

High Senate Post Goes To Lawrence B. Coleman of UCD

Meeting in Berkeley on May 21, the Senate's Universitywide Assembly elected Lawrence B. Coleman, a professor of physics at UC Davis, to be the next vice-chair of both the Assembly and its executive committee, the Academic Council. As such, Coleman will assume the vice-chair's post this fall and succeed in fall 1999 to the position of chair of the Assembly and the Council — the most important offices in the statewide Academic Senate.

Coleman was the chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate from 1995-1997. Before that, he was acting vice provost for academic programs and dean of undergraduate studies at Davis (in 1991-1992) and acting associate vice chancellor for academic programs (in 1990-1991). He began Senate service at Davis early in his career, chairing his college's committee on courses while still an assistant professor. During his time as divisional chair, UCD approved a major revision to its general education program. Coleman was widely perceived during his tenure as a conciliatory voice, presiding over a Senate that had been divided during the previous several years over diversity issues in general and the "gender pay equity" issue in particular. In addition to serving as divisional chair at Davis, Coleman also chaired a campus task force on instructional computing and served for many years on a special divisional committee on general education.

Coleman came to UCD in 1976 after having received his Ph.D. in physics from the University of Pennsylvania. He received a bachelor of arts degree in physics in 1970 from The Johns Hopkins University, which he came to after having graduated from high school in his home town of Baltimore. In physics, he is a condensed matter experimentalist who works primarily in new-materials physics, using infrared and far-infrared spectroscopy as his main tool. He and his students were the first to extend ultra-thin film reflection-absorption spectroscopy into the far-infrared region.

In teaching and education, Coleman

(Please See: Council, Page 4)

Top 4 Percent of Each High School Would Be UC-Eligible Senate Committee Needs More Information Before Deciding on New Admissions Plan

The Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools decided in June that it needs more input from several sources before it can decide on whether to go forward with a proposal that would establish a new route to UC eligibility while making major changes to the existing route. The new route would confer eligibility on the top 4 percent of students in each California high school.

At one time, it seemed possible that the Board of Admissions (BOARS), which sets basic UC eligibility standards, might bring such a proposal to the UC Regents as early as July. In June, however, the committee decided that, before it could make such a recommendation, it needed to have more information on three subjects: What the state's high schools think of the proposal, what the Senate faculty on each of UC's campuses think of it, and what the academic pro-

file of the "4-percent students" is.

If all the concerns regarding the idea are satisfied, BOARS Chair Keith Widaman said, "we could go to the Regents as late as February [1999] and, with their approval, still have it affect the class of 2000." He added, however, that it is uncertain what the BOARS information-gathering will reveal.

One of the reasons for the committee's concern is the replies it has gotten so far from the state's high schools regarding the proposal. About 80 high schools have responded to a questionnaire BOARS sent to them on the subject — less than 10 percent of the high schools queried, but with responses fairly evenly split among schools that have high and low academic achievement levels. Many questions were asked, but on the general question of what they thought of the 4-

(Please See: Eligibility, Page 3)

Issues of Student Transfer and 'Articulation' Taken Up by Faculty in Statewide Conference

The rise of the Internet and the growth in California's population has brought into sharp relief issues concerning the transfer of students among the sectors of higher education in the state, along with the question of the portability of individual courses both within educational systems and among them. In April, about 100 faculty and administrators from both the private and public institutions of higher education in California got together in Los Angeles to try to identify barriers to transfer and course "articulation" and to propose solutions to these problems. The meeting was sponsored by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which brings together Academic Senate leaders from UC, the California State University (CSU) and the California Community Colleges (CCC) to work on

issues of common concern.

Sandra Weiss, chair of both the UC Senate's Academic Council and ICAS, noted that the idea for the conference grew out of the discussions of the Governing Design Team for the California Virtual University (CVU). "As members of that team, we chairs of the three Senates committed ourselves to address the many complexities facing effective transfer of distance-learning courses across our segments. But we believed that the issues involved were relevant not only to technology-mediated instruction; so we charged the workshop planning committee with identifying articulation process that can effectively support transfer of all types of coursework." UC members of Intersegmental Planning Committee included Aimée Dorr (vice-chair of the Academic Council), Janice Plastino (chair of the Senate's University Committee on Educational Policy), and Dorothy Perry (vice chair of the Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools).

(Please See: Conference, Page 2)

Inside Notice: The Digital Age and Intellectual Property

Conference: Taking a Statewide Look at Transfer and Articulation

(Continued from Page 1)

There has always been student movement from one segment of higher education to another in California, of course. Indeed, the state's governing document for higher education, the California Master Plan for Higher Education, stipulates that the University of California undergraduate student body should exist in a ratio of 60 percent upper-division students to 40 percent lower-division students, the difference being accounted for by upper-division transfers into the system, mostly from California's community colleges. Each year, as many as 12,000 Community College students come to UC, while almost four times this many transfer from the Community Colleges (CCCs) to Cal State. These numbers stand to increase in the future; last November, UC President Richard Atkinson and CCC Chancellor Thomas Nussbaum signed a memorandum of understanding that committed their institutions to increasing the number of transfers to UC to a minimum of 14,500 by 2005-06; meanwhile, in March President Atkinson asked, at a symposium on transfer, whether it might not be a good idea for UC's 60:40 ratio of upper-division to lower-division students to go to 67:33.

One of the key issues in student transfer is that of whether a course taken at one institution will be accepted for credit by another. The basis of such acceptance is the process of "articulation," meaning the development of formal, written agreements that identify courses on a "sending" campus that are comparable to, or acceptable in lieu of, courses or requirements at a "receiving" campus. Articulation has an importance beyond its role in transfer in that it must be in place for students who remain enrolled at a "home" institution and yet simply want to take courses from either another institution or from another campus within their own institution.

This issue of the portability of courses has increased in importance with the growth of the Internet, which greatly enhances the potential for students to engage in "distance-learning." The question for students becomes: "Is a given course, taken via the Internet from an institution 500 miles away, acceptable at my campus for graduation credit, general education credit, or credit within the major?" This question stands to be asked with increasing frequency, given the development of the California Vir-

tual University, which promises to be a clearinghouse and development center for on-line courses in the state.

Against this backdrop, educators from across the state met in Los Angeles to discuss the problems and potential of transfer and articulation in California. Those assembled identified seven major impediments to articulation and transfer in the state. Among these were:

- Faculty to Faculty Communica-

Senate Service Award Goes to Professors from UCSB and UCR

The Academic Senate honored two of its own at the Universitywide Assembly meeting in Berkeley on May 21, as two longtime Senate activists were presented with the first Oliver Johnson Award for Service to the Academic Senate. The two are Elliot Brownlee, a professor of history at UC Santa Barbara, and Carlton Bovell, a professor, emeritus of microbiology at UC Riverside.

Both Brownlee and Bovell have extensive records of service to the Senate. Both chaired the Senate's Academic Council — Bovell in 1990-91 and Brownlee in 1992-93 — and both were chairs of their divisions, Bovell from 1974-78 at UCR and Brownlee in 1983-84 and again from 1988-90 at UCSB. Bovell took on his first UCR Senate committee post in 1959 and served this year on the universitywide Senate's Task Force on Governance. Brownlee came to UCSB in 1968 but before he gained tenure he had chaired its Special Committee on the Status of Assistant Professors.

The Johnson Award is given every two years to a faculty member who has demonstrated outstanding creative contributions to both divisional and systemwide faculty governance. Nominations for the award are sent by Senate divisions to the Senate's University Committee on Committees at the beginning of the academic year in which the award is to be made. UCoC then reviews the nominations and selects two candidates from among them, forwarding its choices to the Academic Council, which is charged with making the decision on who will receive the award.

Oliver Johnson, a professor of philosophy, emeritus and longtime Senate participant at UC Riverside, made a substantial gift to the systemwide Senate in 1996, the earnings from which are used to fund the award that bears his name.

tion and Trust. Articulation agreements require communication and there currently is an insufficient structure within higher education for this communication to take place. In addition, CSU and UC faculty sometimes behave "as though their course requirement needs were the only factors that needed to be considered by their counterparts in CCC," according to a draft report that resulted from the conference.

- Technology. Access to existing on-line articulation databases is not universal and a significant amount of training is required to make such systems useful even where access exists.

- Evaluation of courses. Is a given course upper-division or lower-division? Community colleges are responsible for teaching the latter, but courses constantly are being moved by four-year institutions from one category to the other and there are differing ideas about which category given courses fall into. In addition, students have no process open to them for appealing articulation decisions.

- Data and Information. In some cases, a process of "transcript evaluation" takes place only after a transfer student has arrived on a four-year campus. Students sometimes must wait half a semester or more before such evaluation takes place, leaving them in limbo about the status of their articulation. In addition, not all parties have equal access to the information in articulation databases. As a result, "some operate with current knowledge and others rely on outdated information."

- Process, Variability and Venue. The entire articulation process lacks consistency and uniform standards. Expectations in terms of effort, the sequence of activities undertaken, the time-frames in which they are to be completed, the essentials of review, and reporting mechanisms are all variable within and among institutions.

Having agreed to the nature of these problems, conference attendees then set about trying to propose solutions to them. Regarding faculty-to-faculty communication and trust, one suggestion was to put CSU and UC faculty on CCC program review committees and vice versa. Another idea was to set up dialogues cutting across several lines: by geographic region, between feeder and receiver institutions, and by disciplines.

Regarding technology, the conference participants recommended estab-

(Please See: Conference, Page 4)

Eligibility

(Continued from Page 1)

percent proposal, almost 60 percent of those who responded were negative, while only 21 percent were positive, the remainder being neutral. BOARS intends to find out if this response is representative of all the schools by going out to high schools this fall, perhaps conducting focus groups at some of them.

Beyond this, the committee intends to look at the academic quality of the 4-percent students and seek the input of all of the Senate's divisions on what they think of the proposal. Widaman is hopeful that the divisional responses can be gathered in the fall.

Much of this inquiry has to do with the possibility of establishing the new 4-percent route to admissions. In this route, a group of "UC Merit Scholars," defined as those students who rank in the top 4 percent of their high school classes, would be identified at the end of their junior year. By the time they graduate, these students would need to have taken all 11 "a-f" courses required by the University — four units of English, three of math, etc. — just as all UC-eligible students must; further, they will need to have taken the normal standardized tests, though, unlike other eligible students, they will not need to achieve minimal scores on the the tests.

The top 4 percent of California public high school seniors is a group of about 10,000 students. An analysis run at the request of BOARS by UC's Office of the President indicates, however, that about two-thirds of these students already are UC-eligible. Thus, the BOARS proposal would make UC-eligible an additional 3,600 students. BOARS Chair Widaman says it may be that many of these students fall into the group known as "potentially eligible," meaning those whose grades qualify them for eligibility, but who have not taken the proper standardized tests. Uncertainty about this, however, is the reason for the inquiry into the students' preparedness.

BOARS has deliberated on adding this "local context" option to UC's eligibility routes partly as a matter of "leveling the playing field" for students from disadvantaged high schools, some of which offer few honors or advanced placement courses and a few of which don't even offer all of UC's required a-f courses. If this is done, BOARS believes, UC will increase its proportion of both rural and urban students, the rural students being mostly white, the urban students being mostly black and Latino.

(Please See: Eligibility, Page 4)

Notes from the Chair: Digital Dilemmas

Digital advances are generating complex dilemmas regarding intellectual property. To name one issue, how will we disseminate knowledge in the future? The American Association of Universities and the National Research Council, among others, have converged on a common view: the academy needs to assume greater control over the distribution of its scholarly works and the process of evaluating faculty research. The alarming increase in costs of journals, as a result of for-profit publishers taking over academic publishing, necessitates these changes. There's some irony in the fact that we give our intellectual property to commercial publishers, only to buy it back again through licensing agreements that are so costly that they're decimating our libraries. Beyond this, in conventional publishing there is also the issue of prompt access to emerging research and theory. Some of the most prestigious journals have review and acceptance processes that might last from eight months to a year, with another year elapsing before the article goes to print. Such a system clearly results in an unacceptable lag between research discovery and research publication.

Last Fall, the AAU advanced a proposal to decouple the publication of scholarly works from two related processes, peer review of the works and certification of them. The AAU proposed that institutions of higher education manage the peer review process themselves, perhaps through scholarly societies. With this, the evaluation of a faculty member's work would no longer be dependent on the traditional publication process. Under the AAU plan, universities would also take more responsibility for early dissemination of knowledge through electronic preprints or on-line journals, thus shortening the research-to-publication lag.

Some of the nation's top research Universities are adopting these approaches. But such changes present challenges to the faculty appointment and promotion process, specifically its dependence on review of a faculty member's record of publications in refereed journals. Are we willing to accept certification of our work by a scholarly society in lieu of formal publication? And how would we disseminate or archive "certified" articles that were never officially published? UC's Academic Senate has joined with the Office of the President's Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives to tackle these questions through a Task Force on Scholarly Communication. Charged with considering various models of academic publishing, this group is expected to bring forward a set of recommendations next year.

The whirlwind of digital advances has also provoked a flurry of copyright concerns. Over the last few years, the information industry has been pushing for legislation to protect its proprietary rights in the new electronic environment. Depending on its severity, such legislation might threaten our access to the information necessary for our research and teaching. Currently, the fair use doctrine allows us to incorporate selected text, film, or other copyrighted material into our courses or scholarly works under circumstances involving limited use and clear social benefit. It will be essential to preserve these fair use principles in the expanding electronic milieu. We also need to guard against being infringed upon ourselves with respect to our own scholarly output.

Beyond this, there is the debate over what intellectual property belongs to the University and what belongs to the faculty. Traditional distinctions between the classroom lecture (owned by the University) and the products developed for the courses (belonging to the faculty) are not easily interpreted when we consider courses taught via the Internet or materials distributed on the Web. In an effort to frame the discussions on these issues, a Copyright Task Force was created at UC last year whose report will be available for discussion this coming fall.

Needless to say, the growth of electronic communication stands to influence the very foundation of our research and pedagogy. As I see it, either we help to build this foundation or a structure will be handed to us that may provide little support for our scholarly endeavors, the needs of our students, or the University's role as a reservoir and guardian of knowledge.

—Sandra J. Weiss
Chair, Academic Council

Council Vice-Chair

(Continued from Page 1)

was the co-principal investigator of a recently completed NSF-funded project aimed at reforming the non-calculus introductory physics course, which he has taught to biological science students at UCD for many years. In the project, Coleman and his UCD Physics colleague Wendell Potter created a new "inquiry-based" course that de-emphasizes lectures while increasing the amount of hands-on learning that students do.

Looking forward to his time as an officer of the statewide Senate, Coleman says he is interested in pursuing the possibility of making greater use of small ad hoc working groups, composed of members of several Senate committees, to deal with individual issues. He is a great believer, he says, in the power of informal communication between Senate leaders and administration executives as a means of enhancing a collaborative approach to solving problems, as opposed to formal sets of proposals and responses sent by one camp to the other. In the broader scope, he said, "I'm looking forward to trying to make a real contribution to the University in general and my faculty colleagues in particular over the next couple of years."

Notice

is published eight times during the academic year for the University of California faculty by the Academic Senate's Academic Council.

Sandra J. Weiss, Chair
UCOP, 12th Floor, 1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200

David Krogh, Editor
Room 422, 2223 Fulton Street
UC, Berkeley, CA 94720-1020
(510) 642-6068
david.krogh@ucop.edu

Notice is available on the World Wide Web at: <http://www.ucop.edu/senate>

Conference

(Continued from Page 2)

lishing benchmarks by which technology-mediated courses can be evaluated, with the outcome of this work distributed in an on-line and printed handbook. In connection with the evaluation of courses, those at the conference concluded that "Comparability does not mean that two courses are the same, but that the student has gained the knowledge and ability to succeed in subsequent course work." Faculty on both sides of the articulation process need to know what information should be provided in order to decide about articulation and what criteria will be used to make such decisions.

For students who have transferred, transcript evaluation needs to be accelerated so that students can be informed more quickly of their status. Transfer students should also be interviewed after transfer "to determine how well prepared they believe they were for the transition."

Regarding data and information, the conference report suggests production of a readable student handbook on articulation that would be available in electronic and printed form. Finally, on the issue of process, variability and venue, the conference members proposed reviving the idea of systemwide articulation conferences in which faculty and articulation officers meet on a regular basis and they suggested that a mechanism needs to be established under which an articulation agreement between two campuses could be extended to other campuses as well.

Following the conference, ICAS faculty decided to appoint a work group that will propose an "action agenda" that will provide guidance on how to implement the recommendations stemming from the conference. The final report of the conference, now being prepared, will be distributed to faculty and administrators within the three systems and to California legislators as well.

Eligibility Proposal

(Continued from Page 3)

In addition to the local-context route to eligibility, BOARS has been considering a plan calling for significant modifications to the existing statewide route to eligibility. It may propose: that pluses and minuses (+ and -) be used when computing GPAs in the a-f courses; that the extra grade points for honors and Advanced Placement courses be reduced or even eliminated; that proportionately more students be made eligible through UC's eligibility index — a combination of grades and standardized test scores — and that SAT II scores be factored into a revised eligibility index, with these scores perhaps being given greater weight than SAT I scores.

The rationale for using pluses and minuses is that the University has been "throwing away information" as BOARS puts it, by disregarding these grade increments. On honors and AP courses, BOARS says that the full grade point given for them — an "A" in an AP course counts as 5 GPA points — has little predictive value for performance at UC.

With respect to broadening the eligibility index, at present students with a GPA of 3.3 or higher are eligible for UC on the basis of grades alone; they must take the SAT I and II exams, but it does not matter how they score on them. Meanwhile, students with GPAs of between 2.82 and 3.29 are eligible by index: they must achieve a prescribed combined GPA/SAT score to be eligible. BOARS would like to broaden the class of students who achieve eligibility in this way, the 4-percent students being a notable exception in that they would not have to achieve minimal SAT scores. The greater use of standardized scores would, among other things, provide some check on grade inflation. The rationale for factoring the SAT II exams into UC's eligibility index is that a BOARS analysis has shown that the SAT II scores are more predictive of success at UC than are SAT I scores.