

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

December 10, 2008

Wednesday, 11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Roxanne Monnet (ASO analyst), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Don Potts, Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep), Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Linda Burman-Hall, Dave Helmbold.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Jon Ellis (Senate Service Scholar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Michael McCawley (Associate Director of Admissions).

I. Announcements and updates.

Chair Padgett apprised CEP of recent actions regarding honors at UCSC. A couple of years ago CEP surveyed degree sponsoring units regarding their honors practices. Great variability was noted, particularly in the proportion of students receiving honors. CEP wrote to recommend that 15 percent be the upper-limit on honors in the major/college. At that time CEP also decided to send annual reports showing the proportions of honors given by college/major. This year's report was provided by Registrar Hunt-Carter for CEP's consideration. CEP noted that it does not appear that CEP's recommendations made much of a difference in honors-giving practices overall. The current CEP confirmed that they agree with the past CEP's recommendation of a 15 percent upper-limit and decided to send this year's results and with a reminder of the recommendations. Chair Padgett will draft a letter to go with the report.

Merrill Provost Lourdes Martinez-Echazabal met with Chair Padgett on the topic of interdisciplinary topical clusters (ITCs). She plans to ask faculty to offer courses possible as soon as next fall as part of an ITC. Chair Padgett will meet with the provosts of Crown, Oakes, Kresge, and Cowell Colleges individually later this week also regarding ITCs.

A question was brought to Chair Padgett regarding transcripts. Students may request transcripts without narrative evaluations being included. The inquiring faculty person feels strongly that this should not be permitted. CEP briefly discussed their thinking on whether it should be allowed that transcripts are produced without narrative evaluations. Members responded that it was their intention as instructors that the narratives should accompany the grades, and wondered whether there was text on the top page of the transcript such as a legend to tell readers that the narratives have been eliminated. It was noted that the cost to the students is greater for a complete transcript. This topic will be added to an agenda later in the quarter.

CEP extended a thank you to Jon Ellis for working with CEP this quarter as the Senate Service Scholar.

The minutes from November 5 were accepted as amended.

II. External review closure meeting reports.

The Politics Department external review closure meeting was reviewed for CEP. A faculty member provided a minority report for the external review committee (ERC) which is now available on the password protected review site. The letter was not discussed at the meeting. The size of the Politics faculty versus their student numbers was discussed. The dean is supportive of growth in the number of ladder-ranked faculty members in Politics but cannot say at this time when that will happen or what the number would be. The dean has offered more lecturer resources to the department. Although the student-to-teaching assistant ratio was discussed, no action points were identified for inclusion in the closure letter. The group agreed that there should be an internal campus review of the Legal Studies Major with campuswide representation of interested parties. The goal would be to determine how the campus as a whole would support the Legal Studies Major, assuming they want it retained. It is one of the larger majors at UCSC. That meeting will be arranged by Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Alison Galloway's office.

CEP was apprised of the Sociology Department external review closure meeting. A topic of concern by the ERC was that Sociology has a part-time undergraduate advisor. The ERC suggested that it be increased to full-time. The dean is willing to discuss increasing it to full-time. However, the department chair is not convinced of the need to add resources in that area. The new Minor program in Global Information and Social Enterprise Studies (GISES) was discussed. Since a significant amount of GISES related work was already happening via its internship program and course offerings, the department decided to formalize it into the Minor. The student-to-teaching assistant ratio was discussed; with no major changes proposed. The group discussed the GPA requirement for entry into the Major, which seems to be achieving its goal. It was noted that the department has not submitted their disciplinary communication (DC) recommendation to CEP. Although the department finds its capstone requirement to be a good experience for its majors, the faculty do not think that it fits what they would want for the DC requirement for their Majors.

III. Action Plan High-Level Indicators: Measuring Our Progress, Next Steps.

The Action Plan High-Level Indicators document provided by Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Klinger to the Senate for feedback was discussed at the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting. CEP was reminded that this is not connected to the systemwide accountability document that they reviewed last month.

CEP discussed the relationship between the two documents. UCSC's document grew out of a request from our Senate, as an implementation step toward the Strategic Academic Plan that the Senate looked at last spring. UCSC's document intends to identify visible ways of assessing campus progress toward its goals, as well as provide a means of comparing ourselves to comparable universities. It was noted for CEP that in its discussion last week, UCEP commented that although departments should talk about assessment, this should be with a depth of evaluation--not simple quantitative measures.

CEP did not find much to comment on in the document that was within their charge. The Committee noted the lack of emphasis on undergraduate education in UCSC's high-level indicators document. The foci are primarily graduate education and research topics. Although first-year retention and sixth-year graduation rates will be looked at, time to degree should also

be considered. These three measures are not enough on the topic of undergraduate education. They do not demonstrate how educationally valuable students' experiences were while here. CEP understands that it is difficult to find concrete measures that are easily attainable. Nonetheless, CEP would like this document to be broader than topics of funding and size of the faculty groups. For example, measures might be given for other activities such as internships, research opportunities, volunteerism, what students do after graduation, etc. Class failure and repeat rates might be considered, as well as the number of students migrating to other UC campuses after two years. EAP and internship participation are not necessarily good measures because they are affected by student financial status. And consideration needs to be given to issues of class size.

The document lacks measures of interdisciplinary work, and does not take into account the history of our campus. The comparison universities are not necessarily comparable in terms of academic structure and size.

CEP discussed what to recommend as a way to measure interdisciplinarity. All agreed that student involvement in activities beyond the minimum for graduation needs to be considered. For example, how far down the socioeconomic structure are we being successful in making opportunities attainable for students.

VPDUE Ladusaw indicated that the high-level-indicators document does not necessarily reflect how he evaluates the success of undergraduate education. He discussed the importance of measuring the educational effectiveness of requirements that apply to all students. For the extra opportunities, it is good to know what exists and whether those opportunities are succeeding in increasing academic engagement and involvement. Goals set for the extra opportunities should not be designed in terms of providing things for all or even most students if the funding is not present to sustain that opportunity for an increased number of students. It is also important to match the goals to the form of opportunity. For example, when an opportunity is designed for the most highly-achieving students, to set a goal of an unrealistically high rate of participation in that opportunity could result in a good thing looking unsuccessful. For limited opportunities, it may be best that the measure be one of counting participants rather than reflecting a percentage of total students who participate, for example.

The group noted that a structure is needed to effectively track research experiences for students. Capacity for each research opportunity for students needs to be considered. Members wondered how close UCSC is to having filled the capacity of faculty to provide certain research experiences and whether UCSC has reached it for thesis-type experiences.

CEP also responded that more thought needs to be given to measures of research excellence. National Academy membership and awards and citations are not broad enough to recognize the scope of scholarly excellence across disciplines. The document addresses quantity but not quality. Quantity does not necessarily indicate continued excellence. For example, once a faculty member is awarded a NAM award, their success rate for these awards often increases. Measures for faculty research productivity were also found to be of concern. Little weight was given to other options like the citation index. The National Research Council rating is not useful for interdisciplinary work, which is a particular issue since UCSC is planning to foster more interdisciplinary work per the Strategic Academic Plan.

The draft letter will be circulated for sending by the January 21 deadline.

IV. Double counting questions, draft letters.

CEP considered a draft policy statement on double counting of coursework toward multiple Majors and Minors. CEP believes that the amount of overlap defined in the Regulation is the right amount as a rule, and will suggest that degree sponsoring units work within those parameters. CEP will communicate that if degree sponsoring units want to be stricter than the Regulation calls for with regard to combinations of majors or courses that may not count toward more than one major, a compelling argument will need to be made to CEP.

It was suggested that some information be pulled out of the document and provided as an informational addendum in order to reduce the size of the policy statement.

The double-counting policy document will be finalized via email. It will be sent to departments and colleges as well as posted on CEP's web page.

V. Stakeholder map.

CEP was reminded of the spring 2008 discussion regarding development of a stakeholder map. When changes are proposed to service courses, CEP asks the course sponsoring unit to consult with affected units. In order to make it easier to ensure that all affected units have been consulted, last spring CEP asked the Registrar to create a stakeholder map. Stakeholders are those units who do not have control over courses that are required for their degree program(s).

Registrar Hunt-Carter shared a sample of a stakeholder map with the Committee. The data for the sample was drawn from AIS. Such maps may only be created for degrees that are coded in the degree audit system in AIS, which has been done for most but not all degree sponsoring units at this time. Registrar Hunt-Carter indicated that the rest of the stakeholder maps will be ready by spring with the exception of those not in the degree audit system. This topic will return to an agenda in the spring.

The Committee on Preparatory Education may also find these maps useful when they consider proposals such as the recent request to change the Math Placement Exam.

It is also thought that stakeholder maps will aid in transfer course articulation decisions since when a course changes, what articulates to meet it will also change.

VI. SCR 6.5.6: Independent Studies.

The Committee was recently made aware that SCR 6.5.6 is not being enforced. This Regulation calls for College permission for students to take more than one independent study type course in a quarter. The Regulation limits students to one such quarter unless there are special circumstances. The form for students to sign up for independent studies will soon be modified to include the proper signatures.

The Community Studies Major does not conform to this Regulation in that it requires two quarters of greater than five credits of field study for all majors. In response to CEP's inquiry, the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (CRJE) indicated that something global could be arranged for the first quarter. Signatures of faculty, college provosts, and affected

students are required. The student signatures for the first quarter affected by SCR 6.5.6 could be obtained at the time of declaring the major. However, CRJE thinks that the second quarter must be considered student by student, and that it cannot be something done routinely for whole groups of students.

Systemwide Senate Regulation 764 on special studies courses does not give allowance for students to take more than 5 credits of special studies courses per quarter. Most UC campuses have an approved variance to this Regulation on file at systemwide, allowing for some exceptions. UCSC's variance has language for "special circumstances and for outstanding students." The reference to outstanding students was lost from the most recent change to UCSC's Regulation 6.5.6. CRJE proposed to ask the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) whether both criteria must be met or whether "and" may be interpreted as "and/or".

Although the systemwide Regulation and UCSC's approved variance do not indicate specifically which courses are special studies courses, in the most recently approved Divisional Regulation, SCR 6.5.1 clearly defines which types of courses would be affected by SCR 6.5.6.

CEP discussed whether they want a different question to go to UCRJ than the one posed above by CRJE. CEP wants more time to consider the situation and will request CRJE to give them the month of January to respond regarding what CEP would like asked of UCRJ regarding UCSC's variance to SR 764 versus the current SCR 6.5.6.

It was noted that if Community Studies should need to reduce the number of credits allowed for their field studies program to 15 (in one quarter), there should not be an issue with the minimum number of upper-division credits for the major.

VII General Education legislation (non-writing).

Over the last week, members ranked possible general education requirements according to what they thought should be required of all students. Topics included scientific inquiry, quantitative/formal reasoning, visual/auditory/performative fluencies, textual analysis, ethnicity and race, cross-cultural analysis, statistical reasoning, human behavior, environmental understanding, creative endeavor, ethical inquiry, and gender and sexuality. Realizing that this list is too long, the Committee continued to discuss whether to allow more than one general education designation per course, which of these topics might be combinable without losing too much value, and where it would be acceptable to develop a list from which students would select X number.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy