

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### MINUTES

April 4, 2007

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

Present: Heather Bullock, Joel Ferguson (Provost rep), Russ Flegal (present 12:30-1 p.m.), David Helmbold, Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Anatole Leikin, Roxanne Monnet (ASO staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF rep), George Zhang (SUA Rep).

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

#### **Executive session 12:30-12:40 p.m.**

The Committee voted to re-extend standing invitations to Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions), and Stacey Sketo-Rosener (Academic Preceptor) for spring quarter 2007.

CEP discussed a possible legislative modification to its charge regarding budgetary oversight to UCSC University Extension (UNEX). Since the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) looks at UNEX as it does for all other elements of UCSC's budget, CEP would support leaving the financial aspects to them. A draft legislative change will be considered at a future meeting.

The Executive Committee updated one another regarding the status of the topics they were assigned early in 2007. The Committee will strive to complete as many of the following topics as is possible during this quarter: resolution of the writing-intensive (W) course capacity issue, academic integrity, honors, pandemic planning, and medical notes. The Committee supports holding to the catalog deadlines in order to complete some of these topics.

Regarding the topic of GE reform, the members speculated that the W requirement will need to be the lead focus for the balance of this year. Their thinking is that if this part gets resolved the rest of GE reform may be easier.

Course capacity overall was noted as a future topic for CEP. One member expressed that students who need to switch courses at the beginning of the quarter find a serious lack of open courses. The Registrar indicated that the new (upcoming) version of AIS will aid students in projecting what courses to take into future quarters and years. This could aid units in planning curriculum. However, for it to work, multi-year curricular planning is necessary at the level of course sponsoring unit.

#### **I. Announcements and updates.**

The above mentioned guests were re-invited. The executive session was reviewed for the full group. All present were invited to add to the list of important topics for CEP for this quarter.

The Committee was reminded that guidelines for GE course articulation have not been updated in approximately 20 years. The upcoming review of topical courses for articulation is viewed as an opportunity for review of the other GE articulation parameters as well.

New SUA representative George Zhang was introduced to the group.

Chair Padgett discussed a point regarding the posthumous certificate guideline language approved by CEP at a meeting last quarter to see if clarification was needed. The language says that a student must have enrolled in at least one quarter. The members were asked if they meant that a quarter at UCSC needed to be completed for certificate consideration. CEP decided that they would like to leave the language as it stands, and consider exceptions for those who are in their first quarter on a case by case basis.

The recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting was reviewed for the group by Chair Padgett. Late in spring term there will be a forum regarding the proposed school of management. The proposed school of management is envisioned to be located in the Silicon Valley and may not benefit on-campus undergraduate programs. Concern was raised at SEC regarding possible financial draws from the core campus for this school.

SEC asked Chair Padgett to propose to the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) that AAC (with CEP Chair Padgett and other appropriate invitees attending) serve in lieu of a task force on retention as raised in the May 2006 Senate Resolution. CEP members support this approach.

Representatives from the Board of Admissions and Relations to Schools (BOARS) will be here on April 13 to introduce new ideas regarding admissions. Chair Padgett will be out of town and asked for a member to represent CEP during the lunch (12:30-1:30 p.m. at the University Center). Member Bullock will attend as CEP's representative.

The search committee for UCSC's next Chancellor has been staffed. UC President Dynes will visit UCSC on April 9. Chair Padgett and other Senate chairs will have the opportunity to meet with him. CEP members were invited to give input to Chair Padgett for this meeting.

Chair Padgett conveyed information on three topics based on a recent UCEP meeting:

1. Funding to UC from Tobacco Companies was discussed. The Assembly is divided on this issue.
2. There is still discussion at the systemwide level on the topic of UC faculty salaries compared to those of our comparison institutions. Much of the discussion centers on which benefits should be included in any comparison, and how they should be counted. The topic is under debate by the systemwide Committee on Faculty Welfare and UCOP.
3. The University Committee on Preparatory Education is proposing again this year to amend the Entry-Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) class limit to 20 students. Some campus representatives to UCEP do not support the proposal because it is an unfunded mandate. Consideration of the proposal will continue.

Merrill College will no longer use the Z grade option to motivate students to continue from course Merrill 80X in the fall to Merrill 80Y in the spring.

**II. Minutes.** The minutes for February 28 and March 7 were accepted as amended.

**III. Detailed calendar.**

The Committee reviewed the proposed UCSC academic calendar. A member asked why UCSC does not begin on Monday, January 7, 2008, in order to improve the dates toward the end of the quarter. Colleges are concerned that students would not come to a Friday orientation and that they would miss other opportunities to be prepared for winter quarter. The proposed calendar allows for a class on Monday during finals week which was viewed as an improvement, due to the two Monday holidays during winter quarter. It was noted that there are no days between the end of classes and the beginning of finals.

With regard to the Request for Non-Release of Public Information deadline, the Registrar noted having learned that this information is now drawn nightly from the data source and is not as tied to the academic calendar deadlines as it was in the past.

CEP approved the proposed calendar, with the knowledge that UCSC will not be in sync with the systemwide Common Calendar with regard to winter quarter start date in particular.

**IV. Transfer course articulation update.**

The Committee discussed the handouts provided by Associate Director of Admissions Michael McCawley. The group assigned to consider guidelines for Topical course articulation found it difficult to look at just this one aspect of GE articulation without looking at all of the GE guidelines. It was noted that one handout, dated 2005, is an Admissions document, building off the 1985 CEP guidelines for GE articulation (the Committee's last comprehensive review). For review of Topical courses in particular, some courses will move from the "I" list to the "T" list. Chair Padgett will draft guidelines for Topical course articulation for the articulation group to consider. CEP hopes that articulating of topical courses will begin this year. For 2007-09, Admissions proposes to continue looking at units that students bring in and only deal with course to course articulation if the student requests that it be done. The idea behind this is to not confuse people around catalog rights. If the student requests review for course articulation, they must pick either units or articulation, not a hybrid of the two. CEP supports this plan for admissions consideration of transfer credit toward satisfaction of the Topical requirements. It was noted that some amount of petitioning to CEP will undoubtedly occur.

A CEP subcommittee was formed to work with Associate Director McCawley, Articulation Officer Love, and Preceptor Sketo-Rosener to review articulation for all GEs. Associate Director McCawley will facilitate the meetings of this group.

It was noted that the timeline listed in the original document will move back by one month. Given the timeline, articulation can not be automatic for courses taken this summer. Students

can, of course, petition to CEP. Chair Padgett will work with Articulation Officer Love regarding what he is currently looking for with regard to Topical substitutions as a starting point for the review of courses for Topical requirement articulation.

#### **V. Writing-intensive topics.**

The Committee discussed the recommendations made by CEP in its oral report to the Senate and next steps. The recommendations are:

1. Reformulate W as a requirement that students learn to write according to the conventions of their own academic field
2. Broaden W to a “Disciplinary Communications” requirement encompassing not only writing but other forms of communication
3. Provide TAS funds to targeted departments or divisions where the need for W support is greatest
4. Restore the Peer Writing Assistant Program
5. Provide FTE for professional writing instructors to support writing in the disciplines

CEP believes that numbers 1 and 2 are clear conceptually and will require a change in regulations.

Number 3 needs more shape before implementation plans can be considered. Chair Padgett will offer to meet with representatives of certain departments and divisions. The group agreed that discussion of the resources would most likely need to occur in tandem with meetings with departments and divisions regarding what they want for their majors, whether this is happening already, and what would be needed to achieve their vision of what their majors should have in the way of writing or disciplinary communication—assuming it is not already happening in the opinion of that department.

CEP discussed the possibility of a pilot program. Discussion points including how to staff the pilot, pros and cons of targeting those departments not currently meeting the needs for a significant number of their majors, the lack of incentives for departments and faculty to take on this issue, the meshing of CEP’s role (pedagogy) and CPB’s (financial) to work toward bringing the Resolution to fruition, disciplinary/divisional courses rather than department sponsored courses, multiple course sequences.

A handout was provided with a timeline on how to move forward on the topic in light of deadlines for the May 30 Senate meeting. Chair Padgett will consult with CPB at its May 3 meeting. CPB Chair Gillman has been invited to attend CEP on May 9. The Legislation deadline is May 10. The agenda deadline is May 15. Divisional deans have been invited to a portion of CEP’s May 16 meeting.

The Committee supports Chair Padgett's offer to meet with departments and divisions on this subject, and to develop specific ideas for plans.

**VI. Catalog Topics.**

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

Attest,

Jaye Padgett, Chair  
Committee of Educational Policy