%, UCD, 100% when fully funded)
   - Marketing Director (when fully funded and contingent on marketing plan development Q2 – see detailed timeline in Section VI)
   - Instructional Designer, northern region (100%, UCB, begins 4/1/11)
   - Instructional Designer, southern region (100%, UCI, begins 5/1/11)
3. **Course development and instruction** Presently, 29 UC Senate faculty have been selected as course developers/instructors through a competitive process completed in January 2011. A full list is available in appendix along with course titles.

4. **Service Providers** acting under contract to provide key functions to UCOE (project liaison only are identified below)
   - Evaluation (will determine whether, how, and at what cost online instruction is or is not effective in delivering a UC-quality undergraduate education. John Yun, Associate Professor of Education, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education and Director, UC Educational Evaluation Center, UCSB)
   - CLE Service Provider and Development Partner (TBD via RFP, selection expected 5/11)
   - Marketing (contingent upon marketing plan, staff appointment(s) will be made or a service provider will be selected via RFP in Q3 – see Section VI)
   - Student Services Provider (to be selected via RFP issued Qs2-3, See Section VI)

The project also benefits from

An advisory group, formed in 2010, has been appointed by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and includes representatives nominated by the system-wide Academic Senate. The group is chaired by Gene Lucas, executive vice chancellor and provost at UCSB, and includes members listed below. If fully funded, the advisory board will transition into a governing body that will involve additional key perspectives, including planning and budget, undergraduate deans, business development, students, student services.

Jim Davis, Vice Provost, Information Technology, UCLA
Christopher Edley, Jr., Dean, Berkeley School of Law
Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, UCOP
David Kay, Chair, University Committee on Education Policy and Lecturer SOE, Informatics, UCI
Gary Matkin, Dean, Continuing Education, UCI
Brett Stalbaum, Lecturer SOE, Visual Arts, UCSD
Jose Wudka, Professor, Physics, UCR

A support network. Integral to the project’s success is the network of campus-based functional and subject matter experts that is mobilized to provide support. Networks are developed and managed by members of the management or advisory groups in areas that reflect their expertise and include:

- Regents and Chancellors (Edley)
- Executive Vice Chancellors and Provosts (Lucas)
- Chief Information Officers (Davis and Hancock)
- Directors of Educational Technology including audio-visual and related production units (Hancock, Alexander, Davis)
- Directors of instructional and faculty support units (Hancock, Alexander)
- Deans of University Extension (Greenstein)
- Vice Provosts for Undergraduate Education (Greenstein, Williams)
- Academic Senate committees on educational policy, planning and budget, etc. (Williams and Greenstein)
- Intellectual property, purchasing technology transfer, patent, and other similar business functions (Combs and Greenstein)

With this collection of academic excellence and technological expertise supporting UCOE, we believe the project will succeed, bringing recognition to UC for its response to the needs of today’s students and for its awareness that a university, to remain great, must evolve continually with the times.
## VI. Detailed Project Timeline, April 2011 to September 2013 (by quarter)

Critical “cut-and-run” decision points are marked in bold italic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
<th>Quarter 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Full time project staff hired</td>
<td>• 2-4 new online courses available to UC students in summer sessions using beta CLE</td>
<td>• 2-3 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
<td>• 6-8 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
<td>• 8-12 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course development schedule developed for first 20 courses and course design / development / Senate review and approval begins</td>
<td>• CLE provider and development partner selected</td>
<td>• Marketing campaign launched targeting non-UC students for fall 2012; student recruitment begins according to plan</td>
<td>• Student services up and running for enrollment management and advising</td>
<td>• Faculty provisionally selected to build additional courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation Framework finalized</td>
<td>• Student recruitment and marketing plans commissioned and completed</td>
<td>• Student services provider(s) selected (non-UC students)</td>
<td>• First cut and run decision in light of early review of marketing and student recruitment campaigns; early progress towards enrollment targets; data on average cost per student enrollment.</td>
<td>• Second cut and run decision in light of preliminary analysis of evaluation data gathered by project on educational effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intellectual property regime finalized</td>
<td>• Strategize plan for offering courses to non-UC students, including enrollment, hiring instructors, support services, etc.</td>
<td>• All-project meeting reviews experience of first 4-7 courses (development and delivery, etc)</td>
<td>• Specification developed for administrative and business services required to support non-UC students, and RFP released</td>
<td>• Review identifies emerging good, bad, and best practices and informs design of 2nd gen CLE, refresh for year 1 courses, design approach to year-2 courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RFP released for CLE provider and development partner</td>
<td>• Specification for student services function developed (non-UC students) and RFP released</td>
<td>• RFP issued seeking proposals from faculty interested in developing additional courses (list of target courses published in RFP)</td>
<td>• Faculty provisionally selected to build additional courses</td>
<td>• Provider(s) selected for administrative and business services required to support non-UC students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All-Project Workshop review initial detailed course designs</td>
<td>• Work with Registrars to facilitate inter-campus registration</td>
<td>• Marketing campaign launched targeting non-UC students for fall 2012; student recruitment begins according to plan</td>
<td>• Student services up and running for enrollment management and advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop methods to make students aware of online course offerings (e.g., campus registration/catalog materials or systemwide online catalog)</td>
<td>• 2-4 new online courses available to UC students in summer sessions using beta CLE</td>
<td>• 2-3 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
<td>• First cut and run decision in light of early review of marketing and student recruitment campaigns; early progress towards enrollment targets; data on average cost per student enrollment.</td>
<td>• Second cut and run decision in light of preliminary analysis of evaluation data gathered by project on educational effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2-4 new online courses available to UC students in summer sessions using beta CLE</td>
<td>• CLE provider and development partner selected</td>
<td>• Marketing campaign launched targeting non-UC students for fall 2012; student recruitment begins according to plan</td>
<td>• 6-8 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
<td>• 8-12 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2-3 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
<td>• Student recruitment and marketing plans commissioned and completed</td>
<td>• Student services provider(s) selected (non-UC students)</td>
<td>• First cut and run decision in light of early review of marketing and student recruitment campaigns; early progress towards enrollment targets; data on average cost per student enrollment.</td>
<td>• Second cut and run decision in light of preliminary analysis of evaluation data gathered by project on educational effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6-8 new courses available to UC students on 1st gen CLE</td>
<td>• All-project meeting reviews experience of first 4-7 courses (development and delivery, etc)</td>
<td>• RFP issued seeking proposals from faculty interested in developing additional courses (list of target courses published in RFP)</td>
<td>• Specification developed for administrative and business services required to support non-UC students, and RFP released</td>
<td>• Provider(s) selected for administrative and business services required to support non-UC students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 6</td>
<td>Quarter 7</td>
<td>Quarter 8</td>
<td>Quarter 9</td>
<td>Quarter 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6-10 new courses offered to UC students on beta 2nd gen CLE</td>
<td>• First courses offered to non-UC students admitted on open enrollment basis, using 2nd gen CLE</td>
<td>• 4-6 new courses available</td>
<td>4-6 new courses available</td>
<td>4-6 new courses available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Third cut and run decision results from review of progress towards operational scale targets, enrolment targets, and financial results</td>
<td>• 4-6 new courses available</td>
<td>• All-project meeting evaluates Q7 data collected for non-UC students; mitigating adjustments identified and planned e.g. for course content, technology, student services, etc.</td>
<td>4-6 new courses available</td>
<td>4-6 new courses available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preliminary report to Academic Senate on the assessment of online courses with regard to quality</td>
<td>• Phased periodic course refreshment/revision begins</td>
<td>• After refresh, year 1 courses are offered again (4-6 courses)</td>
<td>• All-project meeting reviews progress to date including data gathered for UC students during 2012/13 academic year.</td>
<td>4-6 new courses available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation framework extended as needed to accommodate non-UC students</td>
<td>• Extensive data collected for non-UC students about educational effectiveness, student satisfaction, student</td>
<td></td>
<td>• After refresh, year 1 courses are offered again (4-6 courses)</td>
<td>4-6 new courses available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student services extended to include advising and support for non-UC students</td>
<td>• After refresh, year 1 courses are offered again (4-6 courses)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed report to Academic Senate on the assessment of online courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative and business services implemented as required to support non-UC students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• After refresh, year 1 courses are offered again (2-4 courses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>