

January 9, 2015

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Ken Baerenklau, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy



Re: Review of CNAS Teaching Policy

CEP discussed the CNAS teaching policy at its meeting on January 9, 2015. Committee members raised many of the same concerns that were articulated in the comments from CNAS chairs that were provided to the committee. Concerns were expressed about the process by which the policy was developed, the proposed methodology for calculating teaching loads, and the implications of any significant changes in teaching load expectations. The conversation was generally negative. However, committee members also felt that we were asked to opine on a subject for which we had substantially incomplete information. Therefore, before we can provide specific responses to the proposed policy vis à vis undergraduate education, CEP requests the following additional information.

1. **Does a dean have the authority to unilaterally and without Senate consultation undertake the process of developing a college-wide teaching load policy?** Members generally doubt the authority of a dean to do this, particularly when there are potentially far-reaching curricular implications of such a policy, but some uncertainty remains. A definitive answer to this question is needed so that CEP may clearly understand our role in reviewing such a policy.
2. **What are the motivations and justifications for developing this policy?** Significant changes have been presented without any background information. CEP lacks an understanding of the specific problems this policy proposes to alleviate; of the process by which other candidate solutions were declined in favor of the proposed policy; and of the rationale for believing that the proposed policy will be successful. A better understanding of these issues is needed before we can properly evaluate the proposed policy.
3. **What is the exact methodology for calculating teaching loads in the proposed policy?** The documents provided to CEP included detailed comments on the policy from CNAS department chairs and a lengthy background document on system-wide instructional activities. The description of the policy was limited to slightly more than two pages of text and several tables with calculation results. The committee requests a more thorough presentation and explanation of the policy. Based on the documents received, we do not fully understand the mechanics of the policy and thus we are reluctant to offer specific feedback on it.