

**Undergraduate Council
Minutes of Meeting
September 21, 2011**

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council (UGC) met at 8:45 am on Wednesday, September 21, 2011, in Room 232 of the Kolligan Library, Chair Gregg Camfield presiding.

II. Consent Calendar

The agenda was approved as presented. Minutes were approved with minor edit.

III. Chair's Report

Chair Camfield welcomed new members.

IV. Academic Reinstatement Policy – VCSA Lawrence

VCSA Lawrence asked UGC to review and make recommendations on a revised Academic Reinstatement policy. The current policy requires 24 credits with at least 16 of the credits being deemed relevant to the student's intended major, as well as a 2.7 minimum GPA while away from campus. The proposed revisions are based on elements of the same proposal at UCB, UCSB and UCD. The proposal attempts to provide both the students and the Schools better information about what students need to do before they are reinstated.

UGC asked VCSA Lawrence to revisit the policy and address the following questions:

- How long should the new policy be in effect for students?
- How long will students have before they can apply for reinstatement
- Language will be included into the proposed policy that would allow a student to be enrolled part-time at least one of the semesters/quarters they are enrolled at another college
- Provide demographic data on those who have been dismissed:
 1. family income
 2. first generation status
 3. ethnicity
 4. year of study
 5. sample of why students are getting dismissed

This data will enable UGC to evaluate the degree of rigidity of the policy. Once the data is available and the policy is revised, UGC will reconsider it and make a recommendation. The policy should allow some flexibility for exceptions.

Actions:

- VCSA will consult with E. Boretz, Director of the Calvin E. Bright Success Center, and come back with a revised proposal.

- VCSA will provide data for students who de-major and data for students who were dismissed last academic year.
- UGC will revisit this topic once a revised proposal is available.

V. Summer Sessions Schedule – Kevin Browne, AVC of Enrollment Management

A few years ago, a proposal was put forth to reassess summer sessions and how the schedules are offered. Last year there was a substantial change whereby summer 1 and summer 2 sessions were realigned to the same start date. This change was implemented for a variety of reasons. In the earlier proposal Student Affairs envisioned a summer 3 session for the following summer to accommodate incoming freshmen. New students would come in early to campus, get acclimated, and deal with orientation issues. A total of 600 students was not a number beyond the realm of possibilities for summer 3. For various reasons, summer 3 is going to be reassessed (summer bridge, funding models, orientation). Summer sessions are currently bringing in 1400 new freshmen.

Under this proposal, the summer program is modified. Last year when summer 1 and summer 2 were realigned we knew we were going to be making it impossible for any CA community college students or high school graduates to take any of our summer courses. This was done for a various reasons: we wanted to realign the sessions and we knew that by doing so, the loss would be minimal and that we would at the same time be able to increase dramatically as we took in 1400 additional new summer students from our native population.

Current calendar:

Session 1	May 23 – July 1, 2011	6-week session
Session 2	May 23 – July 18, 2011	8-week session

Proposed:

Session 1	May 21 – June 29, 2012	6-week session
Session 2	June 18 – August 13, 2012	8-week session

This proposal purposely re-establishes a disconnect between summer 1 and summer 2 and is designed to capture the students returning to Merced or those graduating from local high schools or community colleges and to position the campus for a future conversation about a summer 3 term in 2013. Under this proposal, summer 1 would be a 6-week session and summer 2 would be an 8-week session, when the majority of science and mathematics courses are offered.

UGC voiced its deep concern about the overlap between the two sessions. Students who take summer 1 may experience difficulty taking summer 2 courses. A course has a trajectory; likewise a semester has a trajectory that allows students to plan and to have a sense of cumulation by the end of the semester. Starting a new course when students are not finished with the first course alters the intellectual character of what they are doing and is actually

asking them either to defer applying their attention to the second course as they finish the first one or to ignore the pressure at the end of first course as they begin another one. This is a mistake intellectually and educationally. If there must be an overlap, it should be between the second term and the third because they are intended to attract different student populations.

AVC Browne explained that Student Affairs has tried to offer sessions that did not overlap but it was difficult to implement due to various reasons:

- A large number of students prefer a 6-week session for summer 1 so they can still get a summer vacation.
- Science courses are delivered during summer 2 (8-week session). The science course offerings were approved as an 8-week delivery methodology as recommended by UGC in the past.
- The overlap is purposely designed. It enables the Registrar to organize class schedules.
- Summer 1 cannot start a week or two earlier because of graduation. The campus needs a week after graduation to reset; furthermore incoming freshmen cannot start in May because they have not graduated yet.

AVC Browne also noted that the UCB Summer Session Dean will visit UCM next week to discuss future directions of summer sessions and Berkeley's plan to move towards a 5-week term.

Action: UGC will summarize its concerns in a memo to DivCo.

VI. Online Education

The UCOP online education pilot project is a systemwide initiative that was launched in 2010. Upon reviewing the proposal, the Academic Senate approved the pilot on the condition that it be funded only by external funds. The Senate voiced its concern about many issues surrounding the program, mainly its funding model; the potential shift from the research and educational mission of the University to a revenue production model; the potential deterioration of a UC quality education; students' qualifications and enrollment. UCEP has spent a significant amount of time discussing these issues and is currently evaluating and analyzing the project to consider how it fits with University expectations about education.

Online education does have its advantages. For example, it may offer some students who – due to economic or geographic reasons – do not otherwise have the means or ability to be in the central valley, to take some courses in the summer. It may also provide the campus the ability to build critical mass where it is needed and thereby have a cohort of graduate students in a given educational field. However, members noted that a number of issues will need to be addressed. UGC is mainly concerned about the asynchronous nature of the educational method; how to preserve the student/faculty interaction; how to maintain a UC-quality education; and about the design, evaluation and assessment of courses. A member noted that resources to deliver online courses will need to be managed adequately to meet the program's needs. It was also noted that faculty could be required to provide more

information about how they will teach their online courses. A solid approval process will be needed to ensure quality. A comment was made about the many definitions of online courses and the potential need to clarify the reference to “distance education” in the proposed draft policy particularly when dealing with hybrid courses.

A motion was made, seconded and carried to approve the proposed policy as an interim policy until guidance is provided by UCEP. Faculty submitting CRFs for online courses will have to fill out the questionnaire included in the policy.

Professors Lei Yue and Arnold Kim will now move forward with the submission for Senate approval of the CRF for the online version of MATH 5.

VII. Program Review Policy

The current language in the policy states that faculty and student surveys should be redacted. It was found that this was extremely difficult to do in a way that preserves the anonymity of the reports; it is time-consuming and, if inadequately managed, might inadvertently breach confidentiality. Thus, it would be better to have the PRC summarize the content of those surveys rather than redact them.

A motion was made, seconded and carried to approve the policy with the suggested changes noted above.

Action: Senate analyst will edit the policy accordingly and send it to the Chair for final review.

VIII. BOARS Transfer Proposal – Director of Admissions, Chon Ruiz

Action: Chair Camfield encouraged members to email their comments via the discussion forum on Crops. If no significant comments are received within five days, Chair Camfield will draft a brief memo stating that UGC has no objection to this proposal and that it is in fact congruent with the policies that were adopted last year.

The Digital Assessment Working Group report will be discussed on October 12, 2011.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:30am.

Attest:

Gregg Camfield, Chair