

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

February 20, 2008

Wednesday, 11:45 a.m.-1:45 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Joel Ferguson (Provost Rep), Russ Flegal, David Helmbold, Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex officio), Roxanne Monnet (ASO Staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Kip Tellez, Jack Vevea.

Absent: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Michael McCawley (Acting Director of Admissions).

I. Announcements and updates.

CEP members reviewed their several recent visits to departments to discuss general education (GE) reform. The Psychology Department will give further consideration to the creation of a special proposal identifying a series of courses already existing in the major that could satisfy the writing-intensive requirement for their students.

One department found the term “teamwork” to be corporate sounding and recommended a change in terminology to collaborative or collective work.

In these particular visits, departments gave support across the board for increased writing in the curriculum. Most supported there being a language requirement. At some of these recent visits it was suggested that CEP consider a reduction to very little or no GE requirements. Apparently many departments would like to see a reduction in the number of credits of GE that students take. The question was raised about allowing students to opt out of GE coursework in some way. A number of units think that all students should have opportunities for research experience. No department has expressed support for leadership training.

The ability to form arguments was identified as a hope to be achieved through GE Reform.

There was encouragement to do something unique and creative.

It was recommended that attempts to rectify “remedial skills” not be in GE coursework since all students must take GEs but not all need remedial level work. Another department suggested that GE coursework be used specifically to remediate poor quality K-12 experiences in order to bring students up to UC level performance, which would create the need for there to be an option to test out of these courses.

One department commented that some topics such as cultural understanding and sustainability are reasonable values that should be a natural outcome of a University experience, not topics to

be forced into courses. For example, ethics was not accepted as a course topic by departments. Faculty asked “whose ethics would we teach.”

II. Minutes. The January 16 and 23 minutes were accepted as amended.

III. Regents Task Force on Diversity Reports (Undergraduate Report).

CEP discussed the Undergraduate Work Team of the Regents’ Study Group on University Diversity and agreed that most of the report fell into the charges of other Senate committees (CPE, CAFA, and CAAD). Nonetheless, CEP considered the report and found it to be good. Discouragement as to whether the recommendations would be achieved was expressed since all recommendations would need considerable resources to establish and/or sustain. CEP will endorse the report and will comment on the resource concerns. It was noted that since UC draws from lower performing schools, the University has developed a local issue with how to support these students which needs to be addressed. CEP recommends that UC pick some things from the report and seek permanent funds for them. Even if one of the recommendations could be assured of on-going funding positive progress would be made.

A draft response will be considered at a future meeting.

IV. Dialectic on the use of Remote and Online Instruction for the Delivery of University Curriculum.

CEP considered a list of points related to online education and the need for coursework in residence. The Committee finds that the variables of modes of instruction versus course content are so extensive that specific course proposals need to be considered on a case by case basis. And that development of broad statements regarding online instruction are difficult to make and would likely be ineffective when considering the reality of the courses themselves, by and large. CEP is flexible to alternate modes of instruction but thinks that there need to be boundaries, acknowledging that there are probably areas in the curriculum that may be better delivered in an online format. Perhaps, for example, some math content (such as remedial Math 2 and/or 3) could be delivered using tried-and-true prepackaged software. It was noted that some people benefit significantly from human content. Office hours and in-person sections/labs could fill that gap for students. Online work is seen as a beneficial supplement but not an acceptable substitute for the core of the curriculum. The question was raised as to whether use of online supplements would categorize a class as only computer-assisted, rather than fully online courses.

The report asked whether online courses could be of UC Quality, CEP first considered what might be the definition of “UC Quality” and decided that they prefer the phrase “high level education.” CEP recognizes the need to distinguish UC from 3rd party online vendors in order to ensure that our students receive a high quality degree.

On the topic of a residence requirement, CEP noted the important benefit of residence to help young people develop and learn to interact with a community of scholars and peers.

A draft response will be considered at the next meeting.

V. Catalog reviews.

The Committee agreed to share initial review of catalog requests for upcoming meetings. Assignments were made to lead the discussions of the Chemistry disqualification policy request, Psychology's request for advanced placement statistics in lieu of PSYC 2, and discussion of Politics' catalog copy request.

STEM Minor: CEP discussed the proposal for a Minor in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). This second Minor in the Department of Education would build off of the content of courses offered with the support of CalTeach in addition to existing courses in the Education Department. CalTeach is administered under the umbrella of the Physical and Biological Sciences (PB Sci) Division where its funding resides. Calteach Director Gretchen Andreasen has been working with the Education Department and its undergraduate curriculum committee. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Alison Galloway suggested to CEP that they get a letter of commitment for funding of the courses needed for this Minor proposal. A letter from the Dean of PB Sci endorsing the new Minor was included with the proposal. There is some danger that the money for CalTeach would dry up within couple of years across the UC system. On the flip side, if UCSC does not do something to aid UCSC's reaching the goal of student numbers, that could also result in the loss of funding to UCSC. If the Calteach funding were discontinued, the financial implications for the Education Department would be that they could not pay the teachers to work in the schools as discussed in the proposal. It would also result in a workload increase to the Education Department in order to place people in school and oversee their training, etc.

The proposal requires 15 upper-division (UD) credits, which would necessitate an exception to Senate Regulation related to the minimum UD credits for Minors being 25. CEP wonders whether EDUC 92A/B/C could easily be changed to UD courses. CEP decided to table this discussion until they could consider the history that lead to the existing Education Minor having less than the required UD credits.

GISES Minor: VPAA Galloway asked funding questions of the division and department prior to forwarding the Minor proposal to the Senate for consideration. Both VPAA Galloway and CEP are satisfied with the responses to those questions.

SOCY 30 A/B/C (3 credits each) currently have identical catalog statements. Changes to the text that spell out their distinct content have been submitted. In the draft response, CEP will assume that the repeatable status of these courses will not be approved. CEP will ask the department to specify the learning outcomes of these courses and to clarify who approves the UD curriculum.

The proposed title for this Minor created certain expectations for some members who asked whether there is a mismatch between the announced goals and name. The name implies more technology. Some members would like the title and content to correlate better.

A draft letter will be circulated for feedback via email.

VI. GE Reform: disciplinary communication.

In the recent GE Reform meetings with departments, some objection was raised to the Disciplinary Communication (DC) idea. Faculty do not support any reduction in writing for students. CEP hopes that faculty will agree that the amount and kind of writing may appropriately differ discipline by discipline, underscoring the importance of the Faculty determining the goals and approaches for their students. Faculty expressed concern that the C1 and C2 requirements are not working to prepare students for upper-division writing. They want students be good writers before they come to take their W course.

CEP considered a draft template for use by departments to develop proposals for DC/writing-intensive requirement satisfaction by their students based on courses students already take toward the major. A member expressed the thinking that the satisfaction of the DC requirement through a series of courses will not fit for all departments, and that some units will better achieve a DC requirement through a specific additional course. The example was given of the accreditation requirements for Engineering. Nonetheless there was unanimous support for the template as an approach for encouraging departments to make proposals for their Majors to satisfied a DC requirement.

The Committee discussed whether different questions related to GE courses should be asked on student evaluations, such as whether the GE criteria of the course were met. Evaluation of courses as a way of maintaining GE expectations will be an important part of enacting changes that would come out of GE Reform.

Members were asked to make an attempt to use the DC template for their discipline and to give their feedback to Chair Padgett. This request is viewed as a working exercise, not intended to create actual proposals for those departments (proposals must be vet through the affected departments and their divisional deans).

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy