UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
November 14, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Denise Segura, Chair (UCSB)
Lynda Bell (UCR), Jaye Padgett (UCSC), Richard Weiss (UCLA), Steven Constable (UCSD), Keith Williams (UCD), Benson Tongue (UCB), Stephen McLean (UCSB), Paul Elkof (UCI), Tina Park (Student Rep-UCLA), Cliff Brunk (Chair, Academic Senate), Julie Gordon (Director, Intercampus Program Coordination), Linda Guerra (Assistant Vice Provost), Barbara Hoblitzell (Student Academic Services), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – *Denise Segura*

Employee compensation was a topic at both the Academic Planning Council and the November 9 meeting of the Academic Assembly. Discussion focused on the need to bring salaries for all employee groups up to market parity and a Regents' agenda item that would authorize the use of private funds to augment salaries for certain senior executive positions. The Academic Assembly passed two related resolutions; the first, "On Proper Compensation Priorities for the University of California," and the second, "In Opposition to the Use of Private Funds for Senior Leadership Salaries." At Assembly, BOARS reported that a letter is being sent to campus admissions committees indicating that BOARS is considering making a recommendation that campuses eliminate the honors/advanced placement grade point "bump" for UC eligibility, and consider measures like strength of schedule at campus selection.

UCEP representative Sanchez (UCSF) attended the October Council meeting for Chair Segura.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP approved the draft minutes of October 10, 2005 with minor changes.

III. Request from BOARS for UCEP to re-affirm its position against changing the "d" Admissions Requirement

In each of the past two years, faculty in the Earth and Space Science (ESS) have proposed adding ESS as a fourth core laboratory science course option in UC's "d" and "g" admissions requirements. BOARS makes the final decision on this policy, but has also sought UCEP's input. There has been little or no support in UCEP or BOARS for adding ESS or any other specific discipline to the core laboratory science requirement list if the requirement were kept at two years, but the ESS community has continued to lobby BOARS to achieve their desired outcome. As a result, BOARS has decided to ask Academic Council for a formal endorsement of its position against changing the "d" requirement.

UCEP members agreed that the committee will send BOARS a memo reaffirming prior UCEP recommendations and endorsing BOARS' Request for Council Action. Members generally regard the matter closed, as the appropriate agencies of the Senate have considered the proposal thoughtfully and sufficiently and arrived at a conclusion. (One UCEP member, an Earth Scientist, expressed support for the ESS proposal).

In the memo, UCEP will also acknowledge that the intellectual merit in the argument for ESS might be usefully considered in the context of wider, longer-range discussion of the a-g requirements by concerned faculty in the scientific community and elsewhere, who should develop a constructive dialogue around these issues at the campus level.

Action: UCEP will forward its memo to BOARS Chair Brown.

IV. Report from UCOP – *Julie Gordon, Director, Intercampus Academic Program Coordination*

With the Provost's resignation, there is some question about how several systemwide initiatives will proceed and along what timeline. Acting Provost Rory Hume is continuing campus site visits focusing on graduate education; the President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity is also continuing its campus visits; and the Science and Math Initiative remains a high priority.

What was originally conceived narrowly as a review of the Education Abroad Program has been expanded to encompass a review of "International Education in the 21st Century." A committee forming to lead this effort will include UCIE Chair Fred Burwick and several other faculty members and administrators. UCEP is invited to bring questions and concerns related to educational policy to the committee for consideration. These might include questions about the role International Education can and should play in the undergraduate experience; whether IE should be built into the curriculum in more structural ways; and identification of impediments to fuller undergraduate participation in IE. UCEP representative Lynda Bell volunteered to assemble basic briefing materials about EAP for UCEP, which she will bring to the December meeting. Director of International Strategy Development Gretchen Kolonji plans to attend UCEP in February to talk about how the programs in her department impact undergraduate education.

Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and UCEP consultant Julius Zelmanowitz will return to research and teaching in March 2006.

V.   Independent Course Responsibility for Graduate Student Instructors

UCEP members were asked to gather divisional information on the role of graduate students in undergraduate instruction, including the extent to which instructor of record authority is granted to students in lower and upper division classes; the number of courses taught by students; and campus policies in place for oversight and review. The Senate has been asked to consider whether current policies, practices, and quality control mechanisms are appropriate or whether changes are needed.

Although in some cases, graduate students have "instructor of record" authority to independently assign grades, students more frequently teach courses with varying levels of oversight and supervision from a faculty member of record who has final sign-off on grades. However, this oversight can be difficult to quantify. The faculty sign-off may be little more than a formality, making the student *de facto* Instructor of Record. UCEP members gathered data on both cases.

Senate Regulation 750 states that persons holding instructional titles other than those designated may teach lower division courses only, unless individually authorized by the Senate through a special appointment to teach upper division.

Member-reported statistics and guidelines for students designated *Instructors of Record* (no faculty sign-off)
UCB: Ten courses were taught last fall by *Acting Instructors-Graduate Student*. AI-GS's are appointed in rare instances for upper division courses only. Specific experience and expertise in teaching is required, and appointments are approved by the graduate COCI.

UCD: *Associates-In* taught 126 lower division and 64 upper division courses. The Senate COCI approves all upper division Associates-In. Department Chair recommendation is sufficient for lower division. Explicit guidelines require a faculty mentor for Associates-In, teaching experience, pass to PhD candidacy, and excellent knowledge of the course material.

UCI: At UCI, no graduate student may have instructor of record responsibility.

UCLA: A graduate student may be appointed *Teaching Fellow*. A special committee selects Fellows, who last year taught 12 upper division courses.

UCR: The Senate COCI approves *Associates-In* for upper division course work on the recommendation of the dean's office. No lower division approvals are needed, but the student should

be "competent independently without supervision to conduct the entire instruction of a lower division course." Associates-In must have a master's degree or equivalent training and at least one year of teaching experience. Last year, Associates-In taught 32 (2%) lower division and 35 (2%) upper division courses.

UCSD: *Associates-In* with unique talents and expertise may teach upper division courses only (32 last year). Students must have advanced to PhD candidacy; have certain experience and expertise in teaching; and be approved in advance by the Senate, which sets criteria and provides oversight. Each department is limited to 10% of total courses per year and a faculty mentor submits a written assessment of teaching performance to CEP.

UCSB: *Associates-In* taught 120 lower division and 84 upper division courses. The Graduate Council, the Committee on Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policy, and the dean all review and approve requests for upper division teaching by Associates-In based on qualifications and the circumstances of the request. Lower division teaching requires no approval outside the dean.

UCSC: *Teaching Fellows and Associates-In* taught 28 upper-division and 9 lower-division courses. Fellows work under the general supervision of a faculty member. Associates-In are more like lecturers. All Fellow and Associate In appointments require CEP approval for upper division, or courses that have a general education or core requirement attachment to the major. Their use is discouraged in core program and GE courses.

Data on student instructors with faculty sign-off (may assign grades but do not sign-off)
UCB: There are many *GSI*s teaching upper and lower division courses at UCB. Appointments are made by the relevant departments. In order to be appointed, students must meet clearly delineated pre-requisite requirements and the departments are required to provide both mentorship and guidance in their duties.

UCD: *Teaching Assistants or Associates In* taught 88 upper division and 407 lower division courses. A policy outlines procedures for chair or dean approval.

UCI: *Teaching Associates* taught 65 upper division and 340 lower division courses (together about 5% of total credit hours). All instructional activities of Associates must be supervised by a faculty member. For upper division courses, the candidate must have advanced to candidacy and received formal approval from the dean of graduate studies and the Senate COCI. No approvals are required for lower division courses beyond the requirements of training and experience. Most Associates teach in the Humanities—writing classes and foreign languages.

UCLA: *Teaching Associates* taught 3% of upper division and 7% of lower division courses.

UCR: *Teaching Fellows* are required to be under the general supervision of a faculty member for lower division courses (8 last year), and must be approved by COCI for upper division courses on the recommendation of the dean's office. Fellows should have advanced to candidacy or achieved "appropriate professional maturity." *Teaching Assistants* are common in the writing program and lower division science labs. Many are probably *de facto* instructor of record.

UCSD: Many *Teaching Assistants* teach lower-division courses. There is no Senate policy.

UCSB: *Teaching Assistants* are active mostly in introductory foreign language courses. Numbers are unknown. There is no formal Senate oversight or approval policy, but faculty supervisors are expected to play a significant role in training and in-class evaluations.

UCSC: N/A

Graduate student instructors tend to teach smaller classes, although they are clustered in large lower division courses at a couple of campuses. Graduate students are frequently used in writing sections and foreign languages, a largely "undocumented" area where it is assumed that the instruction is essentially unsupervised

Key questions include whether UCEP is satisfied with current policies and procedures for the approval, supervision and mentoring of graduate student instructors; whether sufficient safeguards exist to ensure a high quality of education; whether there are convincing reasons to maintain a sharp review policy difference between upper and lower division courses; and the effect on Senate workload of modifying approval mechanisms.

SR 750 says graduate students may not teach upper division courses without Senate approval, but it is not clear that current practices of approval and oversight are enough to be consistent with SR 750. However, anecdotal instances where a TA is teaching a course without faculty oversight and only the formal of a sign-off probably can't be proven with current accounting mechanisms.

Members would like to explore how much the situation is driven by budgets. In an era of shrinking and inadequate budgets, there are not enough faculty to teach, and departments are being forced to do more with less.

UCEP may want to provide a statement of guidelines articulating where the line between appropriate and inappropriate behavior lies. This may take the form of a general consciousness-raising recommendation to the campuses, but may also include a specific proposal for some new or modified regulation regarding approval, oversight, and mentoring of graduate students. The Berkeley model has a lot of merit.

GSI instruction supports graduate students and also provides an as-good or better quality of education to undergraduates. However, some campuses have better training and mentorship support for students than others and clearer guidelines for their use. In general, members felt graduate students should not be responsible for teaching and assigning grades without Senate review, and that university policy should require all graduate student instruction to be approved by an independent body of the faculty with proper oversight. Finally, if students are teaching and exercising independent authority in every way except signing grades, they are essentially instructors of records and should be processed that way.

Action: A rough draft will be developed and circulated to members.

VI. Undergraduate Education at the University of California – *with Linda Guerra*

UCEP has been asked to advise the Academic Planning Council about whether it would be useful for a task force to examine broadly the status of undergraduate education at UC as well as what UC's philosophy of undergraduate education is or should be. In addition, the Council of Undergraduate Deans wants UC to develop a culture of assessment and evidence with regard to undergraduate education; and the WASC accreditation review process is focusing more on philosophies and self-assessments. Topics UCEP might consider include how the undergraduate education mission of UC should be defined; how UC should measure its educational goals and achievements; and whether UC should have a central philosophy or mission statement to help guide self-assessment.

The undergraduate experience at a large research university is unique. At UC, students have the opportunity to participate in the discovery process by working alongside faculty researchers. However, many students are unable to articulate why they have chosen to come to UC or why UC has the reputation it does. Moreover, many students, particularly in the social sciences and humanities, do not participate in a research experience. Some campuses are recommending that undergraduates participate in a "capstone" experience of some kind, but what the capstone could involve across campuses and disciplines has not been fully articulated.

The proposed review is an opportunity to consider what it means to teach at UC – whether UC faculty are better (or worse) teachers because of the research mission; whether the delivery of undergraduate education should be re-evaluated as student demographics and knowledge demands change; and how UC can assess the desired outcome – to make students better.

There is a concern that in seeking to define a central philosophy or mission statement, the discussion could become too large and unwieldy. Questions about the nature of knowledge and knowledge delivery could take decades to resolve and issues would arise that might damage the University. A central mission statement might also come at the expense of divisional identities. Other members thought that a central mission statement would still allow each campus to find its own path to the achievement of the mission goals.

Members decided it would be better to shift the focus of the discussion away from philosophy to the major questions facing undergraduate education over the next 20 years.

Action: Members will locate the undergraduate education statements prepared for WASC, and get input from local committees on what they see as the questions facing UC undergraduate education over the next 20 years. Topics may include the internet, distance learning and other technologies; international education; and capstone courses.

VII. Implementation of SR 477 and 478 – *with Barbara Hoblitzell, Student Academic Services*

Academic Council has asked UCEP and BOARS to work together with the Student Academic Services Office to define an implementation policy for two new regulations related to transfer policy—SR 477 (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process) and SR 478 (SciGETC). Barbara Hoblitzell from the Office of Transfer Preparation, Policy and Programs reported that implementation planning for 477/478 is being considered by her office in the context of a broad review of all foundational transfer policies.

SciGETC allows prospective transfer students planning a science major to defer two general education courses until after transfer and requires the student to substantially complete the articulated lower division course requirements for the major. Policy needs to be developed to ensure SciGETC certifiers will have coordinated access to information about which UC the student is preparing; how the major preparation has been articulated for that campus; what constitutes "substantial completion"; which courses may be used to satisfy the remaining GE requirements; and how the opt-out provision will be implemented. The office of SAS has outlined 10 tasks summarizing relevant implementation issues, one of which is a transcript study of entering fall '04 transfer students.

SR 477 extends articulation for similar courses within common majors across campuses. It says that if at least four campuses agree that a course or a set of courses from a Community College are sufficient preparation for a specific UC major; it is considered sufficient systemwide. 477 will expand opportunities for CCC students who are preparing for a specific major but applying to several UC campuses. Work needs to be done to define and identify what constitutes "similar" majors and common lower division course requirements. SAS computer models are helping to identify common majors and similar courses, but the academic expertise of faculty is needed to define similar majors and common requirements to see where courses are not articulated.

BOARS has identified math and history as possible starting points to guide the identification of similar majors/common requirements. Some members said it would be a poor use of resources for UCEP to do the mechanics but are willing to give assistance to SAS if they receive guidance and data.

Action: SAS will provide data and ongoing consultation to UCEP.

VIII. The California Science and Math Initiative

UCEP members had been asked to gather information about the local status of the California Science and Math Initiative. They reported their findings:

UCR. At UCR, CalTeach will be enfolded into the Copernicus Project, an existing science teacher training program. A faculty SMI director has been identified, and collaborative relationships with

NSF funding are already in place at UCR. However, there are concerns about funding, slapdash communication and planning at systemwide, and the Summer Institutes.

UCD. SMI is being incorporated into the existing [Future Science Teacher's Program](#), and students expressing an interest in SMI are being encouraging to start in the FSTP. The SMI oversight committee has determined that Davis has a full curriculum in place, and existing internships will be used for the field experience courses. The campus is concerned that appropriate funding resources will be available for students and the campus.

UCI. A faculty director and a (non-Senate) oversight committee are in place, which are reviewing curricular issues. An existing minor in education is being adapted.

UCB. An administrative structure is in place, with co-directors from math and physics who are working with Lawrence Hall of Science and the Graduate School of Education to recruit mentors and master teachers. UCB is also concerned about cost and wants a statement from UCOP about the certainty of the teacher certification piece of the program. When appropriate, some summer institutes should be made discipline specific.

UCSD. An SMI director is in place. The campus will use an existing minor in education.

UCSB. An SMI oversight committee has formed, but there are concerns that the teacher shortage is a retention problem, which will not be solved by producing more teachers. Faculty want to ensure that the SMI creates teachers who stay in teaching, but studies have shown that fifth-year teaching programs have higher retention rates. There are also concerns about placing teachers with little experience in classrooms and uncertainty about an indistinct funding plan.

UCSC. SMI is housed with the dean of Physical and Biological Sciences, and a staff SMI director has been hired. The Senate is not formally involved yet, but faculty directors will soon be named. An existing education minor will serve as the program frame, and interested students are being pointed to certain education courses.

UCLA. CalTeach will be folded into UCLA's existing 5-year science and math teacher training program that students enter in junior year. The program is beginning a dialogue with the Academic Senate. Some faculty are unsure that a sizeable pool of students actually exists for the program, but if it is sold better, it could be very successful. For many idealist students, service through teaching is a very appealing option.

Chair Brunk reported that at the systemwide level, the Senate's SMI workgroup will consist of one representative from each campus, and be chaired, initially, by Berkeley Divisional Chair Alice Agogino. Financing for SMI is still a serious question, and industry money not yet secured, will be essential to its success. There is room for the program to be modified as it develops.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Denise Segura

Distributions:
1. Instructors of Record at UC Davis
2. SMI at UC Davis
3. UCI California Teach Flyer