

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2007**

**Attending:** Richard Weiss, Chair (UCLA) Keith Williams, Vice-Chair (UCD), Kim Griest (UCSD), Lowell Gallagher (UCLA), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Benson Tongue (UCB), Omer Blaes (UCSB), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Martin Kohan (Student Rep-UCB), Susan Wilbur (Director of Undergraduate Admissions), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

**I. General Announcements and Updates – UCEP Chair Richard Weiss**

Chair Weiss noted several of the issues being discussed by the Academic Council and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS).

The Regents have asked the Senate to clarify its position on a proposed universitywide ban on research funding from tobacco companies. In addition, Regent John Moores asked Senate Chair Oakley to respond to a series of specific questions related to the proposed ban. A Council Work Group comprised of faculty on both sides of the issue was formed to coordinate a response.

Council is encouraging the UC Administration to conduct Senior Management Group searches and reclassifications in an open and transparent manner, and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare has questioned Mercer Consulting's assessment of UC compensation, which suggested that taking benefits into account, UC provides better total remuneration than its competitors despite lower faculty salaries. The University Committee on Planning and Budget wants the University to increase its efforts to convey to the state legislature the urgent need to increase faculty salaries, and the University Committee on Preparatory Education – despite losing the support of UCEP – is moving forward with its proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 636, codifying a systemwide cap on the class size of entry level writing requirement courses.

UCEP Vice Chair Williams reported that an ICAS task force met in late February to discuss “C-ID,” a proposal from the California Community Colleges for a common, cross-segmental numbering system for lower division major preparation courses. UC's position on C-ID is that the benefits for UC are not clear, but UC would like to continue participating in the project as long as significant additional resources are not required. Chair Weiss participates in a second ICAS task force that is discussing the cross-segmental alignment of general education requirements.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** UCEP approved the draft minutes of the February 5, 2007 meeting.

### III. Streamlining Articulation and Transfer Preparation Paths Initiatives – with Susan Wilbur

Undergraduate Admissions Director Susan Wilbur joined UCEP to update the Committee on efforts to implement Senate Resolution [477](#) (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process) and *UC Transfer Preparation Paths*.

“Streamlining” is intended to ease and improve community college student transfer by obligating individual UC campuses to articulate specific courses or course sequences required for UC majors with community college courses. *UC Transfer Preparation Paths* is the mechanism that displays the Streamlining transfer requirement information for prospective transfer students. The goal of *Transfer Paths* is to allow students to easily compare lower division major preparation requirements for specific majors at different UC campuses. It provides information about common requirements that are both campus-specific and that show differences or similarities between UC campuses.

Campus articulation officers and UCOP staff have identified the 20 highest demand majors and developed *Transfer Path* documents for four of those majors – biology, history, chemistry, and psychology – to test its usability. Those four paths are now posted to <http://www.uctransfer.org/>. The next step is to gradually expand implementation to all 20 top transfer majors.

**Guide to Process.** At a previous UCEP meeting, the Committee asked UCOP staff to produce a guide outlining the process for developing, vetting, and approving a *Transfer Path*. Director Wilbur circulated two draft documents: *Streamlining UC Major Articulation and the UC Transfer Preparation Paths Process: Overview and Consultation Guidelines*, as well as a draft *Transfer Path* template for the chemistry major. Also distributed before the meeting was a draft letter from Chair Oakley to divisional Senate directors asking directors to identify a campus committee to “oversee and coordinate,” together with campus articulation officers, the local review of future *Transfer Paths*.

The overview document described a five-step implementation process for both Streamlining and for the development, review, and publication of future *Transfer Paths* documents. Director Wilbur said the first three steps – Identifying the top 20 disciplines by demand, Identifying/analyzing similar majors and common requirements for each of the top 20 disciplines, and Initial development and review of the Transfer Paths for a discipline – were complete for the four initial majors. The fourth step, outlining a process for identifying articulation gaps and inconsistencies, and the fifth step, outlining the process for the annual update and review of Streamlining and *Transfer Paths*, were still in development.

Director Wilbur added that UCOP does not intend to impose mandates on campuses to close articulation gaps or align major preparation requirements with other campuses; rather, the intent is to work with campuses to discuss what might be possible.

***Transfer Paths* template.** Director Wilbur said the goal of the *Transfer Paths* documents is to provide clear, simple, and useable information to students about the lower division coursework required for graduation in a major, the coursework needed to be competitive for admission into a major as a transfer, and general education requirements. The requirements and commonalities of lower division major coursework, as well as potential pitfalls, must be explained clearly.

Some UCEP members were concerned that campus articulation officers would not be able to keep *Transfer Paths* accurate and current unless changes to catalog copy were linked to mechanisms for updating the Paths. Another concern was that students should be informed about impacted majors.

**Faculty consultation and review.** The overview document also outlined a consultation process involving campus articulation officers, UCOP staff, departmental faculty, and local Senate committees for vetting and approving *Transfer Paths* on both an annual and ongoing basis. This review process will precede the publication of the *Transfer Paths* information.

The draft memo to Senate chairs proposes that the local campus CEP or Admissions committee work with articulation officers to identify local faculty with expertise to provide input about major preparation requirements, and participate in review and sign-off of future *Transfer Paths*. It notes that meanwhile, UCEP and BOARS will continue considering overall goals and facilitating communication between local and systemwide entities.

UCEP noted its approval of both the process overview presented by UCOP and the proposed role for local committees and UCEP outlined in Chair Oakley's draft letter. Feedback from faculty, campuses, and potential users would be essential for *Transfer Paths* to clearly and accurately communicate the requirements for admission into a major. The Committee felt that the divisions should identify the responsible committee by the end of the 06-07 academic year.

UCEP also noted that the document should clarify UCEP's role in the implementation of the "opt out" provision of SR 477. If UCEP is informed about a campus' decision to opt out of a proposed articulation, it is not clear what UCEP does with that information.

**Action:** Members will discuss the materials with local CEPs. UCEP will give additional feedback to Director Wilbur, who will put finishing touches on the process guide and the new *Transfer Path* template and present a progress report to UCEP in the future.

#### **IV. Systemwide Review of The Regents' Proposed RE-89 – Adoption of Policy Restricting University Acceptance of Funding From the Tobacco Industry**

The Regents asked the Senate to clarify its position on a proposed policy to ban research funding from tobacco companies. Faculty opinion is divided between those who view the principles of academic freedom and no-strings-attached research funding as the highest concern and those who are uncomfortable with the unethical and manipulative practices of the tobacco industry.

**Action:** UCEP voted to oppose RE-89. The vote was five to one against with one abstention. The Committee will report its vote to Council.

#### **V. UCEP/CCGA's Joint Report on the Role of Graduate Students in Instruction**

In March, Chair Weiss and Vice Chair Williams met with CCGA's chair and vice chair in a conference call to discuss next steps for the joint committee report *The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction*. Chair Weiss suggested that UCEP and CCGA identify the

core principles that should guide campuses' use of graduate student instructors, and then base a revised set of recommendations on those principles that would embody more flexible standards instead of mandates. The conference call participants also reviewed UCEP's preliminary ideas about what the core principles should be.

Chair Weiss noted that many campuses are concerned about protecting local structures and practices. Some divisions expressed opposition to the report's proposal to establish two new systemwide graduate student instructor titles. In addition, the recommendation to prohibit graduate students from assuming full responsibility as "Instructors of Record" except in rare circumstances, met resistance from graduate students, who are concerned that to be competitive for jobs, they need to cite instructor of record experience.

Chair Weiss said campuses define "instructor of record" status differently, and that graduate students with different levels of experience require different levels of mentoring and supervision. The report should articulate in better detail what might be entailed in faculty "mentoring," both during the regular year and in summer – e.g., reviewing and providing feedback on syllabi, course materials, and exams; observing lectures; signing off on grades; and being available to meet with students if problems arise. In summer, such oversight might be less intensive and involve one or more faculty members being available to assist students from multiple classes. UCEP and CCGA might propose, rather than mandate, different general categories of student instructors, but allow campuses the flexibility to establish titles and enact a system that was more or less restrictive based on local needs. Chair Weiss asked members to forward any written campus guidelines about training and mentoring student instructors, so they could be assembled as a basis for best practices.

**Summer Instruction.** Acting Director for Academic Planning and Budget Carol Copperud distributed data on Summer Session teaching by faculty and graduate student instructors. She said the state provides UC extra funds to help it increase summer enrollment to 40% of the capacity of a regular term. The state wants the quality of summer teaching to be "substantially equivalent" to regular academic year standards. Campuses can maintain their existing summer practices to some extent, but it is also important for UC to show that the use of graduate students in the summer is consistent with regular year practice. She asked UCEP to keep these goals in mind as it makes revisions to the report.

UCEP members noted some barriers to the expansion of summer session: resistance from students, sequential course schedules, and higher summer housing costs. Some members felt the UCEP position that instruction by graduate students should not exceed 10% of total instruction could be difficult to apply to summer when many more graduate students teach. These members thought the proposed 10% limit should be eliminated from the report. Chair Weiss noted that increasing faculty involvement in GSI training and oversight during Summer Session presented challenges; but it could also be an opportunity to implement a new system of training at the time of year when the largest numbers of graduate students are teaching.

**Action:** Members will forward links to or copies of campus policies, guidelines, and approval processes having to do with how graduate student instructors are trained and mentored.

## **VI. Undergraduate Education Planning Group**

Provost Hume is moving forward to establish the Undergraduate Education Planning Group originally proposed by UCEP to consider various “21<sup>st</sup> Century challenges” for undergraduate education. The UCEP chair and vice chair will both serve as UCEP’s representatives to the Planning Group for the remainder of 2006-07.

Chair Weiss said UCEP could help drive the initial direction of the Group. He asked members to consider how undergraduate education should be defined and viewed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century University. He noted that the conception of the University in America had shifted away from being an institution engaged primarily in the “search for truth” to an institution whose main mission was to provide job training.

Members noted that job training was one of many facets of UC’s mission. That mission should not be considered the primary mission, but it should not be ignored. Some members thought UCEP could help draft a mission statement articulating a global view of undergraduate education. Others thought it would be difficult to arrive at a simple mission statement representative of everything the Steering Committee would be addressing.

**Action:** Chair Weiss will prepare an initial draft mission statement articulating a preliminary list of goals for the University in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, for the Planning Group to consider.

## **VII. The Public Availability of Grades and GPAs**

Recently “Pick-a-Prof,” a commercial website, successfully sued UC for the right to post data listing the average GPA given in every course at every UC campus, which is sortable by specific instructor. UCEP had previously discussed the possibility of pursuing recommendations about how faculty should be addressing this new public availability of GPAs, the resulting realization of grading policy differences, and potential negative effects, such as grade standardization and grade inflation. It was noted that although some students pick professors based on their reputation for giving higher grade point averages, others seek out instructors and courses that they believe will benefit them intellectually and/or allow them to enhance performance on graduate school entrance exams.

**Action:** UCEP decided not to pursue the issue further at this time.

## **VIII. Earth and Space Sciences**

Chair Weiss received a letter and resolution from the State Mining and Geology Board asking the Senate to reconsider a decision to not add Earth and Space Sciences (ESS) as a fourth core laboratory science option in UC’s “d” and “g” admissions requirements. He noted that the ESS community has been lobbying the Senate for several years to change the requirement. BOARS and UCEP both discussed the issue on several occasions and each time came out in favor of maintaining the current policy. He distributed a memo from BOARS Chair Rashid to a reporter that summarized the rationale for the BOARS/UCEP position. The memo noted that ESS courses are, in fact, considered sufficient for core discipline requirements as long as they include fundamental knowledge in biology, chemistry, and/or physics.

**Action:** UCEP decided to take no action.

## **IX. Campus Reports and UCEP Member Items**

**Santa Barbara.** The UCSB committee is discussing a Film and Media Studies course that includes a prerequisite agreement that students produce a promotional film for a private company in exchange for \$1200 and academic credit. Some faculty are uncomfortable with the arrangement. The UCSB representative asked about systemwide principles or regulations related to students who receive money and academic units for taking an undergraduate course and the principles behind UC policies for paying students to teach courses.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Richard Weiss

### **Distributions:**

1. Streamlining UC Major Articulation and the UC Transfer Preparation Paths Process Overview and Consultation Guidelines
2. UC Statewide Transfer Preparation Path – Chemistry
3. Divisional Coordination of UC Transfer Preparation Paths
4. UC Summer Faculty – Number of Faculty Teaching Primary Courses 2000-2006
5. Memo from CCGA Vice Chair Schumm re: GSIs and Academic Freedom
6. Memo from Boars Chair Rashid re: Earth/Space Sciences