

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

October 18, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Joseph Kiskis, Chair (UCD)

Denise Segura, Vice Chair, (UCSB), Randall Bergstrom (UCSB), Richard Weiss (UCLA), Richard Hughey (UCSC), David Bunch (UCD), J. Keith Gilless (UCB), Anne Kelley (UCM), Robert Newcomb (UCI), Charles Perrin (UCSD), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Eligio Martinez, Student Rep, (UCLA), Rozana Carducci, Student Rep. (UCLA), Julie Gordon (Director, Intercampus Program Coordination), George Blumenthal (Academic Senate Chair), Clifford Brunk (Academic Senate Vice-Chair), Maria Bertero-Barceló (Academic Senate Executive Director), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Joe Kiskis

Chair Kiskis welcomed members and reviewed the charge of the committee. The UCEP Chair represents the committee on Academic Council, Academic Assembly and the Academic Planning Council, and also attends meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). Vice Chair Segura sits on the UC Washington Center Committee.

Academic Council is currently focusing on a number of topics, including the Senate's role in the Department of Energy laboratories and the four new multicampus-industry research partnerships known as the [California Institutes for Science and Innovation](#) (Cal ISI). A preliminary version of a new faculty code of ethics proposed by UC administration was not well received in Council, and has been referred to UCFW.

In coming months, UCEP can expect to review a report on Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information, a proposal to streamline the course major articulation process and a report from the Instructional Activities Implementation Task Force. The Implementation Task Force has completed its analysis of prototype data and is still working on a draft letter to Provost Greenwood and a report about how to consolidate the 18 course categories into a single number for the Legislature.

UCEP has been budgeted for seven in person meetings this year, but the committee can schedule additional telephone conferences as needed. Tapes of meetings are erased after the Chair approves the minutes and they are circulated to members. Finally, members can send messages or documents to all committee members through the UCEP listserv by addressing an email to UCEP-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU.

II. Message from the Academic Senate Chair – George Blumenthal

Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal joined the meeting and thanked members for their volunteer service to the Academic Senate. He explained how systemwide Senate committee work gives faculty a voice and an opportunity to directly influence University policy. He encouraged UCEP to be proactive, not simply reactive, and asked that members report regularly to their local committees about systemwide business, and in turn, to share local concerns with UCEP. Members should be informed about divisional positions on policy, but they are not bound to represent any particular view. Student representatives and UCOP consultants add unique and valuable perspectives to meetings.

Chair Blumenthal briefly outlined some of the major issues and challenges facing the systemwide Academic Senate and the University in 2004-2005. These include:

- Long-range strategic budget and academic planning in the context of the Compact.
- How to address declines in funding for and quality of graduate education.
- Pending Requests For Proposals related to management of the National Labs.

- Research strings, restrictions on funding sources, government panels, and academic freedom.
- Senate involvement in oversight of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation.
- Continued study of admissions, eligibility and comprehensive review policy, including admissions by exception, geographical preferences and the new SAT.
- A pending report from the AP Honors Task Force.
- Review of the Compendium and systemwide Senate regulations and variances.
- How to improve transfer articulation between UC and the Community Colleges. UCEP will be asked to review a Council-modified version of a plan to streamline the articulation process, which the committee endorsed two years ago: if four UC campuses make an articulation agreement with a CC for a course, then that course is automatically articulated at the other campuses, unless a campus explicitly chooses to opt out.
- Efficiency of the personnel process and gender/ethnic disparities in the step system.
- Faculty welfare issues: potential changes to the funding of the University retirement system; recall policy; fee waivers; and parking.
- Authorizing official divisional status for the UC Merced Senate in May.

In addition, the Senate recently launched a new effort to monitor and track legislation, which it hopes will be effective in keeping faculty better informed about Federal and State legislation related to the University. Some elements of the California Performance Review—proposals to save money in state government—could have a negative effect on the University. The Committee Analyst is available to help prepare agendas; to draft minutes, responses and reports; and to share knowledge about the work of other Senate committees.

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

Senate Executive Director Bertero-Barceló described her role and the administrative role and mission of the Senate Office, which is to support the academic mission of the faculty through their Senate committee work. Committees are encouraged to suggest topics for inclusion in the electronic newsletter *The Senate Source*, for which the committee analyst is available to draft and write articles. A new Senate web page will be dedicated to legislative matters, and committees or committee members with expertise about particular issues are encouraged to get involved. Beginning this year, meeting minutes will be posted on the web, and members should monitor for sensitive content on the assumption that anyone could potentially see them. UCEP can schedule executive sessions, during which consultants are not present. Executive session minutes will not be web-posted, but are publicly discoverable. A password-protected website will soon allow UCEP to post complete agendas, minutes and working documents online. Senate policy has changed so that hard copies of agenda packets are no longer provided or mailed unless they exceed 125 pages. All systemwide committee members are now required to use UCLA travel to book airline tickets.

IV. Report from UCOP Consultants – *Julie Gordon*

Director Gordon helps develop and coordinate intercampus academic programs, including UC Washington (UCDC), UC Center in Sacramento (UCCS), and the UC Consortium for Language, Learning and Teaching. These programs are designed to leverage various individual campus resources for the larger and greater good of the system. Last year, UCEP was enlisted by Director Gordon's office to help promote awareness and use of Senate Regulation 544, which allows students registered at one UC campus to enroll in courses at other UC campuses. As a result of UCEP's efforts and Council endorsement of those efforts, Provost Greenwood has sent a letter to the EVCs asking campus Registrars to implement policies that will facilitate the use of simultaneous enrollment. Last year, UCEP agreed to act as the review and approval body for

universitywide programs and courses such as UCCS, UCDC, and the Consortium, but only after a course has gone through the approval process at the home campus of record. The Assembly will review this UCEP bylaw change.

UCEP has suggested on a number of occasions that campus registrars take a serious look at how to align divisional calendars—or as a minimum, to institute common start dates—as part of an effort to remove barriers to transfer and summer session enrollment across campuses. Director Gordon noted that UCOP supports this effort and has drafted a letter to the Senate agreeing to help push the Registrars forward.

Recently proposed legislation that may have been harmful to the University, including proposals to eliminate credit for AP and Honors, and a policy requiring balance between regular faculty and lecturers, have failed or been vetoed. There may be an opportunity for UCEP and the Information Technology and Telecommunications Committee (ITTP) to work together this year on educational technology issues like distance learning. Finally, UCDC is currently recruiting for a new Director, and UCCS is holding an open house in Sacramento on January 26, to which UCEP is encouraged to send a guest.

V. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes of June 21, 2004 were approved subject to minor corrections.

Action: The committee approved Draft Recommendations for Guidelines and Procedures Governing the Academic Senate's Role in the Development of a New UC Campus.

VI. SciGETC Proposal

Junior transfer students entering UC from California Community Colleges planning to major in the Sciences and Engineering are often unprepared to do upper division-level work, and unable to fulfill their major requirements in two years. SciGETC is a transfer curriculum agreement developed by IMPAC and approved by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS). It is modeled on the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), but designed to prepare students interested in the Sciences (and possibly Engineering) for successful transfer to UC or CSU. With SciGETC, prospective science transfer students take more science and math lower division courses and have the option to defer two general education courses to create more space in their curriculum for a math and science core. Right now, the fields of Physics, Biology, Chemistry and Geology have been addressed, and the specific cores for the disciplines and majors are being developed by IMPAC (Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum). IMPAC brings together faculty from the three segments to agree on specific course content and articulation requirements.

Like IGETC, SCIGETC would allow transfers to arrive having satisfied GE requirement even if they don't correspond exactly to what the campus GE requirements are for a native student. As with IGETC, SCIGETC will ultimately require approval by the Academic Assembly.

Some UCEP members remarked that the proposal didn't go far enough, but most thought it was at least a step in the right direction in being more explicit with students and advisors about what UC expects from transfers. One member said his department would adopt SciGETC immediately.

Members discussed the inadequate nature of the advising at CCC, especially in the Sciences. Transfer students often arrive at UC having completed IGETC, yet unprepared to do upper division Science and Math work, and lack time or opportunity to explore different academic avenues and opportunities. The hope is that SciGETC will ensure that prospective transfers take the lower division science and math courses that fit into the sequence of courses at the campus

and major they expect to transfer into, so they enter UC with the background necessary to be successful and graduate on time.

The committee felt that the applicability of SciGETC to engineering mentioned in a proposal was underdeveloped. One member, the only engineer on UCEP this year, noted that it would be difficult to apply SciGETC to Engineering majors, which are particularly problematic in terms of students arriving at UC unprepared to do upper division work. Without strict course planning, it is difficult for even native Engineering majors to graduate in four years. General Education requirements for Engineering students should ideally be spread out over four years—a full load of major courses, particularly in the fourth year, is too much. One member noted that if Engineering departments approved a SciGETC-like preparation, it would be something like 60 units rather than 44, when specific campus major requirements, which sometimes double to satisfy a GE course, are taken into account. Members agreed that a third category, in addition to IGETC and SciGETC, might be needed for Engineering majors. Engineering faculty should participate more closely in the development of major preparation agreements at IMPAC, and Engineering schools should begin to explicitly state that they will reject transfer student who attempt to enter UC having taken only IGETC without additional courses.

ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer) helps California Community College students determine—through a website—which of their courses will transfer for lower division credit to a CSU or UC. Members agreed that ASSIST, while useful, has shortcomings, and should be sufficiently funded so it can be improved to be more user friendly. One member noted that some of the writing in the report is not always comprehensible and should be rewritten (perhaps by a non-Scientist) to ensure better clarity for advisors and students who lack a science background. The terminology is also sometimes inconsistent. The report refers to the scientific category of majors as “technical” majors in some places, and as “high unit” major in others, neither of which the committee thought was the best or most accurate terminology to use for an audience of students or advisors.

Overall, the committee favored passage of the proposal insofar as it is effective in clearly communicating to students and Community College advisors what course preparation is necessary to be a successful transfer major in Science at UC.

Action: UCEP will send comments to Council.

VII. UCD Proposal to Reconstitute the Division of Biological Sciences as the College of Biological Sciences

UCEP considered a revised proposal from UC Davis to reconstitute its Division of Biological Sciences as a College. UCEP reviewed the preliminary version of this proposal in June 2003. At that time, UCEP asked that the report include an outline of potential impacts on other programs, implications for Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) appointments, plans for general education curriculum, and comments from Davis faculty. Establishing a College requires approval by the Board of Regents, although the Regents would be expected to vote for approval based on Academic Council's, and UCEP's endorsement.

No large, immediate changes in terms of courses or budget would take place as a result of the reconstitution. Administratively, the DBS is currently under both the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the College of Letters and Sciences. However, DBS says it already acts like a College in almost every way but name, and says a reconstitution to College should occur for purposes of clarity, efficiency and the added fundraising and recruitment advantages of being a College. By untying DBS from its two parent colleges, cumbersome processes for personnel and curricular approval processes would be streamlined, and DBS faculty would be more empowered with a stronger voice in the academic senate.

UCEP is sympathetic to the merits of the case, but some members feel the committee's previous concerns have been only minimally addressed and have not been articulated in a compelling manner. First, there is no rationale for the reconstitution based upon academic reasons. Members asked what intellectual and academic benefits arise as a result of separating DBS into a new college and how the formation of this College is the next logical step in the historical and intellectual development of these programs at Davis.

Points addressed in the correspondence from faculty and departments on the website are also important and need to be addressed in the main body of the proposal. UCEP was particularly concerned about the close faculty vote in the College of Letters and Science and wondered why there was such substantial unexplained opposition.

Members noted that the report lacks a coherent intellectual justification for the reconstitution that connects closely with undergraduate education. What will the College's authority be over general education requirements and how are curricular changes and curricular autonomy addressed? More than one member questioned why it would not be more logical to move DBS into the College of L&S with joint faculty appointments in the CAES.

Another member remarked that the proposal should address the implications for faculty with appointments Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES). What would teaching load policies look like and what would the nature of funding and FTE transfers be in hybrid units that include both AES and non-AES academic personnel?

Davis seems to consider the proposal as little more than a name change. Although UCEP members supposed this to be basically true in one respect, the implications for forming a College are still great. In sum, a majority of the committee believes the case for reconstitution still needs to be strengthened and clarified. The committee decided that the case for creating a new College in a University of California by reconstituting the Division has not been made with sufficient clarity or rationale

Action: UCEP will submit comments to Council.

VIII. Students on Academic Probation/ Disenrollment

Although advocated by one faculty member, disenrollment was not recommended last year as a Senate priority in the context of the budget and enrollment crisis. However, data collected from at least two campuses indicated that there were significant numbers of students at UC subject to dismissal for either poor academic performance or failure to meet minimum progress, combined with a correspondingly low dismissal rate. On one campus in a given quarter, the percentage of students subject to dismissal (for low GPA) ranged from 5.6% to 10.4%, and of those subject to dismissal, 9% to 38% were actually dismissed. However, available data is uneven; most campuses do not keep data, and if they do, it's only "snapshot" of the situation at a particular point in time.

Disenrollment is officially a Senate responsibility, although it has now been largely delegated to deans. Last year, Academic Council decided it would be a good idea for the faculty to be more involved. UCEP was asked to facilitate a more systematic and thorough collection of data, in order for the Senate to be able to study the numbers and to talk about the issue more definitively. UCEP agreed to develop a template listing precisely what kind of information would be needed and then to request that data from campuses. UCEP also said it wanted to give the impetus to the local faculty committees to take responsibility for regularly collecting this data in the future.

The reasons for the high numbers of students on academic probation are mostly speculative. For instance, students included in these data may be having a bad quarter, or may be struggling to adjust as freshmen. Some, if not most, are assumed to recover with the help of counseling, and go on to graduate. Probationary policies and procedures for helping students vary from campus to campus. One member noted that a freshman who fails a single course in the first quarter will automatically be placed on the list. Ultimately, it might be good to encourage campuses to more appropriately define disenrollment rules as well as advising functions. One member said UCEP should consider what counseling services are available to students and how well prepared counselors are to address student needs. Some counselors do not appear to be well informed about minimum progress policies.

Before speculating about reasons, it will be necessary to gather uniform, longitudinal data to get a more complete picture. It would also be extremely useful, though difficult, to track individual cases through time.

The committee would like to review data on students subject to dismissal for low GPA and students subject to dismissal for failing to meet minimum progress. Longitudinal data points might include how long such students have been on probation—one quarter, two quarters, etc. It would also be useful to know whether there had been mediation and whether the student ultimately went on to graduate.

What percentage of subjects who were identified as Subject to Dismissal were actually dismissed? What happened to those who weren't dismissed?

Action: Members will develop a list of possible questions related to the data they want for the December 6 meeting. An account of the work done at UCD last year and some data from there can be found at http://goober.ucdavis.edu/kiskis/ug_council/ugc_hp.html, in items under Dismissal.

IX. Future UCEP Agenda Topics

The Chair asked UCEP to consider one or two significant topics or projects that the committee might want to address and make progress on during the year outside of those they expect Council or the Administration to hand it. Suggestions included:

- Instituting an entry-level mathematics requirement analogous to the Subject A writing requirement.
- Academic dishonesty and grading policy: Registrars have taken away the “non report” grade option. The Faculty may decide this is not acceptable, as they have been given control over grading policy. It’s a systemwide issue. The general topic of dishonesty is also an issue. <http://www.turnitin.com/>
- The burden of program reviews and how to streamline the process.
- Grade inflation: truth in grading and possibly calibrating the grade on the transcript with the class average.
- Student/Faculty ratios: data on the situation and the consequences of further deterioration. Julie Gordon recommended Jerry Kissler from the UCOP Budget Office.
- Review faculty oversight of Teaching Associates.
- The decline in graduate education: the issue overlaps with undergraduate education and research.
- Systemwide policy on distance learning

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Joe Kiskis