

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

November 22, 2006
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), Jaye Padgett (Chair), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF rep).

Absent: Loisa Nygaard.

Guests: Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions), Stacey Sketo-Rosener (academic preceptor).

I. Announcements.

Chair Padgett relayed the outcomes of the CEP topics from the November 17 Senate Meeting to the Committee. The SCR 10.2.2.3 legislation modification related to transfer credit for Topical GE designation courses passed. Committee members who attended agreed that the oral report on general education reform went very well.

The Committee briefly discussed what to look for when considering the writing requirements of other campuses. Chair Padgett will provide the members with a list of the points discussed.

The group was reminded that CEP will hold its last meeting of the quarter on December 6.

II. Minutes. The November 8 minutes were accepted as amended.

III. External review discussions:

Electrical Engineering: CEP continued its discussion regarding the Electrical Engineering external review. The Committee found the undergrad curriculum to have a number of interesting and successful elements. CEP noted the high number of required courses and wonders how many of these are required for accreditation purposes in electrical engineering. Concern was expressed regarding the lack of time for students to take electives outside their major. A draft letter will be circulated to the Committee early next week.

Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology: A handout of points was considered regarding the MCD Biology external review. The Committee expressed appreciation for the very detailed and data-rich self-study that MCD Biology prepared. The lack of discussion during the review regarding the general BA and BS in biology was noted. In its letter CEP will raise the point that all of the biology undergraduate degree programs need to be reviewed as part of the MCD external review or when Ecology and Evolutionary Biology is reviewed. CEP discussed the points raised with regard to the BMB major. The Committee will recommend that the Chemistry Department and MCD Biology work with their divisional dean regarding what would be the best outcome for this degree. CEP thinks that streamlining makes sense due to the high-level of duplication between this and the MCD degree. Regarding the health sciences major, the Committee finds it to be a successful degree option as it

currently stands. However, they also understand the importance of having places for students to go who have an interest in biology and would be best suited or more interested in a less rigorous science degree. A BA in health sciences would be one idea to consider. Concerns were expressed regarding MCD's retention rate of undergraduates. CEP wonders how enrollments are faring at the upper-division level. Is this the point at which retention becomes an issue? A draft letter will be made available early next week for discussion at the November 29 meeting.

V. UCEP proposal regarding Graduate Student Instructors (GSI) and local streamlining options.

Chair Padgett reminded the Committee of the current situation with GSIs at UCSC and the details of the UCEP proposal. The proposed Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) title is very much like our Teaching Assistant is now. Although the position description for the Graduate Teaching Fellow (GTF) remains unchanged, a number of changes to its use are being proposed. According to the proposal, all appointees must be advanced to candidacy, GTFs would not be instructors of record, a distinction would not be made between upper-division and lower-division courses, GTFs would not be used for the larger enrollment courses, and campuses would not have more than 10 percent of their curriculum taught by GTFs.

CEP agrees that there should not be a distinction between upper and lower division. They would like to give department chairs the flexibility to use graduate student instructors for any course. They do not support the suggestion that GTFs should not be instructors of record. They agree that there should be a limit on the percent of the curriculum taught by non-Senate faculty but did not specify an amount.

CEP thinks that there should be a salary range for the GTF rather than a flat stipend in order to allow units the flexibility to work around such things as differing research salaries which can cause challenges in finding the best match of graduate instructor to particular courses or to enable recognition for the more advanced teachers.

The Committee thinks that the level of faculty supervision should not vary among the titles.

A draft response to the UCEP proposal will be prepared for consideration at next week's meeting.

Draft revisions to our local GSI procedures and practices were considered. A cover letter was reviewed and approved for circulation to departments and divisions within the next couple of weeks for a response by the end of January 2007.

VI. Retention task force.

Discussion regarding a draft charge for a task force on retention will be carried forward to a future agenda due to lack of time.

Attest,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy