

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

May 8, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Attending: Denise Segura, Chair (UCSB)

Richard Weiss, Vice-Chair (UCLA), Eugene Nothnagel (UCR), Steven Constable (UCSD), Richard Hughey (UCSC), Keith Williams (UCD), Benson Tongue (UCB), Stephen McLean (UCSB), Paul Elkof (UCI), Lynn Verhey (UCSF), Evan Heit (UCM), Rozana Carducci (Student Rep-UCLA), John Oakley (Chair, Academic Senate), Michael Brown (Vice-Chair, Academic Senate), (Julie Gordon (Dir. Intercampus Program Coordination), Margaret Heisel (Student Academic Services), Eric Taggart (Dir. ASSIST), Jeanne Hargrove (AWPE & HS Articulation Coordinator), Ellen Switkes (AVP, Academic Advancement), Mark Westlye (Dir. Graduate Student Advancement), Michael LaBriola (Senate Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Denise Segura

Chair Segura reported that UCEP's recommendation regarding the formation and charge of a systemwide joint Senate/administrative Task Force on Undergraduate Education was received and endorsed by Academic Council in April and presented to the Academic Planning Council. Acting Provost Hume and Senate Chair Oakley are writing a formal charge.

UCEP members Keith Williams and Benson Tongue sit on the Academic Council Workgroup on the Science and Mathematics Initiative (SMIG), which recently met at UC Irvine. They reported that there had been mid-course changes to the administrative and leadership structure of the SMI to make the initiative more campus-based. SMIG is reviewing this transition to campus management and has made recommendations about leadership and coordination. Campuses are concerned about the overall stability of the project and UCOP's role in fundraising support.

The President's [Task Force on Faculty Diversity](#) will discuss its findings and recommendations at a systemwide Summit in Oakland on May 23. Diversity was also a topic at the joint Academic Council/Council of Chancellor's meeting in April.

Academic Council is considering the parameters of a pending review of the International Education programs at UC. There is significant pressure on President Dynes to respond to the recent audits on University compensation practices and re-organize the Office of the President.

The UC Student Mental Health Committee, which is assessing trends in student mental health, campus services, and resources needs, invited a UCEP member to participate in a discussion at UCLA about undergraduate mental health. Vice-Chair Weiss volunteered to attend.

The Universitywide Committee on Planning and Budget just released its [report](#) on *Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California*, which is available on the Academic Senate website.

II. Implementation of Senate Regulation 477 – Margaret Heisel and Eric Taggart

Margaret Heisel and [ASSIST](#) Director Eric Taggart joined the meeting to discuss *UC Transfer Preparation Paths*, a proposal for implementation of SR 477 that will better communicate to Community College students and counselors the full range of available UC lower division transfer preparatory paths.

In 2005, the Senate adopted SR 477, which requires UC to articulate specific CCC courses systemwide when at least four campuses have articulated them as common requirements in a similar major. All traditional major preparation articulation is now in place, but implementation of 477 requires UC to identify similar majors and common lower division requirements across campuses in an ongoing process. Director Taggart reported that the goal of *Transfer Preparation Paths* is to develop clearer communication vehicles to inform potential transfer students about the similarities and differences in transfer requirements, which will allow students to easily compare major preparation patterns at specific UC campuses and plan a curriculum accordingly. The combination of SR 477 and *Transfer Preparation Paths* will contribute to student success.

UC majors are unique and highly specialized, which has made it challenging to identify common course sequences. *Transfer Preparation Paths* helps students identify the specific courses at every CCC they can use to meet transfer requirements for UC majors, and organizes the information in a way that is easy to understand. It provides students with general descriptions of majors; identifies common lower division major requirements and degree programs across UC campuses, additional minimum academic requirements at each UC campus, and additional selection criteria such as GPA and minimum grades, which help students be more competitive for selection and admission. If students change their mind about a campus or major, information is provided about other degree programs where the completed coursework can apply.

UCEP members reviewed preliminary paths for sample majors Psychology and Biology. Those, along with Chemistry and History, will be finalized and posted for students in the fall with an expansion plan for 16 other top majors. Over the summer, organizers will consult admissions directors, articulation officers, and other campus representatives, before a final draft is prepared in early August. The top twenty majors should be completed by June 2007. Organizers will report to UCEP in September and throughout next year. Individual UCEP members are encouraged to contact Director Taggart if they want more closely involved in the progress of the proposal during the summer.

Transfer Preparation Paths will present individual major requirements as applicable only for a specific timeframe, and will be upgraded every year. UCEP recommended that Preparation Paths be integrated in the campus program review process.

Recently, UCEP Chair Segura, Senate Vice Chair Brown, Margaret Heisel and ASSIST Director Eric Taggart met with aides of Senator Jack Scott to discuss UC work around the implementation of SR 477. Senator Scott had also introduced legislation intended to standardize the major preparatory paths between CCC and UC, using CSU's Lower Division Transfer Preparation (LDTP) as a model. LDTP is a course pattern completed at a CCC that advances a student to any CSU campus offering a specified major. UC had noted to Senator Scott that it is working to improve transfer, but couldn't meet the rigid structure of the LDTP.

Members received a summary of pending legislation related to transfer.

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

Director Gordon updated the committee on a few executive vacancies at the Office of the President and systemwide. Director Gordon herself will be retiring in June. UCEP's new

consultants will likely come from a unit being re-organized under a new umbrella to include both undergraduate planning and intercampus activity.

Director Gordon and UCEP Vice Chair Weiss recently attended a UCDC Academic Advisory Committee meeting in Washington. Vice Chair Weiss noted that UCDC is an incredible opportunity for students seeking a unique academic experience and access to internship opportunities in the nation's capital. Most UCDC students are non-science majors, but there are many opportunities for students interested in Science policy, and UCDC is working to attract more Science students. UCDC Director Bruce Cain is developing a proposal for dealing with certain UCDC courses through a systemwide approval mechanism possibly involving UCEP. Vice Chair Weiss will forward the proposal, and it was suggested that UCEP invite Professor Cain to a future meeting.

Next year, UCEP will review the UC Center in Sacramento, which was instituted as a five-year pilot project and is up for permanent status. The Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching is a systemwide collaboration in its sixth year. It offers a mechanism for campuses to share their diverse language resources systemwide.

IV. Message from Academic Senate Chair Oakley

The Academic Assembly is meeting by teleconference in May. The upcoming Regents meeting will focus on compensation issues and the recent audits and include discussion of proposals for reform. Some people are calling for the president of the university to step down, but it would be better for the university to focus on solving its systemic issues before considering major leadership changes.

The university is considering the future of pension plans and benefits. Most of the changes being proposed would only affect future employees. All persons employed by the University as of July 1 2007 will remain part of the existing UCRS plan.

VI. Independent Course Responsibility for Graduate Student Instructors

At its March 22 meeting, Academic Council asked UCEP and CCGA to work together to prepare a single set of recommendations regarding current policies, practices, and quality control mechanisms for graduate students teaching with independent course responsibility. Chair Segura had been working with CCGA member Bruce Schumm to merge the analyses and recommendations of UCEP and CCGA into a joint memo that would bring the views of both committees into concurrence and reconcile any differences. Professor Schumm joined the meeting by phone to discuss the draft memo with UCEP.

Both committees agreed that graduate students should not have Instructor of Record authority except in urgent need or as part of a thoughtful training process. All graduate students who have responsibility for instruction must have real faculty oversight, which will ensure quality and afford students and instructors protection under the Faculty Code of Conduct.

The degree of student teaching responsibility and faculty oversight vary across a broad continuum, but two main types of instructional responsibility were identified by CCGA, which proposed a new standard title, "Teaching Fellow" for graduate students who are approved by the Senate to have complete instructional authority under the mentorship of a faculty member. Fellows would have at least one year of teaching experience, an advanced degree or advanced-

to-candidacy status, and be in charge of instruction under specified conditions under faculty mentorship. The second major group, "Teaching Assistants" would remain those who currently work under close faculty supervision to teach small sections. Chair Segura noted that there is great systemwide variation in how student teaching is handled and the creation of this clear dichotomy between faculty supervision and faculty mentorship will help clarify matters.

The relevant campus Senate committee would extend its review and approve authority to lower division teaching done by Teaching Fellows. CCGA and UCEP have proposed changes in relevant policies, SR 750 to include approvals of lower and upper division and graduate teaching by graduate students in the Senate purview, and APM-410-20 governing titles.

One member noted that the proposal should make an exception to allow for the possibility of a dual appointment for qualified graduate students who are also in the Lecturer series; for instance, lecturers who are finishing a PhD, or a graduate student who arrives at UC with CCC faculty experience but no PhD. Therefore there may be a need for a third category - Instructors of Record without faculty supervision.

It was noted that graduate students currently classified as Teaching Assistants in some departments manage entire small section courses and are the only people students see. If the student instructor is the sole face of instruction in the classroom, that person should be a Teaching Fellow, not a TA.

A remark was made that it is incorrect to assume something inherently wrong with the existence of graduate students in the classroom, or that their instruction is of a lesser quality. There are sound pedagogical reasons for the use of student instructors, and faculty are very selective about who they let into the classroom. This new standards would not remove the opportunity for graduate students to teach, but would instead allow them to augment their training through greater faculty mentorship.

UCEP members noted that there may be resistance on the campuses to adding lower division review, because it will mean adding to faculty workload. It is impossible to codify supervision vs. mentorship so the intention is to provide a rough guideline for departments. If there really is solid mentorship there doesn't need to be senate approval of teaching. That question should be left to the campuses. It was noted that the idea that "faculty shall sign the grade sheet" needs to be made more explicit in the document, although faculty need to be reviewing and overseeing classroom methods and activity on a deeper level as well.

The issue of summer session was raised, because the majority of summer session courses are currently taught by graduate students. Given the University's move to implement fully funded summer instruction, members decided they should include consideration of how faculty mentorship and supervision in summer session would be affected by the recommendations. Instructional monies are intended to fund regular UC courses for regular UC credit. The budgetary effect of moving hundreds of independent student Instructors of Record to the Teaching Fellow category with added mentoring requirements may be very large.

Chair Oakley encouraged the committee to arrive at a recommendation that faculty could live with and that could be supported financially. He said UCEP and CCGA should take a long term view that will preserve UC's niche as a world class public research university.

The memo will be recast to highlight the pro-active mission of the UC faculty to train graduate students to be excellent teachers, a mission that also benefits the state. There are different levels of teaching and supervision needs, which vary by discipline, but all must involve faculty members directly mentoring and collaborating with students to develop excellent pedagogical methods. There will be no student Instructors of Record without some kind of faculty oversight, but implementation of the actual supervision and oversight are best articulated by individual departments.

V. Credit for International Baccalaureate Curriculum – *with Jeanne Hargrove, AWPE & High School Articulation Coordinator*

The International Baccalaureate is an internationally standardized pre-University course of study founded in Geneva in 1968, which is offered at 67 California High Schools. UC awards 30 quarter units to students who complete the full 4-year IB Diploma Program, an intensive program of six courses, three IB Higher Level (HL) two-year courses, and three one-year Standard Level (SL) courses. 85% of IB students complete the full Diploma Program. UC also grants an Honors grade point bump and college credit for individual IB HL courses if the exam score is 5, 6, or 7. Recently BOARS recommended that *certain* SL IB courses should also qualify for the Honors bump and UC college credit.

Last year, Coordinator Hargrove asked UCEP to review the curriculum for several IB Standard Level (SL) courses, which BOARS had determined to be college level, to decide what number of university units students should be awarded for completion of those courses, along with what minimum IB exam score should be required for credit. At the time, members requested information about the correspondence between performance levels and course exam scores before making a recommendation. Coordinator Hargrove was still working with IB to obtain the necessary information.

There was concern expressed that the IB program probably involved a very small proportion of UC students, and it might not be worth a labor intensive effort on the part of UCEP faculty. It might be better to simply advise students to petition their departments. UCEP would still need to determine a minimum score and minimum credit.

UCEP members noted that before making a recommendation, they needed additional information about how many domestic IB students apply and enroll at UC each year who have taken qualifying SL courses without completing the full Diploma Program. They also requested information about final exam scoring methodology, including how final exam scores are determined based on exam responses and in-class participation grades; the practices of other comparison institutions in giving credit; and an understanding of the relationship between AP and IB standard level courses can be measured.

VI. Consent Calendar

Action: UCEP approved the minutes of the March 6, 2006 teleconference.

Action: UCEP approved the proposed modification to Senate Bylaw 185 related to UCOL.

VII. Summer Instruction

UCEP was asked by Acting Provost Hume to review a set of draft guidelines for the implementation of fully funded Summer Session into UC's existing academic framework. UC

has made certain commitments to the state for the use of Summer Session, including the expectation that the quality of summer instruction will be equivalent to standards during the regular year. There is no expectation, however, that Summer will become a compulsory 4th quarter or 3rd semester for faculty.

UCEP should consider whether the current state of summer instruction is satisfactory. There are positive aspects to summer instruction and many unique opportunities exist for students, but how do most students view summer session and why and in what types of courses do they enroll in summer? Some uses of Summer Session, e.g., lightening a regular year load, may be contrary to the state's goal of increasing overall capacity.

The committee should consider the role of graduate students and lecturers in Summer instruction. What impact will the move to full funding have on teaching? When fewer classes are taught by regular faculty members, and the classes are shorter (even if contact hours are the same), can the teaching be as good? UCEP may want to develop guidelines for making summer academically "equivalent" to the regular terms.

There was a question about how to interpret the term "overload" in the document.

Action: Members will bring the draft guidelines to their local committees for discussion. Chair Segura will also send members a list of possible topics for committees to consider.

VIII. UCAF's Proposed Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles

Action: The committee endorsed the principles articulated in UCAF's document and will send a memo to Council.

IX. Review of Proposed Legislation – ACR 34 Legislation

UCEP discussed Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 34. UCEP agreed with the concept of ensuring students' access to higher education and keeping student fees affordable. However, the committee was concerned that the bill did not guarantee that the state would allocate sufficient funding to meet the anticipated rising costs associated with instruction at the university. Members felt that lacking a provision for how the low fees would remain funded, there was a danger that the state could ultimately pass down a mandate to the University to keep fees low irrespective of state funding. In particular, certain provisions of the bill could place undue burdens on UC, CSU and the community colleges to provide student grant aid.

Action: Chair Segura will send comments to the Senate Legislative Analyst.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Denise Segura

Distributions:

1. Position Briefs on State bills
2. International Baccalaureate Program