

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

February 6, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Denise Segura, Chair (UCSB)

Lynda Bell (UCR), Steven Constable (UCSD), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Richard Weiss (UCLA), Keith Williams (UCD), Benson Tongue (UCB), Stephen McLean (UCSB), Paul Elko (UCI), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Rozana Carducci (Student Rep-UCLA), Tina Park (Student Rep-UCLA), Cliff Brunk (Chair, Academic Senate), Julius Zelmanowitz (Vice Provost, Academic Initiatives), Julie Gordon (Director, Intercampus Program Coordination), Gretchen Kalonji (Director, International Strategy Development), Margaret Heisel (Student Academic Services), Barbara Hoblitzell (Student Academic Services), Eric Taggart (Director, ASSIST), Cliff Brunk (Chair, Academic Council), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Denise Segura

Academic Council continues to discuss Executive Compensation, including APM provisions concerning the length and recompense for sabbaticals and leaves by administrators with academic appointments, and proposed “slotting” schemes for senior management salaries. Council has urged more transparency in compensation practices and asked that any planned compensation structures for senior management should be subject to full review by the Academic Senate. President Dynes indicated that while UC's comparison schools are a mix of private and public institutions, competition for faculty, administrators and students is more and more often with private institutions, which often have more resources for employee compensation.

The UC-Bechtel partnership was awarded the contract for management of the Los Alamos National Laboratory and competition for Lawrence Livermore is about to begin.

The review process for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation has been finalized, and review of one of the institutes, IT², is scheduled to begin this year.

There is a mid-course correction to the structure of the Science and Math Initiative that is making the initiative campus-based. SMIG, the Senate workgroup is working on the transition to campus based management and coordination.

At its February meeting the Academic Assembly will consider a Memorial to the Regents proposing the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students after their first year. If Assembly passes the Memorial, a mail ballot will be circulated to all faculty on the campuses. A faculty-administration Graduate Student Financial Aid Task Force is also looking broadly at the potential consequences of possible revenue and funding shifts. Assembly will also act on Council's nomination of BOARS Chair Michael Brown (UCSB) to serve as 2006-07 Academic Senate Vice Chair. Suggested agenda topics for the joint Academic Council-Chancellor's meeting in April include the President's Diversity Task Force, the public status of UC, faculty quality of life, graduate education, and systemwide academic planning.

A small faculty Task Force that includes former UCEP Chair Joe Kiskis is reviewing systemwide [Senate Regulations](#) for possible improvements to consistency and modern relevance. The Task Force welcomes suggestions from committees or individual faculty for items in the Regulations that need attention.

UCEP's April 3 meeting will be cancelled.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP approved the minutes of December 5, 2005 with a few minor changes.

III. International Education – with Gretchen Kalonji

Director of International Strategy Development Gretchen Kalonji joined the meeting to talk about how the programs in her department impact undergraduate education.

International Strategy Development seeks to engage educators and institutions around the world in collaborative research initiatives that focus on practical issues and challenges facing both California and partner countries. No other American research university can provide the capacity of UC, and many potential international partners are eager to capitalize on the diversity, international character, and scale of the UC system and California and their leadership in areas like biotechnology, information technology, and the health sciences. UC is also eager to enhance its research with international expertise, and enrich UC and California communities with international students and scholars.

Key elements of UC's emerging international strategy include sharpening the focus and scope of existing international education and research collaborations; opening up new opportunities for UC faculty and students, including EAP students, to participate in international research; and identifying existing international research collaborations that can be expanded systemwide.

Director Kalonji said five pilot projects are currently in development, the most developed of which is the "10 +10 Alliance"—a recently launched partnership between UC and ten of China's public research universities. The goal of 10x10 is to address common social and economic challenges of California and China by capitalizing on existing research collaborations and other connections between American and Chinese faculty and California's large Chinese community. Multi-national teams of faculty will design curriculum around one of several research themes addressing social issues or problems—e.g., "Planning for Sustainability in a Wilderness Area," which is hoped will attract undergraduate students seeking a unique and substantial international education experience.

The four other pilot projects involve either existing or new research collaborations with universities in Canada, India and Mexico (UC-UNAM), as well as in Africa, where four new Institutes of Science and Technology are being developed to focus on health, agriculture and technology issues.

Director Kalonji said there are structural constraints in the UC system that need to be addressed and overcome to make the programs work effectively. These include the challenge of how to build the project administratively within the UC multi-campus structure—particularly, the integration of the curricula into the graduate and undergraduate program structure in departments on each campus. There are also financial concerns and constraints, including the current policy on non-resident tuition, and how to secure funding from research grants, and foundation, industrial, and private support. Coordinating access to language instruction will be critical. Finally, it has been difficult to gather comprehensive information about existing international education resources at UC within existing data structures.

UCEP members endorsed the general principles described by Director Kalonji. They said it will be essential to motivate the large community of international scholars, as well as others, to be involved in curricular development and to care about international education, and recommended that program organizers involve UC faculty in all aspects of project development. Some members expressed concern that the program seemed to lack a specific plan for the development of a practical implementation structure; a plan for administrative oversight of the curriculum and themes; and an analysis of the impact of undergraduate education. They said integrating research into the undergraduate curriculum is difficult with domestic programs. Members noted that to be successful the program must not merely capture existing international collaborations and move them under the umbrella of International Program Development, but also create new opportunities. Members said this could be a way to generate more interest in Engineering among women, and that it should be marketed to both Science and non-science students.

Finally, UCEP Members noted that the issue of international education should be also be included in UCEP's broader consideration of the future of Undergraduate Education at UC, particularly in the context of how various experiential programs—EAP, civic engagement, research, and other opportunities—impact the undergraduate experience.

IV. Report from the Office of the President—*Julius Zelmanowitz and Julie Gordon*

Director Gordon described a problem with an elective course offered at UCDC by Center Director and UCB Professor Bruce Cain, which was approved at Berkeley, and is taught at UCDC to mostly quarter campus students. The UCB registrar would not accept the course as a quarter course, which forced UCDC to put the course through a quarter system campus by appointing a UCSB faculty member as the instructor of record.

Two years ago, UCEP agreed to amend its charge to include the review and approval of universitywide domestic academic programs and courses. UCEP is now authorized to function as the systemwide approval committee for courses offered through UCDC, UCCS and the language consortium, after they have been approved at a home campus of record, which circumvents the need to put such courses through the approval process on all campuses. UCEP would not review the quality of the curriculum, but would instead be limited to determining whether such a course was appropriately a systemwide course.

UCDC is developing a proposal for dealing with its courses through a systemwide approval mechanism involving UCEP. Courses would originate from an individual campus, and with UCEP's approval become a UCDC or UCCS course. UCEP would also establish rules outlining how the course would be delivered to semester and quarter students and how the semester-quarter credit conversions should work. These issues will be revisited in depth at a future meeting.

Vice Provost Zelmanowitz reported on the status of several systemwide academic initiatives. The UC Center in Sacramento, which was instituted as a five-year pilot project, is in year three and is developing a permanency plan, which UCEP should expect to review next year.

The UC Teaching, Learning and Technology Center focuses on the use of technologies to improve teaching and learning. The Center's instructional focus is being linked to efforts by the UC IT Guidance Committee, a new systemwide group dealing with a long-term vision of IT in both administrative and scholarly terms.

The Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching is a systemwide collaboration in its sixth year. It offers a means by which UC's diverse language resources can be shared more widely. New national strategic priorities for language instruction may have a positive effect on funding.

UCEP members thanked Julius Zelmanowitz, who was attending his last meeting before returning to research and teaching at UCSB, for his service and advice to UCEP.

V. Implementation of Senate Regulation 477 and 478 – Streamlining and SciGETC

Academic Council has asked UCEP and BOARS to work with the Student Academic Services office on the systemwide implementation of SR 477 and 478. Margaret Heisel and Barbara Hoblitzell joined the meeting to discuss "UC Transfer Preparatory Pathways," a proposal for implementation that communicates to Community College students and counselors the full range of available UC lower division transfer preparatory patterns. Also present was Eric Taggart, director of [ASSIST](#), a website repository for intersegmental course articulation information.

Transfer students require a minimum 2.4 GPA and 60 transferable units of coursework, including a specific set of major preparation and general education requirements. UC advises prospective transfer students that fulfilling the transfer eligibility requirements does not guarantee admission to a specific campus or major. Students should prepare for a specific campus and major and apply broadly. The majority of UC transfer students come from only a handful of the 109 CCCs. Transfer applications to UC fell last year after increasing every year since 1998-99. Transfer students tend to be as successful as students who enter UC as freshmen.

The Legislature has asked UC to increase transfer enrollment and clarify the path to transfer. SB 1415, proposed in 2004, also asks UC campuses to develop a common course numbering system for its 20 largest majors. In 2005, the Senate passed SR 477, which provides that if at least four campuses articulate a course or set of courses for transfer from a CCC to UC and a specific major, then it is considered articulated systemwide. UC also sees SR 477 as a positive step in meeting the spirit of SB 1415, while maintaining the pedagogical diversity of the UC system.

SciGETC is a variation of IGETC, the transfer curriculum pattern for UC's general education requirements. It allows prospective transfer students planning a science major at UC to defer two general education courses while requiring the student to substantially complete the articulated lower division course requirements for the major.

The goal of UC Transfer Preparatory Pathways is to give students the ability to easily access the information they need to understand and compare transfer preparation patterns across campuses and systems, and plan a curriculum. Pathways would help the student identify majors for which IGETC is sufficient preparation, the majors that have similar preparation patterns across campuses, and the majors for which common course patterns do not exist and require a distinct required and/or recommended set of courses.

UCEP members reviewed four sample majors identified as having different levels of similarity and dissimilarity in lower division preparation requirements across campuses: Mechanical Engineering, Mathematics, Comparative Literature and Film Studies, along with each campus's reported advice to students about required ("req") and recommended ("rec") lower division courses needed for transfer admission into the major.

Members expressed concern that some departments were providing bad or inaccurate advice, and that selection and competitiveness were not being communicated in the designations of “rec” and “req,” which could mislead students into believing they could successfully complete a major on time without taking any of the “recommended” courses. The recommended courses are also ultimately required for completion of the major. Students should get the information that “rec” courses are ultimately going to be required for a degree in the major and that they should take as many of these lower division major prep courses as possible to have the best chance of being accepted at the campus of their choice and successfully completing the major of their choice. SAS noted that they are planning to convene a meeting of academic advisors from campus departments to help define the patterns more accurately.

It was also noted that since “Streamlining” was first proposed, UC has actually advanced from 71% articulation to what is now 95% of possible course articulation for major preparation. Members said the main goal should be to make the transfer process easier to understand and to help transfer students arrive at UC better prepared for the curriculum. With 95% articulation, the most important thing, over and above the mechanics of 477 implementation, was to get the new information out to students. UC and the Senate should perhaps “repackage the mandate” to make this the main priority.

Action: Student Academic Services will provide UCEP with a new grid that integrates the concepts that were indicated in the meeting as being important to clarify.

VI. Independent Course Responsibility for Graduate Student Instructors

Members reviewed the draft memo and identified the committee’s main policy proposal questioning the divide between Senate oversight of lower and upper division graduate student teaching. The notion that the faculty should not be delegating the approval of certain graduate student instructors to deans, but should be involved directly in the approval of all graduate student teaching, should be distributed to the divisions for comment through the standard Council review mechanism. One member noted that the Senate approves all Extension instructors at some campuses, and courses taught by graduate students should be considered at least as important.

UCEP may also want to propose changing the wording of Senate Regulation 750 to include approvals of lower division graduate student teaching in the Senate purview, instead of delegating those approvals to the dean (effectively dean’s staff), which is the situation at most campuses.

It was noted that as non-Senate instructors, virtually no graduate students are bound by the Faculty Code of Conduct. If new procedures are set up for graduate student instructors, there should be consideration of how to possibly bring them under the Code, although these titles are under union agreements, which may cause such a proposal to come under additional scrutiny. In the second to last paragraph, there should be stronger message to the campuses.

Action: UCEP will re-craft the memo to be a stronger call to the campuses and request a standard senate review of graduate instruction at all levels.

VII. Undergraduate Education at UC

UCEP was asked to advise Academic Planning Council about whether it would be useful to constitute a task force to conduct a broad review of undergraduate education at the University.

A draft discussion document was distributed summarizing UCEP's ideas for the key questions and recommended areas that could be usefully explored by a task force.

Members decided the statement should establish a clearer context, and if the recommendation is for a Task Force, provide a clear charge. The charge should include an examination of the distinct opportunities that go along with being an undergraduate in a large research university, and how undergraduate education might be enhanced by such elements as research, international education, service learning, a capstone requirement, and future innovations and new technologies like distance learning and "pod-casting". The Task Force would focus attention on the part of UC's mission involving teaching and the education of undergraduates, which are sometimes overlooked. Finally, the task force could serve a program advocacy role and make long term planning recommendations.

UCEP should also include a recommendation about which faculty and/or administrative entities should constitute the TF. It was decided that the Senate should provide much of the leadership for defining a vision of what undergraduate education is or should be, so a Senate-only Task force may be preferable, with input from campus undergraduate deans.

Finally, members decided an appropriate outcome of the Task Force would be a white paper on "Undergraduate Education for UC in the Next Twenty Years".

Action: UCEP will re-craft the draft statement to incorporate the ideas from the discussion and to outline a clearer proposed charge.

VIII. Review of UCAP/Council's Proposed Modifications to APM language criteria for advancement to Step VI and Above Scale

UCEP weighed in during the informal review stage, particularly in terms of how teaching was presented in the language. The proposal is now out for formal review.

Action: UCEP endorsed the Council-approved version.

IX. Program Reviews

Discussion was deferred until a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Denise Segura

Distributions:

1. 10 + 10 Alliance
2. International Strategy Development at the University of California
3. Academic Senate Regulation 477: Streamlining UC Major Preparation Articulation
4. Implementing Streamlining: Powerpoint slides