

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

November 29, 2006  
12:30-2 p.m., Kerr Hall RM 307

Present: Heather Bullock, 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).

Absent: Joel Ferguson (Provost rep), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF rep).

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

**I. Announcements.**

CEP will meet on December 6 at its usual time.

Chair Padgett handed out a list of possible topics for members to consider when researching writing requirements at other campuses. The addition of an evaluation question was recommended, such as “Do you have any metrics or comments regarding the success of your program?”. If members call other campuses, they were encouraged to ask for the person’s perception of whether or not the requirement is successful in its goal, such as “In your opinion is the requirement achieving its objectives and is it sustainable?”. It was suggested that a preamble be added to the document to aid the members in making their phone calls. The group would like to add a question regarding the timing when the requirement tends to be fulfilled by their students. The Chair will revise and circulate the questions by email.

**II. Minutes.** The November 15 minutes were accepted.

**III. Draft Academic Plan.**

The Committee discussed what to include in their response to the Draft Strategic Academic Plan. Suggested topics included:

Vision: What is the undergraduate mission? Is there a shift from the “uncommon commitment” expressed by past campus leadership since commitment to excellence in teaching and the undergraduate curriculum is not significantly discussed in the plan?

There appears to be no connection between where we have undergraduate strengths, where the enrollments are, and where they are planning to put faculty FTE. There is a disconnect between where we can predict enrollment growth and where the FTE would

go according to this plan. The planned areas for divisional growth do not match were student growth can be predicted.

The Committee discussed capacity issues in relation to retention, honors, FTE allocation. Is the plan realistic enough regarding where we are now? The group noted that it is getting more difficult for freshpersons to get into courses. CEP wonders what resource support can be given to accommodate the needs of first-year students and whether we have adequate classroom space for the larger courses. The plan should address existing problems such as classes for first-years, and how student to faculty ratio funds are being spent (are they used to solve these problems).

Regarding principle #4 CEP wonders how impact is defined? What criterion is to be used? Numbers 2 and 4 are not necessarily very distinct.

Members were asked to look at their home division's section of the plan in order to answer the following questions: Do you think that the plan capitalizes on the strengths of your division (what are the strengths); what do you think of your division's inter-disciplinary themes (are they plausible); are they promising (good for research and educationally interesting). Finally, what do you want the letter to say? Their feedback will be discussed at the next meeting.

#### **IV. GSI response to UCEP letter.**

The Committee reviewed the current draft response to UCEP. With minor modification, the letter was deemed ready for sending to the Senate Chair.

#### **V. Biomedical Engineering B.S. Proposal.**

CEP considered the response by the School of Engineering to the Committee on Planning and Budget's questions. Issues that may create bottlenecks for students were discussed. There remains concern about availability of physical and biological sciences courses. Additionally, the lack of a host department raised concern. SOE has a centralized undergraduate advising office which may diminish the issues around the lack of a home department. The charter seems to address faculty involvement quite well. It was noted by a member that UC Davis has a number of degrees without home departments. One issue for them is faculty affinity to their department rather than the degree program. Is mentoring by faculty an issue for students without home departments? There are very few new course needs for this proposed degree and no faculty needs specific to this proposal.

This degree may require that some students take significantly in excess of 180 units. There is no known obligation for CEP to approve only degrees that can be done within four years. The Committee will consider a question regarding particular concerns over the numbers of requirements. CEP was apprised that CAFA is the body to approve any requests for financial aid for students who would exceed 15 quarters.

It was pointed out that students who do not pass ELWR will have issues with the first winter quarter of the proposed degree program. However, these students could catch up by making use of summer term.

CEP approves the proposed BS degree program, contingent on a COE providing a plan for those who do not pass the ELWR by the end of fall quarter and those who do not test initially to the level of math stated in the plan.

As a future task, CEP needs to evaluate the number of requirements that should be the campus limit, and how to coach students on getting through the more intensive programs. Providing multiple plans in the catalog may prove beneficial for some areas.

## **VI. External Review discussion.**

Art: A draft letter of response to the Art Department's external review was considered. The Committee had questions regarding what the department means by a plan to limit majors and wonders how they would plan to implement it. The revised letter will be circulated via email.

MCD Biology: The Committee discussed a draft letter of response to the Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology Department's external review. Some suggestions and revisions were recommended. The revised letter will be circulated via email and sent within one week.

Electrical Engineering: Another draft of the response to the Electrical Engineering Department external review was discussed. Modifications were recommended. The revised letter will be circulated via email and sent within one week.

## **VII. Retention taskforce.**

The topic was carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

Attest,

Jaye Padgett, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy