

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

**February 11, 2009**  
**Wednesday, 11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Linda Burman-Hall, Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Dave Helmbold, 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).

Absent: Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Michael McCawley (Associate Director of Admissions).

### **I. Announcements, updates, and minutes.**

CEP Chair Padgett announced that Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CPEVC) Kliger has confirmed that if the Disciplinary Communication (DC) legislation passes, the administration will support funding up to \$250K for it. Chair Padgett also announced that the Alumni Council has resolved to support the DC requirement and Interdisciplinary Topical Cluster (ITC) idea, and to work on raising funds for these.

The Committee on Teaching (COT) has offered to help CEP in its general education (GE) endeavors. CEP would appreciate COT's support to get faculty to respond to changes that may be upcoming in GE requirements such as through co-sponsored forums next year on best practices for designing GE curricula. CEP hopes that redesign of courses to meet the new GE requirements would be a future focus for COT grants. CEP would also like to collaborate with COT on how to prepare graduate students to be effective teaching assistant for undergraduates taking DC and other GE courses. CEP wants to begin a conversation on capacity/enrollment management with other Senate committees such as COT and CBP, but the topic will likely need to wait until next year given other work needing to be completed this year.

Chair Padgett, Member Nygaard, and NSTF Representative Cordova met with students and interested faculty yesterday regarding the possible revision to the current U.S. ethnic minorities/non-western society (E) requirement. Work will continue on the guidelines for the two related requirements being proposed by CEP.

In coming weeks, Chair Padgett will be meeting with divisional councils of department chairs. The meeting with Physical and Biological Sciences (PB Sci) was this morning. Chair Padgett apprised them of what CEP is currently doing with GE Reform. Attendees indicated their support for the draft proposals. The hope was raised in the PB Sci meeting that the DC requirement could be satisfied with four credits (two 2-credit upper-division labs for example). The request is too late to be considered for a change to the proposed legislation. CEP does not want to consider it as a friendly amendment at this time.

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) met yesterday. Chair Padgett shared that an offer has been made to a School of Engineering (SoE) dean candidate. The new arts division dean will be

announced after it is confirmed by the Regents. The UC Retirement Program (UCRP) is not in good shape. The Committee on Faculty Welfare is planning a forum to help faculty better understand the situation regarding UCRP. The SEC subcommittee working on faculty salaries reported to SEC that they plan to present an update at an upcoming Senate Meeting. Following up on last year's task force recommendations, SEC is likely to ask for a one-time dispersal of funds to bring salaries up for targeted faculty and will ask departments to work to change the culture of evaluating each other so that they do not unduly hold their salaries lower than is the case at other UCs, despite having the same level of accomplishments. CPEVC Kliger had previously agreed to support these salary-related recommendations. The Regents voted in support of the proposal to reform admissions criteria at UC. The Senate will need to respond with modified bylaws in light of the passing of this proposal. It appears now that there would be a significant reduction in the number of Asian Americans guaranteed admission to UC. The numbers of Latino and African-American students guaranteed admission to UC are predicted to stay about the same. Any increase in diversity is expected to come from the new group designated as Entitled to Review.

The January 7 minutes were accepted as amended.

## **II. Non-writing general education topics.**

At a recent meeting of SUA members, the following straw votes were taken. A majority was in favor of keeping creative process in the GE requirement proposal. All present were in support of service learning remaining in the choice category of proposed requirements. A majority was in favor of Core courses being allowed to satisfy more than one GE requirement. The vast majority of those present were generally supportive of the GE reform direction overall.

It was decided that the focus of today's meeting would be to finalize the GE legislation for Friday's deadline. Members received a revised draft of the legislation prior to the meeting. Members were asked to identify the topics in the draft legislation that needed further discussion. That newly created list formed the basis for discussion in this meeting.

Members expressed the need to consider the names further, including the names of the two choice categories.

CEP discussed whether to let courses carry two GE designations as long as no double counting of the designations for the same course would be allowed toward graduation requirements. A similar practice currently holds with regard to Topical courses which have been deemed appropriate pedagogically to satisfy two or more Topical requirements which any given student can only apply towards one. Those who spoke in favor of the idea of allowing multiple designations argued that this would foster interdisciplinarity without encouraging students to pick courses according to the number of GE requirements they satisfied. They mentioned that the idea may work better with ITCs than for stand-alone courses. Those who spoke against such an allowance indicated that it would be challenging to develop courses that would adequately meet two GEs designations in a ten-week term. If the purpose of GE is to ensure that students get a focused experience in these areas, the course should be designed for just one designation. To allow multiple designations even if students will only be able to count the course toward one requirement reduces simplicity and clarity, and potentially reduces breadth. Conflating of two categories could lead to incoherency. It did not make sense to some that, if a GE requirement is

intended to ensure that all students have minimum exposure to a subject or approach and a course is deemed to meet this goal for two GE requirements, how it could be said that the student had not met both requirements. CEP voted against allowing multiple designations for one course even if the course would not satisfy both GEs for the same students.

The question was considered of whether the proposed requirement currently being called Cross-Cultural (CC) should be required for all undergraduates in addition to a version of the current E requirement. Those in favor made the following points: the requirement will prepare students well for their futures outside of the University. The nature of the CC requirement is interdisciplinary. Those not in favor of the requirement spoke of concern regarding the overall number of courses to be required. If CC is added to the required list, there would be less than 5 credits fewer for some students over the current GE system. At their recent meeting, Student Union Assembly members indicated that they were in favor of having CC required for all students, even if it meant more requirements (22 voted yes, 4 voted no, 8 gave no response). CEP members were divided on whether to add this as a requirement and decided to ask the member absent today to express her thinking on the question. Members agreed to reach a conclusion on this item over email by Friday's deadline.

Next CEP discussed whether, if CC is required of all students, it should be allowed to satisfy more than one GE requirement. The idea was not supported by CEP because it was not seen as easy to determine where overlap would be appropriate, and allowing the overlap was viewed as less of a gain than the problems that might be caused by students opting for certain courses solely due to their carrying multiple designations.

CEP discussed whether Core courses should be permitted to satisfy C1 or C2 plus another GE designation. Those in favor indicated that support of this overlap will keep the required credit count lower. If it is decided that GE and Core may not overlap, the ITC idea cannot happen as envisioned. College 8 is proposing for its ITC sequence that the units of their Core course increase to 8, allowing for satisfaction of both C1 or C2 and another GE (currently Core courses also satisfy a Topical requirement). Those who spoke against allowing Core to satisfy more than one GE designation indicated that unless there are 10 credits worth of work associated with earning two GE designations, one or the other topic will get less focus than if it were a stand-alone course. The suggestion was made that a bonus GE satisfaction be given to students who complete an ITC rather than allowing this overlap for all Core courses. Another possibility would be for the overlap to be allowed only when the Core course is part of an ITC. A majority of members voted in favor of allowing overlap between Core and another GE designation.

Members decided unanimously to favor names for the requirements that are distinct from what they are now, and that the alphabet designations also be different from the present.

CEP discussed the possibility of a requirement called something like Historical Perspectives (HP) or Study of the Past (SP) which would mandatorily overlap with another GE designation, such that a course with some historic focus would satisfy another GE requirement. Harvard has a similar requirement. Those who spoke in support of the requirement stressed the importance of understanding where something comes from and that the answer to that question adds to comprehension of ideas and concepts. There are a large number of courses on campus that would satisfy this requirement. They spoke of UCSC being excessively present- or future-oriented in the curriculum. Those speaking against expressed the thinking that this would take

away from the clarity of the GE system and that topical history needs more context than any one course can provide. Also, if CEP were reopening to more options, there was a sense that members would want to discuss others before deciding in support of this one. A majority of members voted against adding this overlapping designation to the GE proposal. CEP next discussed whether HP (or SP) should be added to a choice category. Those in favor stressed the reasons expressed earlier on the importance of classes that give context from the past. Those who spoke against it indicated that there is a place for historical perspective courses in courses for majors. Again members indicated that if the choice categories were to expand they may want to discuss other possibilities before opting for this one. The initial vote was split, but those voting in favor of adding HP/SP to the list withdrew the question in order to keep the GE proposal from expanding further at this late date.

The Committee discussed whether to allow advanced lab work to count toward the Creative Process choice option. The idea was discussed and the suggestion that advanced lab work count in this area was withdrawn. CEP recognized that lab courses may be proposed under the rubric of the Collaborative Work choice option.

Members reviewed the draft legislation and voted to change Interpreting Media to Interpreting Arts and Media, and Collaborative Work to Collaborative Endeavor.

The Committee voted to submit the legislation for Friday's deadline.

### **III. Feb 18 Senate Meeting Presentations.**

Members will be provided with the Senate Meeting presentations via email for input (one for the DC legislation and one giving an update regarding the GE reform proposal).

### **IV. Concurrent enrollment topics.**

Discussion of concurrent enrollment topics was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

### **V. AAGC proposal to change Appendix C.**

CEP considered the proposal submitted by the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee (AAGC) to reduce the amount of time by which students must submit their grievances to AAGC from one year to six months. Six months was perceived as an issue for spring quarter courses because of potential challenges reaching instructors and/or department chairs during summer months. CEP will ask AAGC to consider nine months for spring courses. Six months was viewed as fine for fall, winter, and summer courses. CEP voted in support of submission of this proposed legislation for Friday's deadline after confirming AAGC's support for the above noted change.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy