UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2005-2006

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Purpose/charge: To set standards for and policy on undergraduate education and to provide advice and consent on all matters of policy, planning, programs, and practice that impact the quality and diversity of UCSB’s undergraduates and their educational experiences at UCSB.

The Undergraduate Council has completed its fourth year reviewing, overseeing, and initiating policy and programs pertaining to the University’s undergraduate education mission. The Council met every other week as did its three committees, the Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS), the Committee on Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policy (CUAPP), and the Committee on Undergraduate Student Affairs (CUSA). This Report summarizes the major work of the Undergraduate Council for the year.

This fourth year of the Council’s existence has been especially collegial and engaged. Chair McLean wishes to thank each and every member of the Council for unprecedented levels of attendance and engagement that led to many meaningful discussions. It has been a pleasure to serve as Chair.

I. The Agenda of the Undergraduate Council

Participation in Academic Program Review of the following Departments:
- Dramatic Art and Dance
- Mechanical Engineering
- Chicana and Chicano Studies
- History of Art and Architecture
- Spanish and Portuguese and Latin American and Iberian Studies Program

Recommendation on the adoption of a new Department of Counseling/Clinical and School Psychology in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education

Recommendation of name changes:
- CCS Emphasis in Chemistry to Emphasis in Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Department of Film Studies to Department of Film and Media Studies
- BS in Hydrological Sciences to BS in Hydrological Sciences and Policy
- Major in Chicano Studies to Major in Chicana and Chicano Studies

Recommendation on establishment of new emphases:
- Computational Geography and Computational Biology within the BA in Computer Science
- Biology and Ecology; Physical and Chemical Sciences; and Policy within the BS in Hydrological Sciences and Policy
- Geographic Information Science within the BS in Geography

Recommendation on the discontinuation of emphases:
- Cultural / Ideological and Socio-economic / Political within the BA in Global Studies

Recommendation on the suspension of admissions to the Law and Society Program until the Program demonstrates long-term viability.

Recommendation on reinstating the emphases in the College of Creative Studies to their original status as majors

Evaluation of and comment on campus and systemwide policy issues including: Policy and Procedures for the Transfer, Consolidation, or Disestablishment of an Academic Unit and Procedures for Transfer, Consolidation, or Discontinuance of a Graduate or Undergraduate Program; Senate Regulation on Academic Integrity; implementation of the Math-Science Initiative; implementation of Senate Regulations 477 (streamlining
the major preparation course articulation process between UC campuses and California community colleges) and 478 (SciGETC); and faculty workload principles

Review of and comment on planning documents, the campus Draft 2006-25 Academic Plan in particular, and participation in planning through representation on the Campus Planning Committee.

Reports from CAERS and discussion of the effects of the ‘AP bump’ on eligibility, admissions, and enrollment

II. Major Policy Issues

Suspension of Admission to LawSo – In Spring, 2005 the Law and Society Program asked the College of Letters and Science FEC and the Undergraduate Council to place a moratorium on admissions to its major program for a period of three years. At that time the Council reluctantly approved a one-year moratorium. In Fall, 2006 this issue was revisited as the LawSo Program wanted to continue the moratorium beyond one year. The Council found that this Program has grown beyond its means to serve its students effectively, having only 4.5 FTE and in excess of 700 students. This is due in part to the fact that LawSo has evolved from a program without FTE that depended on faculty from cognate departments to a program with a small number of FTE that is trying to do it all on its own. Also, there is a false perception that LawSo is the appropriate pre-law major at UCSB. Because this is the second time the Program has asked to shut its doors, the Council suspended admission of new majors and asked the Program to develop, within two years and with the assistance of the Administration, a plan for assuring its long-term viability.

Science and Math Teachers Initiative (SMI) – Last year the Governor and UC President Dynes promised to increase UC’s output of science and math - trained teachers. They sought to do this by establishing programs on each campus that would provide pedagogical training to science, engineering and math majors and allow them to graduate with a BS degree and a teaching credential in four years. Although producing more science and math teachers is a good thing, there is substantial research indicating that a fifth-year experience greatly increases the longevity of a teacher’s career. Because there was little in the way of funding from UCOP for this initiative, UCSB has been slow to develop an SMI program. The Council is very much in favor of developing a high quality program at a reasonable pace, such that this slow start is not seen negatively.

After beginning as a system-wide, top-down initiative, SMI has now evolved toward a bottom-up approach in which each campus is developing its own program, drawing from and developing on programs that were already in existence. The UC Academic Council formed a committee (SMIG) for on-going SMI Administration, Oversight and Implementation whose documents outline governance and expect “that schools of education and math and science departments share equally in leading campus SMI programs.” Here at UCSB, between January and June, a committee of three, Jane Conoley, Ken Millett, and Duane Sears met to outline the SMI and shared a one-page graph of proposed program components with the Council. The proposal would provide science, engineering and math majors early exposure (freshman and sophomore years) to elementary and junior high classrooms and provide them with training in pedagogy, and upon graduation, place them in internship positions in local schools so they can complete the credential requirements during their fifth year. Plans include starting courses Winter quarter that would be part of a new science and math education minor housed in the GGSE. Proposed program details, however, have not been released, and science and math departments have not yet participated in the planning process. Presumably these are the next steps before the Council reviews the components of this new degree program.

Graduate Students as Instructors of Record (GSIs) – for several years CUAPP has had some concern about the possible overuse of graduate students as instructors of record. This year the
University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) was asked to investigate this as well. The investigative process began by 1) researching just how often graduate students are used as instructors of record and 2) determining what policies and procedures were followed by the various campuses in vetting appointment proposals for GSIs. Existing policy requires Senate approval of GSI appointments for upper division courses only. According to Academic Senate Regulation 750:

‘Professors, professors in residence, professors of clinical ____ (e.g., medicine) and adjunct professors of any rank, instructors, instructors in residence and adjunct instructors, and lecturers may give courses of any grade. Persons holding other instructional titles may teach lower division courses only, unless individually authorized to teach courses of higher grade by the appropriate Committee on Courses or Graduate Council.’

Here at UCSB (and systemwide) data from the last several years indicate that the use of GSIs in general is not widespread (< ~5% of courses) (see Appendix A), but within some departments the use of GSIs is heavy, in both lower and upper division courses. The following procedures are presently followed in the Senate process of reviewing and approving GSI appointment proposals:

Upper division courses taught during fall, winter, and spring quarters: A department submits a request which (1) describes the qualifications of the candidate and (2) details the ‘extraordinary circumstances’ that precipitate the request. A CV that details the qualifications of the graduate student and previous teaching evaluations (for courses in which they have served as either a teaching assistant or an associate) accompany the request. The Graduate Council first considers the request and affirms that the student is in good standing and that he/she has a Masters Degree or has advanced to candidacy or has equivalent training and one year of teaching experience. Thereafter CUAPP considers the request based on the qualifications of the graduate student, teaching evaluations, the ‘extraordinary circumstances’, and what is in the best interests of the students who will be in the class. Finally the request is forwarded to the office of the Dean of the appropriate college, where it is also considered on the basis of resources; the Dean signs off on all associate appointments for fall, winter and spring quarters.

Lower division courses taught during fall, winter, and spring quarters: The office of the appropriate Dean has final approval authority, once Graduate Division approval is granted. Teaching evaluations are considered and resource availability is checked.

Upper division courses taught during summer sessions: Requests containing the same documentation as noted above are submitted directly to the Academic Senate. Upon receiving Senate approval, the materials are forwarded to Summer Sessions, which carries out the same type of review as that conducted by both Graduate Division and the Dean’s office during other quarters. CUAPP’s review is the same as that conducted for fall, winter, and spring requests.

Lower division courses taught during summer sessions: Summer Sessions checks for appropriate graduate standing of the candidate and availability of funding for the appointment, but relies solely on the departments to assess whether the candidate is qualified to teach the subject matter proposed.

One of the main topics of deliberation, both at the local and systemwide level, has been when is it reasonable and prudent to use graduate student instructors?*. Although extraordinary circumstances, such as unexpected absence of regular faculty were seen as an appropriate use of GSIs, it was overwhelmingly concluded that teaching opportunities are also valuable to the training of future professors. Furthermore, there is no clear evidence that undergraduate education in any way suffers from the use of GSIs. Many are outstanding instructors and highly dedicated to teaching.
As of this writing UCEP is forwarding a recommendation to the Academic Council that a new systemwide Instructional Title (Teaching Fellow) be established for certain graduate student appointments. UCEP and GGSA propose that Teaching Fellows “should be competent to provide the entire course of instruction to a group of students, and normally should be given such assignments. The Teaching Fellow is subject to the general supervision of a faculty member, with an appropriate title according to APM-110-4 (14), designated in catalogs and published schedules as responsible for the content and conduct of the course. The responsibility of entering formal assessments of student performance shall reside with the overseeing faculty member. Authorization to provide instruction as a Graduate Teaching Fellow shall be subject to the approval of the appropriate Academic Senate committee.” By assigning a faculty mentor to each Fellow, both the rights of Academic Freedom and the responsibilities of the Faculty Code of Conduct would adhere to the supervising faculty member. This would do away with the UCSB practice of assigning ‘Teaching Associates' without direct faculty oversight. 

UCEP also recommends that both lower and upper division, as well as graduate courses all be subject to the same policy. Whether or not it’s appropriate to assign a Teaching Fellow given the circumstance would be determined by CUAPP, while vetting of the instructors themselves would be done by the hiring department or program.

**Academic Plan (AP)** – The Council was asked to review two drafts of the campus 2006-25 Academic Plan that will be part of the new Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). Not surprisingly much of the focus of the Academic Plan was on the direction of the research mission of the campus. The Council therefore sought to increase the visibility of the teaching mission in the document and encouraged recognition of undergraduate students as "full participants" in the "educational journey of discovery."

The plan states the intention to grow the student population by 5000 FTE over the next twenty years, but the planned growth in faculty FTE would maintain a student/faculty ratio that is already too high. If growth is needed in order to improve the lot of UCSB, we should in fact seek to improve the situation, not maintain the status quo. In order to achieve this, good teaching needs to be rewarded in a more systematic way. The Council is also concerned about which majors those additional students would ultimately choose and the need for the campus to have a plan for distributing them that will not further strain the already impacted programs.

**Writing** Program – Due to the tight budget situation, funding for the Writing Program was cut by approximately $125K this year. Consequently, the Program was unable to offer enough writing classes to supply the demand. Because this demand is mandated by university requirements, with few alternatives available to students, the Council reasoned that the Writing Program should enjoy special protection from the vagaries of campus budgets. The Council therefore strongly recommended to the Executive Vice Chancellor that a solution be found whereby funding for the Writing Program is stably maintained at a level that’s capable of meeting the mandated demand for writing courses.

**Instructional Equipment** – As a result of general dissatisfaction with the inadequate availability and condition of media equipment in our classrooms, the Council consulted with Art Battson of Instructional Resources (IR) about how classroom equipment and technology is obtained and maintained. The discussion focused on severely stretched resources and resulted in acknowledging that IR is doing the best it can with the resources provided. The Senate Committee on Research and Instructional Resources has also been exploring this topic, and our joint conclusion is that more resources need to be channeled into this important asset. Our consideration of this matter has in fact generated research in the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department into how new technology might be developed that would reduce the funds needed to provide the ability to project Power Point (and similar) presentations directly from computers in the instructor’s own office. This would reduce
the cost of the equipment itself, but also the need for duplication of software and thus would allow more classrooms to have this capability.

**Transfer Admissions Requirements** – The Department of Economics and both Biology Departments requested changes in their transfer admissions requirements that would reduce the numbers of majors and ensure their better preparation. Such changes require additional manpower, either within the departments or in the Admissions Office. The Council reasoned that this is best handled by Admissions, but given that other departments are likely to follow suit with heightened requirements to stem growth in their majors, the council recommended that the EVC increase funding to the Admissions Office and establish a workgroup to investigate how the campus could achieve a more balanced distribution of students across majors.

**Teaching Assistant Training** – In the process of Council participation in the Academic Program Review process, a recurring theme in the student evaluations presented in the departmental Data Notebooks was dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching assistants. With this in mind, we contacted the Graduate Council and recommended that an *ad hoc* joint committee be formed to look into how we might improve the process of training our teaching assistants. Departments are mandated to provide TA training but it is left to them to determine what that entails.

This committee has been formed. The membership includes three members from the Undergraduate Council, three from the Graduate Council, Shirley Ronkowsky from Instructional Development and John Ramsey from Graduate Division. The first thing the committee learned was that the last survey of department practices in TA training was conducted in 1990. We therefore initiated in short order a survey of current practices. Not unexpectedly, the results indicated that there is large variation in the quantity and probably quality of what is offered to our teaching assistants.

The committee is especially concerned that basic pedagogy is being left for the most part to departments and that they tend to provide content specific training rather than basic insight into the process of learning. Furthermore the campuswide TA orientation program (required of all TAs by the TA union), due to shrinking resources, has been forced to focus more on ‘ancillary’ topics such as sexual harassment, dealing with diversity, etc. We have found that UC Berkeley has developed very good web-based training modules that cover many of these topics and can be completed on the TAs own time schedule. The TA training committee is developing a recommendation that we adopt a similar web-based training regimen. This will free up the campuswide orientation program to focus more on basic pedagogical ideas, which we hope will better prepare the TAs and improve their ability to teach.

**III. Academic Program Review**

The Undergraduate Council took part in the program reviews of the Departments of Dramatic Art and Dance, Mechanical Engineering, Chicana/Chicano Studies, History or Art and Architecture, Spanish and Portuguese, and the Latin American and Iberian Studies Program. The Council used the procedure developed over the previous three years to review the Departments’ data notebooks; draft, discuss, and submit questions to the Program Review Panel for the External Review Committee; meet with the ERC through the Council Chair or Representative (done as part of the concluding ERC luncheon meeting at which the Graduate Council and Committee on Budget and Planning Chairs participate); review and respond to the ERC Report and Departmental Response; and review and reply when called for to the one and three-year follow-up reviews. The Council also recommended the following Departments for review in 2007-08: History; Chemical Engineering; Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology; Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology; and Statistics and Applied
Probability. We also suggested that the Law and Society Program be reviewed, given the difficulties it's having in serving its majors.

IV. Committee Reports

The Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools, as the name indicates, oversees the process by which students are brought into the university community. Richard Flacks chaired the Committee and served as the Committee’s and Undergraduate Council’s representative to systemwide BOARS. The Committee consulted regularly with BOARS Chair, Michael Brown, Institutional Research officers Steven Velasco and Sal Castillo, and Enrollment and Admissions officers Betty Huff, Christine Van Gieson, and Lisa Przekop.

The topic that dominated discussions this year concerned the so-called ‘honors bump,’ the practice of awarding an extra point to the grades of high school students taking Advanced Placement (AP), honors and some International Baccalaureate courses. This practice has been questioned for the following reasons: 1) inequities in access to such courses, 2) wide variation in the quality of such courses, 3) evidence that taking such courses does not predict improved performance in college, 4) effects of the honors bump on the attitudes of students and parents—‘gaming’ of course-taking to increase GPA, and 5) the inherent illogic of giving extra grade points in a blanket fashion even for students who earn C’s in the AP or honors courses.

Early in the year, BOARS circulated a draft recommendation that would have eliminated the honors bump in the calculation of GPA for eligibility, but would have allowed the local campuses to use it in the admission process itself. This engendered a great deal of discussion. In order to better understand this issue, CAERS hosted a gathering of area high school guidance counselors to discuss the consequences of changing the policy. The complexity of the issue was apparent. After much discussion, both at the campus level and systemwide, the matter has been tabled for further study. For more detailed information see the full CAERS report in Appendix B.

The Committee on Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policy was chaired by Bob Warner. A major task of this committee is to make approval decisions on GE courses, new courses, changes to existing courses, discontinuation of courses, and the assignment of teaching associates (graduate students as instructors of record). In the last year the committee addressed the following as part of its regular workload:

- GE proposals approved: 74
- Associate appointment proposals reviewed: 115
- New courses approved: 136
- Modifications to existing courses approved: 609
- Courses discontinued: 141
- Total course requests reviewed: 886

The conduct of this business was greatly enhanced by the new on-line course approval system that was launched this fall. Major issues that were discussed in addition to this included possible changes to the course hibernation process, graduate students as instructors of record, and the need for policy and procedures for overseeing on-line courses and other distance learning instructional offerings. See Appendix C for a more detailed report.

The Committee on Undergraduate Student Affairs was chaired by Omer Blaes in Fall, 2005, and Steve Allaback in Winter and Spring, 2006. The committee consulted regularly with Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Michael Young and Dean of Student Life Yonie Harris. A sampling of the topics that occupied the committee includes: monitoring the campus strategy for minimizing the deleterious
effects of Halloween weekend; clarification of procedures for dealing with athletic policy matters; examining and making plans for future oversight of Campus Learning Assistance Services (CLAS); working with the Office of Judicial Affairs and the Registrar on implementation of the new Senate Regulation on Academic Integrity; and selecting the recipients of the Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research. For more complete information on the activities of CUSA see Appendix D.

V. Relationship of Undergraduate Council with Systemwide Units

UCEP, UCOPE, and BOARS

As noted in previous reports, the Undergraduate Council participates and receives reports through its representatives to the following committees. The Council Chair represented the Council on the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP); Council and CUAPP member Susan McLeod represented and reported to the Council on the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE); and CAERS Chair Richard Flacks represented and reported to the Council on the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). The policy discussions and planning on those systemwide committees generally informed and reflected the debates on UCSB’s Council. It should be noted that the campus was especially well represented on UCEP with past Undergraduate Council Chair Denise Segura serving as the Committee’s Chair for 2005-6 and on BOARS where the 2005-06 Chair is previous UCSB CAERS Chair Michael Brown, who is also now the Vice Chair of the Academic Council.

VI. Coordination with UCSB Administration

The Undergraduate Council consulted regularly with other Senate, College, and University officers. The Committee had representatives on the Senate Executive Council, on the Campus Planning Committee; at Program Review External Reviewer sessions; in interviews of candidates for the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services position; and at the Faculty Legislature sessions. The Council consulted regularly with Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Young, Dean of Student Life Harris, Associate Deans Navarro and Buford, L&S Dean of Undergraduate Studies Wyner, Institutional Research Director Velasco and Senior Analyst Castillo, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Huff, Admissions Director Van Gieson and Associate Director Przekop, Director of Relations with Schools Villasenor, Registrar Johns and Associate Registrar McNulty; the College Executive Committee Chairs, and officers and representatives of Associated Students. Other administrators provided consultation on significant issues, in particular Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas, Dean Conoley of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, Dean Oliver of the Division of Social Sciences, and various department chairs.

Council Analyst Debra Blake is truly the heart and soul of the Undergraduate Council. She provides invaluable experience, expertise and well-timed reminders, and she serves as the institutional memory of the Council. For those of us who are memory-challenged this latter service is absolutely crucial. She manages the mountain of paper (and electronic) work, the articulation between subcommittees, and monitors the pulse of the academic and administrative life of the campus. Debra has served as the Council’s guide to achieving a measure of success as an effective voice in the recently restructured Senate government.

VII. Ongoing Issues and Concerns

The structure of the Council seems to be working well, with the contribution of the Council’s component committees taking primary responsibility for gathering information and framing responses, while opening deliberation to the larger group. The time demand of the weekly meetings, significant reading and other preparation, and participation in the research and conduct of business makes the Council a fairly demanding committee assignment, as has been emphasized in prior reports. Volunteering to serve on the Undergraduate Council is tantamount to joining two committees which
has its obvious disadvantages, but also provides benefits as well. While the subcommittees focus on fairly narrow areas of interest, allowing us to gain specialized expertise in some campus programs, the Council as a whole deals with a spectrum of issues broadening the landscape and bringing the bigger picture into view.

In the coming year there are a number of issues that will require continued discussion as well as a few new topics that are expected to appear.

There will almost certainly be continued discussion of the use of graduate students instructors as the recommendations of UCEP and CCGA are put before the Academic Council and individual campuses are more fully consulted.

UCOP is seeking to ‘normalize’ the summer session so that the instruction received by students is equivalent to that of the regular academic year. The Council will be asked to gather information on how the summer session is being used by students, how it is being manned by the faculty, and how well the courses delivered are serving students.

As on-line courses and other forms of remote instruction become more prevalent, the Council will address the development of guidelines for controlling quality.

As more departments try to stem the flow of students into their already overloaded classes, the University will need strategies for better distribution of students among the various departments and programs. Targeted recruiting of students, more accurate and informative material in catalogs and online publications as well as earlier access to career advising will be explored as possible means to achieving a more even distribution of students across the campus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
<th>Faculty/Lecturer</th>
<th>Graduate Assoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td># Courses Taught</td>
<td>Average Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Creative Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Art Math, Life &amp; Physical Sci.</td>
<td></td>
<td>992</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Creative Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Art Math, Life &amp; Physical Sci.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>Creative Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Art Math, Life &amp; Physical Sci.</td>
<td></td>
<td>992</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All course counts have been adjusted for team-teaching and cross-listings.
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‘Honors Bump’

For a number of years, BOARS has been concerned about the UC policy of awarding bonus points for students taking AP, honor and other ‘rigorous’ courses in high school when calculating high school GPA for determining eligibility. The so-called ‘bump’ has been questioned for various reasons:

- Inequities in access to such courses
- Wide variation in the quality of such courses
- Evidence that taking such courses does not predict improved performance in college
- Effects of the honors bump on the attitudes of students and parents—‘gaming’ of course taking to increase GPA.
- The inherent illogic of giving extra grade points in a blanket fashion even for students who earn C’s in the AP or honors courses

The bonus point policy, which dates from 1984, was formally reconsidered in 1998-1999 by BOARS and the Academic Senate, and resulted in a Senate-approved recommendation to the Regents that the bonus point for honors-level courses be reduced from a full point to one-half (A = 4.5, B = 3.5, C = 2.5). The recommendation was predicated on two findings: 1) research indicated that the bonus point inflated the high school GPA and that the prediction of UC freshman grade performance was better with no point or the half point; and 2) the change would make the honors point policy more fair than the current policy because not all schools can offer an extensive array of honors-level courses, and students with less access to such courses do not have the same opportunity as other students to get extra points added to their GPA. The Regents did not accept this recommendation and asked the Senate to deliberate further on the matter.

That further deliberation culminated during this academic year. Academic Council had appointed, in 2003, a special taskforce, headed by Gayle Binion, to review the matter. The Task Force issued a final report in the winter of 2005 that recommended that the current honors bump policy was educationally unsound. However, task force members were evenly split in terms of revising the policy. Half of the panel recommended halving the number of courses eligible for the current bonus (i.e., reducing the number of semester-length courses for which the bonus points would be allowed from 8 to 4) and the other half recommended no bump in the determination of eligibility but full consideration of honors-level participation in campus admissions selection. Task Force members supporting the halving of the current bump policy expressed worry that without the bonus point in determining eligibility for the University, students might elect not to take advanced courses. The question of the universal availability of advanced courses was not specifically addressed.

BOARS called on campus admissions committees to comment on a proposal to eliminate the honors bump in calculating GPA for the determination of eligibility. CAERS discussed the matter at length, and transmitted the following to BOARS:

In principle the committee was unanimous in supporting the ending of the bump. But there was not unanimity about the process and timing and a great deal of concern about a number of issues. Here are questions raised:
1. Need for better data on the actual effect on the eligibility pool of doing away with the bump. Why create firestorm if there are few students affected and under represented students are not going to be added.

2. Concern that the letter loses effectiveness by being too much an advocacy rather than presentation of a balanced view.

3. Questions about the data showing minimal predictive value of the bump. The letter text seems to skirt findings that indicate that in the sciences and math these courses may be of significant benefit. Also skirted is the differential effect of removing the bump for students at low performing high schools. Generally, people agreed that many honors and AP courses are not deserving of the bump—but perhaps some are. For example IB courses are better screened and evaluated—maybe the bump should be retained for that.

4. Will the bumped GPA be used to calculate ELC? This should be seriously considered since in this case it will provide an in context way of evaluating the bump.

5. Will removing the bump lead to grade inflation at high performing schools? Will teachers in such schools figure out that they can do their own bump?

6. In favor off eliminating the bump is the observation that school standards are narrowing the content differences between honors and regular courses. Perhaps this trend would be encouraged by removing the bump.

7. General agreement that incorporating assessment of the rigor of student’s course taking into comprehensive review is a good idea—but some skepticism that it can be done because readers can’t evaluate the quality of the courses being presented.

8. One way of doing a quantitative measure would be to compare the number of honors courses taken by a student with the average number taken by applicants from that school, and using that number as a piece of information provided readers.

9. UCSB would continue to use the bump in arriving at its ‘school context’ selection process—this would allow intra school comparisons.

10. We want to convene a meeting between our committee and a representative group of local high school counselors and department chairs to dialog about their perception of how the policy change would affect their schools. This suggests a need for more time for a final decision. As does the suggested need for additional data above.

CAERS convened a meeting with a select group of high school counselors and teachers drawn from local area schools. There was considerable variation in the attitudes of those attending, although most agreed that there were good reasons for reducing or eliminating the bump. On the other hand, at least one teacher from an underperforming school argued strongly that the bump was an important incentive that helped recruit students in his school for AP courses. This meeting was illuminating for CAERS members and suggested that the issue was difficult to resolve.

CAERS’ doubts about the wisdom of changing the policy were echoed by other campus committees. Meanwhile, BOARS’ data on the demographic effects of eliminating the bump suggested that eliminating the bump would not result in a net addition of disadvantaged students to the eligibility pool. At its May meeting BOARS decided to table the honors bump issue, and agreed to undertake a more thoroughgoing assessment of the concept of eligibility as a whole.

Admission by Exception

During the 2004-05 academic year CAERS reviewed the campus Admission by Exception policy. This was prompted by a Regents request that BOARS consider this issue. CAERS discussed the issue and decided to review files of students who didn’t attend accredited high schools or had a 9 read score, but who for some reason or another were not admitted to UCSB. Based on its study of these files, CAERS recommended new policies in spring 2005.
During winter 2006, Bill Jacob, Chris Van Gieson, and admissions staff studied 230 files that might meet the criteria for admission by exception previously set by CAERS. 50 were home schooled or unaccredited applicants, 128 had read scores of 9, and 52 were missing a test score but had high GPAs. 19 home/unaccredited were admitted, 42 of the read scores of 9 were admitted, and 49 of those missing a single test score were admitted after applying the new criteria. Many of the unaccredited admits were either test scores eligible or had completed their graded course work in an accredited school, only to transfer to a non accredited school during their senior year. The read score of 9 admits had to have a multiple reasons for justifying the 9 and solid evidence they could succeed at UCSB to be considered for A by E. Those admitted with missing test scores were students with exceptional qualification for whom we suspected some unforeseen incident could have prevented them from completing the tests.

It was agreed that CAERS would review how many of these A by E actually attend UCSB with an eye towards the diversity of this pool during the next year.

Transfer admissions requirements

CAERS was asked to review and report back to the Undergraduate Council regarding a proposal from the Economics Department requesting the establishment of a GPA-based admission requirement for transferring economics majors. Effective Fall 2008, these applicants would be required to complete four key courses with a GPA of 2.80 or better. While the Department has engaged in some consultation with the Admissions Office, Director Van Gieson was uncertain as to whether the Economics faculty realize how much time and effort is involved in the screening process to determine whether applicants meet the proposed criteria. CAERS reported these concerns to the Council. Economics appears to be the second department to establish specific GPA and course requirements for admitting transfers to the major. Biology has had such criteria in place for a while, and the Admissions Office has been doing the requisite transcript reviews to meet these criteria. This spring, the Biology Departments proposed to revise these criteria in hopes of simplifying the review process. The Admissions office reported to CAERS that the new proposal did not help matters, and proposed that Biology undertake their own review, a proposal that the departments in question resisted. The academic year concluded with the following understanding: In general, it is preferable for the admissions office to be the reviewing agency for admissions, but that additional resources to enable department-specific reviews will be needed for this to happen. The Undergraduate Council and CAERS need to examine more comprehensively procedures for establishing department specific criteria for transfer admissions, and to work to ensure that appropriate resources are in place if the number of departments interested in establishing such criteria begins to grow.

Relations with schools

CAERS continued this year to increase its focus on issues of marketing and recruitment of students. We met with front line campus recruiters and talked about the images and messages that the campus communicates to potential students. An administration committee on recruitment was established this year; CAERS has been represented by Bill Jacob. In general, CAERS has taken the position that Academic Senate input on the way the campus frames itself for prospective students is desirable, and CAERS has taken the role of urging improved resources for recruitment activities for UCSB. We were pleased to note that there has been some improvement in this regard this year.

We also continued to monitor the degree to which the campus is receiving applications and enrollees from local high schools, especially partnership schools. Although there is no steady upward trend, the campus outreach program has been effective in increasing numbers of college applicants, including
UC and UCSB applications during the last few years. We agreed that more attention needs to be paid to the college going orientation of minority students at all area schools, including those whose overall college going participation is high.

After its final meeting CAERS has learned that the School University Partnership Office will be closed, with its staff taking early retirement or leaving the UCSB. CAERS will look into the reasons for the discontinuance of this program to see what it can learn about the success or lack of success of the SUP. It is noted that the students centered programs in partnership schools administered by Early Academic Outreach remain unaffected.

**Enrollment outcomes**

At the end of the academic year, we reviewed data on next year's freshman class. The campus met its numerical enrollment target, despite an initial shortfall. That shortfall was due to very large over enrollments at Davis and several other competitor campuses. We met our enrollment target by reviewing several hundred admission appeals.

UCSB's entering class is the most diverse in history, nearly ¼ of the class are underrepresented minority students; we are well ahead of the other selective campuses in this regard. UCSB's admissions model, which emphasizes students' performance in their high school context, allows us to admit students from many schools in the state that historically have been under-represented in the UC, including rural as well as inner city schools. With respect to indicators of academic achievement, the incoming class closely resembles the current freshman class. More than 30%, both this year and next, have better than 4.0 HS GPA scores, for example; the average GPA both this year and next is above 3.9.

The admissions model planned for next year will be very similar to the one we have been using for the last several years.
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This is a very hard-working committee, meeting every other week with a full agenda, plus a considerable amount of work outside of meeting times. I am very grateful for the time and dedication of the members. The heaviest burden was on Debra Blake, who was simply superb in her role as our advisor and handler.

Day-to-day work

Over the course of the year, CUAPP addressed the following as part of their regular workload:
GE proposals approved: 74
Associate appointment proposals reviewed: 112
Associate appointment proposals pending final decision: 3
New courses approved: 134
Modifications to existing courses approved: 607
Courses discontinued: 140
Total course requests reviewed: 881!

While the new course approval system has streamlined that process considerably, all other proposals still require review of paper files, some of considerable girth.

Major issues

Course approval system: We participated in the launch of the on-line course approval system, modified it in several areas, and elected to delegate approval of routine changes to staff.

Clarification of the circumstances under which CUAPP approval/review of changes to majors should occur: Initiated by a proposed change in major requirements in Chemical Engineering, we engaged in a dialogue with the college faculty executive committees (FEC) to clarify the circumstances under which proposed changes in major requirements are substantial enough to trigger review by CUAPP under Bylaw 10. We are now in the phase of reviewing FEC activity in this area to see if our conceptions of what constitutes a significant change are congruent with those of the FECs.

Hibernation policy: CUAPP reviewed this policy several times, and eventually revised its recommendations in order to converge on a policy acceptable to the Academic Senate Chair and the Graduate Council. Because courses can be easily changed under the new on-line system, we recommended that the current policy be continued until further notice.

Teaching Associates: In the beginning of the academic year, CUAPP requested and reviewed data on the frequency of use of Teaching Associates at UCSB, department by department. We then released a memo to the Executive Vice Chancellor, the Deans, FECs, and Department Chairs that explored the issues involved in the use of graduate students as instructors of record. This memo and the many responses were reviewed by the Undergraduate Council and by UCEP. Since UCEP is currently developing new suggested policy in this area, we have elected to hold off suggesting any revisions to campus-specific policy. At the close of the year, we also compiled statistics on the relative teaching performance of teaching associates and regular faculty, as measured by standardized ESCI scores.
In general, Teaching Associates perform as well as UCSB faculty, with the possible exception of large courses (enrollments larger than 50).

Major/premajor requirement review: In the context of reviewing pre-major requirements, CUAPP engaged in dialogue concerning the fate of students denied access to certain majors. At this point, few if any students face graduation without having been accepted into a major, but the situation should receive attention over the coming year.

Law and Society moratorium: After considerable consultation, we recommended that Law and Society be barred from accepting new majors until LawSo’s faculty presents a reorganization plan to the Undergraduate Council.

On-line/distance learning instruction: CUAPP began deliberations on setting policy for the review of courses that are given primarily on-line. UCSB does not currently offer any courses that are strictly on-line, but they already exist on other UC campuses. Next year, we will review the different methods through which instruction can be given on-line, establish criteria for evaluation, and suggest changes to the master course approval form that will provide sufficient information to allow CUAPP to make decisions about the approval of on-line courses.

Other issues on which CUAPP made recommendations to the Undergraduate Council

Name change of CCS Emphasis in Chemistry to Emphasis in Chemistry and Biochemistry: This required some consultation outside CCS with potentially affected departments.

Administration of the GGSE minor in Education: A GGSE-level committee was established to oversee this minor.

Major/premajor/transfer student requirement review: Economics; Global Studies; Biological Sciences

Name changes: CCS Emphasis in Chemistry to Chemistry and Biochemistry; Hydrological Sciences to Hydrological Sciences and Policy

Reinstatement of Majors: recommended that CCS emphases be restored to original status of majors

Establishment: Emphasis in Geographical Information Science; Honors program in Chicana/o Studies
CUSA consulted with Vice Chancellor Young and Dean Harris on the major issues they anticipated for the 2005-6 academic year.

CUSA received pre and post Halloween reports from the Office of Student affairs, including status reports on CASE (College Alcohol Skills Education), which appears to be quite successful.

CUSA clarified to relevant parties that it has assumed the duties of the former Senate Committee on Athletic Policy. It also reaffirmed the intercollegiate athletic policy of UCSB as revised in July, 2003, and determined that a member of CUSA will sit on the Intercollegiate Athletic Policy Board (IAPB), a committee of the administration.

CUSA received a presentation given by representatives from Spring Insight, who described that enterprise and sought the support of the Undergraduate Council, which they received.

CUSA met with representatives of Campus Learning Assistance Services (CLAS) and received a full report of their services. CUSA decided to meet with CLAS representatives annually, to share information and keep the Senate informed of potential issues.

At the request of the Undergraduate Council, CUSA instituted a plan whereby all students, at the time of registration (through GOLD) will agree to comply with the Senate Regulation of Academic Integrity. Vice Chancellor Young hopes the system will be in place by fall quarter.

CUSA asked the Chancellor, and he agreed, to permanently expand the number students (one in each of the three disciplinary categories) to be granted the annual Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research. CUSA selected one faculty and three student recipients for this award as well as two graduate student recipients of the Fiona Goodchild Award for Excellence as a Graduate Student Mentor of Undergraduate Research.

CUSA invited Nan Anderson, Coordinator, Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities, to address the committee regarding further publicity for the many outstanding undergraduate research projects. L&S Associate Dean Mary Nisbet also reported on the undergraduate research and honors program. CUSA and the Undergraduate Council sent a memo to the Chancellor urging further publicity.

Willy Brown, Executive Director, Housing & Residential Services, reported to CUSA on current and future housing projects and on the history and components of student housing fees.