## Annual Report: Academic Year 2008-09
### Davis Division: Academic Senate

### Undergraduate Council

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Meetings:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting frequency:</td>
<td><strong>Meetings are scheduled once or twice a month during each quarter.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours of</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair can expect to put in 4-5 hours/week; committee members no more than 1 per week.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee work each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposals Reviewed:</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total projects deferred from the previous year:</td>
<td><strong>Two</strong></td>
<td>Total projects deferred/continued to the coming academic year: <strong>1</strong> (Emergency Preparedness, Pandemic Planning Guidelines)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:** None.

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

**Issues considered by the committee:**
1. Proposed Policy: Involuntary Psychiatric Hold Withdrawal
2. General Education Implementation
3. Academic Standing Display on Official Transcripts for Undergraduate Students in File to Graduate Studies
4. Proposal to Establish Department Status for Asian American Studies
5. Departmental Status Proposal: Chicana/o Studies
6. Graduate School of Management Academic Plan
7. College of Biological Sciences Academic Plan
8. L&S: Division of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies Academic Plan
9. College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Academic Plan
10. L&S: Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences Academic Plan
11. L&S: Division of Social Sciences Academic Plan
12. School of Education Academic Plan
13. School of Veterinary Medicine Academic Plan
14. College of Engineering Academic Plan
15. Integrated Curriculum Management Proposal
16. Academic Standing Minimum Progress Report
17. Law School Academic Plan
18. Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering Name Change Request
19. Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering – Change to Undergraduate
Curriculum
20. Spanish and Classics Reconstitution Proposal
21. NEAT ORU 5-Year Report
22. PPM 390-10: Emergency Management & campus Security Policy
23. Programs for students that would use philanthropic support
24. Institute of Transportation Studies 10-Year ORU Review
25. Institute of Governmental Affairs 5-Year ORU Review
26. Primate Center 10-Year ORU Review
27. Campus Furloughs/Pay Reduction
28. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 121
29. Pandemic Planning: Academic Senate Emergency Preparedness Legislation
32. Guidelines for Non-Resident Enrollment Proposed by BOARS
33. ANR Review: Systemwide consultation
34. Undergraduate Drop for Non-Payment of Fees
35. Listing of Online or Remote Course Offerings and Policies: Systemwide Request
36. 2009-2010 Faculty Guide
37. APM 010: Academic Freedom, Appendix B

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None.

**Committee's narrative:**
The Chair of the Undergraduate Council attends the Provost/Senate Chairs meetings, Quarterly Briefing Meetings with the Chancellor and Provost, Academic Senate Executive Council meetings, and Davis Division Representative Assembly meetings. The Chair also serves on several task forces including the Pandemic Planning/Emergency Management task force and Transfer Student Task Force. John Yoder served as the representative to the University of California Educational Policy (UCEP) committee during the 2008-2009 and provided regular updates to the Undergraduate Council regarding systemwide issues pertaining to undergraduate education on all UC campuses.

The Undergraduate Council dealt with a number of issues of great importance to the campus during the 2008-2009 academic year. One of the most important issues was the implementation of the revised General Education Requirements on campus. A joint Senate/administrative implementation task force was appointed by Committee on Committees in December 2008, which includes faculty from across campus, administrators, and representatives from the Academic Federation. The GE Implementation Task Force is co-chaired by Chris Thaiss (University Writing Program) and Liz Constable (French & Italian and Women and Gender Studies). The charge of the task force is to work with the General Education Committee on implementation of the new General Education requirements. This will include working with the Committee on
Courses of Instruction and the Registrar’s Office on developing an interim system to be used for tracking and designating courses on campus to meet the new core literacies.

The new General Education Requirements were approved by the Davis Division Representative Assembly in June 2008. Implementation took place throughout the 2008-2009 academic year and will continue into the 2009-2010 academic year with all GE courses being approved by November 2010 for final campus implementation in Fall 2011. Please see below for the final (approved) version of the New General Education Requirement.

**Final General Education Proposal – approved by the Davis Division Representative Assembly June 2008:**

Revised General Education Requirement  
June 2008

The General Education (GE) requirement reflects the faculty’s image of “the well-educated person.” All students have the opportunity to develop expertise in depth in their majors, minors, or a combination of these. The GE requirement adds to that depth a breadth of knowledge and experiences represented by coursework outside of the area of the student’s major. The GE requirement also trains the student in four core “literacies” that the faculty considers crucial for success in one’s profession but also crucial to thoughtful, engaged participation in the community, nation, and world.

The GE requirement has two components: Topical Breadth, and Core Literacies.

The GE requirement is defined in terms of units, not courses. The units of every course at UCD (with very few exceptions) are assigned to one of the three Topical Breadth Areas or are certified as interdisciplinary. Unless otherwise restricted, every course unit that a student takes, including courses for major and minor requirements, will be counted toward the required minimum number of units in each Topical Breadth Area. In the case of a course that has been certified as interdisciplinary, a student may count the units of the course in only one of the areas in which it has been certified.

With the exception of units used to satisfy the English Composition element (1a) of the four Core Literacies (see below), units approved for a Core Literacy will be accepted toward satisfaction of the appropriate Topical Breadth component. However, units may be counted toward satisfaction of only one Core Literacy.

Students may take courses P/NP to fulfill their GE requirements, up to the limits set by college and campus regulations. Students may not present Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate credit in satisfaction of GE requirements.

**A. Topical Breadth Component .................................................. 52 units**
  - Arts and Humanities .................................................. 12-20
B. Core Literacies Component .................................................. 35 units

1. Literacy with Words and Images .................... at least 20 units

The ability to form, organize, and communicate one’s ideas is at the center of the faculty’s notion of what it means to be an educated person. The objective of this core literacy is to help create graduates who can communicate their ideas effectively in written, oral, and visual forms. The requirement also seeks to enhance students’ critical judgment of oral, written, and visual messages created by others.

a. English Composition (8 units)
   (College of A&ES, College of L&S, College of Biological Sciences, College of Engineering)

b. Writing experience coursework in the student’s major or elsewhere (at least 6 units)
   Writing experience coursework provides students instruction on how to communicate ideas in the subject matter of a course. Students write in appropriate forms under the guidance of faculty and graduate students. The opportunity to improve writing after having received careful commentary is crucial to this requirement.

c. Oral skills coursework or additional writing experience coursework (at least 3 units)
   The skills involved in the effective communication of ideas through oral presentation build on and strengthen the critical thinking skills exercised through writing. As an alternative to developing oral communication skills, the student may take additional coursework certified as writing experience (see requirement b).

d. Visual literacy coursework (at least 3 units)
   The objective of this requirement is to provide graduates with the analytical skills they need to
understand how still and moving images, art and architecture, illustrations accompanying written text, graphs and charts, and other visual embodiments of ideas inform and persuade people. Coursework may stress the skills needed to communicate through visual means as well as the analytical skills needed to be a thoughtful consumer of visual messages.

NOTE: A student must have completed the Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly known as the Subject A requirement) before receiving credit for coursework satisfying requirements a, b, and c.

2. Civic and Cultural Literacy . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . at least 9 units
   The objective of this core literacy is to prepare people for thoughtful, active participation in civic society. Such graduates think analytically about American institutions and social relations, understand the diversity of American cultures, and see the relationships between the national and local cultures and the world.

a. American Cultures, Governance, and History (at least 6 units, of which at least 3 units must be in a course certified as focusing on issues of domestic diversity)
   The objective is to create graduates who have an understanding and appreciation of the social and cultural diversity of the United States and of the relationships between these diverse cultures and larger patterns of national history and institutions. Such graduates are able to bring historical understanding and analytical skills to their participation in the civic spheres of society and are able to think analytically about the nature of citizenship, government, and social relations in the United States.

b. World Cultures (at least 3 units)
   The objective is to create graduates with a global perspective, graduates who can live comfortably and productively in a world where communication technologies, economic relationships, and the flow of people across national borders increasingly challenge national identities and create transnational cultures.
Students can satisfy this requirement through coursework or through certified study abroad.

3. **Quantitative Literacy** ................. at least 3 units
   The objective is to create graduates who understand quantitative reasoning and who are capable of evaluating claims and knowledge generated through quantitative methods.

4. **Scientific Literacy** ................. at least 3 units
   The objective is to create graduates who understand the fundamental ways scientists approach problems and generate new knowledge, and who understand how scientific findings relate to other disciplines and to public policy.

**General Education Web Site**
During the 2008-2009 academic year, the UGC analyst worked extensively with the Academic Senate programmer to re-design the web site devoted to General Education. This was a large project that involved meeting with several committees, individual faculty members, and members of the administration. The UGC analyst worked with the programmer on designing the web site so the information would be more easily accessible and the important information including regulations and course listings so these items would be more convenient for staff in faculty in departments. The web site went through several revisions, but overall faculty appreciated the web site because all the information, including historical documents related to the process of GE revision, was all contained in one place. Development of the web site had significant impact on the entire campus and provided assistance by educating faculty and staff on the GE proposal and revision. All information pertaining to the General Education revision including advisory course listings and course approval descriptions can be found at: [http://ge.ucdavis.edu](http://ge.ucdavis.edu).

**General Education Tracking System (GETS)**
One of the highlights during the 2008-2009 academic year was the development and implementation of the General Education Tracking System (GETS). The GETS system was put into production on July 1, 2009 and departments/units will have through Fall quarter 2009 to conduct course reviews on all courses designated as general education. The UGC analyst was the lead analyst assigned to work and support the GE Implementation Task Force. This included working extensively with the GE Implementation Task Force membership, the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI), the University Registrar’s office, and the programmer from Student Affairs to design and implement an online system for existing courses that require only GE designation to meet the new general education requirement. The web-based GETS system will allow departments/units to view/edit/review courses which have been pre-designated as a GE course. Revisions to these courses are reviewed, routed and approved
through GETS. All departments/units will be required to follow the proposed procedures in the GETS system to ensure courses are in compliance with the new GE regulations. All GE course review should be finalized in November 2010 for full campus implementation in Fall Quarter 2011.

**General Education Resolution (Delay in Implementation to Fall 2011)**

In February 2009, a resolution to delay implementation of the revised General Education requirements to Fall 2011 was presented and approved by the Davis Division Representative Assembly. This resolution was endorsed by the General Education Committee and the Executive Council of the Davis Division.

**Rationale:** In order to meet the September, 2010 implementation, all current courses (estimated at 1200-1600) would have to be updated to designate the appropriate “Literacy” by November, 2009, or at the latest by the end of Fall Quarter, 2009). This is not advisable, for the following reasons:

- The colleges, departments, Academic Senate office and administrative offices would need additional time to assure appropriate classification of courses and entry into the course database and the General Catalog.
- The current electronic Course Approval Form (CAF) system is sorely inadequate for the purposes of managing the workload associated with the revision of existing courses and any new course proposals. The system’s failings cause unacceptable delays, and heavy traffic causes sub-par performance, which slows review and approval of courses. Therefore, approval of more than 1000 courses using the current CAF would demand a tremendous staff commitment due to the slowness of the system alone, which would be exacerbated by the quantity of courses being reviewed at each level.
- Campus departments and advisers need additional time to become knowledgeable about the new requirements in order to advise students under the old GE requirements and the revised GE requirements during the period in which the revised requirements are being phased in.

**Other important UGC Business Items Reviewed During 2008-09:**

**Academic Plans**
The Undergraduate Council was asked to evaluate academic plans for the College of Engineering, College of Biological Sciences, Graduate School of Management, School of Veterinary Medicine, School of Law, School of Education, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and the three divisions in the College of Letters and Science (Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies, Social Sciences, and Mathematical and Physical Sciences). The
Council focused on undergraduate education during their review and discussion of the academic plans. Most of the professional schools do not have a formal responsibility for offering undergraduate education. Most of the undergraduate college academic plans did not specifically address the assessment of majors and courses of study. Undergraduate Council would like to suggest a consideration of this important topic in future versions of academic plans. Our accreditation agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, has made it clear that our next accreditation review must involve a serious commitment to the assessment of learning outcomes.

**Transcript Notation Change Request**

The Undergraduate Council was asked to review a request from the University Registrar Frank Wada regarding transcript notations for undergraduate students.

**Request:** To remove the official transcript notation of “Not in Good Academic Standing” for undergraduate students who meet the following requirements:
- a) “file to graduate” status, and;
- b) Probation or subject to disqualification for only quantitative (i.e., minimum progress) reasons.

**Situation:** There is a three month window from the end of the quarter to the official degree posting where graduating seniors who have officially filed to graduate but are on probation or subject to disqualification for minimum progress requirements will be in “Not in Good Academic Standing.”
- Graduating seniors, particularly those graduating in the Spring or Summer quarters, that are in good standing for qualitative (GPA) academic standards, but have not met minimum progress reasons (since students may opt to enroll in less than 13 units during one of their last three quarters) are impacted since official transcripts sent to graduate and professional schools during this three month window indicate a status that would be normally removed if the campus degree award process was completed closer to the end of the quarter.

The Undergraduate Council voted unanimously to remove the official transcript notation of “Not in Good Academic Standing” for undergraduate students who meet the following criteria: (a) “file to graduate” status and (b) probation or subject to disqualification for only quantitative (i.e., minimum progress) reasons. Removing the “Not in Good Academic Standing” transcript notation will remedy the current situation for graduating seniors who have officially filed to graduate but are on probation or subject to disqualification for minimum progress requirements due to the three month window from the end of the quarter to the official degree posting.

**UC Davis D-1 Athletics Report**

At the time our campus moved to Division I of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Academic Senate believed it was necessary to monitor the
academic performance of our student athletes. As you know, Davis has a long
tradition of emphasizing the "student" in the expression student athlete. During
the 2007-2008 year, the UGC requested additional information from Student
Affairs Research and Information (SARI) regarding information contained in the
2007 report. The Undergraduate Council requested that the final report include a
presentation of mean cumulative grade point average, average units completed
per quarter and fraction of students subject to dismissal by team. The Council is
aware that this may not be possible in all cases given issues of sample size for
some of the smaller teams. The additional information was received in May 2009
and the Undergraduate Council reviewed this additional information along with
the 2008 Athletics Report. Overall, the Council was satisfied with the additional
information and SARI will now include this additional information in the future as
part of the full report. Furthermore, the Undergraduate Council would simply like
to stay "ahead of the curve" where possible, to insure that the troubles in one
program are not the first of several others.

Integrated Curriculum Management System
In December 2008, the University Registrar, Frank Wada, provided the
Undergraduate Council with a thorough presentation of the Integrated Curriculum
Project. The Council was unanimously supportive of this important project.
Properly instituted, the Council anticipates a marked improvement in the
management of undergraduate education across the campus. The University
Catalog will become a "living document" (at least in its presentation on the
Registrar's website) and the integration of data with Degree Navigator and
Banner should also simplify the work of faculty and staff advisors. The Council
was also mindful of the considerable costs this effort will require. The hope was
that this investment will return itself in time saved and more effective advising of
undergraduates.

Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan
The Undergraduate Council was asked to review the proposed furlough and
salary reduction plan from President Yudof. The proposed plan included three
options for furlough and salary reduction.

Option 1 was a proposed 8% salary reduction for all faculty and staff. Salaries
for faculty and staff earning less than $46,000 per year would be reduced by 4%.
This option would not result in an interruption of teaching, research, medical
center operations, or essential services. The option would also be easily
administered in the payroll system and this option would impact employee
retirement plans unless addressed through Regental action similar to the
provisions of the START program. Faculty and staff would not benefit from a
reduction in time worked and this option would not present Fair Labor Standard
Act concerns.

Option 2 was a proposed 21 unpaid days plan. Through a combination of
certain unpaid holidays and scheduled furlough days totaling 21 days (14 days
for academic year faculty and 19 days for fiscal year faculty), staff and faculty salaries would be reduced by 8%. For staff and faculty earning less than $46,000 per year, the Plan would include 11 unpaid holidays and scheduled furlough days (7 days for academic year faculty and 10 days for fiscal year faculty). Accrued vacation and/or sick leave could not be applied to unpaid days. This option would present significant operational challenges to the campuses and, in particular to the UC Medical Centers. This option also presents some challenges for implementation in the payroll systems. This option would also impact employee service credit for UCRP unless addressed through Regental action similar to the provisions of the START program. This option, while reducing the earnings of faculty and staff by 8%, would provide some reduction in time worked. Fair Labor Standard Act issues would need to be addressed.

**Option 3** was a proposed 12 unpaid days plus a 3.4% salary reduction plan. Through a combination of unpaid holidays and scheduled furlough days totaling 12 days (8 days for academic year faculty and 11 days for fiscal year faculty), and imposing a 3.4% salary reduction resulting in an overall reduction in salaries of 8%. Faculty and staff earning less than $46,000 per year would have their salaries reduced by 4% through a combination of 6 unpaid holidays and scheduled furlough days *4 days for academic year faculty and 5 days for fiscal year faculty) and a 1.7% salary reduction. Accrued vacation and/or sick leave could not be applied to unpaid days. Under this plan, Campus and Medical Center operations would be affected although less than that anticipated under Option 2. This option would also present some challenges for implementation in the payroll system. This option would impact employee UCRP service credit and retirement plan benefits unless addressed by Regental action similar to the provisions in the START program. Measures would need to be implemented to protect benefits and leave accrual levels for faculty and staff. Under this option, faculty and staff earnings reduction is partially mitigated by time away from work. This option also does present Fair Labor Standard Act issues that would need to be addressed.

**UGC Response:** Option 1 (8% Salary Reduction Plan) received overwhelming support from the Council. The comments included terms such as "the most straightforward, practical, and, for the faculty at least, honest". Other members included terms expressing "fairness" and ease of implementation. The Council members were very concerned about protecting retirement benefits and a need for the Regents to also keep this component of compensation viable and equitable. Several council members also mentioned the impact of any furlough/salary reduction plan on staff, including an understanding that though the Council's Senate members seem to point to Option 1, staff are likely to expect a release from time at work along with their reduction in salary (i.e., Option 2, 21 Unpaid Days Plan). Though not an option given us by President Yudof, a member of the Council thought a "two-track plan" (i.e., Option 1 for faculty, Option 2 for Staff) might be more acceptable.
Option 1 should not come as a surprise, given this Council's commitment to "hold the students harmless" and the hope to persuade colleagues to continue teaching in the face of furloughs. The hope of the Council is to minimize the impact this decision has on the quality and delivery of our undergraduate programs.

**Pandemic Planning/Emergency Preparedness**

The Undergraduate Council was charged with reviewing the recommendations of the Pandemic Planning Task Force, in consultation with the Graduate Council, the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction, and the Faculties of the several colleges and schools, to proposed nonbinding guidelines for consideration by the Executive Council and for reporting to the Representative Assembly pursuant to the Davis Division Bylaw 73(C).

Davis Division Bylaw 73 was amended in May 2007 motivated by the prospect of an emergency situation—such as a pandemic or natural disaster—which might disrupt instruction with uncertain consequences for thousands of students. The outbreak of H1N1 (swine flu) virus in May 2009 prompted the Academic Senate Chair and Executive Council to request the development of guidelines for these types of situations on campus. The Yolo County Health Department was concerned that the University community was not taking this health threat seriously.

The Undergraduate Council came up with a draft outline of academic guidelines that will most likely be presented to the Executive Council in Fall 2009. Such emergencies could range from accommodation of ill students where classes will still meet to a suspension of classes and a “closure” of the campus. The plan is to develop three notices or letters for the faculty. The thought behind this process is that in the event of a health emergency or pandemic, some element of the Executive Council will be asked to make decisions/recommendations to the faculty. The three letters would be formed as follows:

1. Inform the faculty of their role and responsibilities in the event of a health emergency. (Introduction of the problem to members of the Academic Senate and Academic Federation)
2. Inform the faculty of a decision by the Department of Public Health and remind the faculty of their role and responsibilities (from Letter 1).
3. Inform the faculty of guidelines for the management of classes in the event of a closure.

Undergraduate Council will continue working on this item during the 2009-2010 academic year. The Council is not expected to draft explicit rules and regulations. Instead, the Council will work to provide a document that prioritizes the regulations of the division and provides the necessary accommodations of the impacted students on campus.
Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Famula, Chair
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