

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

October 10, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Denise Segura, Chair (UCSB)

Lynda Bell (UCR), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Steven Constable (UCSD), Keith Williams (UCD), Benson Tongue (UCB), Michael Colvin (UCM), Stephen McLean (UCSB), Paul Elkof (UCI), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Rozana Carducci (Student Rep-UCLA), Tina Park (Student Rep-UCLA), Cliff Brunk (Chair, Academic Senate), John Oakley (Vice-Chair, Academic Council), Julius Zelmanowitz (Vice Provost, Academic Initiatives), Julie Gordon (Director, Intercampus Program Coordination), Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Denise Segura

Chair Segura welcomed members and reviewed the charge of the committee. UCEP makes educational policy recommendations in reviews initiated by the Senate, administration, the Regents, or campuses. UCEP is also invited to pro-actively initiate policy reviews through the senate authority structure.

UCEP's chair represents the committee on Academic Council and Academic Planning Council (APC), and attends meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). Academic Planning Council is a joint administrative/Senate committee that advises the Provost on systemwide academic planning. Provost Greenwood and incoming Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Rory Hume are currently conducting individual campus visits, and UCEP members are encouraged to attend their presentations.

Topics of discussion at the September Academic Council meeting included implementation of the Science and Math Initiative (SMI); executive compensation funding; a proposal to add Earth and Space Science to the "d" requirement for UC eligibility; the bidding process for management of the Department of Energy National Laboratories; the Senate's role in review of the [California Institutes for Science and Innovation](#) (Cal ISI); and graduate education.

ICAS has been discussing strategies to improve intersegmental transfer, the state budget situation, and the WASC accreditation process. ICAS is developing a white paper on the status of higher education in California.

UCEP has a budget for seven in-person meetings this year, and can schedule additional telephone conferences as needed. Tapes of meetings are erased after a Chair-approved draft of the minutes is circulated to members. Members can communicate with each other through the UCEP listserv by addressing an email from a registered account to UCEP-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP approved the draft minutes of June 5, 2005.

III. Message from the Senate Chair and Vice Chair – Cliff Brunk and John Oakley

Academic Senate Chair Cliff Brunk and Vice Chair John Oakley thanked members for their volunteer service to the Academic Senate. Chair Brunk said undergraduate education is a core faculty issue and UCEP is central to the effective operation of the Senate. He encouraged members to communicate regularly to their local committees about systemwide business, and in turn, to share divisional concerns with UCEP. The Chair and Vice Chair are members of UCEP and will try to attend meetings whenever possible. All Senate committees are encouraged to schedule regular executive sessions.

Vice Chair Oakley called on members to consider the importance of the shared governance mandate, which gives faculty a voice and the opportunity to influence University policy, including direct authority for admissions, courses and degrees. Online resources, including the committee [bylaws](#) page, can help members navigate the more arcane aspects of committee service.

The Chair and Vice Chair outlined a few of the major topics facing the Senate this year.

- A Senate workgroup is forming to consider how UC will successfully implement the SMI and the role of the faculty in that enterprise. UCEP will be asked to help recommend the best mechanisms for SMI course and curriculum approval.
- The Senate is monitoring legislation sponsored by groups outside the university to address alleged political bias in the classroom. In addition, a joint faculty-administration-student workgroup has been meeting to consider the possibility of addressing student academic freedom in a new university policy or statement.
- The Senate plans to initiate a full review of the international education program, which has not been reviewed since 1994.
- The Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs ([ACSCONL](#)) is monitoring the outcomes of the pending competitive bids for management of the Department of Energy National Laboratories and the implications of the decision for the University and the nation.

IV. Message from the Academic Senate Executive Director – *María Bertero-Barceló*

Senate Executive Director Bertero-Barceló reported that the goal of her office and staff is to ensure that the administrative and academic mission of the Senate and its faculty are met. The committee analyst is available to prepare agendas, to draft minutes, responses and reports, to share institutional knowledge and help ensure proper protocol. Meeting minutes are posted on the web and other committee documents are publicly discoverable, so members should monitor for sensitive content on the assumption that anyone could see these materials. A password-protected website will soon allow UCEP to post drafts and working documents online. UCEP may be asked to comment on proposed federal and state legislation of interest to faculty to help the Senate leadership provide a faculty perspective in the development of UC's legislative policy positions. Committees are encouraged to suggest topics for inclusion in *The Senate Source*, for which the committee analyst is available to draft and write articles. UCEP members are required to use UCLA Travel to book airline tickets, and are asked to contact their divisional senate office if they cannot attend a meeting so an alternate can be found. Student representatives add valuable perspectives to meetings.

A suggestion was made to enhance the Senate's online [acronym](#) glossary with definitions or links.

V. Independent Course Responsibility for Graduate Student Instructors – *with Ellen Switkes, AVP, Academic Advancement*

AVP Switkes reported that enrollment and budget pressures have led to increasing numbers of graduate students teaching at all levels in the university. Graduate students have traditionally taught some courses with varying levels of oversight and supervision from a faculty member of record who signs off on the course and on grades. However, officials have noted more instances in which graduate students are being listed as the instructor of record for upper and lower division courses and occasionally even graduate courses. Normally for upper division courses a Senate committee must approve a graduate student as the instructor of record. However, this does not appear to be the case for lower division courses.

AVP Switkes has asked the Senate to look at the situation and decide whether current policies, practices, and quality control mechanisms are appropriate or whether changes are needed. She

suggested UCEP consider questions such as whether it should ever be permissible for graduate students to be instructors of record without faculty oversight; whether the Senate should oversee the appointment of graduate students teachers in lower division as well as upper division courses; and whether it would be acceptable for graduate students to teach unsupervised in summer session but not the rest of the year.

Before the meeting, UCEP members were asked to gather information on campus policies for granting instructor of record authority to graduate students in lower and upper division classes; the percent of courses taught by such students; and the review processes in place.

UCSD's policy allows for a small number of students with unique talents and expertise to teach as "Associates" in upper division courses only. They must have advanced to candidacy and have certain experience (as a TA) and expertise in teaching, and be approved in advance by the Senate. Each department is limited to 10% of total courses per year. A mentor provides oversight and submits a written assessment of teaching performance to CEP. Most instances occur in Arts and Humanities.

At UCB, in rare instances and in upper division courses only, a graduate student is appointed "Acting Instructor- Graduate Student". Specific experience and expertise in teaching is required and there is still some department oversight.

At UCLA, only faculty can assign grades, and there are no graduate student instructors of record.

At UCI, graduate students may be instructors of record only during summer session.

At UCSB, the title "Teaching Associate," not GSI, is used to refer to graduate students who teach and assign grades. Departments who wish to use Teaching Associates for upper division courses must seek approval from UCSB's Committee on Undergraduate Programs and Policies.

Members discussed what the parameters of discussion and data collection should be. To thoroughly understand the role of graduate students in undergraduate instruction, some said it would be necessary to broaden the scope beyond the collection of data solely on "instructor of record," because it is possible for a student to effectively have independent course responsibility without that designation. There are thousands of classes "taught" by graduate student "TAs" or "GSIs" in which the instructor of record is a faculty member. This faculty member may sign off on a course, but the sign off may be little more than a rubber stamp. It is difficult to quantify faculty oversight or to what extent a student is effectively in total control of the course, designing course materials, syllabus, etc.

It was suggested that the committee assemble the categories in which graduate students serve as instructors and then ask the campuses to what extent they use graduate students in each category. Alternatively, the committee could narrow the focus to the students designated as Instructors of Record and make recommendation based on this data only. UCEP members agreed it is desirable to have the best person possible teaching undergraduate courses. Some graduate students have particular expertise either from prior experience or from current studies, which may put them in the best position to teach a course. But members also believe faculty oversight is important to quality control.

Action: Members will receive specific instructions over email, and will continue to gather information, prepare a summary of the policies for both upper and lower and provide URLs if the policy is on the web.

VI. Report from UCOP Consultants – Julius Zelmanowitz and Julie Gordon

Vice Provost Zelmanowitz briefed members on the work of the Office of Academic Initiatives, which helps launch systemwide academic initiatives in support of undergraduate education. He outlined a few major systemwide academic issues facing the university this year – securing

increased support for graduate education; developing new relationships and strategies for international education; and the Science and Math Initiative.

Provost Greenwood has been developing a series of [presentations](#) to help the Regents become more familiar with the broad range of issues facing UC, including the scope and role of research, graduate education, and eligibility and enrollment. One future topic is expected to be undergraduate education, and feedback from UCEP will be welcome.

Executive Vice Provost Rory Hume is interested in capitalizing on systemwide synergies and confronting the impediments to systemwide collaboration. He has expressed support for UCEP's recent initiatives on systemwide courses, systemwide minors and a common calendar.

Partnership agreements between Google and UC libraries as well as Yahoo! and the California Digital Library will digitize new parts of library collections, which is a positive development for undergraduate education.

Director Gordon added that UCOP is interested in collaborating with faculty to get new undergraduate education initiatives off the ground. A few examples of this are the UC Center in Washington ([UCDC](#)), the UC Center in Sacramento ([UCCS](#)) and the Teaching, Learning and Technology Center ([TLTC](#)).

VII. Implementation of SR 477 and SR 478

The University has been asked to accept a larger number of transfer students to meet a growing demand for higher education in California. UC has agreed to increase transfer enrollment and clarify the path to transfer to prospective transfer students and community colleges, which have sometimes criticized the process as confusing and inefficient.

In May 2005 the Academic Assembly passed two regulations related to transfer policy: SR 477 (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process) and SR 478 (SciGETC).

Academic Council asked UCEP to be the lead committee in charge of monitoring the implementation of SR 477 and BOARS was asked to work on SR 478 (SciGETC). Over the summer, the Senate decided to consolidate implementation plans for 477 and 478 and recommended that BOARS and UCEP members form a subcommittee that would propose a defined implementation policy.

SR 477 provides that if at least four campuses agree a course or a set of courses from a Community College are sufficient preparation for a specific UC major; it is considered sufficient preparation systemwide. Last year UCEP agreed that the implementation of 477 should address a number of topics, including how to define and identify what constitutes a "similar major" from the top 20 UC majors; how to define and identify common lower division major preparation requirements; how the consultation process among departments, campuses and UCEP will be structured; and how the opt out process will work.

Chair Segura and BOARS Chair Michael Brown believe it is reasonable to complete up to five of the top 20 majors this year and at the same time target majors related to the SMI. Chair Segura asked for two UCEP volunteers to be on the subcommittee. The department of Student Academic Services is also available to consult with UCEP and/or the subcommittee and to do the implementation legwork.

Action: Jaye Padgett (UCSC) agreed to serve on the subcommittee

VIII. The California Science and Math Initiative

The [California Science and Math Initiative](#) is a statewide effort to train 1000 highly qualified science and math teachers annually to meet California's educational and workforce needs. SMI is being designed to allow students to earn both a science or math degree and a teaching credential in

four years (with two additional summer teacher training institutes and a 5th year field internship). A joint letter from President Dynes and the Governor was recently sent to all freshman students informing them about the opportunity. Each campus has been asked to submit a proposal to UCOP for an SMI Resource Center.

Last year, UCEP members shared a draft of the SMI proposal with their divisional committees to get feedback about what the Academic Senate's role in curricular development and program review should be along a proposed timeline. There was strong support for SMI, but also concern that the timeframe for project startup was too ambitious for a full and proper review and to ensure a UC-caliber program from the beginning. The summer institute curriculum still had to be developed and approved, as did a plan for integration of the SMI into campuswide and department-level program review cycles. Other concerns included the credentialing piece of the proposal and a fear that SMI was being publicized before it was firmly in place.

Few UCEP members were familiar with the status of SMI at their campus. Chair Brunk said the program originated with UC administration as a top-down initiative, but its success required a bottom-up component, which had to involve the faculty. He said UC faculty had to be involved for SMI to be a quality program, and the Senate was in the best position to encourage that involvement. Therefore he is proposing a Senate SMI work group to help facilitate this process by identifying best practices and challenges to implementation. The SMI Workgroup will be discussed at the next meeting of the Academic Council. He is also proposing that the Chair of UCEP participate in the Workgroup. SMI has a model structure that can be imposed with modifications on each campus, but different campuses will implement these things in different ways and different speeds. UCEP may want to look at the possibility of a systemwide credential and systemwide courses for the summer institutes. Officials believe there is a large pool of students wanting a rewarding career who will take interest in the program.

Action: Chair Segura asked members to become more familiar with what is happening with the SMI locally. At a future meeting, UCEP may want to make implementation recommendations to the Academic Council and/or Senate SMI workgroup.

VII. Proposed Diversity Statement from UCAAD

UCEP reviewed a proposal from the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity for a systemwide Statement on Diversity. UCAAD has asked the Academic Council to endorse the statement and forward it for the broadest possible distribution. One of the main theses of the statement is that diversity is integral to the excellence of the university.

In general, a majority of committee members were supportive and willing to endorse the statement. However, a few members felt that the first two statements of the second paragraph were too vague. They opined that not all forms of diversity are always integral to excellence and also felt it was logically possible for excellence to exist without diversity. These members suggested deleting or modifying the first two sentences of the second paragraph of the statement.

Action: UCEP will submit comments endorsing the statement, with minority reservations noted.

VIII. Students in Academic Difficulty

Last year UCEP was charged by Academic Council to investigate concerns over large numbers of students on academic probation and subject-to-dismissal status who were not being dismissed. UCEP was able to gather data from a few campuses on the issue, but not enough to definitively address the issue. In its final report to Council, UCEP noted that a wide range of advising policies

and procedures are in place at the campuses to help students in difficulty, but limitations on the availability of longitudinal data made it impossible to comprehensively assess the effectiveness of those policies. Council accepted UCEP's report and left it up to the committee to decide if it wanted to pursue the issue further.

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

IX. Campus Reports

Chair Segura invited members to report on local issues or concerns. At the request of Merced, members reported campus drop date policies.

At the request of UCR, members discussed the program review process. The UCR Senate has decided to institute a system of undergraduate program review that will be conducted separately from graduate reviews. UCR is seeking best practices. UCSC, UCI, and UCLA conduct joint reviews, and UCSC has concerns that such an arrangement is not beneficial to undergraduate programs, but at UCI there is general satisfaction with the process. At UCLA, program reviews are the joint responsibility of Undergraduate and Graduate Councils and occur simultaneously, are conducted every eight years, and outcomes are reported to the administration. The review team includes two members of UGC, two members of GC and two external reviewers. The internal review team prepares a final report supplemented by a separate external reviewer report. At UCSB, an internal program review panel reviews programs and coordinates a review by an external review committee. Undergraduate and Graduate Councils meet with and give input to the panel and external review committee near the end of the process. UCD and UCSD conduct separate undergraduate/graduate reviews.

VIII. UCEP Projects/Priorities

Program Review: Program Review is also a UCEP carry-over item from 2004-05. A subcommittee headed by Richard Weiss began looking at campus variations in review practices and faculty opinion about the value of reviews, and the fundamental question: to what extent does undergraduate education benefit from the current process of program reviews. The review process is seen as cumbersome by some, but also valuable, especially if there are problems. There have been significant outcomes as a result of program reviews - programs have been transformed, others dissolved, funding structures and leadership changed have occurred.

Action: The subcommittee will continue gathering information from each campus on the program review procedures, follow-up procedures (if any), and outcomes (which might be anecdotal).

Entry-Level Quantitative Skills Requirement: Last year a UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee discussed a proposal for an entry-level quantitative skills requirement. **Action:** The UCSC representative will speak to last year's subcommittee chair about the status of the project.

Academic Integrity: Last year's subcommittee chair was not present to give a report.

Civic Engagement: Chair Segura would like UCEP to think about a forthcoming draft report developed by last year's student regent and the provost's office regarding the academic community's engagement in the community outside the university. She agreed to bring more information to the committee in the near future.

International Education: How should the Senate interact with EAP and other new international strategies and partnerships? The committee will request a briefing paper from Director of International Strategy Development Gretchen Kolonji, addressing undergraduate education.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Denise Segura