

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

June 6, 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), Randolph Bergstrom (UCSB), Harry Green (UCR), Eligio Martinez (Student Rep-UCLA), Margaret Heisel, (Student Academic Services), Barbara Hoblitzell (Student Academic Services), George Blumenthal (Chair, Academic Senate), Cliff Brunk (Vice-Chair, Academic Council), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Joe Kiskis

The Academic Assembly met May 11 at UCB and approved the establishment of the Merced Senate Division (pending sufficient funding for a Senate office), Academic Council's Resolution on Research Funding Sources, an amendment to Senate Bylaw 128 (appointment of subcommittees by UCOC), and 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).

ICAS has been discussing how regular faculty can play a bigger role in WASC reviews, and what will replace the California Articulation Numbering System now that CSU has withdrawn from participation in CAN. ICAS' finalized transfer discussion document is included in the agenda.

BOARS recommended to Academic Council that UC stop considering National Merit Scholarship status for any admissions or scholarship decisions, and CCGA proposed that international graduate students be treated like out of state domestic students for purposes of tuition. Council has asked several Senate committees to look into possible systemwide standards for Institutional Review Boards.

II. Consent Calendar

UCEP approved the minutes of May 9, 2005.

III. Consultation with Student Academic Services

– With Margaret Heisel and Barbara Hoblitzell

As the university prepares to implement several new initiatives from legislators, UCOP and the Senate related to transfer—including SR 477 (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process) and SR 478 (SciGETC)—the Student Affairs Office has asked for closer communication with the Senate, in order to provide faculty with a coherent view on transfer issues from the Student Affairs perspective, and to get feedback from faculty about how to implement the new policies most effectively. Margaret Heisel and Barbara Hoblitzell joined the meeting. They work at UCOP on programs geared toward potential incoming UC students, including those transferring to UC from California Community Colleges.

Currently the majority of UC transfer students come from only a handful of the 109 CCCs, and most of those colleges are in affluent areas or near a UC campus. Few students transfer from

CCCs located either in very remote areas of the state or in urban districts. Roughly 1/3 of students arrive at CCC with a transfer objective, others have different purposes, and others are less certain about their goals. Only about 33% of students who arrive with “transfer intent” transfer within 6 years.

Transferring to UC has become more selective. UC advises prospective transfer students to be academically competitive, to prepare for a specific campus and major, and to apply broadly. UC transfers require a minimum 2.4 GPA and 60 transferable units of coursework, including a specific set of major preparation and general education requirements. However, the preparation requirements for a given major can vary widely from campus to campus, which can be confusing for students. It has been challenging to guide CCC students in the selection of courses that will prepare them for a specific UC campus’ major, facilitate their application for admission to multiple campuses, and ensure they are appropriately prepared with a minimum of excess non-transferable units. CCC students tend to be less informed about opportunities in higher education or about how transfer and course articulation work. There is also a perception, both in the Legislature and at CCC that UC makes it too difficult for students to transfer.

The university remains committed to a 1999 Partnership Compact agreement to raise its CCC transfer enrollment by 6% per year to 15,300 in 2005-06, although UC has not yet met this target because of budget and enrollment cuts. As demographics shift over the next few years, the University will be asked to accept a larger number of transfer students to meet a growing demand for higher education. The Legislature wants to improve transfer and increase efficiencies in higher education, and has asked UC to increase the enrollment of transfer students and clarify the path to transfer.

UC is responding to these concerns. Focus group interviews are being conducted with transfer students around the state, which is providing useful data about what students see to be confusions and weaknesses in the system. UCOP has formed an UC-CCC transfer advisory board to discuss strategies and options for improving transfer. UC campus admissions offices are working together on a new system called CETAD, which will enable them to share application data. In 2004, the Legislature asked UC campuses to develop a common course numbering system for its 20 largest majors. Senate Regulation 477 is a positive step for UC in meeting the spirit of SB 1415.

Academic Council has asked UCEP to be the lead committee in charge of monitoring the implementation of SR 477. BOARS has been asked to work on SR 478 (SciGETC). Student Academic Services expressed interest in working with the Senate on these and other issues. They said it is important for communication about implementation to be well coordinated at UC, and for UC’s print, electronic, and in-person messages about transfer to be improved and consolidated so that clear, accurate messages reach CCC students, faculty and advisors.

Members agreed that discussion about the implementation of 477 should include a number of topics—the process for identifying similar majors (which UCEP has suggested should include the input of both IMPAC and divisional committees); common major preparation requirements; how the opt-out process and articulated course decertification would be structured within the

different campus schedules and calendar systems, and finally, whether funding is available to automate the process through ASSIST or some other mechanism.

Finally, SAS asked UCEP's help in a study of transfer student transcripts to determine the causes of excess unit accumulation and patterns of enrollments into various majors. One member suggested that UCUES could be used as a tool to get data on community college transfer students.

Action: Chair Blumenthal and Chair Kiskis agreed to consolidate implementation plans for SR 477 and SR 478 in order to develop a comprehensive plan for lower division transfer preparation and communication of this pattern to prospective transfers and to community colleges. It was recommended that BOARS and UCEP members participate in this effort, possibly in the form of a subcommittee. It was also noted that this senate group or another subcommittee—perhaps at the Intersegmental level—should look proactively and comprehensively at transfer problems or potential problems. The Academic Senate leadership will consider this. Chair Kiskis will write a memo to next year's UCEP Chair. A proposed timeline for action will be developed, and work will commence during the summer if faculty schedules allow.

V. Technical Review of APM 190 Appendix F – Policy on the Use of Non-19900 Fund Sources to Support Ladder-Rank Faculty

The committee raised concerns about both the revisions in question and the policy as a whole. Members did not agree with the “technical” characterization of the revisions, particularly the move of Professional School Fees from the Non-19900 (General) fund source category to the General Fund category.

Members were surprised that the University had been including overhead monies in its definition of “General Funds”, and concerned that General Funds would now include professional school fees. It did not seem appropriate to some members that a portion of research overhead money would be used to fund teaching or to supplement general faculty salaries, and that the large professional school fee increases were not being returned to the individual units as part of an ongoing policy to make the units self-supporting, but instead going directly into the “General Fund.” It seemed unfair that student fees would not be returned to improve student education through the unit that generated the fees, but put into the general fund.

Members agreed that the Senate, perhaps with UCPB taking the lead, should take a closer look at the details and implications of both the revisions and the policy.

Action: David Bunch and Keith Gilless will conduct additional research into the issue and send comments to Chair Kiskis.

VI. Entry Level Writing Class Size

In May, UCEP reviewed data drawn from a survey of campus undergraduate Vice Provosts estimating the resource implications of bringing campuses into compliance with national standards for the basic writing class. In general, UCEP members felt that the systemwide costs associated with capping the entry-level writing class size at 20 students were not significant, when averaged over the system. And although the costs required for a 15-student cap were

significantly higher, the committee also felt they were in the reasonable realm of possibility, especially as new funds become available through the Compact agreement.

After the May meeting, UCEP reviewed UCOPE's study on the effectiveness of reduced writing class size. In general, the committee found strong evidence for a beneficial effect of smaller writing classes in the report. However, some members would have been more impressed by additional evidence, and not all members were convinced that the case for smaller ELWR classes is stronger than that for smaller classes in other subjects.

Members agreed that smaller class size has a positive educational effect on all fields and disciplines. They also agreed with UCOPE that writing instruction has unique pedagogical importance due to the nature of the work and the instruction, and the benefits of smaller class sections.

UCEP agreed that a move to a 15 or 20 cap would have the biggest impact on campuses with the most ELWR students and with the largest current class sizes, but if adjustments are made slowly as campus budgets and classroom space increase, the impacts on other programs would be small. As new resources become available from the Compact and other sources, reducing writing class sizes to the recommended levels should be a high priority use for the new funds.

UCEP will recommend that campuses voluntarily adhere to UCOPE's proposed standard of a 15-20-student class size cap. In addition, data focusing on the effectiveness of local ELWR courses should be collected at the campus level on an ongoing basis. This data may include the success rate in ELWR courses and the number of times the course is taken to achieve success. Other relevant indicators would include the performance of students in later writing classes and classes in other subjects that include substantial writing. Campuses that do not wish to comply with the smaller class size standard should submit evidence that their ELWR writing program with larger caps is as effective as those that have the recommended class size.

Action: UCEP will draft comments and communicate with UCOPE about the possibility of submitting either a joint letter with UCOPE or simultaneous, separate letters.

VII. Credit for International Baccalaureate Curriculum

A few questions arose after members agreed in May to review the curriculum for several IB SL courses, which BOARS has determined to be college level, to decide what number of university units students should be awarded depending on their IB exam score. First, the packets distributed to UCEP members did not provide a clear correspondence between performance levels and exam scores, and then a question came up about whether UCEP even had the authority to set unit credit. (It would be UCEP's role to determine general unit credit for these courses, but up to individual divisions to say whether a particular test score could satisfy a specific course requirement.)

Action: Chair Blumenthal recommended that UCEP continue its work on the project if the information about the former becomes available. In the meantime, the Senate office will resolve the latter question.

VIII. UCEP Projects

Entry-Level Quantitative Skills Requirement: Richard Hughey reported that the UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee discussing a proposal for an entry-level quantitative skills requirement would continue its deliberations over the summer.

Action: The subcommittee will write a memo to next year's UCEP.

Academic Integrity: After the May meeting, members were sharing Keith Gilless' report on campus academic integrity-related policies with their local CEPs for an accuracy check, discussion and comment. After all responses come in, UCEP will forward the document to campuses for formal consideration and feedback about whether there should be systemwide policies on punitive grades; faculty authority and responsibility for assigning punitive grades; and/or the use of anti-cheating software. It is hoped that campuses and CEPs will work together to clarify policies around these issues.

Action: The committee will continue work on the academic integrity issue next year.

IX. Update on the California Science and Math Initiative (SMI)

Chair Kiskis reported that a systemwide Task Force has met twice to discuss the SMI, and will send its report to President Dynes in mid-June, after which the Senate will conduct a full review of a final proposal. A media event was held at UCI to announce financial commitments from the governor and private industry. Proposals have been sent to NSF to fund the development of the summer institutes and for a research project to study the efficacy of the initiative.

UCEP members had brought a draft of the proposal to their campuses to get feedback about the Academic Senate role in Senate review of SMI programs along a proposed timeline as well as possible impediments to that review. There is some concern that the timeframe for the project is too ambitious to ensure a full and proper review.

SMI will need to be integrated into the campuswide and department level program review cycles. Although review time could be amplified due to the high level of curricular innovation in the SMI, members are confident that the mechanisms for Senate review and approval of the field experience course proposals are in place. However, work must be done to identify faculty on the campuses who will actually define and produce the proposals. There may be already-existing field experience courses that can be used at least during the first year of the Initiative, which will need to be identified and coordinated at the local level. Working with K-12 schools to expand capacity for field experiences to accommodate SMI students may take considerable time.

The credentialing piece of the proposal was a particular concern for committee members. Currently, a single-subject Science teaching credential in California requires a certain breadth in science that an individual physics major for instance, would not get in four years. Members agreed that resolution of this issue (with the state credentialing committee and others) should be the highest current priority. SMI organizers must be able to state with certainty that they will be able to offer a credential as advertised, and the program must be designed to produce excellent teachers, and be of excellent, UC-caliber quality from the start.

Finally it was noted that historically UC has not been successful in producing teachers. One hope is that the new program is structured so that students will graduate both qualified to teach and to pursue technical careers or graduate study and that the teaching option will be attractive to more students.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Joe Kiskis

Distributions

1. Powerpoint Slides: CCC-UC Transfer Preparation Initiatives and Challenges
2. Binder and Associates Focus group report