

Conference Committees On Senate Bills 6 and 550  
and Assembly Bills 56 and 242  
Master Plan For Education  
Senator Alpert and Assembly Member Goldberg, Chairs

University of California Testimony  
Vice Provost Zelmanowitz and Academic Council Vice Chair Blumenthal  
Sacramento  
August 5, 2004

Good afternoon, Chair Alpert, Chair Goldberg, and members of the Conference Committee. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to appear before you. I am Julius Zelmanowitz, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives at the University of California. With me is Academic Council Vice Chair George Blumenthal.

- On behalf of the University of California, I would like to express my gratitude for your willingness to take on the ambitious task of devising a comprehensive framework for education in our state.
- The 1960 Master Plan for *Higher* Education was about ensuring opportunity to higher education for all who desired it. This Master Plan for *all* of education maintains the emphasis on the importance of access, affordability, and quality in higher education.
- We especially want to thank the Legislature for reaffirming—both in policy and in its recent budget actions—the Master Plan access promise that *all* students who are eligible for UC and CSU and who seek to attend will be offered a place somewhere in the system. As we saw very clearly this year, this promise is what the public understands as the heart of the Master Plan.
- The report’s goal of ensuring that the state provide necessary schooling and support services to ensure that California students “keep up” rather than needing to “catch up” is something that we wholeheartedly endorse. Thus, UC is very supportive of recommendations on improving access of K-12 students to rigorous academic preparation and on ensuring that underserved students have the resources to succeed in more challenging curricula. The necessary resources include an adequate supply of well-trained teachers qualified to teach college preparatory subjects and modern K-12 classroom and laboratory facilities.

We do however have concerns with a few of the specifics that are included in the bills under consideration by the conference committee:

- **While sharing your concerns over inequity in access to AP/honors courses, we believe SB 550 should focus on expanding access to these courses and on ensuring that students who lack such access are not disadvantaged.** UC adopted the practice of giving extra weight for honors and AP courses to encourage students to take the most rigorous classes. We continue to believe it is important to offer incentives for students to challenge themselves. Through the UC College Prep/AP Online program, we provide courses to students in schools that do not already offer an advanced placement curriculum.

Nonetheless, we recognize continued disparities in students' access to AP/honors work. Through comprehensive review, we now consider whether or not applicants for admission have had the opportunity to take such courses. Through Eligibility in the Local Context, we ensure top students at every high school have the opportunity to attend UC regardless of the depth of curricular offerings at their respective secondary schools.

Moreover, University faculty are reviewing the current AP/honors practice *precisely because of the concerns over disparities in access to such classes*. They will carefully consider the effect changes in the GPA calculation would have on the composition of the UC student body. It is important to ascertain the consequences of potential changes before any one option is implemented. Aside from being too detailed a provision for a Master Plan that sets out broad state policy, the recommendation to eliminate a particular academic calculation could restrict the faculty's future ability to fine-tune incentives for students to take the most rigorous high school classes available.

Accordingly, we respectfully request amending the bill to reflect a more general principle: enabling all students to have access to AP/honors courses and ensuring that those who lack access are not penalized in university admissions processes.

- **UC supports the principle of valuing teaching in tenure review and the idea of ensuring flexibility in how the systems deploy permanent and temporary faculty, but AB 242 is overly prescriptive in these areas.** The recommendations on temporary faculty in AB 242 are too detailed for a state Master Plan and would intrude on the internal management of important faculty resources. Specifically:

- 1) Adopting a single ratio as the appropriate balance between permanent/tenure-track and temporary faculty would limit our ability to respond to significant changes that affect the faculty pool. Our proportion of temporary faculty has remained relatively stable, within a range of 20-30% of total faculty. Universities need some flexibility in this figure to respond to changing circumstances such as rapid enrollment growth or budgetary deficits. For example, the large enrollment increases expected over the next decade as well as the opening of the Merced campus will require the use of more temporary faculty in the near term. Concomitant growth in the permanent faculty—essentially the long-term teaching infrastructure—will follow but will occur more slowly given the time needed to hire for these positions.

We respectfully request that AB 242 be amended to ask that UC examine and report on practices regarding the balance of temporary and permanent/tenure-track faculty, rather than seeking adoption of a policy particular ratio as the “appropriate” balance.

- 2) Providing “pro-rata” compensation to one group of faculty based on distinct functions is not appropriate for a university where all types of faculty carry out the institution’s multiple missions. At UC, there are few if any functions reserved exclusively for permanent faculty. Though the combination of responsibilities varies by academic appointment and disciplinary convention, many faculty in “temporary” categories

perform activities in addition to direct instruction. They participate in research and service endeavors as well as teach. For example, both temporary and permanent/tenure-track faculty serve on departmental committees. Neither group is separately compensated for this service; it is considered part of the set of responsibilities that justify the total compensation level. Adopting a pro-rata compensation policy could have the unintended consequence of discouraging recruitment of temporary faculty to participate in activities that build their academic portfolios in preparation for permanent or tenure-track jobs.

To the extent some temporary faculty positions require multiple responsibilities that are more challenging and diverse than others, salaries will reflect that—but not necessarily on a “pro rata” basis. There are not separate pay “rates” for the three UC missions. Compensation reflects a complex combination of each faculty member’s experience, scholarship, and disciplinary “market” value as well as the range of teaching, service and research responsibilities required for the job. Moreover, compensation for the largest subset of UC’s temporary faculty (lecturers) is governed by collective bargaining agreements that can differ from policies that apply to other types of temporary faculty.

We would respectfully request that AB 242 be amended to delete reference to the University.

- 3) On the issue of ensuring teaching is given weight in the tenure review process, we request that in lieu of the segments conducting a one-time examination, AB 242 be amended to require ongoing commitment to “ensure that teaching excellence is given significant weight in decisions regarding promotion and tenure and that affect the compensation awarded to faculty.”

- The University requires demonstrated excellence in teaching in the appointment and promotion of faculty as evidenced by UC’s guidelines for review of these activities: (Academic Personnel Manual, Section 210-1)  
*“Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role.”*
- Multiple measures are used to evaluate the quality of instruction. Significant types of evidence of effective teaching include student evaluations, appraisals by faculty colleagues, development of new and effective techniques of instruction, awards for distinguished teaching, term-by-term enumeration of the courses taught, etc.

- **The University supports exploring the development of a transfer associate’s degree that would guarantee admission to the UC system, rather than admission to a specific campus.** UC is eager to work with colleagues in the other institutions to develop such a degree, but extensive faculty consultation would be required to address divergent major and GPA requirements among the various institutions accepting this degree. Any admission

guarantee would have to apply to the system in general rather than a specific campus, just as it does for freshmen; the Master Plan guarantee of access has always been to segments as a whole, not to specific campuses. As currently drafted, the bill would guarantee a spot at an impacted campus to the holder of a transfer AA degree, even if that student had minimal academic qualifications. This arrangement could displace better-qualified transfer and freshmen students who did not have a campus-specific guarantee. We respectfully request that SB 550 be amended to eliminate this inequity.

- **Transfer articulation provisions in SB 550 would result in “cookie-cutter” curricular offerings.** The new language of SB 550 includes some very universal requirements for course transfer that, if implemented, could dilute course quality and result in extreme curricular homogeneity in lower division coursework in California. Rather than specifying that courses must transfer universally irrespective of their content, quality, or applicability to our over 700 different majors, it would be better to focus on the consumer protection model of ensuring that students know up front what they need for specific campuses and programs. We respectfully request that SB 550 be amended to have the segments devise articulation policies to enable students to “more easily transfer units among the institutions that comprise their respective segments” and that courses taken by CCC students who plan to transfer are “clearly identified as to whether or not they are acceptable for transfer credit” at UC and CSU campuses.
- **Teacher training provision in AB 242 and AB 56 should be amended to apply to the licensure requirements for the profession rather than putting the CTC in the position of dictating course content to university faculty.** We have proposed amendments to AB 242 and AB 56 that preserve the intent of producing certified educators with the skills and knowledge required, but without having a state agency specify higher education course content and program content.

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Requested Amendments on 7/16/04 Conference Committee Drafts of Master Plan Bills – SB 550, AB 242, and AB 56

Additional language indicated by underline  
Deleted language indicated by ~~strikethrough~~

### **SB 550 (Vasconcellos)**

Amendment 1, Section 10, page 2:

66010.3. (a) The public elementary and secondary schools shall be responsible for academic and general vocational instruction from kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, including preparation of pupils for postsecondary instruction, future participation in California's economy and society, and adult instruction to the extent of state support.

(b) It is the intent of the Legislature that the California State University and University of California should continue to collaborate with the public elementary and secondary schools in order to accomplish all of the following:

- (1) To increase the rigor of all academic courses.
- (2) To achieve both of the following goals:
  - (A) Reducing demand for remedial instruction among freshman college students.
  - (B) Eliminating the current practice of providing additional weight to honors and advanced placement courses in the grade point average calculations made during the admissions process. Ensuring all high school students who may benefit from honors and Advanced Placement coursework shall have access to such classes, and that students lacking such access are not penalized during the admissions process.

Amendment 2, Section 11, page 3:

66010.9. It is the intent of the Legislature to provide for the development of transparent and sustainable articulation and transfer processes to provide students with clear curricular guidance on the transition between grade levels, between high school and college, and between and among two- and four-year colleges and universities. The Legislature therefore urges the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the independent colleges and universities, either directly or through the efforts of their respective faculties, to devise system-wide articulation policies ~~appropriate to each major~~, to enable students to more easily transfer ~~major-specific, lower division units universally among all the~~ institutions that comprise their respective segments.

Amendment 3, Section 12, page 3:

66722.7. It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California collaborate to strengthen the programs in community colleges that prepare students to transfer successfully to the California State University or the University of California.

It is the intent of the Legislature that the courses taken by community college students who plan to transfer are ~~acceptable for transfer credit at all~~ clearly identified as to whether or not they are acceptable for transfer credit at the various campuses of the California State University and the University of California.

Amendment 4, Section 13, page 3:

66722.9. The Legislature requests the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California to establish an intersegmental group, including faculty and students, to consider what steps need to be taken to establish a transfer associate degree, within the existing associate degree unit requirements, the attainment of which would guarantee admission and course transferability, but not necessarily admission to the campus or major of choice, at any campus of ~~to the California State University or the University of California~~ for students who successfully complete the transfer associate degree program.

### **AB 242 (Liu)**

Amendment 1, Section 6, page 4:

99053. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Trustees of the California State University shall, and the Regents of the University of California are requested to accomplish both of the following:

(a) ~~Examine practices~~ Adopt policies regarding the ~~appropriate~~ balance of temporary and permanent tenure-track faculty characteristic of ~~for~~ their respective systems.

(b) Report these practices ~~respective policies~~, and the rationales therefore, in written reports to the Legislature, to be submitted no later than January 1, 2005.

99053.3. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Trustees of the California State University shall, and the Regents of the University of California are requested to, submit an annual report to the Legislature setting forth the ratio of permanent/tenure-track faculty to temporary faculty who are employed by their respective systems ~~and how this ratio compares to their respective systemwide policies.~~

Amendment 2, Section 6, page 5:

99053.5. (a) No later than January 1, 2005, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Trustees of the California State University shall, and the

Regents of the University of California are requested to, submit a report to the Legislature on the activities reserved for permanent/tenure-track faculty in their respective systems and the reasons why these activities are so designated.

(b) It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Directors of the California Community Colleges, and the Trustees of the California State University, ~~and the Regents of the University of California~~ should provide pro rata compensation to temporary faculty who agree to perform functions in addition to direct instruction.

Amendment 3, Section 6, page 5:

99053.7. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Directors of the California Community Colleges, the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California should ~~direct an examination of faculty promotion, tenure, and review policies and practices, and revise them, as needed, to ensure that teaching excellence is given significant weight in decisions that affect the compensation awarded to faculty. Should ensure that teaching excellence is given significant weight in decisions~~ regarding promotion and tenure and that affect the compensation awarded to faculty.

Amendment 4, Section 1, page 1:

44227.8. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing and, where appropriate, the State Department of Education, shall incorporate into licensure requirements for teacher candidates, and professional development requirements for renewal of licenses, and accreditation requirements for preparation programs components to ensure that teachers are capable of teaching children with diverse needs, ethnicities, nationalities, and languages, of teaching children who bring particular challenges to the learning process, and of teaching in urban settings.

Amendment 5

Move Chapter 1.5 into the Donahoe Higher Education Act (Title 3, Division 5, Part 40 of the Education Code commencing with Section 66000.)

**AB 56 (Steinberg)**

Amendment 1, Section 2, Page 9:

8239.65. The plan developed by the Blue Ribbon Committee pursuant to Section 8239.60 shall specifically include, but not be limited to, recommendations on: (a) Delineating early care and education personnel core competencies to achieve the desired child outcome goals for teaching and administrative levels; (b) ~~Aligning college instruction among all levels of the higher education system to provide Early Childhood Education curriculum and course subjects and establish uniformity of course content and~~

~~certification requirements~~ Developing licensure requirements leading to Early Childhood Education certification to prepare current and potential personnel to achieve the necessary competencies;

Amendment 2, Section 2, Page 10:

8239.70. Based on the Blue Ribbon Committee’s recommendations, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing shall do all of the following:

(a) Develop regulations that establish the appropriate certification of expertise ~~in~~ for Early Childhood Education teacher ~~and program standards for preparation programs leading to that certification authorizing teaching children ages’ birth through eight years. This~~ The certification requirements ~~and these preparation standards~~ shall reflect California’s infant/toddler and Preschool For All standards, as well as the academic content and performance standards for kindergarten through third grade.

(b) Establish a “one time only” extreme hardship exemption process for current early care and education personnel who do not meet the new requirements. This process shall be based on the criteria and time limit defined by the Blue Ribbon Committee.

(c) Revise the Child Development Permit Matrix requirements in alignment with the newly established Early Childhood Education certification.