

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**March 22, 2006  
12:15-1:45, KERR HALL RM 307**

Present: Heather Bullock, Pedro Castillo (Provosts Rep), Tim Fitzmaurice (Non-senate teaching faculty rep), Richard Hughey (Chair), Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex-officio), Roxanne Monnet (ASO staff), Jaye Padgett, John Tamkun.

Guests: Cher Bergeon (Preceptor Rep), Margie Claxton (Academic Editor), Jorge Hankamer (spring 2006 CEP member), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions), Tchad Sanger (AIS Advising Support Coordinator), Sharon Van Kirk (Academic Advising Coordinator, VPDUE Office).

Absent: Floyd Amuchie (SUA representative), Tracy Larrabee, Anatole Leikin.

**I. Announcements.**

CPB and SEC are planning to jointly sponsor a resolution to the Senate regarding the LRDP for April meeting.

Spring CEP meetings will run from April 5 through June 14, from 12:15-1:45 p.m.

**II. Minutes.** The March 15 minutes were accepted as amended.

**III. Program statement review.**

Feminist Studies: Carried forward, awaiting confirmation of divisional support.

History: The proposal to renumber courses was approved. The relevant subcommittee will consider the catalog copy specific details.

**IV. Writing Topics.**

The Committee considered a proposal for Health Sciences majors to fulfill their W requirement by successfully completing BIO 20L - Experimental Lab (2 units), BIO 130L - Human Physiology Lab (2 units), and BIO 189 - Health Science Internship (5 units).

It was decided that petitions for students who have completed these courses will be approved through summer 2006 by which time CEP expects to have longer-term recommendations for management of the W requirement.

CEP postponed further discussion on modification to 10.2.2.3 (transfer credit) until they have reached an agreement regarding guidelines for this GE designation which is planned for spring quarter 2006.

Topics for further consideration include: should this be an upper-division requirement; should it be in a discipline; and should transfer credit be considered to fulfill this requirement.

See item VI below for more writing related notes.

**V. Discussion regarding response to the May 2005 retention resolution.**

The Committee considered a list of points to be made into a report to the Senate responding to the May 2005 resolution on Retention. The Committee will provide a draft report to CPB and CAFA for consideration in April, and for submission to the Senate at its May 2006 meeting.

CEP has encouraged the administration to ask academic units to discuss retention in their external review self-studies and statistics on degrees completed.

The Committee was encouraged to provide additional feedback to Chair Hughey prior to the April 5 meeting.

**VI. Proposal for articulation of transfer credit for C1/C2 GE requirement.**

CEP clarified for Admissions that it did not intend that C1/C2 courses must be taken at UCSC, as is currently the case for the W GE requirement.

The Committee considered a proposal from Admissions related to transfer credit for writing courses. It was noted that there is no evidence that those students who take the GE requirements at UCSC consistently perform better than those who meet them through IGETCI.

The Committee was reminded that students who have entered UCSC through the IGETCI agreement have met the W requirement, unlike no other category of students per Senate regulations. This relates to about 50 percent of all incoming transfer students. IGETCI students take two writing related courses whereas regularly admitted UCSC students are required to take three. The Committee reviewed the BOARS requirement that students take two courses in writing to meet IGETCI. ENG 1A is specifically required of all. The other course must relate to composition and critical thinking. ENG 1A has a 6000 word minimum. The other allowed courses require ENG 1A as a prerequisite. Students may place above ENG 1A.

At present there is a disparity between our categories of students and transfer of writing courses. Transfer students may count courses toward GEs that regular students taking the same courses at community colleges during the summer cannot use for the same requirements. Further, transfer students who have not met IGETCI must do their W at UCSC even if they have taken the same writing courses as those who did meet IGETCI.

Points within the proposal:

All transfer students would be treated alike on the writing requirements.

Changes may be implemented within existing Senate bylaws and regulations.

Frosh, students would continue to take a core course, whether or not they have tested out of C1.

ENG 1A or higher would be allowed for the C1 and ENG IB or higher for the C2 as well as the W.

The provost rep to CEP indicated that the Council of Provosts prefers that only freshmen be held to the core course requirement. They encourage CEP to enable transfer credit for C1/C2 such that students beyond their freshman year will not need to take the core course simply to satisfy that requirement.

One distinction given to the Committee is that IGETCI exempts students from GE requirements, rather than their having satisfied them on a course to course basis. IGETCI is an all or nothing opportunity. The American Culture requirement is an exception to the IGETCI agreement because it is not described as a GE. It acts like the college core course requirement in that way.

The proposal will be modified further for future discussion by CEP.

A related topic of discussion was the present issue of managing students' Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) and C1 requirements via AIS. Students are required to take their core course during their first term at UCSC. These courses carry the C1 or C2 designations. However, students who have not satisfied the ELWR may not be granted their C1 before doing so, in accordance with systemwide Academic Senate regulations. Nonetheless, a number of students successfully pass the core course without having satisfied the ELWR. Annually ~110 students do not pass the ELWR exam upon entrance, of which about 50 percent take special core course sections to satisfy the ELWR. 80-90 percent of those students do satisfy it by the end of that first quarter.

After some discussion the Committee concluded that there is no clear way to globally address the challenge of managing this situation in AIS as it is currently programmed. The most logical thing to do appears to be to continue to manually back out the students who do not satisfy the ELWR that term and to re-add satisfaction of their C1 credit once they have.

## **VII. Discussion regarding timing of C1/C2 courses.**

Carried forward to a future agenda.

Attest,

Richard Hughey, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy