

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

May 10, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Joseph Kiskis, Chair (UCD)

Denise Segura, Vice-Chair (UCSB), Richard Hughey (UCSC), David Bunch (UCD), J. Keith Gilles (UCB), Anne Kelley (UCM), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Rozana Carducci, Student Rep. (UCLA), Julius Zelmanowitz (Vice Provost, Academic Initiatives), Julie Gordon (Dir., Intercampus Program Coordination), Jeanne Hargrove (AWPE & High School Articulation Coordinator, Student Academic Services), Cliff Brunk (Vice-Chair, Academic Council), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Joe Kiskis

Action items on the May 11 Academic Assembly agenda include approval of the establishment of the Merced Senate Division; Academic Council's Resolution on Research Funding Sources; the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 128 (appointment of subcommittees); and proposed amendments to SR 477 (Streamlining the Course Major Preparation Process), SR 478 (SciGETC), and SR 600b (bestowal of degrees by faculty colleges on fellow faculty).

Academic Council met with campus EVCs for a half-day session on March 31 to discuss two agenda topics: graduate education and faculty diversity. There was agreement that UC is facing a graduate education crisis, as costs rise and campuses struggle to attract the best graduate students with competitive financial offers.

At its regular meeting, Council endorsed UCEP's general outline for procedures governing systemwide minors. (ITTP is working on a formal proposal) Council also discussed and endorsed a systemwide Statement of Ethical Values, with a proviso that it would not supersede the Faculty Code of Conduct. It voted to oppose California State Senate Bill 992, which would include UC police officers in the list of police agencies exempted from prohibitions against overhearing and recording communications without an individual's consent.

Academic Planning Council has been discussing proposed legislation, still under review by the legislature, which would give CSU the right to grant applied doctorates. ICAS is discussing CSU's decision to end its participation in CAN, alternatives to CAN, and the WASC accreditation review process.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee declined to comment on the Draft Policy on Human Subject Inquiry and Draft Guidelines on Implementation.

III. Credit for International Baccalaureate Curriculum – with Jeanne Hargrove

Jeanne Hargrove, Student Academic Services Coordinator for High School Articulation and the Analytical Writing Placement Exam, joined the meeting with 15 International Baccalaureate Standard Level Curriculum guides. She asked members to review the guides to determine what, if any, university credit should be given for successful completion.

IB was established in 1968, and is based in Geneva. Eighty California High Schools offer the IB curriculum, which is standardized in 110 countries. Students can earn an IB diploma after an intensive program of six courses, three of which must be IB Higher Level (HL) two-year courses, in addition to three one-year Standard Level (SL) courses. At UC, students who complete the full IB diploma program receive 30 college units, and UC systemwide honors policy has been to grant a grade point bump as well as college credit—eight quarter units or four semester units—for individual IB HL courses, if the IB examination scores is 5, 6, or 7. Each campus then determines course equivalency based on the score. However, after it was recently noted that students who complete the full IB diploma program were indirectly receiving credit for IB Standard Level courses (80% of students complete the full diploma program), BOARS was asked to evaluate the IB SL courses. BOARS recommended that certain SL IB courses should also qualify as Honors for grade point bump and UC college credit.

Coordinator Hargrove asked members to review the curriculum of the fifteen IB SL courses that BOARS deemed to be Honors level and to determine how many college units students should be awarded for completion of those courses, along with what minimum IB exam score should be required for them to receive that credit. UCEP members are asked to complete their review by June. Coordinator Hargrove also distributed review notes and recommendations from BOARS faculty about the curriculum. A list of the IB exams for which the University grants credit can be found at: <http://www.ucop.edu/pathways/IB1104.pdf>

Action: Members agreed to review the curriculum and the exam and decide what number of university units students should be awarded depending on what test score. The committee divided review responsibilities according to the discipline and/or expertise of committee members and/or colleagues not present:

Geography: UCEP member Professor Green;

History: UCEP member Professor Bergstrom;

Language A: UCEP member Professor Segura's colleague on UCOPE;

Further Mathematics: UCEP Chair Kiskis;

Classical Languages and Language B: Chair Kiskis will contact colleagues associated with the Language Consortium;

Music: UCEP member Professor Perrin's CEP colleague at UCSD;

Visual Arts: Professor Kelley's UCM colleague.

Computer Science: UCEP member Professor Hughey;

Economics: UCEP member Professor Gillis;

Philosophy: UCEP member Professor Perrin's colleague, ex-UCEP member Richard Arneson.

Psychology and Social Anthropology: UCEP member Professor Segura

It was suggested that faculty evaluators begin with a default score of 5 for credit, with the possibility of raising it higher, depending on the rigor of the curricula. One member noted that it might be unwise to grant equal honors level credit to Standard Level courses with a corresponding Higher Level section, and a suggestion was also made that perhaps ½ honors credit was appropriate for these courses.

IV. Entry Level Writing Class Size

In January, UCEP requested data from the campuses through Academic Council and Provost Greenwood estimating the resource implications, including the increased cost in dollars, of bringing campuses into compliance with national standards for the basic writing class. UCOPE proposed last year that entry-level writing requirement classes should meet a target class size cap of fifteen students and a maximum of twenty students per section based on national and UC Comparison Institution standards. Academic Council also asked UCOPE to gather evidence about the effectiveness and benefits of reduced class size in Subject A writing sections, though at the time of the meeting, UCOPE had not yet completed its study.

UCEP reviewed data drawn from a survey of campus undergraduate deans. In their responses, the deans expressed concern that the costs and resources required for the proposed caps could have negative effects on upper division writing programs, other curricular areas, and classroom space. In addition, some deans questioned why entry-level writing classes were being targeted over other academic areas for smaller class size.

The survey showed that Berkeley, which caps its Subject A classes at 14, was the only campus with a cap less than 20. Several campuses capped at 20, and several others in the range of 21 to 30. The survey noted that campuses sometimes separate certain categories of students, e.g., higher risk and ESL students, into smaller class sections. Other campus differences exist. For instance, students at some campuses retake the original Subject A exam at the end of the course, while other campuses administer a different exam.

In general, members agreed that the costs and resources associated with capping the entry-level writing class size at 20 students were not significant, when averaged over the system. However, members also agreed that convincing data on effectiveness from UCOPE were still needed to make a strong final recommendation.

Members noted a few data points in the survey that supported the argument for the effectiveness of smaller class size. For instance, at UCSC where the cap is 22, 80% of Subject A students passed the exam, while at Davis, which caps at 30, fewer than 50% passed. At UCI, the pass rate for the ESL and other higher risk students who sit in 15-student sections was similar to the rate for regular Subject A students in 20-student sections—an outcome members thought could be explained only by the individualized attention enjoyed by students in smaller sections.

Members decided it would be better to frame their report as a recommendation, rather than a formal policy proposal. The committee will recommend to Council, contingent on UCOPE producing convincing evidence demonstrating the increased effectiveness of smaller class size, that campuses be encouraged to voluntarily adhere to UCOPE's proposed standards. UCEP will add that the resource demands of a 15-20 student class size standard are reasonable. The committee agreed that smaller class size has a positive educational effect on all fields and disciplines, but that writing instruction is uniquely important. Competent writing has a crucial impact on student success throughout the subsequent years of a college careers, regardless of discipline or major.

UCEP will also recommend that information be collected at the campus level on an ongoing basis. This would include keeping track of the original Subject A scores, and the success rate of local Subject A courses—measured by the number of courses to completion of Subject A and the number of students who take a second course. UCEP will suggest that campuses with larger classes may want to compare the success rates of their students with those on campuses that do adhere to the 15-20 class size standard, and if this success rate is not being met, reduce class size. In addition, campuses should explore the possibility of a smaller cap for certain groups of students identified as needing extra attention.

Action: Chair Kiskis will email the UCOPE Chair for an update on the progress of their report, and to coordinate future cross committee communication and reporting to Academic Council.

V. Report from UCOP Consultants – Julius Zelmanowitz and Julie Gordon

Julius Zelmanowitz and Julie Gordon brought to the attention of the committee concerns from Student Academic Services about SciGETC. The Academic Affairs Office as a whole is seeking ways to improve internal and external communications, and it was suggested that as a future agenda item, UCEP invite representatives from Student Academic Services, along with Professors Blumenthal and/or Brunk to a committee meeting for a discussion of transfer issues. Specifically, there is a strong desire for the Senate to get a coherent view on issues like the difficulty of Community College transfer, from the Student Affairs perspective.

VI. UCEP Projects

Quantitative Requirement. Richard Hughey reported that the UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee discussing a proposal for an entry-level quantitative skills requirement, analogous to Subject A, has decided to discuss the option of an Algebra II exam as an entering achievement level assessment on the admissions requirement. He said the exam would be a positive way to emphasize the importance of elementary mathematics as something expected of all students early in their career. Professor Hughey distributed a short survey for campuses asking about campus math requirements and how campuses viewed the possibility of a quantitative skills entry-level requirement.

Action: Members will bring the survey to their local committees for discussion.

Academic Integrity: Keith Gillless reported that he is close to completing his report on academic integrity-related policies from across the campuses. There are many policy differences among campuses around, for instance, cheating, definitions of grades and how grades are recorded on transcripts, and anti-cheating software. Some campuses are considering a notation on the transcript indicating the average or mean grade in the class. UCEP members were asked to share the document with local CEPs for an accuracy check, discussion and comment. Issues for CEPs to address in particular include whether it should be a matter of faculty prerogative for faculty to assign a grade based on a failure of academic integrity without due process, and whether it would be worthwhile to consider a systemwide policy for any of the issues.

Action: Professor Gillless will distribute the draft over email.

VII. UCAP's Proposed Modifications to APM 220-18

Last year, a Senate Professorial Step System Task Force that had been charged by Academic Council to study the barrier step reported that APM language describing the criteria for advancement from Step 5 to Step 6 was difficult to distinguish from language criteria for advancement to Above Scale. Council asked UCAP to undertake a review of the language and if necessary, to recommend changes.

Members briefly discussed the effect of outside market pressures on the academic step system, which has led to large off-scale increments or different salary scales altogether for faculty in some disciplines. However, it was decided that the committee should focus its comments on the modifications to the extent that they have positive or negative impacts on education. The academic personnel process has educational implications because the criteria for advancement influence views of how faculty should allocate their time across research, teaching and service.

In general, members considered the changes to be an improvement. However, there did appear to be a subtle change in the emphasis on teaching, which was a concern to some members that teaching be valued and recognized appropriately. The language still indicates that faculty must demonstrate sustained excellence in the three areas of research, teaching and service to accelerate to Step 6. But the requirement for “great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally” no longer mentions teaching, which means that teaching alone appears to no longer, by itself, qualify an individual for Step 6.

There was concern that excellence in all three areas—scholarship, teaching and service—is a balance, and any effort to redefine the balance or codify a new hierarchy for the three areas is inappropriate.

Some UCEP members felt strongly that it is possible for a faculty member who satisfies the criteria for excellence in research, teaching and service, but who has “great distinction” in teaching, and not scholarly or creative achievement, to be advanced to Step 6. For example, since a textbook is generally considered by CAPs to be a contribution to teaching, not research, it seems reasonable that a textbook with a great, national or international pedagogical impact on a field should be enough for Step 6. These members felt that the APM language should include a broader view of scholarship that takes into account contributions to advances in pedagogy and scholarship of teaching.

Other members felt strongly that the special mission of UC is the research mission, and advancement to the higher career levels depends upon the research component more so than teaching. Great classroom teaching, or even contributions to pedagogical scholarship alone, is not sufficient for 6.

The committee agreed that a consensus existed for UCEP to ask UCAP to explain their reasoning for changing the emphasis on teaching, and whether UCAP believes the idea of contributions to pedagogical scholarship is taken into account in creative achievement.

Action: UCEP will send comments to Council.

VIII. California Science and Math Initiative (SMI)

At the March UCEP meeting, Executive Faculty Associate Lynda Goff gave a presentation on the California Science and Math Initiative, known as “One Thousand Teachers, One Million Minds.” Since that time, a systemwide Task Force, which includes Chair Kiskis, has met to discuss the Initiative. The SMI Task Force is meeting for the second and last time June 1. A report will be sent to President Dynes in mid-June, after which the Senate will conduct a full review of a final proposal.

A proposed timeframe for the program roll out was distributed to UCEP. There is some concern that the timeframe for the project is too ambitious to ensure a proper and full Academic Senate review, which can be very time consuming. Review time could also be amplified due to the high level of curricular innovation in the SMI.

The largest role will be for local CEP committees—particularly in the review and approval of the field experience courses. There may be already-existing field experience courses that can be used at least during the first year of the Initiative. Identification of those courses as well as the details of SMI involvement will need to be coordinated at the local level. UCEP will need to facilitate approval of the summer institutes. Other serious issues to resolve are how SMI graduates will be credentialed to teach and the place of field experience and summer institute courses in general education.

Action: UCEP members agreed to take the draft SMI proposal to their campuses for additional discussion of the Senate role in the SMI. The basic questions that need to be asked are: Where in the plan do you see a role for the Senate, how realistically does the proposed timeline intersect with that role, and what do you see to be the impediments to proper Senate review along that timeframe?

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Joe Kiskis

Distributions

1. IB Program Summary
2. IB Curricula
3. Minutes of BOARS subcommittee meeting, 5-9-03
4. SMI Program phased roll-out timeline