

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

April 16, 2008

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

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

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

I. Announcements and updates.

Chair Padgett gave the Committee an update regarding the recent meeting of the Steering Committee on Retention which is co-chaired by the CEP Chair and The Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE). The first-year retention rate was up to 90 percent, a high for UCSC since we began tracking in 1989 when the rate was 84 percent. Unfortunately, the sixth-year graduation rate dropped by 1 percent after being steady for several years. UCSC is 5 percent lower in retention of the upper-performing cohort of students than most other UCs, perhaps because students often transfer to the UC of their first choice after 1-2 years.

UCSC is retaining students of under-represented minority groups well by comparison with institutions with similar characteristics, but still not as well as other groups at UCSC. The retention of minority groups is worse at the upper-division level. It is speculated that transition into some majors is difficult. It may be that once students become majors there is less of a focus on retention. Do some departments still have a “weeding out” mentality? This is something that the committee will think about. Do major performance standards start separating people at the UD level? Institutional Research is conducting a study on retention by major as declared in the third year. It was noted that how students came into the major and their progression through it will be important elements to consider for the report. For example, is the student one who was disqualified from another major? Did the student have challenges meeting their ELWR requirement in a timely fashion?

At the Steering Committee for Retention meeting a study of reasons for leaving UCSC, which was done for Porter and Kresge students, was discussed. These colleges have lower retention and graduation rates than other colleges at UCSC. The leading reasons given by students for leaving were mental health concerns (primarily depression), academic probation, and transfer.

Members reconsidered whether to conduct a general education survey of faculty and decided that since CEP members met with each department and received preliminary input, faculty feedback to the proposal itself will be more useful than a general survey.

Divisional meetings with Chair Padgett, deans, department chairs, and undergraduate directors have been scheduled for May 20-June 5.

II. Minutes. No minutes were confirmed at this meeting.

III. Service Animals Report.

CEP found that there was very little overlap in the report with the Committee's charge. Nonetheless they reviewed the documentation and having nothing to add. It seems to the committee that all important points have been considered.

IV. Academic Calendar.

Registrar Hunt-Carter introduced revisions to the academic calendar for 2008-09 for CEP's consideration. Consideration was given to the appropriateness of holiday names and the two-pass enrollment system listed in the calendar (the recent pilot will be discussed next week). The deadlines for grading were discussed. UCSC is one of the more generous in the UC system, allowing 5 days after finals are completed for grades to be submitted. CEP reaffirmed that the deadline for turning in grades should not be extended beyond 5 days.

CEP approved the calendar as presented, realizing that UCSC will not be matching the systemwide Common Calendar for the start of winter quarter (the mandate to comply is effective 2010-11).

There was a brief discussion regarding late submission of grades (inappropriate use of the Z grade option) which will be continued at a future meeting.

V. BOARS revised proposal.

CEP reviewed a draft response to the BOARS proposal and found it to be an accurate reflection of the Committee's discussions at recent meetings.

The group discussed the numbers of potentially eligible frosh versus those guaranteed admission in statewide and local contexts. CEP notes that, according to the report, the proportion of underrepresented minorities likely to be admitted by guarantee is not likely to change much. Rather, any changes toward increased representation of these groups would have to come from the roughly 2.5% of those remaining as entitled to review. The Committee wonders whether the amount is large enough to achieve the goals of the report.

CEP appreciates that the revised proposal restores guaranteed admission. The Committee continued to support dropping of subject SAT and increased flexibility on the A-G admission requirements. CEP continued to be concerned regarding the lack of clarity, the probable public response, cost implication, and that these significant proposed changes feel rushed.

A revised response will be circulated by email for submission by Friday's deadline.

VI. Catalog topics.

The existing disqualification policy was discussed. It was noted that a number of those approved are not in keeping with the existing policy in that they do not necessarily require that students take the same course multiple times. Topics of discussion included whether policies should either have multiple failures of the same course or several failures from a list of courses. Concern was expressed that students who are far into a major should not be barred after one bad quarter. A disadvantage to the idea of the policy being disqualification after three failures would be that it would take longer to move students to degree programs that are potentially more doable for them. An option may be for students to be disqualified if they fail one or more classes in two different quarters. The Committee discussed the appropriateness of upper-division courses being on the list of potential disqualifier courses. The Committee would like to ensure that departmental re-qualification processes are spelled out for students. CEP will continue its discussion regarding disqualification policies next week.

Biology: CEP approved the request to renumber the biological classes to better reflect which were sponsored by the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology.

VII. Consultation with Chair of CPB and senate director.

Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) Chair Susan Gillman and Senate Director Mary-Beth Harhen visited CEP to discuss questions related to general education reform that overlap into topics for CPB. CEP requested a response to their questions by May 8.

CEP would like to know whether the assumptions they are making about costs associated with general education make sense to CPB. There is an assumption made by some faculty that GE changes of this scope will cost more than it does to support GE at present. The CPB Chair agrees with CEP that this is not necessarily true.

In order to understand what UCSC is spending now on GE it was seen as best to separate out the current cost of the writing-intensive (W) requirement specifically. If as CEP suggests there will be some new ways to deliver the W requirement directly through the departments, incorporated into the majors, it may be that the costs associated with the other GE changes will not increase.

It is not yet clear to what extent allocation of resources will need to shift if at all. To connect courses akin to the present topical course with a sister core course, the student enrollments would still go to the department and the resources that supported the course would, in theory, be available to support the course.

It was noted that some of the ideas being discussed would strengthen the faculty connection to the colleges and that this should be pointed out as in keeping with the expressed interest of many faculty and students. Reorganization of the core courses and direct enrollment of students into associated topical courses would have the advantage that the number of students per course would be known, dramatically reducing issues with planning and the over/under enrollment scrambles that ensue.

The instructional improvement program (IIP) adjudicated through COT was discussed. The committees would like to encourage that the GE Reform changes be given priority for at least one round of the major grants. CPB and CEP speculate that this is a good reason to ask for more IIP funds, and to ask for them to be directed to GE Reform course development. If desired, CPB could write in support of this request.

CPB will seek to learn more about instructional improvement funds such as whether they may be used for instructional salaries. Both committees would like to know how the Senate can weigh in on the allocation and/or spending of these funds.

CEP would like to know how best to get general education considered when it comes to use of Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) and specifically TAs. UCSC may not be structurally positioned at present to equally consider GEs versus major requirements. The trend of running student to TA ratios very high in GE courses in order to maintain lower ratios in major courses makes it currently difficult to consider how to maintain high-quality GE offerings. CEP wonders how to adjudicate the connection between resources and enrollments for general education. CPB will consider the Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) piece in order to respond to CEP's questions.

The CPB Chair supports the idea that CPB and CEP will either co-sponsor the proposal for the fall meeting, or that CPB will endorse CEP's proposal if time does not permit full co-sponsorship.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy