

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES

April 25, 2007

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

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

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

I. Announcements.

Chair Padgett confirmed that any double counting for computer engineering degrees was approved by CEP prior to its getting into the catalog, per CEP's normal catalog review process.

Additional spring quarter subcommittee assignments were confirmed as follows:

Writing and Disciplinary Communication: Padgett (chair), Helmbold, Parmeter
Honors – Leiken, Hunt-Carter (possible consultation with a past member of the honor's committee such as David Jones, possible cross committee consultation with CAFA Chair Tamkun, possible consultation with VPDUE Ladusaw).
Academic Integrity – Flegal (Chair), Ferguson, Padgett
GE Course articulation – Bullock (Chair), Nygaard. McCawley will consult with the subcommittee and coordinate the meetings.

The Committee confirmed its support to modify the UNEX portion of its charge for the upcoming Senate Meeting.

II. Minutes. The minutes from April 4 were accepted as amended.

III. Disciplinary Communication Requirement.

A draft letter to department chairs was discussed. CEP considered future actions and timing. It was decided to send the letter now with a fall response deadline. CEP will consider a legislative modification regarding "writing and disciplinary communication" for the fall 2007 meeting. The Committee supports Chair Padgett to begin meeting with select departments regarding writing-intensive options that would be best for their majors and to see whether they would be willing to participate in a pilot program. The Committee will discuss possible ways to fund the pilot when it meets with the chair of the Committee on Planning and Budget Susie Gillman on May 9.

For the May 30 Senate Meeting, the Committee intends to submit a brief written report to update the Senate on its ongoing efforts on these matters.

IV. C2 discussion continued.

It remains unclear as to whether or not the language of SCR 6.2.2 would need to be revised to enable students to enroll for 7th quarter courses who had not fulfilled their C2 requirement and to later back those students out of their fall course enrollment if they had not fulfilled the C2 by the end of the summer. CEP discussed whether to allow students to enroll during their priority enrollment period.

One idea was for a “soft hold” to be placed on student accounts in winter to force students to get advising. In this way the majority of the students would be enrolled in C2 during spring quarter, assuming there were no capacity issues. If students take and pass C2 during spring quarter, they would be able to enroll for fall courses by mid-June. A soft hold to force advising would probably benefit the students who fail their Core course and the first attempt at C1. If those students do not get enrolled in the Core course again or fail Core a second time, they will be too late to satisfy the C2 requirement and enroll for the 7th quarter during their priority enrollment period.

An issue was raised about potential complications for students who go on Education Abroad without having satisfied the C2 requirements.

Chair Padgett will work with Academic Preceptor Sketo-Rosener and Advising Coordinator Lynne Wolcott to form a proposal for CEP feedback.

V. Honors topics.

CEP continued its discussion regarding the charge for the honors subcommittee.

Some members expressed that they would like departments to make independent decisions with only a few points to consider for consistency, and that they did not like the idea of firm statistical cut offs enforced by CEP. It was suggested that if more uniformity is desired, a percentage based cut-off could be recommended, rather than GPA based.

CEP wants to continue discussing the following honors topics: Latin honors designations for campuswide honors; Dean’s & Chancellor’s Lists (in the past these were based on a qualifying GPA for one quarter to be on the Dean’s List and for three quarters to be on the Chancellor’s List); and whether there should be University honors distinct from College honors or whether the two should be the same.

The Committee was made aware that should they decide that they want to enforce firm expectations for honors rather than suggested guidelines (not enforced), a legislative modification would be needed per systemwide Bylaws.

The discussion of honors topics will continue at a future meeting.

VI. Medical Notes.

The topic was carried forward due to a lack of time.

Attest,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee of Educational Policy