

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, JUNE 11, 2007

**Attending:** Richard Weiss, Chair (UCLA) Keith Williams, Vice-Chair (UCD), Kim Griest (UCSD), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), David Kay (UCI), Pierre Keller (UCR), Benson Tongue (UCB), Omer Blaes (UCSB), Cynthia Pineda (Student Rep-UCLA), Nan Zhang (Student Rep-UCB), Susan Wilbur (Director of Undergraduate Admissions), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

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

Chair Weiss summarized some of the major issues being discussed at meetings of the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

Council and Assembly: In May, the Academic Council approved a revised UCRP benefits proposal for UC ladder rank faculty on Leave Without Pay at the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and the Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research, and the Assembly voted to oppose Regents' item RE-89, a proposal to ban the acceptance of research funding from the tobacco industry. A new Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools is expected to be released for systemwide Senate review in fall 2007, and a joint Senate-administration Task Force has been established to review and clarify the language describing the mathematics and laboratory science eligibility requirements. UCOPE's proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 636, mandating a systemwide cap on the class size of entry level writing requirement courses, has been released for systemwide review. Chair Oakley forwarded a request from UCEP and BOARS to divisional Senate chairs asking that the chairs designate a local committee to oversee local faculty participation in the implementation of the Streamlining Articulation and Transfer Preparation Paths initiatives.

Academic Planning Council: The Undergraduate Education Planning Group met for the first time and discussed a mission statement to guide the work of the group articulating the distinctive quality of undergraduate education at a public research university. The Information Technology Guidance Committee has issued a report on the future of IT in higher education, which UCEP will review next year, and a joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education has completed a report on international education recommending some changes in the organizational structure of UC's international programs. UCEP should be asked to review the report and comment on its recommendations next year.

ICAS: An ICAS task force is discussing "C-ID," a proposal for a common cross-segmental numbering system for lower division major preparation courses. A second task force is discussing ways to increase the alignment of general education transfer requirements across segments, although the Community College system prefers CSU's "breadth" system over UC's more restrictive IGETC. ICAS reviewed a draft of BOARS' Eligibility Reform proposal.

Finally, Chair Weiss encouraged members to consider serving as UCEP vice chair in 2007-08.

## II. Consent Calendar

1. Draft minutes of April 2, 2007
2. Systemwide Senate Review of the Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 181 – Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy Committee

**ACTION:** UCEP approved the consent calendar.

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

Undergraduate Admissions Director Susan Wilbur joined UCEP to discuss the implementation of Senate Resolution [477](#) (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process), [California Senate Bill 652](#), and *UC Transfer Preparation Paths*. She circulated final drafts of *Transfer Path* documents covering systemwide and campus-specific requirements for the chemistry major, which were revised to reflect suggestions UCEP made in April. Transfer Paths for chemistry, biology, history, and psychology are now posted to <http://www.uctransfer.org/>, and will gradually expand to include the 20 highest demand transfer majors. The consultation and review process proposed by BOARS and UCEP for vetting and approving future Transfer Paths will begin with physics, economics, and business, after divisional Senate chairs identify a local committee to participate in this process. An additional long-term goal is to link the information at [uctransfer.org](http://www.uctransfer.org/) with data in ASSIST, the website repository of specific inter-segmental course articulation agreements.

Director Wilbur noted that one component of the “streamlining” legislation [supported by the University](#) is a request for UC to identify gaps in major preparation articulation, places where one campus requires a particular course but one or more others do not. SB 652 specifically asks the UC Academic Senate “to review the existing differences in lower division major preparation in each major across UC campuses, recognizing that one goal of these requirements should be to achieve similarity to the greatest degree that is academically appropriate.”

Chair Weiss suggested that the existence of the gaps and differences in articulation could be communicated to departments in a letter co-signed by UCEP. The letter would alert departments about the differences between their requirements and the requirements of other campuses for particular majors, and request that the department review the missing articulation. The letter should not have an accusatory tone or imply a mandate. The language of the template letter should be discussed at UCEP first.

Chair Weiss commended Director Wilbur and her staff for their work on the “streamlining” and Transfer Paths initiatives.

**ACTION:** UCEP will draft a template letter.

## IV. UC Irvine Request for Variances to Senate Regulations 780 and 810A

UCEP reviewed a request from the UC Irvine Division for the approval of two variances to systemwide Senate regulations. The first is an amendment to Irvine Regulation A365, which represents a variance to systemwide Senate Regulation 780. The second is a change to Irvine

Regulation A385, which Irvine forwarded as a requested variance to systemwide Senate Regulation 810(A).

The amendment to A365 – Change of Grade Basis – would allow a student to petition an associate dean in exceptional circumstances to change a P/NP grade to a “C” or “F” letter grade. UCI noted the example of a student who transfers to a university that refuses to accept “P” for credit. UCEP decided the variance was an appropriate accommodation for students in such situations, and the substitution of “C” for the P grade would protect against grade shoppers.

UCI’s requested variance to A385 – Normal Progress Requirement (Undergraduate) – would allow students who take courses through Access UCI: Concurrent Enrollment to have units and grade points counted on their transcripts when they are admitted or readmitted to UCI as regular students. UCEP felt the variance was appropriate, but questioned whether A385 actually required systemwide approval as a variance. The language in SR 810(A) – “Except as may otherwise be provided in the Academic Regulations of the Division, grade points for courses taken in University Extension are not counted toward fulfilling requirements for the degree” – could imply that the ultimate rules governing degree credit are the divisional regulations.

**ACTION:** UCEP unanimously approved Irvine Regulation A365 as a variance to SR 780 as well as Irvine Regulation A385 as a variance to SR 810, subject to UCR&J’s ruling that A385 represents a variance to that regulation.

## **V. Position Description for Vice President – International Affairs**

UCEP reviewed a draft position description for the proposed Vice President-International Affairs. Provost Hume submitted the position description to Academic Council after Council expressed concern that a proposed reclassification for the individual in charge UC’s International Strategy Development unit was proceeding without a position review, a job description (including an explanation of the Vice President’s role within EAP and other international programs), and an open search. Council asked UCEP to comment on the position description.

UCEP felt that the position description appeared to be well-considered and appropriately responsive to the specific concerns Council expressed to the provost in February, although the committee noted that the establishment and search for a high-level administrative position should be conducted in a manner consistent with normal procedures, particularly after the very recent and publicly aired concerns about UC’s executive compensation policies and practices, which damaged the reputation of the University. UCEP will recommend that Council endorse the position description, commend the provost for the thoroughness of the effort, and note its expectation that an open search for the best candidate should proceed without delay.

**ACTION:** UCEP will send comments to Academic Council endorsing the position description.

## **VI. UC Center in Washington Systemwide Course**

In 2004, UCEP’s [bylaw](#) and [Regulation 544D](#) were modified to include in the charge of the committee the approval of UC undergraduate courses as systemwide courses to be listed in

divisional catalogues. In 2006, UC Washington Center Director Bruce Cain indicated to UCEP that UCDC wanted a simple process to offer courses to students from all campuses, but was encountering the bureaucratic difficulty of obtaining course approval at nine campuses and determining appropriate unit credit for both quarter and semester students. UCEP agreed to a process for reviewing and approving systemwide courses, whereby UCEP would send a proposed systemwide course to the approval committee at the campus of the instructor of origin to examine the content of the course. If approved there, UCEP would opine on its appropriateness as a systemwide course, determine the credit units, and request that it be listed in all campus catalogs. UCEP reviewed a proposed systemwide course from UCDC – “California on the Hill” – that had been approved at UC Berkeley.

UCEP decided to approve the course pending additional information. The committee will ask UCDC to send catalog copy for both the semester students and quarter students; to clarify how the credit units for semester and quarter students will be counted; and to detail the assignment of in-class and outside class work related to the non-overlapping course sequence structure for the semester students who take extra material not present for the quarter students. UCEP will ask UCOP and the Registrars to clarify the mechanism through which UCEP’s approval of a systemwide course is communicated to the Registrars, and how the course would be listed in all campus catalogs. UCEP will ask the Registrars to suggest the appropriate course numbering and will recommend that each schedule of classes include a title for Universitywide course listings to include California on the Hill.

**ACTION:** UCEP unanimously approved the course subject to receiving the additional information from UCDC and the Registrars.

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

A subcommittee consisting of UCEP Chair Weiss, Vice Chair Williams and representatives from CCGA met three times to discuss *The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction*. The subcommittee attempted to craft a revised set of recommendations that maintained the primary goal of the document, but was also responsive to concerns raised by reviewers while maximizing the flexibility of individual campuses to implement the recommendations within the context of local practices and needs. The subcommittee asked CCGA and UCEP to give final approval before the end of the 2006-2007 academic year.

Vice Chair Williams noted that “Regular” faculty is a specific term defined in APM 220-4 to describe Professor Series titles, and does not include several of the instructional titles in APM 110-4(14), including Lecturer SOE, which are intended to be potential agents of graduate student instructor oversight. He suggested removing the word “regular” from the text to avoid confusion with the APM 220 definition and to maintain consistency with the proposed removal of “regular” from APM 410-20. In addition, language defining Teaching Assistant and Teaching Fellow in APM-410 4a and 4b should be changed to remove “regular” and replace “lower division” with “undergraduate” to be consistent with the proposed new wording for SR 750. UCEP members agreed and suggested several other minor amendments to the text of the report. The committee was hopeful that the report would be approved.

**ACTION:** UCEP will send its proposed modifications to CCGA in time for its June 19 meeting.

## **IX. Systemwide Senate Review of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates Proposed Resolution on the Proper Use of the California High School Exit Exam**

UCEP reviewed ICAS' proposed resolution for the "Proper Use of the California High School Exit Exam" (CAHSEE). UCEP endorsed the three-pronged resolution by a vote of seven to zero with one abstention. Both of UCEP's student representatives also supported the resolution.

Members opined that there were enough questions about CAHSEE's value and impact to call its use into question. There was broad support in UCEP for the first two recommendations, and many committee members felt strongly that ICAS' third recommendation – against the use of CAHSEE as a sole or major determinant of high school graduation – was appropriate in light of a number of concerns: the apparent correlation between CAHSEE scores and the inequitable distribution of resources in California public high schools; evidence that CAHSEE (and standardized tests in general) carry a cultural bias that has a disproportionately negative effect on underprivileged and underrepresented minority students; and concerns about the effects of standardized testing on pedagogy.

There were a few additional reservations about the resolution noted by individual members of UCEP that were not endorsed by the committee as a whole, including concerns that anecdotal evidence was being used as a basis for arguing against CAHSEE and that Senate support of the resolution might lead to a perception that the faculty do not value high academic standards or are unwilling to apply a measure of those standards and attach consequences to the measurement. Chair Weiss encouraged members to submit additional comments and reservations to the analyst by email.

**ACTION:** UCEP will send a memo to Academic Council noting its endorsement along with additional individual reservations.

## **X. Systemwide Review of Proposed Amendments to APM 620, Policy on Off-Scale Salaries**

UCEP reviewed recommendations from the President's Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales to eliminate exception language from APM 620 policy governing off-scales and re-define "on-scale" to encompass the entire range between steps. The changes are part of an effort to bring the majority of faculty back on-scale, and improve the fairness and transparency of the published salary scales. The new language recognizes that off-scale salaries are in practice not exceptions but a legitimate tool to meet competitive market conditions. Another long term goal is to adjust all salary scales upward.

**ACTION:** UCEP endorsed the proposed modifications to APM 620 and will submit a short memo of endorsement to Council.

## **XI. UCAF Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles**

UCEP reviewed the University Committee on Academic Freedom Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles document, which attempts to define the rights and limitations of students in

their pursuit of scholarly inquiry. It is not meant to exist as a formal policy; rather, it is a statement of aspiration and general principles available as a guide to students and faculty.

UCEP noted that UCAF's document was effective and accurate in defining and rationalizing the differences between faculty academic freedom and student freedom of scholarly inquiry. The committee unanimously endorsed both the document and UCAF's recommendation that once approved, the Principles be appended to APM 010 as a footnote reference to an appendix containing the Principles. The Committee felt that although the Principles would not exist as formal policy, they would serve as an excellent foundation for more reasoned discourse about the issues.

**ACTION:** UCEP voted unanimously to endorse the UCAF document and will send comments to Council.

## **XII. Future UCEP Agenda Items**

UCEP discussed possible agenda topics, priorities, and projects for 2007-08. Noted topics included:

- Distance learning policies for graduate and undergraduate education
- Monitoring the possible application of "No Child Left Behind"-style standardized testing to the University and exploring ways to pre-empt its imposition – e.g., conduct a critical study of its expected effect on higher education
- Best practices around academic integrity, including policies on punitive grades; faculty authority and responsibility for assigning punitive grades; TA training; and the use of anti-cheating software
- The role of international education in undergraduate education
- The role of civic engagement in undergraduate education
- Best practices around major enrollment management, impacted majors, and CEP criteria for limiting enrollment
- Best practices for increasing diversity and fostering a welcoming culture on campus

UCEP members gave Chair Weiss a round of applause in appreciation of his service as committee chair.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Richard Weiss

### **Distributions:**

1. Statewide Transfer Preparation Path – Chemistry
2. UC Berkeley Transfer Preparation Path – Chemistry