

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

**October 25, 2006
12:30-2 p.m., Kerr Hall RM 307**

Present: Joel Ferguson (Provost rep), 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).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Stacey Sketo-Rosener (academic preceptor).

Absent: Heather Bullock, Russ Flegal.

I. Announcements.

Chair Padgett reviewed for the Committee the topics of discussion at the most recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting. The Academic Senate (systemwide) was asked to give an opinion regarding funding associated with the tobacco industry. In response, the Academic Senate passed three associated Resolutions. The recent visit of the UC Regents to UCSC and associated protests were discussed at SEC, who is considering a written response regarding the handling of the situation. The upcoming military recruitment and preparedness for another demonstration was discussed. Support was expressed for the need to create appropriate venues for expression of alternative views. On November 7 there will be a Senate Orientation for all committee members. Members are strongly encouraged to attend. Graduate student growth is the primary topic for the meeting. It will occur at 2:30 p.m. in the Alumni Room at the University Center, with a reception to follow. The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) conducted a survey and prepared a draft report in light of their survey. The report has not yet been submitted to the Senate. Senate Chair Crosby plans to ask last year's committee to make revisions to their draft report, in order for it to be made available. CPEVC David Klinger has agreed to provide support for analysis of the data collected from CAAD's survey.

CEP has been approached by a graduate student regarding the possibility of being a student representative on the Committee. Members expressed their thinking that the two spaces on CEP for students are intended for undergraduates, given CEP's charge and the history of these appointments. A draft justification will be prepared to go to CRJE requesting a confirming change to clarify that the student representatives to CEP are to be undergraduates.

II. Minutes. The October 4 minutes were accepted as amended.

III. Course to course transfer for topical courses.

Concern was expressed over the workload needed to create the articulation database on the needed timeline, should this legislation pass. CEP would need to assist the Admissions

Articulation Officer in creating the guidelines for the course to course articulation of courses for which students would receive the Topical GE designation. The impact to departments is thought to be relatively minor. Articulating Topical courses will create workload with respect to implementation in AIS and processing in admissions.

Catalog Rights creates a bit of a phase-in period, in that students may keep to the catalog under which they were admitted.

With the addition to the text that this change will affect roughly 500 students, CEP supports the draft legislation which is on the agenda for the November 17 Senate Meeting.

IV. External reviews.

Chair Padgett reviewed for the group the Universal Charge and explained that it is not required that the CEP formally respond with recommendations to modify the Charge. To make its decision as to whether or not to respond, the Committee reviews the current and last self studies, as well as the previous review and the responses to that review.

The designated subcommittee led the discussion regarding the charge for Community Studies.

For the previous review, documentation mentioned student complaints that Community Studies courses 100 and 102 had little relevance to their field studies experience. Since that review a questionnaire was completed by Community Studies majors. Questions regarding the field study experience were not included in the questionnaire.

The group noted the absence of lower-division prerequisites for the 100 series. CEP wonders whether majors are well prepared for the 100 series, in light of these courses having no prerequisites. Are the elective courses and campus general education courses that students take prior to the 100 series courses sufficient preparation? The self-study notes that modifications were made to the preparatory courses. CEP wonders whether these changes have been effective as far as preparation for the field study. Given that Community Studies has collapsed the writing-intensive requirement with their capstone, does the department find the students to be adequately prepared for the capstone?

A draft response will be prepared and circulated to the Committee for input.

V. Campus academic plan response.

CEP continued its discussion regarding the draft campus academic plan.

The Committee would like the plan themes to build on what UCSC is already known for. The comment was made that the themes of the colleges should be worked in with campuswide themes.

The document builds around divisional plans and lacks comment regarding what the campus overall will be doing with regard to the goals expressed in the document. For example, what will

the campus do toward such priorities as general education, languages, TA training, and writing?

The first consideration is "who is the audience for this plan, and what is its purpose?" The Campus Academic Plan should frankly show where we are now--faculty, UG enrollment and majors, Graduate majors, and graduates by division--then show the campus goal in these areas at the end of the planning period. The document may tell "which turns to take" but does not clearly state where we are, where we are going, and what the "there" is that we are striving toward.

CEP acknowledges that a plan is given for distribution of the limited faculty positions between Deans and that the plan provides a framework for why those choices were made based on an outline of a vision for the future of the campus. It was expressed that the plan is almost entirely about where to put faculty FTE and does not discuss how to employ these individuals toward the curriculum overall. The thinking of the group is that the plan should show how each hire that is allocated to the division fits into UCSC's plan to be excellent. It should clearly show milestones that need to be met, or faculty positions will need to be reconsidered. The plan should answer the questions of why we are adding faculty in the areas mentioned in the plan and how these hires tie into the goals stated overall. CEP could like for the VPAA to encourage the divisions to communicate their thinking on these connections.

The document is focused on graduate level research. Resources by way of faculty FTE appear particularly directed to the graduate level. How does the campus intend to maintain undergrad programs (financially) with such a strong focus on graduate-level education? The rising trend in capping of courses and majors, coupled with the impact caused to admissions and retention greatly concerns CEP. The lack of available class seats to keep GEs is a significant issue for CEP this year.

If the document is to be more than an allocation of resources with minimal justification, then more could be done to improve the plan. If it is meant to be a plan for excellence and if its audience is the campus community, then it needs to present our current position, where the plan hopes to take us, and how it expects to take us there.

CEP would like the Administration to assess our current strengths, weaknesses, and near-term pitfalls so that we can build upon or around the strengths, shore up the weaknesses and avoid the pitfalls. Our current strengths can be exploited to build other strengths, which is how most new highly regarded programs at other schools came into being.

Taking the necessary time to do this planning well will delay the implementation of the plan, but if it can generate a vision for the campus and get more people to work to reach our goals CEP feels that it is worth the wait.

VI. Reserve seating.

Registrar Hunt-Carter and Associate Registrar Claxton provided feedback related to the fall 2006 pilot Reserve Seating Program. The group was given an explanation of how "gating" differs from reserve seating. Gating allows for a certain number of seats to be held back and later released, but it cannot hold the newly available seats for a particular contingent of students.

The message that students received when they were unable to enroll in classes during this pilot caused an increase in complaints to the course sponsoring units.

For the pilot to be run again, it would be best to find more units willing to be involved so that the pilot results may engender additional feedback to build on what was received this term. The Registrar will consider how CEP may assist further with this opportunity.

VII. GE at the Senate Meeting.

Chair Padgett will ask for some help from members in getting together a power point presentation for the Nov 17 Senate Meeting. The idea is for something akin to CEP's discussion on general education reform at its October 4 meeting.

Attest,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy