

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### MINUTES

February 7, 2007

12:30-2 p.m., Kerr Hall RM 307

Present: Joel Ferguson (Provost rep), Russ Flegal, David Helmbold, Anatole Leikin, Roxanne Monnet (ASO staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF rep).

Absent: Heather Bullock, Flori Lima (SUA rep), Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions), Stacey Sketo-Rosener (Academic Preceptor).

#### I. Announcements

The Committee was reminded of the Faculty Research Lecture scheduled for Tuesday, February 13, 8 p.m. at which Geoffrey Pullum will be the honored speaker.

They were also reminded of the Teaching and Learning Symposium scheduled for the afternoon of February 15 at the University Center.

Chair Padgett apprised the group regarding the recent UCEP meeting. UCEP discussed the situation regarding tuition for non-resident graduate students. It has been agreed that funds returned to campuses which come from non-resident tuition will be marked as a line-item in the return to campuses in order to enable the campuses to return those funds to the students who paid them.

UC Provost Hum will be at UCSC tomorrow. Chair Padgett is among the UCSC Senate committee chairs who meet with him. Provost Hum's goal is to learn about the planning process within each campus.

Admission of transfer students dropped across the UC system, particularly at UCSC. There is some speculation that the budget crisis of 1994 is showing up now via the number and progress of people making their way through the community college system. Of the places that people choose to go, UCLA was the only UC in top 10. Those surveyed included only community college graduates who were moving on to another institution to complete a bachelor's degree. The survey was not restricted to those who were UC eligible. University of Phoenix was in the top 10 also. CEP members expressed concern over how access to classes may be affecting our transfer student admissions. UC has plans to better streamline the transition process into UC and toward increasing the number of articulated community college courses.

It was announced at UCEP that UCSD and UCLA are now posting grades on line.

UCEP discussed the responses received to the proposed changes to graduate student instructor (GSI) titles. There was a high response rate from both divisional and systemwide Senate

committees. A number of campuses were against disallowing graduate students to serve as instructor of record, including UCSC. That recommendation seems likely to be dropped. Some campuses do not want to change the names of the employment titles. Chair Padgett expressed UCSC's interest that a distinction not be made which would limit GSI appointments to upper-division courses more so than is the case for lower-division courses. UCEP will consider how to regroup in light of this feedback. UCEP has an interest in trying to formulate training and mentoring guidelines for GSI appointments, including what should the Senate oversight be.

UCEP discussed the differing values given by the campuses for GPA calculation of A+ grades. Most campuses use 4.0 for A+. One campus uses 4.3. This was not found to be against Senate Bylaws or Regulations.

Chair Padgett reviewed the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting for CEP. The Ranchview Terrace development project is now moving forward since all associated parties have signed on. In light of increased pressure to offer more to recruit and retain faculty because of the market, the Committee on Academic Personnel wonders if there should be a limit to the amount of off-scale salaries that can be awarded and requested SEC's feedback. SEC feels that there should be a limit but that it should be on the high end. A taskforce on faculty salaries has been created. A bonus of 4-6 percent will be added to most successful promotion actions. The amount will be weighted more to assistant professors and will be capped at Professor Step V.

**II. Minutes.** The minutes for January 24 were accepted.

**III. University Extension certificate proposal.**

Chair Padgett explained CEP's role and charge regarding University Extension, including for matters for budget-related matters. A future topic of discussion will be to consider whether or not it would be better to have a separate Committee on University Extension.

The Committee was reminded that this is the first time CEP will have reviewed certification proposals for UNEX per newly established policies and procedures may be CEP 2005-06. It was noted that there appear to be no standards for minimum amounts of course work.

CEP held its initial discussion for three proposed certification programs:

Alternative Education: This proposal seems the strongest of the three reviewed for this meeting. 30 credits are required. It was difficult to reconcile the letter against the chart. It was not clear from the document what the credit value is per course and how the 30 credit minimum is reached. The Committee would like to receive a definition of what one unit/credit is equivalent to in terms of time spent by students in and out of class—is a 3 credit UNEX course in this proposal worth 5 quarter units at UCSC?

Early Childhood Special Education: The guidelines established last year indicate that each certification program is to have a UCSC Senate member on the advisory committee. That does not appear to be the case with this proposal. As with the Alternative Education proposal, more clarity is needed regarding credit values for the coursework.

Personal Physical Fitness: The proposal is for an entirely on-line program. This raised concern for CEP that participants should be properly trained to avoid illness. One way for this to be the case would be for the internship to be required. Again it was noted that no Senate member is on the advisory committee. This certificate would require 12 credits. There is a requirement of a GPA minimum of 3.0.

Chair Padgett will write to VP of University Extension Carl Walsh regarding CEP's questions. If feedback is available, discussion will continue on these topics either via email or at next week's meeting.

#### **IV. Student Representatives to CEP**

The Committee reviewed draft legislation and a cover letter to go to the Committee on Committees (COC) requesting a change to CEP's charge regarding student representation. CEP plans to have the Senate vote on their request that the student representatives be at the undergraduate level at the March 9 Senate Meeting.

#### **V. W Topics.**

CEP discussed a draft proposal for funding the writing-intensive requirement (W). The Committee agrees that the requirement either needs to be funded or dropped.

It was made clear that the numbers in the document will be confirmed prior to the document going to the Senate. Chair Padgett let the group know that the Chair of the Writing Program Elizabeth Abrams and Carol Freeman (member of the writing program and former CEP chair) have received copies of the proposal for feedback. Members encouraged that the text in the report be strongly clear that the funding for the W requirement needs to be on-going in nature, and that it needs to be adjusted for inflation and enrollment increases.

Information received from Institutional Research, Planning, and Statistics indicated that there are 6,000 students who have satisfied the C1 and C2 requirements but not the W. CEP wants the Senate to clearly understand that CEP is talking about funding of the writing-intensive requirement and not specifically the Writing Program. They want to reinforce that this is a campuswide requirement which cannot be housed in the Writing Program as regulations are currently written.

CEP discussed the possibility of putting a Resolution before the Senate. Members feel it is important that this Resolution should contain something that is a direct call for action on the part of the Central Administration.

The group discussed whether it would be best to not to get into as much detail as is contained in the draft so as not to have the Senate Meeting conversation derailed from the bigger discussion of the need to support the requirement. It was recommended that an overall figure be listed, not connected to which category of employee it would be spent on (TAs versus lecturers vs. tutors, for example). It was noted that the majority of UCSC's students are currently having the W met

at the cost of the divisions and departments. CEP understands the need not to lead the Senate to think that the Administration could fund the current gap as well as cover the costs currently being born by departments for this requirement.

Discussion turned to what to do in the meantime such as for spring 2007. CEP is aware of its ability to modify petition expectations. Members strongly expressed the desire to either embrace the requirement or get rid of it.

Chair Padgett will discuss the draft proposal at tomorrow's Academic Advisory Committee meeting in the hopes of beginning collaborations with the Central Administration to fund the requirement. Also tomorrow, Chair Padgett will discuss the proposal at a Committee on Planning and Budget meeting to ask for help with funding elements.

## **VI. Catalog Topics.**

The catalog topics were carried forward to the next meeting due to a lack of time for discussion.

## **VII. Honors topics. Campuswide designation.**

The assigned member apprised the Committee of his research on the topic of campuswide honors designations. Until 2004 only UC Berkeley did not have campuswide honors designation. UCSC's brief attempt was suspended in 2004 after only one year (?). The least labor intensive option appears to be at UC San Diego where they have defined percentiles for the various designations. The top 14 percent receive distinctions. The top 2 percent are *summa cum laude*. The next 4 percent are *magna cum laude*. The remaining 8 percent are *cum laude*. During 2005-06 the average GPA for *summa cum laude* was 3.886.

Associate Director of Admissions McCawley shared with the group that admission survey responses indicate strongly that institutional reputation is an issue for UCSC when compared with most other UCs that undergraduates are considering. It is thought that an honor's program could help. However if it is not well done, it could make things worse from the standpoint of admissions and retention.

The discussion of Honors designations at a campuswide level will continue at a future meeting. The group was asked to read the report of the Taskforce on Honors from 2004 prior to the next meeting.

On a related topic, the UCSC Registrar indicated that the process for giving Honors at graduation is cumbersome for departments and hopes that something will be done to simplify that process. Institution of a GPA or percentile cut off, for example, would be more workable at graduation. Administering honors criteria throughout the years, such as for honor rolls, is more challenging.

Attest,

Jaye Padgett, Chair  
Committee of Educational Policy