

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

April 9, 2008

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

Present: Larissa Adams, Jamal Atiba (SUA 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: Joel Ferguson (Provost Rep).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE).

I. Announcements and updates.

Member Russ Flegal attended the UCEP meeting in lieu of Chair Padgett. He reported on the meeting. California State's budget deficit has increased to ~\$20B. Nonetheless, faculty salaries and graduate student support remain high priorities for UCOP. UCEP gave support to the paper related to on-line instruction. Most UC campuses had little to say regarding the BOARS proposal to modify admissions eligibility for frosh. Only UCSC and UCB spoke against the proposal. Other topics of discussion included issues regarding hiring procedure for the recently hired UC President, an update on common course numbering at community colleges, formation of an undergraduate planning group, development of a mission statement for undergraduate education in UC. The Graduate Student Instructor policies and legislation were discussed but no further changes were proposed. UCEP considered the proposals for a School of Public Health at UC Davis and for a School of Medicine at UC Riverside. Some UCEP members indicated that not enough funding was requested in the proposals to get the programs going.

II. Minutes. The February 27 minutes were accepted as amended.

III. Draft Legislation for SCR 10.4.

CEP discussed another draft of the proposed change to SCR 10.4 that would require a minimum number of upper-division credits for Majors and provide an allowance for overlapping coursework. With minor text edits, the Committee decided that the legislation is ready to submit.

IV. BOARS revised proposal.

The Committee reaffirmed that the revised BOARS proposal to modify admissions eligibility was overly long and redundant in some places and that some significant points appear rather late in the large document. The amount of time for review of such a detailed document was found to be wholly insufficient for a document of this size and complexity. Nonetheless, CEP recognized BOARS' attempt to answer committee questions and to turn the document around fast enough to get a decision in the current academic year.

Concern regarding costs was raised again this week, such as for remedial needs. In the proposal remedial needs were noted as unknown. Also, UCSC does not have a line item funding source for the cost of processing applications. It is not a certainty that the additional costs will be covered without reductions elsewhere. The proposal did not reassure CEP that there will not be workload implications at the campuses. If the applicant pool increases significantly it is going to affect Admissions workload. UCSC has no budget for extra readers whereas UCB hires many people for this purpose. According to Acting Director Michael McCawley, BOARS some years ago said that campuses need to make sure no one is denied without a thorough review. It is not clear that workload for this review is accounted for in this proposal. All applications denied admission are looked at individually before the decision is issued, including transfers.

CEP does not think that the proposal will help the public to better understand how UC makes admissions decisions. The proposal may have the opposite affect. The information is likely to be extremely confusing for counselors to weed through when attempting to coach students. Concern was expressed as to whether UC will be able to make clear to the legislature how it determines the top 12.5 percent of California's students.

CEP continues to support that SAT II subject tests be dropped as requirements since they are not required in order to predict which students will succeed in UC.

The chart on page 37 of the proposal was not understandable given other information received by Admissions which indicated that nearly all schools do offer A-G courses. The information may be more understandable if it was formed by relating the number of courses offered to demand at the school. CEP speculated that students are either not taking A-G courses because there is a lack of access at their high school or because they are not getting advised to do so. CEP suggested that on-line courses be developed by UC for these.

There was agreement among the Committee that the BOARS report is not acceptable.

Chair Padgett will work on a draft for confirmation by CEP next week.

V. GE Reform – prep for CPB meeting.

CEP discussed possible talking points for next week's consultation with Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) Chair Susan Gillman and Senate Director Mary-Beth Harhen regarding general education reform.

Members agreed that CPB can confirm whether paring down the GE requirements would save money, but speculated that it would only save money if there were a reduction of skill-oriented requirements replaced with lower workload courses.

CEP will ask whether CPB has ideas on how to get seed funds for things such as course development to encourage faculty to modify or create courses to better match the new requirements. At least one department has responded that they do not think there will be significant additional cost to them. They plan to redeploy funds that are used for existing courses that will be modified to fit the new requirements.

It is CEP's hope that CPB will either co-sponsor the proposal or be listed as in support of it.

CEP discussed the benefits of delivering the legislation at the fall Senate Meeting in modules in order that portions may pass even if others do not. They will discuss further whether there should be separate justifications for the modular legislative proposal, especially for writing.

The GE subcommittee will review the notes provided by members from the winter quarter visits to departments and come back to CEP on April 23 with discussion points.

VI. Catalog topics.

CEP briefly discussed Chemistry's proposal for a policy to disqualify students from the Major. The Committee carried forward further discussion to a future meeting, including discussion regarding CEP's disqualification policy overall.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy