

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

May 7, 2008

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

Present: Larissa Adams (SUA Rep), Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), Joel Ferguson (Provost Rep), Russ Flegal, David Helmbold, Roxanne Monnet (ASO Staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Jack Vevea.

Absent: Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex officio), Kip Tellez.

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

I. Announcements and updates.

Chair Padgett gave CEP an update from the recent UCEP meeting. The governor's revised budget plan will be out imminently. UCOP is being restructured to reduce costs. Their goal is to cut \$28M permanently by the changes at UCOP. It was noted by UCEP that these are not true savings since some work will be pushed out to the campuses with the hopes that campuses will also make changes amounting to a permanent cut of ~\$40M.

The systemwide Academic Planning Council (APC) is asking for two task forces. One would look at educational objectives and outcome assessment, and whether they are built into the campus review processes. UC wants the faculty to be able to create the context for objectives and assessment. The establishment of this task force is a step in that direction. Review practices across the campuses are wide-ranging. Some campuses have a representative from their CEP equivalent that meets with the review committee. For some campuses the review process is totally run by the Senate. At UCSC the administration takes the lead. The second task force will look at on-line instruction. The UC campuses asked for some central guidelines defining parameters for on-line instruction. Creation of this task force responds to that request. The recommendations of these task forces will be vetted through the campuses in the future.

Eleven professional schools are far enough along in development for Oakland to consider them, one of which is from UCSC. The professional schools for UC Riverside and UC Davis were discussed again at UCEP. Neither of these are undergraduate in nature. UCD received a gift of \$100M for their proposed professional school. UCR is requesting \$100M now and \$500M over some number of years. There is a well documented need for doctors to be trained in California, with a significant projected shortage over the coming 15 years.

The BOARS proposal to modify frosh admission was discussed at UCEP again. UCEP will make a recommendation that is a compromise: Eligibility in the Local Context will be raised from 4 to 8-10 percent (down from 12.5 as indicated in the BOARS proposal). They will

recommend that Eligibility in the Statewide Context be adjusted to bring the UC amount up to 12.5 percent.

UCEP will study class sizes akin to UCSC's recent review. Each campus will report data for their campus at a future meeting. UCEP wonders whether this is leading to deterioration of the educational quality of UC. UC Leadership is concerned that such a review could hurt UC more than help and asked that UCEP take care in how they handle this topic. UCD provided data which was similar to UCSCs (increased class size across all levels). UCD is creating new classes by hiring lecturers faster than ladder rank faculty. According to VPDUE Ladusaw, a recent report prepared by Institutional Research shows this is also the case at UCSC at this time.

Acting Director of Admissions Michael McCawley announced that frosh SIRS are over target again this year by ~400. It may be that UCSC, UCSB, and UCAD were impacted by CalPoly's decision to take 1000 fewer frosh next year. The GPA minimum went up from 3.49 to 3.52 in the SIR pool. Projections are still preliminary, since students tend to SIR at more than one school (although they may not at more than one UC). Some private schools are increasing their waiting list, which encourages prospective students to SIR to multiple institutions.

Last week a CEP member met with students from Crown and Merrill Colleges to discuss GE reform. Approximately 12 students attended. Students responded that the current GE system encourages random course selection to meet multiple GE requirements with as few courses as possible and that GEs have sparked interest in areas that they had not considered before. Students want more choice. They want the issues with course capacity to be resolved. Some attendees attributed the apparent weakness in writing to student procrastination. They prefer writing associated with their major. Other things they held as important include research, speaking, and a math/quantitative type requirement.

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

III. General Education Reform.

CEP discussed another draft of the preliminary proposal for general education reform that will be reported to the Senate at the May 30 meeting.

C2 appears to be doing well across campus and remains in the proposal. Writing in the core courses was discussed. There is speculation that the work needed of C1, T, and core is too much for one course. One idea is that by moving some things from core into a second course, the core courses could focus more on writing. The second course could be taught by other experts in those areas. The Writing Program is collaborating with the Council of Provosts regarding the C1 requirement and actively oversees the core course sections for ELWR non-satisfied students.

Topical course clusters were discussed. For example, students may opt for three courses from a list to be taking over two years. These would be broad interdisciplinary clusters. The C1 requirement could be affiliated with some of them, but that would not be a requirement. Inter-divisional faculty collaboration would be necessary for this idea to succeed.

CEP recommended that the idea of frosh seminars be moved out of this proposal and into an honors program proposal. It was noted that the past attempt at frosh (discovery) seminars did not necessarily reach the intended audience (frosh and sophomores) because more students at advanced levels were interested in these courses as a way to have direct access to faculty in small group settings.

The Committee discussed the idea of overview courses which might replace what are currently called introductory courses. The plan includes not holding students to taking an overview course in the division of their Major.

Members were asked to give further feedback by Friday and to propose an educational objective for the categories to which they were assigned earlier.

IV. CRJE feedback to Draft Legislation

CEP considered the feedback received from CRJE regarding SCR 10.4 (revision to required 40 upper-division credits for all Majors and allowance for overlapping coursework thereafter). CEP accepted the recommended revisions. Where CRJE questioned the intent of the word “difficult” in the text, CEP chose to rewrite the sentence to: “Departments may approve substitution of appropriate upper-division courses to satisfy the requirements of this section.”

V. Catalog Reviews.

AMS 10/10A and 20/20A: CEP approved the creation of Applied Math and Statistics (AMS) 10 and 20, and carried forward discussion of AMS 10A and 20A (3 credits each) to a future meeting.

Discussion of the proposal for an Applied Mathematics Minor was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

VI. Faculty Portal.

Lindsay Bass, Project Analyst, from the Office of the Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, visited CEP to introduce the faculty portal now available through the Advanced Information System (AIS). Members were asked to test it and give feedback directly to Lindsay by May 15.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy