### Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-12
#### Davis Division: Academic Senate

#### Undergraduate Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Meetings:</strong> 15</th>
<th><strong>Meeting frequency:</strong> Meetings were held every other week during the fall, winter and spring quarters, or as needed.</th>
<th><strong>Average hours of committee work each week:</strong> Chair can expect up to 5 hours per week; committee members, approximately 1 hour per week.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Business items Reviewed:</strong> 55 (6 procedural changes; 5 policy reviews; 1 audit; 6 items for consideration; 2 reviews; 2 requests; 7 program reviews; 1 agreement; 1 allocation; 2 reports; 22 proposals.)</td>
<td><strong>Total proposals deferred from the previous year:</strong> 3 (Proposed Engineering Minors in Materials Science; Computational Biology &amp; Bioinformatics; and Biomedical Engineering)</td>
<td><strong>Total projects deferred/continued to the coming academic year:</strong> 5 (Standardization of Emphases Transcript Notations; Standardization and Consistency of Listings of Majors in General Catalog; Meetings with Dean re: Cluster 3 Undergraduate Program Review; endorsement of centralized testing center; continued discussion of standardization of honors programs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:** Amendment to the UGC charge, Davis Division Bylaw 121, to state that any pre-baccalaureate program that is not offered by the UCD University Extension or the Education Abroad Program must be reviewed by the UGC.

**Listing of committee policies established or revised:** None.

**Procedural changes recommended for the coming year:**
1. Guidelines for Governing the Creation of Honors Programs
2. Standardization of Emphases Transcript Notations
3. Standardization and Consistency of Listings of Majors in General Catalog
4. Creation of testing center to accommodate student exam issues

**Issues reviewed and considered by the committee:**
1. Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (Informational)
2. Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs
3. PPM 200-25 Revision Proposal
4. Proposal to Reconstitute the Department of Spanish and Classics
5. Proposed Minors in Engineering: Biomedical Engineering and Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
6. Proposed Minor in Engineering: Materials Science
7. On-line Degree Certification Proposal (PPM 45)
8. Proposal to Establish 3 New Chemistry Degree Programs
9. Proposal to Establish the Department of Design
10. UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011
11. BOARS Transfer Policy Revision Proposal
12. Proposed Course Evaluation Regulation DDR 534
13. Proposal to Merge the Departments of Textiles/Clothing and Biological/Agricultural Engineering
14. Proposal to Disestablish the Department of Applied Science
15. Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 610
16. Student Led Courses
17. Professional Schools Offering Undergraduate Degrees
18. Teacher Coach Role in Athletics
19. Proposal to Discontinue Electronic Materials Engineering Major
20. Review of the American History and Institutions Catalog Galley
21. Proposed Revision to Davis Division Regulation 538 – Disability Accommodations for Final Exams
22. Proposed Revision of Davis Division Bylaw 28 (H)
23. GE2 Exception Request from the College of Engineering
24. GE3 Exception Request from the College of Engineering
25. LUMINA Degree Qualifications Profile
26. Association of American Colleges and Universities Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education
27. Association of American Colleges and Universities Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education: VALUE Rubrics
28. Cluster #3: College of Letters and Science Undergraduate Teaching Programs in Anthropology, Communications, East Asian Studies, History, Jewish Studies, Linguistics, and Philosophy
29. Special Committee on Athletics Report Review
30. Proposed Name Change Request: Expository Writing to Professional Writing
31. Proposal to Discontinue Optical Science (OSE) Engineering Major
32. Proposal for Religious Studies Departmental Status
33. Korea University Exchange Agreement
34. Undergraduate Tuition Allocation – Version 3
35. Proposed Name Change Request: Human and Community Development to Human Ecology (includes proposal to merge Human and Community Development and Environmental Design)
Committee’s narrative:

Undergraduate Council (UGC) has statutory authority over undergraduate education and programs. This includes establishing policy for undergraduate education on the Davis campus, as well as developing and reviewing campus-wide educational objectives and criteria for evaluating educational effectiveness; establishing policy and exercising authority to approve or not approve establishment and discontinuation of undergraduate programs; authority on academic disqualifications and or/dismissals, and authority over undergraduate transcript notations. Undergraduate Council also considers and reports on matters referred to it by the Chief Campus Officer, the Chair of the Division, the Representative Assembly or any other standing committee of the Davis Division, or by the Faculty of any college or school located wholly or in part on the Davis campus; initiates appropriate studies and makes reports thereon involving undergraduate educational policy; and identifies one of its members for nomination to serve as the divisional representative to the University Committee on Educational Policy and one of its members for nomination to serve as the divisional representative to the University Committee on Preparatory Education.

Four subcommittees report to the UGC. The Committee on General Education was active this year responding to questions following in the wake of the implementation of the new GE requirements in Fall 2011 and discussing an assessment plan to determine the student learning outcomes from the implementation. The GE Committee, chaired by Maggie Morgan, addressed campus unit GE administrative questions and formalized answers to develop clear understanding. The differences between the old GE requirements and the new GE requirements were addressed as was the application of each to continuing, transfer and newly enrolled students. The UGC commends and thanks Professor Morgan and the GE Committee for facilitating the continued successful transition to the new GE requirements.

The Special Academic Programs Committee, chaired by Diane Strazdes, focused on honors programs. Participation by students in the social sciences, humanities and arts at the annual Undergraduate Research Conference has
fallen. Many qualified students are not seeing themselves as honor students. Advisors were contacted to encourage students to participate. When the Insect Biology Undergraduate Research Honors Program was proposed, Professor Strazdes analyzed the proposal. Her analysis and subsequent report led to a discussion of the Davis Honors Challenge. A request to change DHC 195 to something other than "Honors" that was sent to the Chair of the DHC. Recommendations outlining honors program requirements were sent to the Chairs of the Faculty Executive Committees of the campus colleges and schools. Another outcome was the reformulation of the Insect Biology Undergraduate Research Honors Program as a research mentoring program.

The Undergraduate Instruction Program Review Committee, chaired by Carl Whithaus, completed the scheduled reviews of the Cluster #3 College of Letters and Science undergraduate teaching programs in Anthropology, Communications, East Asian Studies, History, Jewish Studies, Linguistics, and Philosophy. Each completed review included a UIPR summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the respective program, the conclusions reached, formulated recommendations, and in one program’s case, a request for an update on the status of issues raised by the respective department report and the UIPR summary. The UGC forwarded all materials to the Provost and looks forward in the coming year to reviewing these cluster reports with the relevant deans in order to foster increased dialogue with departments and greater synchronization between program review and resource allocation by administration. We hope that the undergraduate program review process will both become more efficient and also more effective in providing timely and useful information to facilitate better undergraduate learning and efficient and effective deployment of resources.

The Committee on Preparative Education, chaired by Christiana Drake, focused on the impact that increasing the enrollment of international students would have on entry level writing exams, English Second Language courses and funding during the current budget crisis. Service of non-English proficient students will be increased with the greater international student recruitment that is an integral part of the 20/20 Initiative. The Committee discussed this concern and those associated with the fact that the entire UCD curriculum is open to international students. Graduate ESL training was distinguished as another and separate issue.

UGC’s counterpart at the UC system-wide level is the University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP). This committee meets once per month at the University of California Office of the President in Oakland. UGC Chair Jon Rossini served as the Davis Divisional representative to UCEP, and in this capacity he provided regular updates to the UGC about issues relating to undergraduate education on UC campuses system wide. UCEP spent a great deal of time working with issues of system-wide courses in relationship to the developing UCOE (UC Online Education) project through the office of the
President. Other key issues included providing WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) with advice and suggestions regarding proposed changes to the accreditation process.

The most problematic issue that came before UGC was the increasing number of requests from Departments and Colleges to discontinue or consolidate majors. The trend towards major closings or consolidations continues from last year and is largely driven by financial constraints. The UGC responded to concerns that administrative decisions driven by budgetary anxiety are not necessarily the most appropriate decisions from a campus or system-wide viewpoint. And UGC encourages early dialogue with involved parties as appropriate in order to intervene early enough in the process to facilitate solutions. We would hope that concerns about programs would emerge explicitly through review processes and that program reviews would be used in making decisions about changes in undergraduate programs. However, it might be appropriate in specific cases to engage the UGC along with other appropriate bodies to assist programs that are important for the campus as a whole or might be a place for a synergy of faculty investment in a way not organized by a traditional department or college configuration. The UGC would like to see proposals to eliminate majors clearly describe the academic rationale for such actions. The UGC believes that proposals need to include plans for students continuing in the major once admissions are suspended. Because existing students are allowed to finish in a major being closed, the UGC also believes it is generally necessary to suspend admissions to a major initially and eventually close admissions prior to its formal discontinuance. Requests to suspend admissions to a major should therefore include the information and rationalization required to discontinue the major if that is the true intent of the suspension. The UGC’s response to the trend was the creation of Guidelines for Requesting Suspension of Admissions to a Major.

At a voluntary meeting of faculty teaching in large lecture convened by Susan Keen, a member of the UGC, with support of the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the idea of a centralized testing center as a way of facilitating the testing of students who have special accommodations was introduced. The UGC will likely propose this to the Senate for further endorsement in the Fall.

In the moments where the UGC has had to determine contentious issues, we have tried to support the will of the majority of local faculty when possible, although we have also facilitated review processes to help better inform the academic grounds of decision making about majors and programs. We plan to continue to work to standardize certain processes across departments and colleges including honors programs, catalog copy, and the use of emphases within a major, and will be in dialogue with the colleges about these issues in the coming year.
There were no ASUCD representatives on the UGC, and there was no GSA representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Rossini, Chair
Colin Carter
Gregory Dobbins
Christiana Drake
Patrick Farrell
Susan Keen
Maggie Morgan
Janet Roser
Diana Strazdes
Matthew Traxler
Carl Whithaus
Jeffrey Williams
Victoria Cross (Academic Federation Representative)
Patricia Turner (Ex-Officio – Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies)
Elias Lopez (Ex-Officio – University Registrar)
Nancy Kilpatrick, Undergraduate Council Analyst (September to January)
Bryan Rodman, Undergraduate Council Analyst (January to August)

The following remarks are from the outgoing Undergraduate Council chair:
The Undergraduate Council is a relatively recent entity on the UC Davis campus and its primary role is providing a campus-wide perspective on change in undergraduate instruction and policy. Historically, many of these responsibilities were delegated to the Colleges, but there is little or no record of these relegations. The Undergraduate Council sees its role as engaging with questions of undergraduate education at a campus level and as such sometimes appears to act counter to the desires of individual colleges or departments in making changes to majors or other curricular decisions. One role of the Undergraduate Council is to help remind the faculty and the administration that some undergraduate programs may be important to the campus as a whole, even if they are peripheral to a single unit. And, given the increased energy to consolidate driven by financial exigency as well as a positive desire to facilitate interdisciplinary programs, it is crucial for the campus to begin thinking critically about ways to support programs that cross colleges and interests without employing a “lead dean” model. In addition, with the new budget model providing a relatively transparent picture of the allocation of undergraduate tuition based on enrollment and number of majors at the unit level, it is important that a central body review substantive changes that may emerge to serve one unit but which may not serve the interests of the campus as a whole.

Respectfully,
Jon Rossini