

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

June 5, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Denise Segura, Chair (UCSB)

Richard Weiss, Vice-Chair (UCLA), Lynda Bell (UCR), Steven Constable (UCSD), Richard Hughey (UCSC), Keith Williams (UCD), Benson Tongue (UCB), Stephen McLean (UCSB), Paul Elkof (UCI), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Lowell Gallagher (UCLA), Rozana Carducci (Student Rep-UCLA), Bruce Cain (Director, UCDC-Phone), Julie Gordon (Director, Intercampus Program Coordination), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Denise Segura

Chair Segura reported that Acting Provost Rory Hume was formally appointed provost and senior vice president for academic affairs. Provost Hume and Senate Chair Oakley are writing a formal charge for the systemwide joint Senate/administrative Task Force on Undergraduate Education that was proposed by UCEP in April.

At the May Council meeting, President Dynes outlined a five point plan for addressing and rectifying problems with the University's compensation policies and disclosure practices. The president has assembled a committee of faculty and administration members to consider implementation mechanisms that will ensure future compliance. In addition, the Regents have created new positions: a compliance officer who will oversee compensation, and a chief operating officer and a chief financial officer to oversee nonacademic functions within the office of the president. The Long Range Guidance Team will report its recommendations for systemwide planning to the president in July.

Academic Council endorsed the Universitywide Committee on Planning and Budget's proposed [principles](#) on private funding for senior leadership salaries, and UCPB's [report](#) on *Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California*, was posted on the Web. Council endorsed a [memo](#) to President Dynes, which originated with the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), recommending ongoing consultation with the Senate on compensation issues. Council recommended that the task force conducting a review of the international education programs at UC be expanded. Chair Segura nominated UCEP member Lynda Bell for the expanded Task Force.

Chair Segura attended a California Science and Math Initiative meeting at UC Irvine, where the Council Workgroup on the Science and Mathematics Initiative (SMIG) discussed campus curricular models and reviewed the transition to campus management. SMIG also discussed its recommendations about future leadership and systemwide coordination. Campuses remain concerned about the leadership and overall stability of the SMI, UCOP's role in fundraising support, the four-year credentialing program, and the feasibility of training 1000 teachers annually systemwide. The Senate was asked to be ready for possible development of a systemwide minor and a possible proposal to guarantee admissions to [MESA](#) students who wanted to participate in the SMI. There was also discussion about the possibility of folding SMIG's charge into UCEP.

A Systemwide Summit on Faculty Diversity was held in Oakland on May 23 to discuss the [findings and recommendations](#) of the [President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity](#). The Task Force reported that over the last 20 years, there had been little change in the percentage of

underrepresented minority faculty at UC compared to availability pools; that representation varied widely across fields—e.g., STEM fields versus Humanities; and that the pipeline leading from undergraduate student to faculty member was weak. Summit participants were asked to return to their campuses to discuss implementation and applicability of the recommendations.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP approved the minutes of the May 8, 2006 meeting with a few corrections.

III. Creating a UC-wide Course at the UC Washington Center – With Bruce Cain

UC Washington Center ([UCDC](#)) Director and UCB Professor Bruce Cain joined the meeting to describe his proposal for creating certain UCDC elective courses through a systemwide approval mechanism involving UCEP. UCDC wanted to design a curriculum with courses appropriate for students from all ten UC campuses who come to Washington for specific internships opportunities in each of five areas: Congress, government agencies, NGOs/NPOs, museums/the Arts, and science policy. UCDC wanted to develop a more coherent core curriculum for each of those internships areas that cut across campus lines.

Cain currently teaches *California on the Hill*, a course geared to students from all campuses who participate in congressional internships. But teaching this course to students from both quarter and semester a campus is bureaucratically difficult and sometimes impossible. Because the UCB registrar would not accept it as a quarter course, UCDC was forced to appoint a UCSB faculty member as the instructor of record for students from quarter system campuses. Teaching a course to quarter and semester students at the same time has also involved the difficulty of separating modules of the class and teaching them at different times.

Director Cain said UCEP could help streamline the course approval process for UCDC by providing a means of systemwide course approval, so that students would find such courses listed in all campus catalogs. In 2004, UCEP agreed to amend its charge to include the review and approval of universitywide domestic academic programs and courses such as UCDC, UCCS and the language consortium, after they had been approved at a home campus of record, alleviating the need to put such courses through the approval process on all campuses. UCEP's [bylaw](#) and [Regulation 544D](#) were modified to reflect this charge. At that time, UCEP agreed that it would not review the quality of the curriculum, but would limit itself to determining whether such a course was appropriately a systemwide course.

Director Cain noted that UCEP could help make it possible for students from all campuses to enjoy the benefits of a curriculum that was more closely tied to the uniqueness of the UCDC experience. He said a central part of the UCDC mission was to encourage students into public service. Most UCDC students have been non-science majors, but there were opportunities in Washington for students interested in Science policy, and UCDC was working to attract more Science students. Director Cain recommended that UCEP help establish and implement a set of procedures to get two test cases—*California on the Hill* and a course on Science Policy—approved and listed in campus catalogs, and out of that develop a model for other classes.

He said quarter students were not eligible to do certain kinds of internships, so UCDC was experimenting with an extended quarter system that allowed the quarter school students to start their internship before classes began. He said ultimately the planned curriculum would involve

between one and five courses that would be taught in specific quarters. UCDC would continue to have visiting instructors teach courses that didn't fit into the planned curriculum.

UCEP discussed a possible UCDC course approval process: UCDC would send a course proposal to UCEP, which would not vet the content of the course, but opine only on whether it fit into the context of the UCDC mission. UCEP would send the proposal with its endorsement to one campus committee—at a campus whose faculty member was nominally in charge of the course—asking that committee to opine on whether the course met the standards of a UC course. UCEP would then approve the course and inform UCDC. The UCDC director would need to submit all courses for approval to UCEP by early fall or late spring so that UCEP could consider them in time to meet the deadlines for courses to appear in campus catalogs.

Members discussed whether UCEP might just act alone as a CEP for UCDC courses. UCEP felt it had the expertise, and it would involve at most only a couple of courses each year. Such an arrangement would ensure that the course was purely systemwide, and UCEP could still use campus as consultants to vet the course as necessary. It was noted however, that in approving the bylaw change in 2004, UCEP opted not to be a systemwide committee on courses. It was expected that a home campus of record would screen for quality.

There were concerns expressed about the stability and permanency of the UCDC curriculum. Members wanted to ensure that UCDC courses remain UC courses and don't permanently become associated with a visiting faculty or one individual faculty member. It was also noted that the proposal for UC-wide UCDC courses to be numbered 199 would not be feasible.

UCEP decided that UCDC systemwide courses should be taught on a quarter system basis. Where semester and quarter time overlapped, students would take the same class on a quarter basis. For the fall quarter, semester students would arrive a month early and take the systemwide core class when the quarter students arrived, along with another class in the meantime. In the winter quarter, quarter students would take the course and semester students the first ten weeks. There would be no semester students in the spring quarter. UCEP would need to determine the amount of credit each course was worth for quarter and semester students.

UCEP members agreed that semester and quarter students should have the same experience and were not in favor of extended work for semester students to bring them up to a certain number of credit hours.

Action: UCEP will communicate its preliminary views to Director Cain.

IV. UCEP Consultation on UCSD Master of International Affairs Program Proposal

CCGA invited UCEP to review a UCSD proposal to establish a five-year combined program of undergraduate and professional study leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts in International Studies and Master of International Affairs. CCGA thought UCEP should have the opportunity to comment on the proposal, although the Compendium stated that all undergraduate degree programs were approved at the divisional level, and systemwide review was not necessary.

One member commented that from the undergraduate point of view there were only good things to say about these programs. They offered great opportunities, attracted top students, and provided educational integration.

Members agreed that the committee should not say anything substantive on the issue except that UCEP considered the undergraduate aspects of the establishment of the joint bachelor/graduate degree programs to be a matter for divisional approval, and thus did not wish to comment on the proposal.

V. Report from the Office of the President – Julie Gordon, Intercampus Program Coordination Director

Director Gordon said several of the executive job vacancies at UCOP—Provost, Chief Investment Officer and Acting Chief Counsel—had been filled. She said UCEP should follow the progress of the International Education review committee and add its voice to the issues.

Director Gordon said UCEP’s new consultant(s) will likely come from a unit at UCOP being re-organized under a new umbrella that would include both undergraduate planning and intercampus activity. UCEP should consider what kind of consultation they wanted and would benefit from. Members remarked that their new consultant(s) should have a high level of UC experience and institutional knowledge, as well as access to high level meetings, which could increase the visibility of issues UCEP was advocating for. It might also be useful for the consultant to have expertise in the areas that would be discussed by the Undergraduate Education Task Force; summer instruction; and transfer.

Director Gordon noted that after 23 years on the committee, it was her last UCEP meeting before retiring. She said she hoped UCEP would continue to be a pro-active, not simply reactive, advocate for educational policy issues. UCEP members expressed their appreciation for Director Gordon’s longtime contributions to UCEP and the University and gave her a round of applause.

Action: UCEP will forward a memo to Senate Chair Oakley.

VI. Independent Course Responsibility for Graduate Student Instructors

UCEP members reviewed a revised memo outlining UCEP and CCGA’s proposed recommendations for graduate students teaching with independent course responsibility. Academic Council was expected to receive the proposal in June and send it out for review to campuses and systemwide committees.

Members engaged in final wordsmithing of the draft. Discussion focused around whether the proposed requirements for Teaching Fellows outlined the narrative of the proposal—one year of teaching experience and advanced degrees or advanced-to-candidacy status—should be part of the Conditions of Employment of the APM or whether local campuses should ultimately decide. Some thought it better to define specific qualifications in the APM, but the committee ultimately decided to keep specifics out of the APM, noting that UCEP and CCGA should not determine which graduate students were qualified to teach, but only the circumstances under which it would be appropriate for a qualified graduate student to teach. It was proposed that the narrative only be changed to say that divisional Senates should establish minimum qualifications for GTFs—e.g., possession of an advanced degree or advancement to candidacy, and at least one academic year’s teaching experience—for eligibility for appointment.

Other comments and suggestions included:

➤ Exceptions to a graduate student being granted “instructor of record” status should proceed on the recommendation of the campus Graduate Council.

- Language should be added stating the expectation that GTAs would be used only to teach small-enrollment classes or sections such as those offered in language and writing programs.
- The phrase, “The enterprise of instruction” could be more succinctly phrased as “teaching.”
- Add language to the section recommending the use of GTFs for no more than ten percent of classes indicating that CCGA and UCEP encourage the campuses to monitor this ratio.
- Note that the mentoring of GTFs will in some cases constitute an additional demand on faculty time, and that policies for accounting of this workload should be developed by divisional administrations in consultation with the local Senate.

Chair Segura noted that graduate student teaching would still occur and would perhaps be encouraged as part of an overall strategy of professional development for the student. Student teaching would be seen as part of a pedagogical plan, not as an ad hoc method to relieve regular faculty members in an emergency situation. Campuses asking for the approval of a class to be taught by a graduate student would now have to give a statement of qualifications of the graduate student and the circumstance (or opportunity) that required the use of the student.

Action: Chair Segura planned to work with CCGA member Bruce Schuum to finalize the document and submit it to Academic Council.

VII. Summer Session Instruction

In exchange for additional state funding, UC had agreed to increase Summer Session enrollment to 40% of the capacity of a regular term, and to make summer instruction “substantially equivalent” to the regular year. UCEP was asked by the Provost to discuss a set of draft guidelines, developed by UCOP, for the implementation of fully funded Summer Session and to provide feedback in time for a preliminary discussion at the June Academic Planning Council meeting. Some UCEP members had shared the draft with their local committees after the May meeting.

Members said that campuses should evaluate how their current summer session models interacted with overall educational goals. They said summer presented opportunities for pedagogical experimentation and diversification, but that on the other hand, full summer session could have an adverse effect on experimental research and internships, given that many experiments are timed to coincide with summer availability of graduate and undergraduate students.

Campuses should examine whether current summer session practices and the instructional quality is satisfactory. With fewer classes taught by regular faculty members, and shorter classes, there is concern that instruction and curriculum were not “substantially equivalent”. One member opined that classes taught in less than ten weeks could never be substantively equivalent to courses offered during the regular academic quarter in terms of mastering concepts, theories, and knowledge. The appropriate Senate committees should evaluate whether the 3, 5, and 6-week courses offered during summer session are “substantively equivalent” to the 10-week quarter or 15-week semester courses offered during the regular year. Some members agreed three week courses should not be permitted at all. In addition, campuses should consider whether regular term policies for disqualification and normal progress should be the same in the summer.

Campuses should examine how students view summer session and why and in what types of courses they enroll. There should be consideration of whether some uses of Summer Session, e.g., lightening a regular year load, were legitimate uses; and whether they should be

discouraged. Each campus should seek to understand and document the performance of students who enroll in summer session and the role of summer session in graduation rates.

Members said the University would fail to reach its goals unless it could find new ways to encourage students to enroll and ladder faculty to teach in summer. UC should conduct a campus-by-campus study of strategies for growing summer enrollment and faculty participation in instruction—e.g. financial incentives or the ability to exchange a spring or winter term for the summer term.

Other concerns noted were how to coordinate course sequences with expanded Summer instruction and the increased administrative support that would be necessary in summer. Finally, campuses should review the services available to students on each campus to ensure that the cost and availability of housing, tutorial help, library hours, and health services are equivalent to the regular academic year.

Action: A discussion document for Chair Segura to take to Academic Planning Council will be drafted and forwarded to members.

VIII. Student Mental Health – UCEP Vice Chair Richard Weiss

Vice Chair Weiss reported that he attended a meeting of the UC Student Mental Health Committee, which had been assessing trends in student mental health, how those trends were being managed nationally and at UC; whether there were sufficient services on campuses to address mental health needs; and whether the campuses had appropriate resources. Vice Chair Weiss was asked by the Mental Health Committee if he thought faculty members felt prepared to address student mental health issues and what he thought faculty could do about the fact that a significant proportion of mental health issues arose after students received a failing grade. The Mental Health committee planned to have a report ready for UCEP to review in the near future.

The vice chair reported to the Mental Health Committee that faculty were occasionally confronted with a serious situation involving student mental health, but they were largely ignorant about available services. He said UCEP would be reluctant to endorse any proposal that would weaken the prerogative of a faculty member to fairly evaluate a student who was not achieving at satisfactory levels. Contrary to popular belief, there was no formula established by faculty that required them to fail a certain percentage of a class.

UCEP members noted that faculty and the Offices of Student Services should be partners in promoting student mental health. Personal attention makes a difference to struggling students, but it is also difficult for faculty to reach out in very large classes, and faculty are not trained to deal with problems. There should be a guide to student services made available to faculty. Faculty should defend fair and accurate evaluation of student accomplishment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM. Chair Segura thanked UCEP members and Director Gordon for their hard work throughout the year. UCEP members gave Chair Segura a round of applause.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Denise Segura

Distributions:

1. Creating an all UC Course at the UC Washington Center – a Proposal
2. The Role of Graduate Students in Undergraduate Instruction