

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

December 6, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Joseph Kiskis, Chair (UCD)

Denise Segura, Vice Chair, (UCSB), Randall Bergstrom (UCSB), Richard Weiss (UCLA), Richard Hughey (UCSC), David Bunch (UCD), J. Keith Gilless (UCB), Anne Kelley (UCM), Robert Newcomb (UCI), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Lynda Bell (alt-UCR), Eligio Martinez, Student Rep. (UCLA), Rozana Carducci, Student Rep. (UCLA), Julius Zelmanowitz (Vice Provost, Academic Initiatives), Julie Gordon (Director, Intercampus Program Coordination), Clifford Brunk (Academic Senate Vice-Chair), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Joe Kiskis

Since UCEP met in October, there have been two meetings of [Academic Council](#). Council is drafting a Concurrent Resolution on the Importance of Graduate Education, to be introduced in the spring at the State Assembly in Sacramento. In March, Council will meet with campus Executive Vice Chancellors.

ICAS is studying transfer articulation issues and the WASC reaccreditation process. UCEP's Vice Chair will attend the December ICAS meeting in place of Chair Kiskis.

Academic Planning Council has been involved in efforts to promote to lawmakers and the public the importance of UC to the state. Student Regent Anderson introduced a civic engagement initiative, which will be launched at a symposium planned for the spring.

The UC budget adopted by the Regents includes a \$10 million line item for improving the student-faculty ratio. Chair Kiskis is meeting with a senior administrator to get more precise details.

In the process of vetting Davis' proposal to reconstitute its division of Biological Sciences, Chair Kiskis noted that some program review procedures outlined in the [compendium](#) are not typically followed (e.g., the provision for a subcommittee meeting of the chairs of the compendium committees—CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB—convened by the CCGA Chair). Chair Kiskis has spoken to the CCGA and UCPB chairs and informed Davis of UCEP's comments.

II. Students in Academic Difficulty

Last year, prompted by the publicly aired concerns of a Davis faculty member, data was released indicating that there could be significant numbers of students at UC subject to dismissal (STD) for either poor academic performance or failure to meet minimum progress, with a correspondingly low dismissal rate. Although UCEP rejected a suggestion that disenrollment be used in any significant way to help solve the budget and enrollment crisis, the committee agreed that because monitoring students in academic difficulty is a Senate responsibility, it would be a good idea for the faculty to be more involved in something that had largely been delegated to deans. Since the data available last year provided only a snapshot of the situation at a particular point in time, Academic Council asked UCEP to facilitate a more systematic and thorough collection of information, so the Senate could study the numbers and talk about the issue more definitively. UCEP agreed to develop a template for campuses to report data that would give a more complete sense of the situation systemwide.

Members compared procedural details from their campuses, and determined that because definitions for Probation are not as consistent as definitions for Subject to Dismissal, the latter is better for making cross-campus and cross-unit comparisons. Members agreed that the data they ask for should address two groups of students. Data on the first group—students who had been

STD at any point in their careers and not dismissed—would show whether UC is getting a good return on its “investment in compassion,” by helping students overcome difficulties so they eventually go on to successfully graduate, or whether such efforts were ineffective and wasting slots that could potentially be filled by other eligible students. Toward this, data would be needed on the percentage of students STD at any point in their career who graduated in 5 years; the percentage who graduated at all, and the mean number of terms those students were enrolled. The second group—students who were actually dismissed—would require data on the number of terms dismissed students were STD before they were dismissed, and the total number of terms those students were enrolled. A third group was also suggested—those students who leave the university without getting a degree.

UCEP decided its main charge now was not to decide what to do with the data, but to provide the information to the deans and to set up a mechanism for reporting to help college faculties meet their responsibilities. Nevertheless, if the data were to show that most STD students go on to recover and graduate, it could probably be said that UC’s policies are working. If another result is found, UCEP might be in a position to make a policy change recommendation.

Berkeley’s Registrar, Susanna Castillo-Robson, joined the meeting by phone to talk about what data might be available from her office on Berkeley STD students. She said it was possible for the registrar’s office to report how many terms a student had been enrolled and STD, but she did not think the system, at least at UCB, provided a relational database capability that could follow a student’s progress longitudinally. However, the retrospective and longitudinal look is something the Office of Student Research group might be able to provide, although it would depend on what data each campus reports to their institutional research office. Registrar Castillo-Robson offered to forward UCEP’s template to her campus colleagues in both the Registrars offices and the institutional research offices on each campus.

Members discussed the possibility of preparing both an ambitious data request and a more minimalist request (e.g., only dismissed students), but they decided that a request covering both groups of students was going to be the minimum needed to understand the situation. Six data elements would be needed, covering students who entered as freshmen five years ago: Major or College code, number of terms subject to dismissal, whether the student was dismissed or graduated, how many terms were they enrolled, and GPA.

Action: Member Gilless will draft a data request template.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved the minutes of October 18, 2004.

Action: The committee approved the consent item: Amendment to Senate Bylaw 336.B.4

Action: The committee approved the consent item: Council Resolution on Research Funding Sources.

IV. Report from UCOP Consultants – *Julie Gordon and Julius Zelmanowitz*

Director Gordon reported that the Chancellors and UCOP leadership have been supportive of UCEP’s campus calendar alignment proposal, and agreed that a common start date would be useful as a minimum first step. The Provost is expected to send a letter to the campuses asking that they move forward with implementation. UCEP’s proposal for campuses to develop common procedures for simultaneous enrollment via Senate Regulation 544 has met some resistance, but a subcommittee is convening to resolve some of the disagreements around a

common approval process. Assembly passed the amendment to UCEP's charge, which now includes review and approval of university-wide domestic off campus academic programs and courses (after the course has gone through the approval process at its home campus of record). UCEP may want to develop approval policies for these kinds of programs. UCDC is seeking applications for a five-year directorship appointment, and UCEP is invited to send a representative to the UC Sacramento Center open house January 26.

Vice Provost Zelmanowitz reported that the Academic Planning Council has been focusing on two master plan issues: eligibility and transfer. First, they seek to understand why UC faces more pressure than other institutions over turning away eligible students, even though CSU is turning away a higher number of students in comparison to their obligation under the Master Plan, and the privates have not increased their enrollment capacity. In terms of transfer, the California Performance Review indicated that CCC transfers are entering UC with on average, 20 extra semester units, raising concerns in the legislature about utilization of state resources. Members inquired whether last year's proposal to charge higher fees for students who exceeded 10% of the minimum number of credit units required for graduation was still a Compact provision. There is concern on at least one campus that EAP, UCDC and UCCS should be exempted from the excess units fee.

V. Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information

The committee reviewed the report of the Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee, "*Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California.*" Vice Provost Zelmanowitz introduced the report and described the library system as one of the most collaborative academic areas at the university. The report is intended to set goals and objectives in relation to future growth, resource sharing, and the changing nature of collections and scholarly communications. As the shared digital resources of the library system continue to grow, shared print collections (e.g., government documents) are seen as the next big opportunity to increase efficiencies. The university must also develop a set of tools and services to enable such sharing. Library budgets have been slashed, which has a detrimental effect not only on individual libraries, but also on commonly shared and funded initiatives. The look and function of university presses is also changing. E-publishing and e-scholarship continue to make advances, and it will be increasingly important for faculty to handle copyright management.

The committee strongly endorsed the report, which members believed was comprehensive and well written. Members commented that UC's libraries are exemplary models of systemwide collaboration and efficiency, impressive in their ability to work within budgetary constraints, and an excellent value on the investments made in them. UCEP supports funding both by the campuses and the Office of the President necessary to allow UC's libraries to maintain their high level of service as well as to develop the strategies they have proposed for increasing efficiencies. Finally, UC Press should take more initiative to create more electronic publishing opportunities for junior faculty.

Action: UCEP will submit comments.

VI. Proposal to Streamline the Major Articulation Process between UC and CCC

An earlier version of this proposal came before UCEP in April 2003. At that time, UCEP recommended decreasing the number of campuses required for default articulation from five to four. The new version does that—proposing that when four or more campuses agree to an articulation agreement with a California Community College as preparation for a specific major, that course will be considered articulated for all campuses, unless a campus chooses to opt out

within 120 days. UCEP also reviewed a second document, prepared by staff at UCOP, outlining a plan for implementing the details of the proposal, which would be guided by a representative implementation committee.

The committee pondered over how “similar majors” would be defined and who would define them. Members agreed that the Academic Senate, through its participation in IMPAC committees, should be closely involved in establishing these policies. The implementation committee should draw representatives from the appropriate campus sources that understand major specific articulation. In many cases, these will be standing campus Senate admissions committees. The implementation committee should act as a conduit of information about the agreements to the impacted campus departments or programs.

The plan suggests limiting the new articulation process at the onset to the “top twenty” majors. UCEP suggested that these top majors should consist of the highest enrollment majors within the transfer population, which may differ from those majors popular with freshmen.

Action: UCEP will endorse the proposal and include suggestions for implementation.

VII. Writing Class Size

Last year, the University Committee on Preparatory Education asked UCEP to comment on its proposal to limit entry-level writing requirement sections to a target of fifteen and a maximum of twenty students per section, which would place all UC campuses in line with national standards, as set by the Association of Departments of English. In its response, UCEP was sympathetic to UCOPE’s goals, but requested a resource impact assessment. Academic Council has since charged UCEP with the task of gathering data about the resource implications, and UCOPE with gathering evidence about the benefits of reduced writing class size.

Members agreed that writing is fundamentally important and needs to be developed early. Funding for improving instruction and reducing class size should be considered priorities under the new budget compact, and campuses that wish to allocate their resources internally this way should also be encouraged.

Members expect that most of the costs associated with such a change would be related to labor—roughly estimated, a 30-60% increase in costs. However, smaller class sizes should not be achieved at the cost of increasing instructor workload. Such a plan would require additional funding, as UCEP does not support moving resources from other areas to Subject A. That said, there could be cost savings with smaller sections, if as a result, students were less likely to take Subject A multiple times.

The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies or equivalent should be able to estimate the cost of bringing UC into compliance with national standards for class sizes of both 20 and 15. Given that Subject A remains a statewide requirement, policy dictates that UC teach it.

There was an additional concern addressed related to a plan introduced at Riverside to charge students extra for Subject A. UCR also wants to increase Subject A class sizes. UCEP will state in its letter that it is aware of a Senate report at Riverside affirming the value of small Subject A classes, and hopes the Senate and Administration can continue work together on decisions about curriculum and funding curriculum.

Action: Chair Kiskis will draft a letter to be sent by Chair Blumenthal, asking appropriate campus representatives to estimate the increased cost in dollars of bringing the campuses into compliance with national standards for the basic writing class. After receiving that information, UCEP will draft a letter to Council.

VIII. Future UCEP Projects

Members considered a few possible topics for proactive study with concrete and pertinent policy implications.

1. The institution of an entry-level **Quantitative Research** Skills and Methods requirement, analogous to the Subject A writing requirement—a project the committee could collaborate on with UCOPE.
2. The responsibilities of students and faculty in regards to **Academic integrity and dishonesty**, including the possibility of a “non report” or a punitive grade option. The UCSB College of Letter and Sciences has generated a report and instituted measures that could be useful as a starting point.
3. **Program review.** Streamlining the evaluation process and ensuring the significance and effectiveness of the process.
4. **Grade inflation.** Disparities particularly in upper division course grading, and the possibility of recording the class average on the transcript along with the grade.
5. **Teaching Associates.** Defining faculty oversight of graduate students who teach upper division classes, and clarification of policy and titles in the systemwide regulations.
6. **Student Faculty Ratio.** Holding the line against the ongoing erosion of student-faculty ratio, with emphasis on how FTE are allocated to impacted areas and research priorities on campus.
7. **Graduate Education in Crisis.**
8. **Distance Education.** Facilitating the removal of barriers to distance learning opportunities. UC’s foreign partner universities, EAP students, and UCDC students would be interested in having access to UC courses through this technology. ITTP, the Systemwide Information Technology and Telecommunications Committee, may be studying this issue

In addition, members want to invite UCSB Professor Richard Flacks to give a presentation on the Undergraduate Experience Survey project he is leading.

<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/seru21/index.html> Survey findings could have significance for educational policy.

Action: Members voted in support of different projects, and subcommittees were formed to tackle the issues that garnered the most interest. Subcommittees will bring a plan to the next meeting.

Quantitative: Richard Hughey (lead), Anne Kelley and Robert Newcomb

Academic Integrity: Keith Gilles (lead), Harry Green and Rozana Carducci.

Program Review: Richard Weiss (lead), Randall Bergstrom and Eligio Martinez.

Action: If it is feasible within the budget, UCEP will invite Richard Flacks to the February meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Joe Kiskis