WASC INTERIM REPORT (SUPPLEMENTAL)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
1 Shields Ave, Davis, CA 95616

Submitted by Patricia A. Turner (ALO)
Vice Provost – Undergraduate Studies

March 1, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUPPLEMENTAL INTERIM REPORT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
March 2010

I. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

The year 2008-09 marked the centennial of the University of California, Davis. Located 14 miles from the state capitol, UC Davis is home to four undergraduate colleges (Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Biological Sciences, Engineering, and Letters and Science) along with many graduate programs and professional schools including Business, Education, Law, Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, and soon a new School of Nursing. A leader in interdisciplinary study, UC Davis offers 103 undergraduate majors. In part because of our campus's proximity to the State Capital and in part because of our agricultural heritage, we believe that UC Davis is a ready resource for policy makers and state agencies and the logical home for several state and federal research facilities. As a result, UC Davis has achieved a rare degree of synergy among teaching, research and service, a synergy that permeates undergraduate instruction.

First accredited in 1954, UC Davis is now one of 62 North American universities admitted into the prestigious Association of American Universities and is ranked eleventh among public universities nationwide (*US News and World Report).* UC Davis has a long and continuing reputation as a "student friendly" campus with many educational and experiential opportunities for students who choose to be involved. For example, each year over 5,500 students participate in internships, many of which qualify as public service and our Student Programs and Activities Center sponsors over 470 organized student groups each year, developing a sense of community and providing uncounted hours of public service. (See http://www.ucdavis.edu/about/)

3. LIST OF TOPICS OR CONCERNS

a) General Education
   Update the progress in adopting and implementing the new general education plan and in establishing an assessment plan for the GE component of the undergraduate curriculum.

b) Assessment of Student Learning & Program Review
   Report should describe and analyze progress that all programs and departments have made in establishing student learning outcomes and in developing effective assessment plans. Plans are expected to include summative and formative assessment and multiple measures of assessment, both direct and indirect. The process for following through on the findings of assessment should also be addressed in the report.

   Report on progress in implementing the new program review process, including information on the program reviews that have been fully completed; information about what was learned in the reviews should be included, especially the results of assessment of student learning in terms of program objectives.

3. REPORT PREPARATION

The Vice Provost–Undergraduate Studies (VPUS), Patricia Turner serves as the Accreditation Liaison Officer at UC Davis, and her office oversees all matters relevant to accreditation. To prepare for this report, she teamed up with her staff (associate vice provost Gary Ford and assistant vice provost Gail Martinez) and included the expertise of our Teaching Resources Center to work with campus constituents toward the progression of the specific recommendations of the last WASC action letter. Over the last year and a half, weekly updates were held by the VPUS core team with periodic updates back to campus leadership that included Chancellor Vanderhoef and Chancellor Katehi; Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Enrique Lavernia; Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate, Robert Powell; senate committee and council chairs; council of deans and vice chancellors; council of associate deans; and division, department and program chairs. Particular collaborators in the preparation of this narrative included, Christopher Thaiss – senate chair of the GE Committee, and Daniel Potter – senate chair of the Program Review Committee.

IV. RESPONSE TO ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMISSION

General Education

The WASC Commission letter (May 2008) acknowledged the campus's five-year focus on researching, drafting and developing a new model of general education which now calls for 52 units of "Topical Breadth" and 35 units of "Core Literacies." It further commended the plan as "excellent" and applauded the work of the faculty and administration in tackling the challenging issues that surrounded revising GE. However, at the time of the Interim Report conference call (May 2008), the new GE plan was scheduled for consideration at the Senate Representative Assembly in June 2008, and if approved was to be implemented in fall 2010. Furthermore, the panel noted that the new GE proposal did not include an assessment plan, and as result requested that an update on the progress for each of these issues be addressed in this supplemental interim report.

Shortly after the IR conference call (June 2008), the Senate Representative Assembly endorsed the GE proposal. The senate leadership was in recess during the summer, however when its Executive Council reconvened the following October, they adopted the Representative Assembly's recommendation and also approved the proposal. Recognizing the daunting size of the task of establishing an effective implementation strategy, they ordered the formation of a joint senate/administrative implementation committee. The GE Implementation Task Force was formally appointed and charged in December 2008 (see attached) with its first meeting taking place in January 2009.

As the process of establishing an implementation plan evolved concurrently with a rapidly unfolding budget crisis, it became apparent that a fall 2010 implementation date was unrealistic. Therefore, the committee's first action was to request formally a one-year extension of the effective implementation date to fall 2011. This extension was granted by the senate executive council. In the months that followed, the committee's efforts were directed to outreach among the academic departments, educating the faculty on the new topical literacy areas, and encouraging their participation in recommending or modifying existing courses for consideration of GE course approval under the new guidelines. Meanwhile, a technical team focused on the

development of a user-friendly on-line course approval process specific to the support the work of the task force. By fall 2009, the task force was being trained on the on-line approval process and departments were submitting courses to be reviewed.

Thus far, more than 3000 courses have been reviewed by the Task Force committee, the first of a three-stage review. Other stages include a review by the appropriate college courses committee followed by the senate committee on courses and instruction. Courses denied approval by the Task Force have an opportunity to further justify an existing course or modify it to meet the new guidelines, before resubmitting it to the three-stage review processes. We currently project that completing these review processes, updating the campus catalog, and training faculty and staff advisors on the new iteration of the requirement is on track for the anticipated fall 2011 implementation.

As with the previous GE Task Force whose specific charge it was to research, design, and guide the GE proposal through to approval (2006-2008), the GE "Implementation" Task Force also had a specific and labor-intensive charge: to prepare the campus for transition by creating a timely process in the review and implementation of sufficient and appropriate courses available to meet the new GE requirement (2008-2010). In developing the norming guidelines for course approval, the GE Implementation Task Force recognized that another senate committee charged with assessment issues would need to shape the guidelines into assessment goals. As preliminary steps toward that aim, the standing GE senate committee has formalized learning outcomes aspired for students under the new GE (see attached). However, consistent with the prior two stages of the emerging new GE, a third GE joint senate/ administrative task force will be constituted with a specific charge to review best practices and recommend an assessment plan (or combined approaches) that demonstrate students are indeed achieving the GE learning outcomes.

While we prepare to advance to the assessment stage of this process, we will continue to draw upon lessons learned from other curricular assessment initiatives currently being piloted on campus. Given the large enrollments of so many of the proposed GE courses, we are incentivizing other pilots in large popular classes. The implementation of the Spencer Teagle grant is an example of one such initiative. In the second year of a three-year grant for "systematic improvement of undergraduate education," a team from the University Writing Program and the Department of Sociology is studying improvement in writing and learning by students enrolled in 150-seat sections of a lower-division general education course in sociology. This course meets the enhanced writing and teacher-feedback criteria of the new GE program. The research team is finding significant replicable results from the new pedagogy (as reported at conferences and to the foundations) and plans to use the assessment methods of the study as part of the assessment of other representative courses in the new GE program.

As part of another initiative, Professor Liz Applegate, instructor of Nutrition 10, arguably one of the largest enrolled GE course currently offered at UC Davis, has agreed to integrate an assessment pilot into her course. These and other campus efforts will serve as a starting point to inform the work of the GE Assessment Task Force.

Finally, UC Davis is a charter member of the Reinvention Center, a national association devoted to improving undergraduate education at research universities. One of its recent projects was the establishment of an Assessment Network across its membership. Associate Vice Provost Gary Ford and Professor Christopher Thaiss (Director, University Writing Program) currently serve on

this network. Following a meeting in Fall 2009, three working groups were established. Ford serves on the E-Portfolios, Rubrics, and Tools workgroup and Thaiss serves on the General Education workgroup. The third workgroup is Making Sense of Data and Advocacy. Thus far, members of the national GE working group have met by conference call to share best practices, and are working toward a consensus model. Additionally, a fourth working group, Writing as a Tool of Learning in the STEM Disciplines, is chaired by Thaiss and is building a national consortium of scientists and writing specialists to (1) identify and apply best practices and (2) study their success by replicable methods. The results of this process will be applied in assessing the new Scientific Literacy GE requirement at UC Davis, and results from Davis will contribute to the national initiative.

We fully anticipate these efforts to yield recommendations and guidelines from peer institutions that will further inform the adoption of assessment approaches that are likely to be the most successful at an institution of our size and complexity.

Assessment of Student Learning

The campus strategic plan includes the following learning goal: "Provide enriching learning experiences that develop the intellectual and leadership capacity of students and advance the campus's educational objectives." The primary indicator of achievement of this goal as described in the plan is: "Evidence of educational effectiveness, including results from the periodic assessment of instructional programs in relation to program and campus educational objectives for students."

The campus holds to the fundamental principle that student learning outcomes and their assessment should be locally defined, discipline specific and faculty driven. Over time, it is our plan that through existing periodic and systematic undergraduate program reviews, student learning outcomes will be additionally expanded from alignment to campus educational objectives to major-specific objectives. Methods of assessment for these outcomes will be identified, evidence of student learning, retention and completion presented, and analyses by program faculty undertaken to demonstrate the extent to which students meet the defined outcomes. The faculty will use the results of these analyses to improve curricula and pedagogy consistent with the goals and practice currently instituted in program review. These extended principles were affirmed in *UC Way to Educational Effectiveness,* a report by the systemwide Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force prepared in July 2009 (our ALO was a member). The report details ten recommendations made by the task force, and these best practices are currently being adopted by the UC campuses.

The College of Engineering leads the campus effort to define student learning outcomes for its undergraduate programs. As required by its accrediting agency, ABET, programs have adopted the eleven program outcomes identified as Criterion 3, Program Outcomes (*Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs*, ABET Inc., 2008). An example of these program outcomes is that of the Biochemical Engineering program:
(http://chms.engineering.ucdavis.edu/students/undergraduates/biochemical_engineering/index.html)

This program has established a number of indirect and direct measurement tools for assessment of the program outcomes, has a process for annual outcomes assessment, and has used these assessments to identify curricular and program changes to improve the program. Indirect

measurement tools include a senior class focus group interview, departmental alumni survey, campus alumni survey, teaching evaluations, and employer surveys. In defining direct measures, applicable program outcomes were identified for each course. Specific course assignments (homework, exam question, part of a project, etc) were designed to assess each of these associated program outcomes. Each year a subset of outcomes is assessed by these direct measures in a subset of courses. The faculty members teaching the courses identify target scores considered to be indicative of achievement of the program outcome, given the difficulty of the assignment and the scoring rubric used in grading the assignment. These assessments are reviewed by a faculty committee. For program outcomes receiving low rankings, course and program modifications are developed, followed by additional assessments to provide evidence and/or indications that the modifications have achieved desired improvements in achievement of outcomes.

In 2002,the Academic Senate adopted campus-wide educational objectives for all students (http://undergraduatestudies.ucdavis.edu/educational-objectives.html) and phased in analyses of these objectives in its revised program review processes, effective 2006 (see below). In response to the 2008 WASC recommendation, the senate Undergraduate Council, in collaboration with our ALO (Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies), began a process to define major-specific student learning outcomes for all undergraduate programs as an extension of the campus-wide educational objectives. One approach supported by our ALO was to encourage the participation of faculty representatives from among our largest majors to meet with cohorts at a systemwide assessment meeting with the idea of bringing best practices back to the discussions within their respective units. However, the primary strategy has been to engage the undergraduate colleges and divisions sequentially and systematically in this effort. The process typically involves a presentation to the dean and department and program chairs; development of draft learning outcomes and assessment methods by program faculty; feedback provided by the ALO and her team and/or assessment specialists in the Teaching Resources Center (TRC); leading to adoption and publication of the learning outcomes; and initiation of the process for assessment. We have engaged the services of our Teaching Resources Center to support these processes and they have provided additional leadership by leading workshops, developing a SLO/assessment resource website hosted on their server, and attending department and program faculty meetings to provide additional assistance as requested. Although the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (attached) summarizes this activity, several examples of these collective efforts are provided below.

> The Department of French and Italian has defined four categories of student learning outcomes for the undergraduate French program – Language, Culture, Literature and Linguistics
> http://frenchanditalian.ucdavis.edu/french/UndergraduateProgram/French_SLO.pdf).
> Assessments for language include faculty review of oral presentations and written assignments from the required French 100 course. Final exams or papers from upper-division culture courses are reviewed and assessed for cultural competence. Papers and assignments from a sampling of upper-division literature courses are reviewed to assess subject competence. Final work from a sampling of upper-division linguistics courses is reviewed and assessed for competence in the subject area. These assessments are judged against rubrics developed by program faculty.

> The Department of Design has defined four general student learning outcomes (http://design.ucdavis.edu/programs/learning_outcomes.html). Faculty assess the

achievement of these outcomes by reviewing and analyzing portfolios submitted by students in select upper division studio classes. These portfolios are intended to demonstrate four areas of proficiency in discipline-based acquisition of skills in materials, techniques, elements of design and design problem solving. The results of these assessments are used by the faculty to provide feedback to foster students' academic and professional development; to inform faculty members' course development and teaching methods; and to assess whether departmental learning outcomes are being met, to ensure continuity of performance standards and to inform curricular development.

For the Native American Studies program, faculty have defined student learning outcomes grouped in the areas of critical thinking, communication, research, and content mastery. Assessments will be based on written assignments (essays, research papers), oral presentations, and course examinations. A senior exit interview or consultation, attended by faculty, will be used as the final measure of student outcomes.

Institutional research units systematically gather data on student achievement, such as attrition and graduation rates and time to degree, student surveys such as the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), and alumni surveys. This data is made readily available to all programs, but it is specifically assembled for each program as it begins to undergo its periodic program review.

Over the last year and a half, considerable progress has been made in defining student learning outcomes and methods for their assessment. However, continued efforts are required to complete the task for all 103 of our undergraduate programs. The Academic Senate Undergraduate Council and the ALO will continue to work sequentially with each undergraduate college and division to formulate and revise their practices. To hold firm to the commitment that this be a faculty driven process, it is necessary to proceed on a timeline that allows for full deliberation. The process will also be driven by program review, as each program is reviewed every six years and the review process requires an assessment of student learning.

Program Review

In the 2003-2004 academic year, the year following UCD's affirmation of reaccreditation, the administration and the academic senate pursued changes to the program review process encouraged by the visiting team and the commission. In its June 27, 2003 letter the Commission noted

Many team suggestions bolster UC Davis' approaches to assessing and improving student learning: Incorporate assessment of student learning systematically in all program reviews (now in the planning stages), use campus-wide student survey data more effectively in program review, employ trend and benchmark data more extensively, integrate SARI and other research and services more effectively across campus; and coordinate better analytical talent and information. The Commission urges UC Davis to consider these ideas as possible approaches to enhance its efforts in this important area.

In revising the program review process the Senate focused on the advice above, so that the faculty in the majors received extensive data from our institutional research offices to frame their self-study. While at the task of reviewing the process, the faculty and administration elected to

also make changes that had surfaced internally rather than through the WASC critique. Namely, the campus felt that deans and Senate committees could better process the evaluations of units if in any given year, similar units were reviewed. Thus in our old process, majors in an art, foreign language, and cultural studies might be reviewed in a given cycle. In our new process, reviews are conducted of all of the arts one year, all of the foreign languages the next, and so on. We refer to these numerically so that the first set of program reviews are understood around campus as the Cluster 1 reviews, the second set are Cluster 2 and so forth. (The committee is welcome to consult our Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators to view the timeframe of program reviews relevant to their standing categorized by Cluster.)

It should be noted however, that the above program review process had been revised and implemented in 2006 in compliance with 2003 commission recommendations (i.e., data gathered to support, and analysis focused upon, the major's contribution to student learning tied to campus educational objectives). Only in subsequent ALO and ARC meetings, and in response to WASC commission recommendations specified in our most recent 2008 interim report, did it become apparent that our recently revised program review would fall short of evolving WASC expectations (i.e., establishing major-specific learning objectives and developing/implementing assessment plans). Realizing that Cluster 1 had already forwarded its program review to its college and Cluster 2 was in progress, the ALO and her staff initiated a multi-pronged process to meet the most recent WASC recommendations (also described in student learning assessment section above). In regards to program review, one component of the process involved backtracking to Cluster 1 majors to bring them up to date in relation to this goal. As a result of this effort, several Cluster 1 majors have since developed student learning objectives and assessment plans. Additionally, the ALO was able to work with the chair of the senate committee responsible for oversight of program review to further modify the recently revised program review. As a result, program review guidelines and templates now include language that specifies an analysis of major-specific learning outcomes and evaluation of its assessment efforts. (See section 8 – http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Template-for-College-Committee-Reviews.pdf).

A closer look at the Cluster 1 review process reflects the kind of learning that takes place whenever significant change is implemented in an academic environment. Majors within that cluster struggled with their analyses of institutional research data; campus staff had to unlearn the old process; Senate committees needed to come to agreement on how to react to the reports; deans had to determine the best course of action for them. As a result, bringing closure to Cluster 1 took much longer than expected. However, extensive engagement in the campus's educational objectives is evident in the cluster 1 reviews. Additionally, Dean Owens, following receipt of the program reviews in the arts, responded by outlining her goals to rectify issues, within the constraints of an inadequate budget, facilities, FTE, and advising inequities as they surfaced in the arts department program reviews.

Rather than speaking superficially about several different reviews, we will refer to several aspects of one review. (The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators offers additional information on other reviews). The Design program review is a fruitful one for discussion for several reasons. Before the review period, Design was shifted from College of Agricultural and Environmental Science to College of Letters and Science and housed within the division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies. Thus a good program review process ought to shed light on whether this transition is working well. Out of a total 47 page program review document, 33

pages are devoted to the analysis of performance data. The Design faculty focused with great detail on the 115 figures provided by the institutional research office. On pg 37 they conclude,

> a) Students' perception of their learning experience is somewhat different from the teaching goals of faculty. Clarification of educational goals, understanding of the limits of design education in the context of a university, and a point-by-point statement regarding communication skills, leadership and management skills, information gathering skills, etc. must be more clearly communicated by faculty to students.

In the section 9, Assessment, the design faculty offer responses likely to cause WASC to consider them "immature" in terms of their assessment goals. In light of faculty driven priorities, they focus on the quality of their teaching, grading policies, and reputation for keeping apace with their field. The final question and its response are telling (excerpt from pg 40):

> **3.** *Of the outcome measures provided in this report (see Item 7) and the educational objectives for your program (see Item 8), identify those most effective for evaluating your program. Are there other measures you presently use or would like to use?*
>> The faculty in Design would be thrilled to have some formal measures in place beyond course evaluations and occasional alumni surveys. However, beyond the most basic questionnaires and student assessments, the faculty does not have the expertise to evaluate program effectiveness, nor the time to engage deeply in the process.

Still, just eighteen months after their program review was submitted to the college, Design was one of the first departments to respond to the campus initiative to develop major-specific student learning outcomes and assessment plans. This demonstrates that even with the barriers identified by the faculty comment above, the department takes seriously its responsibility to deliver a curriculum that optimizes its students' ability to meet the specified learning outcomes. (See http://design.ucdavis.edu/programs/learning_outcomes.html).

Because of the extended timelines for cluster 1 and 2 reviews, Provost Lavernia is receiving them in the same academic year. The academic senate shared the cluster 1 reports with him in November of 2009 and the cluster 2 reports are forthcoming in spring 2010. Shortly after he receives the cluster 2 reports, Provost Lavernia plans to consider the two clusters together, both addressing the concerns raised by the academic senate as well as discussing the findings with the relevant deans. With guidance from the ALO, he will follow up as necessary on those majors whose reviews continue to reflect inadequate engagement with current practices of student learning and assessment. UC Davis will update WASC on this process in an appendix to its institutional proposal.

V. OTHER CHANGES/ISSUES CURRENLTY FACING THE INSTITUTION

Leadership Changes

Since our last Interim Report (March 2008) there have been several leadership changes at UC Davis. The most significant among these was the decision of Chancellor Larry N. Vanderhoef to return to the faculty ranks in August 2009 after serving 15 years as chancellor. A new chancellor, Linda P.B. Katehi, began her appointment immediately after and is guiding the

campus through significant changes and challenges. Reflecting a shift in strategic vision, she has engaged the campus in a renewed process of examining and updating our existing strategic plan. Additionally, after the departure of our last appointed Provost (July 2006), and the appointment of two different interims, Chancellor Katehi has recently authorized an immediate national search to fill this position.   In conjunction, an additional national search is being conducted for the position of Vice Chancellor for Research.

Also new to campus leadership are the appointments of Steven Currall, Dean, Graduate School of Management; Kevin R. Johnson, Dean, School of Law; George R. Mangun, Dean, Division of Social Science; Robert Powell, Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate.

Financial Resources

        In our interim report in 2008, we stated: "The current (winter 2008) financial forecast for California is not promising." Unfortunately, we have learned that we understated the severity of the fiscal downturn. During the last two years, UC Davis has made tough decisions and difficult choices to resolve shortfalls totaling more than $150 million, or 25 percent of the general fund budget.

To compensate partially for the decline in state funding, the Regents have approved substantial increases in student fees. At the time we prepared our interim report in 2008, the 2007-08 in-state registration fees were $8,925 and out-of-state registration fees were $28,545. For 2010-11, the estimated in-state registration fees are $12,919 and out-of-state fees are $34,940. For California residents, this represents a 44.8% increase.

At the campus level, in further response to this budget crisis, the campus, in January 2009, initiated a new budget planning framework. The scale of the crisis made it evident that we would not be able to absorb the anticipated budget reductions without systemic change. In order to ensure that the budget planning framework benefited from broad input, the process was rooted in the work of budget advisory committees with membership from the entire campus community. The immediate charge for each of the committees was to establish guiding principles and priorities to guide budget planning and to recommend specific changes to university business processes. Recommendations were also sought about the most critical programs and services that ought to be protected, to the extent possible. Finally, the committees were asked to identify ways to reduce or consolidate services and expenses, reallocate resources, and generate new resources. The committees reports submitted in summer 2009 included a wide range of suggestions that provided both short- and long-term opportunities to rethink how we conduct our business.

 Our strategic approach to the shortfall emphasizes our core principles:
- Reduce budgets strategically to maintain focus on the excellence of our academic programs.
- Ensure Californians access to high quality, affordable education.
- Communicate openly, honestly and frequently about the budget process and the reductions. Consult broadly about reductions to determine the best approaches.
- Aggressively pursue new resources.
- Streamline and improve administrative processes and rebalance risk and accountability to ensure our departments can focus on delivering core programs.

We continue to prepare for an uncertain financial future. In 2010-11, the campus faces an additional shortfall of $38 million to $78 million, depending on the outcome of the governor's budget proposal. How our campus addresses this shortfall is critical to three major challenges: the expected end to the furlough program on August 31, 2010, sufficient funding for the restart of contributions to the UC Retirement System, and covering fixed costs such as increases in employee health benefits.

VI. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

We appreciate the efforts of WASC and we find the recommendations valuable and take them seriously. Our top leadership is invested in this and many people and committees contributed to this supplemental interim report. We are pleased that we have made progress but recognize that our progress is uneven across areas and that we still have a long way to go. We look forward to continued self-study and improvement as we prepare for the submission of our proposal in May 2011.

APPENDIX I
Charge Letter to the GE Implementation Task Force

DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

December 17, 2008

Rebecca Ambrose (School of Education)
Margarita Heyer-Caput (French/Italian)
Seeta Chaganti (English)
Marcel Holyoak (Committee on Courses of Instruction)
Joseph Kiskis (Physics)
Sunaina Maira (Asian American Studies)
Gail Martinez (Assistant Vice Provost – Undergraduate Studies)
    Martinez's alternate: **Patricia Turner** (Vice Provost – Undergraduate Studies)
Jim McClain (Associate Dean – Letters and Science)
Kathryn Radke (Animal Science)
Jim Shackelford (Chemical Engineering & Materials Science)
Dann Trask (Undergraduate Dean's Office, Letters and Science)
Frank Wada (University Registrar's Office)
    Wada's alternate: **Keitha Hunter** (Registrar's Office)
Peter Wainwright (College of Biological Science)

Re: Appointment to the General Education Implementation Task Force

On behalf of the Academic Senate Committee on Committees, I want to thank you for agreeing to serve on the General Education Implementation Task Force. Your appointment to the task force expires on August 31, 2009 and is subject to extension by approval of the Executive Council. We anticipate appointing additional members to the group early in the New Year.

The General Education Implementation Task Force will be chaired by General Education Committee Co-Chairs, Elizabeth Constable and Christopher Thaiss. The task force and General Education Committee will collaborate in preparing the campus for transition to the new General Education Requirement by fall 2010.

Kimberly Pulliam is serving as staff to the General Education Implementation Task Force and will be contacting you soon to schedule the first meeting. Kimberly may be reached at kapulliam@ucdavis.edu or 2-4918.

We recognize that Senate service may be time-consuming and we appreciate your willingness to serve.

           Sincerely,
           (signed)
           Brian Mulloney, Chair
           Committee on Committees

c: Co-Chairs Constable and Thaiss
    Division Chair Powell
    Resource Analyst Pulliam

DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
TASK FORCE PROPOSAL

GE implementation: Task Force as subcommittee of GE committee

MEMBERSHIP OF GE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE:
● Academic Senate members from subject areas that aren't represented by GE committee members
● COCI representatives in addition to GE committee rep?;
Also need effective interfaces with College Courses Committees
● Include a member from the College of Biological Sciences
● Include a Hart Hall faculty member
● Include a Social Sciences faculty member
● Include a member from the College of Engineering
● Include a member from the Arts?
● Academic Federation member(s)- including a representative from the Univ Writing Program
● Administrative representatives:
From VP Undergrad Studies – associate VP?
From VC Student Affairs – for ongoing advising, summer orientation advising, registrar's office.

DEADLINES, TIMELINES (working backwards):
● Implementation for incoming class F 2010. Need to train summer orientation personnel, and advising staff and faculty
● Catalog deadline for 2010-2012 issue is March 2010
● COCI deadlines (Senate, College) for approval prior to 2010 catalog deadline are ???
● Submission of courses for approval in Topical Breadth, Core Literacies
● Outreach and education of college, dept, teaching program personnel to encourage submission of courses for core literacy certification

OBJECTIVES FOR IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE
1. Prepare working versions of Course Approval Descriptions ASAP
● GE Committee/ academic members of Task Force with outside assistance from faculty in relevant areas. Start with provisional documents prepared by GE committee 07-08.
● Be sure to include an item requesting that instructor explain how some learning outcome(s) will be assessed using data (re: next WASC review)
● Set up at least 3 – 4 meetings of an informational nature: for master advisors, major advisors, curriculum committee.
● Set up Smart Site workspace for Implementation Task Force, and particularly for the Course Approval Descriptions
● Work closely with the GE Committee

2. Course classification:
● Identify process to be used for course approval
● Requests and approvals – existing online? Paper? As yet to be purchased software?
Who reviews and in what order (e.g. input from Task Force before College Courses Committees see them?) Important that GE Committee/Task Force work closely with COCI
Topical Breadth classification of courses – should be simple

● Send lists to teaching units sponsoring undergraduate courses. Format should be check-off, except when dual certification is requested ("interdisciplinary") and the justification for dual listing should not have to be lengthy.

● Who will review requests (troubleshoot, suggestions) prior to COCI review and approval?

Core Literacy classification

● Identify groups to review requests by area. Need to draw on expertise at this point, before COCI reviews for final approval.

● Send out call to submit courses. Outreach and education of faculty very impt.

Note interim need to classify new courses for both old and new GE programs.

3. Registrar-level

● Work closely with catalog editor

● Catalog copy explaining the GE program

● Design of appendix in catalog

● Develop annotation for courses in catalog and in registrar's software

● Registrar's software modifications to accommodate new program.

Will have to be used in parallel with old system while students meeting old program finish degrees.

APPENDIX II

General Education Student Learning Outcomes

Completing the General Education Core Literacies is intended to help students achieve the following learning outcomes:

- Ability to think clearly and communicate effectively in writing.
- Ability to understand and orally communicate ideas.
- Ability to understand ideas presented visually and to communicate knowledge and ideas by visual means.
- Ability to understand and think critically about the historical processes, institutional structures, nature of citizenship and government of the United States.
- Ability to think critically about social relations and diverse sociocultural perspectives within the United States.
- Ability to think critically about social relations and culture in one or more societies outside the United States.
- Ability to reason quantitatively and to evaluate quantitative arguments encountered in everyday life.
- Ability to understand fundamental ways scientists use experimentation and analysis to approach problems and generate new knowledge.

(These student learning outcomes are taken from Regulation 523. Criteria for General Education Certification)