

FACULTY WELFARE

November 1, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Committee on Faculty Welfare

RE: [Campus Review] Proposal: *Proposal to Improve Assessment of Core Competencies and General Education at UCR*

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the *Proposal to Improve Assessment of Core Competencies and General Education at UCR*. We wish to express the following:

- On page 5 of the proposal, it states:

...the AAC proposes that the Academic Senate formally adopt program learning outcomes for general education and charge a standing committee of faculty with responsibility for managing this important but often overlooked part of our curriculum.

CFW's comments and concerns pertaining to the aforementioned are:

1. The external WSCUC assessment is now under two years away. In 2022, an external WSCUC team indicated that a draft proposal integrating the core competencies into a new general education structure was proposed to the UCR Academic Senate by the Academic Senate's General Education Review Committee; and progress on this draft proposal has stalled. Now, there appears to be an attempt to reallocate labor to a new standing committee of faculty.
 2. We agree that more attention could be paid to integrating core competencies into a new general education structure, as the assessment of our students is important and this has stalled out. But we worry that creating another Academic Senate committee to accomplish this task is just another way for administration to offload the work onto faculty.
- With respect to assessment of students, the work this entails, and the scope of what is being asked of the Academic Senate and/or faculty (i.e that faculty create another committee or do this additional labor), we refer to the following document, ["Instructions on Using CANVAS Outcomes for Core Competency Assessment."](#)

The FAQ section of this document notes:

How does this impact the instructor/TA? The only impact it has on the instructor/TA is the time they put into scoring their students. This does not impact instructors/TAs in any other way.

The previous response wrongly implies that this is minimal impact and misunderstands the time intensity of grading assignments. This is not minimal impact; the time it takes for many of us (and our TAs) to grade assignments is intensive. If the AAC and UCR wants to implement these changes across classes, then they need to appropriately allocate the resources to do so. Asking faculty to do more here (i.e. adding labor to their existing courses, or forming another committee where you offload additional assessment onto faculty) seems concerning to us.

CFW stresses that asking the faculty to do more is always problematic, especially in these days when the faculty are already overloaded with too many things to do. Faculty are still recovering from the effects of COVID on all aspects of our careers: research took a huge hit; teaching is more problematic than ever; and one wonders how we find the time to commit to professional service. To boot, now we have to take into account the whole “graduate student as employee” issue. Taking on additional assessment tasks just adds to the overload.