UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
October 9, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Richard Weiss, Chair (UCLA)
Keith Williams, Vice-Chair (UCD), Pierre Keller (UCR), Kim Griest (UCSD), Jaye Padgett (UCSC),, Benson Tongue (UCB), Omer Blaes (UCSB), David Kay (UCI), Henry Sanchez (UCSF), Lowell Gallagher (UCLA), Cynthia Pineda (Student Rep-UCLA), Martin Kohan (Student Rep-UCB), John Oakley (Chair, Academic Senate), Michael Brown (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Maria Bertero-Barcelo (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I.   Chair's Announcements – *Richard Weiss*

UCEP Chair Richard Weiss welcomed UCEP members and reviewed the charge of the committee. UCEP makes recommendations on a broad range of educational policy issues, primarily affecting undergraduate education, in reviews initiated by the Senate, administration, and campuses. UCEP is also encouraged to initiate projects and policy reviews.

UCEP often impacts the University directly, most recently in its recommendation for an Undergraduate Education Task Force, and its joint report with CCGA proposing changes to policies governing instruction by graduate students. Chair Weiss encouraged members to send him suggestions for agenda items or issues facing campus committees, and he encouraged student representatives to bring ideas and speak freely.

The chair of UCEP represents the committee at monthly meetings of the Academic Council and at the Academic Assembly, which meets between two and four times per year. He attends meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which discusses issues facing the three segments of California higher education, and the Academic Planning Council (APC), a joint administrative-Senate committee that advises the Provost about strategic planning. UC Academic Senate Vice Chair Michael Brown chairs ICAS this year.

The Academic Council identified principles and priorities at a September retreat. These include protecting principles of shared governance, increasing transparency, and ensuring that educational decisions are not driven by budgets. Council is pushing for the implementation of the Senate's [Memorial to the Regents](#) urging the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students, and a more coherent faculty salary and incentive system. Finally, there is concern about the impact of declining state support, the possibility of increased privatization, and the progress of the University around diversity and equity.

In September meetings, ICAS discussed strategies for improving articulation and clarifying course equivalency among the segments, and the Academic Planning Council discussed UCEP's proposal for a Task Force on Undergraduate Education.

UCEP Vice Chair Keith Williams sits on two Science and Math Initiative leadership committees— SMIG, the Senate-only workgroup, and a Senate-Administration consortium.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP approved the minutes of the June 5, 2006 meeting.
Action: Proposed Senate Bylaw 16 was removed for further discussion as item VI.

III.   Task Force on Undergraduate Education

Last year, UCEP proposed to the Academic Planning Council (APC) the formation of a joint faculty/administration task force that would make programmatic and planning recommendations to the provost and president on issues facing undergraduate education at UC over the next decade. The APC responded positively, but also suggested an alternative to the task force that differed in structure and focus from what UCEP originally proposed. The APC suggested expanding the proposed task force into an ongoing APC committee named the Undergraduate Education Planning Committee (UGEPC), which would include a broader range of administrators and address a broader range of topics encompassing not only undergraduate education but also undergraduate life, and budget.

Chair Weiss noted that UCEP's original vision was for the task force to examine "Undergraduate Education in the 21st Century" and to release a series of reports addressing specific themes such as international education, distance learning, service, research, and capstone experiences. He said the APC would take seriously UCEP's views on the composition and scope of the group.

Chair Oakley also noted that the provost was eager to address a lack of systemwide academic planning around undergraduate education. He said the proposed committee could exist in parallel to the Planning Group for Professional and Doctoral Education (PDPE). He said the APC has close links to the faculty; the Academic Senate chair serves as vice chair of the APC.

In general, UCEP members supported the transformation of the task force into a Committee if the more permanent entity instituted an ongoing interest in undergraduate education issues. But UCEP also expressed concerns about the proposed new mission of the UGEPC, its composition, and how its charge would interact with and affect the authority of UCEP. Specifically, there was concern that broadening the charge to include budget and ancillary considerations would detract from the intended educational focus, and that expanding the membership would dilute the faculty role as well as UCEP's role and authority. Members felt that the Committee should be modest in size, and that UCEP and other Academic Senate agencies should have the opportunity to vet any of its proposals. UCEP decided to ask the provost to clarify his view of the relationship of the Committee to UCEP and how their respective charges would differ.

Action: UCEP will invite Provost Hume to the November 6 meeting.

IV.   Report from the Academic Senate Leadership

Academic Senate Chair John Oakley thanked members for their volunteer service to the Senate, and noted that UCEP was one of the most important systemwide faculty committees. The Regents have delegated direct authority for admissions, curriculum and degrees to the Senate, which represents approximately 9000 regular and 4000 emeriti faculty.

Chair Oakley and Vice Chair Michael Brown are ex-officio, non-voting members of all systemwide committees (except UCR&J) and will try to attend UCEP meetings when possible. The chair and vice chair are also Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents. In addition,

the Regents require the president to consult the faculty on all matters affecting the welfare of the University.

Recently, the Regents asked the Senate to consider a proposal to ban research funding from tobacco companies. Council's vote against instituting a ban was based on concerns over academic freedom.

Chair Oakley said the Senate is essentially a parliamentary system. Its leaders are responsible to the membership and are effective only when they have the confidence of the membership. The Senate chair and vice chair seek to understand the views of the faculty and to report accurately those views to the administration and the Regents. The Senate's leaders provide an overall focus to the debate at Council meetings, and work with staff to ensure that the faculty are consulted about any changes in policy. Chair Oakley noted that a split between the chair of the Senate and the rest of the Senate last year led the Assembly to remove the chair.

Finally, he noted that dwindling state support for higher education has made the present a critical time in the history of the University. It will be a challenge to maintain UC's status as a world-class public research university if present trends continue.

V.   Report from the Academic Senate Executive Director

Senate Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barceló reported that the goal of the Senate staff is to help the faculty meet their academic and administrative missions. The Committee Analyst provides professional support and is available to prepare agendas, to draft minutes, memos and reports, to share institutional knowledge, and to help ensure proper protocol.

The Executive Director encouraged UCEP members to communicate with their local committees about systemwide issues, and in turn, to share local concerns with UCEP. She noted that agendas and minutes are public documents posted on the Senate website. Senate policy prohibits the posting of other documents or reports without Council approval.

The Senate Source is the newsletter of the systemwide Senate. It is primarily an online publication produced by the staff and distributed electronically to all UC faculty. Committees are encouraged to propose ideas for articles of interest to the committee or the general faculty. Finally, she noted that a new UCOP policy requires travelers to submit expense receipts within 21 days.

VI.   Proposed Senate Bylaw 16 – Executive Director

Bylaw 16 is one product of the Academic Council's special Subcommittee on the Systemwide Senate Leadership and Office Structure, which formed last year after the senate chair was removed from office. Bylaw 16 makes the Senate executive director a non-Senate officer of the Academic Senate. It is an attempt to improve accountability and resolve some of the existing ambiguity about reporting lines for personnel actions of Senate employees who work within the Office of the President.

Action: UCEP endorsed the Bylaw 16 without comment.

VII.   UC Transfer Preparation Paths – Implementation Update

Margaret Heisel, Associate to the VP for Student Affairs, and Eric Taggart, Director of the Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) Coordination Site joined the meeting to report on the implementation progress of two Senate resolutions—SR 477 (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process) and SR 478 (SciGETC). ASSIST is a website repository for inter-segmental course articulation information.

The California legislature wants to help broaden educational access by increasing inter-segmental transfer, and has asked UC to make room for more Community College transfer students, to make the transfer process more efficient and effective, and to improve transfer student preparation. Director Heisel noted that only 17% of total transferring students come to UC, but approximately 1/3 of UC undergraduates are transfers. She said on average, transfers are as successful academically as students who enter UC as freshmen.

Phase one of streamlining articulation is nearly complete. Since "Streamlining" was first proposed, UC campuses have achieved nearly 100% of possible course articulation for major preparation with Community Colleges. The second phase is the implementation and expansion of *UC Transfer Preparatory Pathways*. *Pathways* allows prospective transfer students and community colleges to access and compare detailed transfer preparation requirements for a number of specific majors at different UC campuses, including details about minimum GPAs and required or strongly recommended courses for highly selective majors. It communicates expectations about requirements that are both campus specific and that show similarities and differences among campuses. It addresses UC faculty's specific concerns about major preparation in the transfer population.

Last year, UCEP asked organizers to test the concept of *Pathways* by implementing it for four high demand majors. Organizers are now developing a proposal for full implementation, and a plan to expand implementation to the top 20 UC majors by June. Based on campus input, the next five majors will be business and managerial economics, computer science, economics, English and physics. UCEP will receive a status report in late October.

There is a provision of SR 477 that makes a major articulation agreement valid for all UC campuses when at least four campuses have established an agreement. Campuses have at least a full year to opt out of this provision.

A few UCEP members expressed surprise that physics had been identified as a top 20 major. One member pointed out that the *Pathways* document should note whether the Additional Lower Division Major Preparation courses are required or not required. Members also expressed concerns that ASSIST would not pick up last minute changes to catalog copy.

Finally, ICAS is considering a proposal for a cross-segmental common course numbering system. The legislature has forced CSU to establish common major preparation patterns across its campuses, but has agreed not to force commonality at UC.

VIII.   UCIE Proposal for "In Association with" Degrees

4

Council asked UCEP to consider a proposal from the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) to allow foreign institutions to add a special designation "In Association with the University of California" to the degrees of students who study at UC through a UCEAP reciprocity program.

UCEP members had reservations about two components of the proposal. First, it was unclear what amount of coursework and time in residency at UC would qualify a student for the designation. Members felt the amount of time and coursework should be significant, but UCIE noted only that a "substantial amount of time" would be required, without further elaboration. There was also more general concern about the University allowing foreign institutions to use the UC name on diplomas and transcripts, as UC has no control over the content of the degrees offered by these institutions. UCEP member were apprehensive about the University giving blanket permission to all partner institutions to use the designation in a way that implied UC approval of the partner institution's own local programs, and without a closer review of its potential use. Members were concerns that UCEAP and UCIE establish some kind of ongoing quality control mechanism for the "In Association with" program if enacted.

Finally, the undergraduate student representative asked for clarification about whether UC students participating in an EAP reciprocity program would, in turn, be entitled to a notation on their degrees from foreign institutions, should an agreement be reached.

Action: UCEP will submit comments to Academic Council.

IX.   Update on UCDC Proposal for UCEP systemwide course approval

Chair Weiss updated UCEP on a proposal from the UC Center in Washington for UCEP to act as the approving committee for systemwide courses offered at UCDC. UCDC is one of two UC study centers (the other is UC Center in Sacramento.) It brings together individual UC campus Washington internship programs at one location. UCDC wants to begin offering courses to students from all campuses, but is encountering the bureaucratic difficulty of obtaining course approval at nine campuses and determining appropriate unit credit for both quarter and semester students.

In June, UCEP agreed to the UCDC request and outlined the following implementation plan: UCDC sends a course proposal to UCEP. UCEP opines on its appropriateness as a systemwide course and sends it to the campus of the instructor of origin to examine the intellectual content. Based on the campus analysis, UCEP approves the course, determines the credit units, and informs UCDC. The course appears in all campus catalogs. Chair Weiss noted that UCEP should expect to see a proposal sometime in 2006-07.

X.   Proposed Systemwide Cap on Entry Level Writing Class Size

In 2005, Council endorsed and forwarded to the provost a recommendation from UCEP and UCOPE to cap the size of Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) classes at 20 students. The decision was based in part on a UCOPE study about the effectiveness of small writing classes, and UCEP's projected cost of implementation (approximately $270,000 systemwide), which was viewed as reasonable when averaged across ten campuses.

The provost responded that the Senate was responsible for implementing a cap. Council asked UCEP to obtain updated estimates on the status of class size as well as cost, and requested that UCEP and UCOPE propose a Senate Regulation to codify the cap, which the Assembly must ultimately approve. UCOPE drafted an amendment to SR 636.

Some UCEP members noted that the proposed cap of 20 was an appropriate target based on national standards, the pedagogical studies cited by UCOPE, and cost. But other members found the evidence for a class size cap to be less than compelling, and were uncertain about the pedagogical rationale for a specific cap of 20. One member mentioned a study showing that the UCSD writing program had no effect on students' writing ability.

Action: UCEP members will obtain updates on class size and cost estimates.

XI.　Independent Course Responsibility for Graduate Student Instructors

UCEP's joint report with CCGA on the role of graduate students in undergraduate instruction is out for systemwide Senate review. The report recommends increasing systemwide uniformity of policies and practices for graduate student instructors, increased faculty oversight of instruction, and other specific policy revisions that institute new systemwide instructor titles.

The recommendations include prohibiting the use of graduate students as Instructors of Record in both regular and summer terms, except in rare circumstances, and placing graduate student teaching under one of two new systemwide titles—Graduate Teaching Assistants, who work under close faculty supervision to teach small sections, and Graduate Teaching Fellows—who are approved by the Senate to have complete instructional authority under faculty mentorship. The report recommends extending the authority of campus Senates to lower division teaching by Teaching Fellows and mandates against the use of Fellows for more than 10% of classes offered during the year. Finally, the report proposes changes to SR 750 and APM 410-20 to include approvals of lower and upper division teaching by graduate students in the Senate purview.

UCEP decided not to comment but to wait for divisional and systemwide comments. One member noted that the next step should be to define a systemwide policy for mentoring.

XII.　Campus Reports

There was a brief report on UCLA's efforts to address a lack of diversity by comparing its admissions procedures with those of Berkeley. Berkeley recently admitted a number of African American students who were not offered admission to UCLA.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Richard Weiss

Distributions:
1. APC Undergraduate Education Task Force Discussion Document
2. UCOPE – Proposed Modification to Senate Regulation 636 and justification
3. ICAS – Course Identification Numbering Project