

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 15, 2006  
12:15-1:45, KERR HALL RM 307**

Present: Heather Bullock, Pedro Castillo (Provosts Rep), Richard Hughey (Chair), Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex-officio), Tracy Larrabee, Anatole Leikin, Roxanne Monnet (ASO staff), Jaye Padgett, John Tamkun.

Guests: Cher Bergeon (Preceptor Rep), Margie Claxton (Academic Editor), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF rep *pro tem*), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions).

Absent: Floyd Amuchie (SUA representative), Tim Fitzmaurice (Non-senate teaching faculty rep).

**I. Announcements and updates.**

CAFA is considering soliciting co-sponsorship of a resolution regarding Regents Scholarship Funding [now deferred]. CPB is considering a letter to the Administration requesting that an honor's program be designed by September 1. Chair Hughey will discuss with CPB and CAFA.

In the coming weeks, CEP will consider the 5 year divisional responses of the 10 year plans. Subcommittees were formed to lead the discussions over the next three weeks. The full committee was asked to read each plan, giving more in-depth consideration to the 2-3 divisional subcommittees to which they were assigned particularly as relates to undergraduate connections.

**II. Academic Program Review Procedures  
And Approval guidelines for concentrations and intensive majors**

The Committee discussed a letter to the VPAA, the Senate Chair, and the Chair of CPB responding to the VPAA letter regarding academic program review, and a definitions document regarding undergraduate programs at UCSC.

Concerns and comments of note that arose during the conversation:

Are departments getting the materials and data that they need well in advance of preparing self-studies?

Can one evaluate the efficiency of departmental management of resources toward their undergraduate degree programs? It is CEPs desire that at the end of the review, departments understand how good a job they have been doing with managing their resources in comparison to other like UC departments.

Are either the departments or divisions reviewing curricular balance of general education offerings in comparison to the needs of the students?

CEP would like to have departments asked how they mentor new faculty regarding curriculum available, options, and student degree requirements.

CEP would like to see departments discuss the quality of their course offerings.

The Committee supports the draft letter and definitions document with minor modifications.

The Committee also discussed how areas of study should be listed in the general catalog. The current thinking is to have the lists of associated faculty formatted differently from that of departments and programs. Additionally, these would be removed from the list of degree programs toward the front of the general catalog.

### **III. On-line courses**

A draft letter regarding the Hamlet course was considered. The Committee decided to adopt a policy similar to that of UCSD, whereby online courses must have in-person final examinations or some other means of assuring individual work.

### **IV. GE subcommittee draft proposal – John Isbister, John Tamkun**

Professor John Isbister visited the Committee to introduce the GE subcommittee proposal for which he has been serving as a consultant. He briefly reviewed the 1998-99 proposal and, more in-depth, the elements of the new proposal.

The proposal has 3 separable sections.

Section A: Three general education options. The first option is the present requirement. The second, clusters, has less breadth but more depth in that student take 5 course in a program other than their major. Clusters could be sponsored by departments, programs, divisions, inter-departmental, inter-division (with lead division designated). Option 3, Foreign Language, is a cluster consisting of depth in one language over a minimum of 5 courses. (The language requirement of many universities is one year, insufficient for gaining useful proficiency) .

Section B: General Education Designations

Introduce G (for general education) to replace the categories of Introduction to the Discipline (I), Topical (T), and Arts (A). Possibly eliminate double counting (with the exception of W and Q), and reduce the total number of requirements.

Section C: Oversight of General Education

A subcommittee of CEP is suggested to oversee general education, including requirement structure, assessment of requirements, and review of courses.

Comments of note:

Elimination of T and I would eliminate some of the present confusion of students and faculty.

The Cluster idea may reduce requests for individual majors.

If the proposal were implemented incrementally, it could lead to significant confusion in the area of catalog rights.

Foreign language requirement. Are language courses in the same language sufficiently broad for general education?

Clusters may be best when inter-divisional.

Attest:

Richard Hughey, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy