

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

May 14, 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, Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex officio), Roxanne Monnet (ASO Staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Kip Tellez, Jack Vevea.

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

I. Announcements and updates.

The Chemistry Department responded to CEP's letter regarding their proposed disqualification policy. They gave good reasons as to why they did not want to take CEP's recommendations to include Withdraw grades in the list along with D, F, and NP grades and to renumber the organic chemistry series to the lower-division. Since at an earlier meeting CEP approved the proposal as it was and raised the above mentioned considerations as options, Chair Padgett confirmed approval of the proposal to Chemistry.

A web page on general education reform has been added to CEP's public web pages.

The Senate Executive Committee responded to the academic freedom related letter which CEP received in the fall, along with other Senate committees. SEC's letter indicated that the Committee did not find there to be a problem since UC is not required to present all points of view on subjects, and procedures are in place for students to complain about course content if they so choose.

Porter College submitted a request to CEP to add the C2 designation to Porter 80W in addition to the writing-intensive designation that the course currently carries. Their idea is that some students would get the C2 and others the W. CEP reaffirmed that C2 is prerequisite to the W and that the content of the two designations is intended to be quite different. CEP denied the request. The Committee decided that it would be problematic to allow a course to concurrently offer both of these GE designations. The course would need to be slanted toward one GE designation or the other, inadequately addressing at least one of the designations, if not both. Chair Padgett will write to the college with CEP's decision.

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections approved the changes to the proposed legislation to modify SCR 10.4 related to upper-division credits for Majors and double counting of coursework above the minimum credits required for Majors and Minors.

II. Minutes. The April 9 and 16 minutes were accepted as amended.

III. General Education Reform Pre-proposal.

CEP completed its discussion on the pre-proposal for general education reform that will be submitted for Friday's agenda deadline for the May 30 Senate Meeting.

The Committee discussed the pros and cons of allowing courses to fulfill multiple GE requirements. It was agreed that some designations lend themselves better to overlap than others. The topic will be continued in the fall.

They discussed possible ways to define diversity or cross-cultural requirements, possible terms to use to name the requirement, and how it may be like or different from the current E requirement. An example of an educational objective in this area might be to help students identify their own power and privilege, and give them exposure to that of others. Another could be to instill an appreciation for diverse approaches to a unified problem.

CEPs proposal includes a matrix of subject areas with educational objectives that cross cut the subject areas. The matrix will lay out the requirements.

UCLA's cluster course structure was reviewed for the Committee by VPDUE Ladusaw. Their structure has students taking three courses in one year. The clusters are not required at UCLA. Instead they are an option that allows students to do fewer distinct GE courses. By enrolling in one of the courses a student is enrolled in the other two, which also serves as an enrollment management technique. UCLA's pilot seems to be going well.

Per the proposal, topical course clusters would not be required of all students at UCSC either. Given the connected nature of the courses in the cluster, when a student signs up for one, they will be expected to take the full cluster. One anticipated benefit of the clusters when associated with college core courses would be better focus on writing. Clusters need not be attached to colleges or writing or anything in particular, although CEP views it as preferable for pedagogical reasons. No mode of inquiry would reside solely in topical clusters since the clusters will not be required of all students.

In the fall CEP will discuss whether there could be a time savings to students for taking the cluster. For example, given the very intent of the clusters to be interdisciplinary, perhaps participating students could have their requirements reduced by one distinct breadth course.

IV. Catalog reviews.

CEP continued its discussion on the course proposals for AMS 10A and 20A. Last week AMS 10 and 20 were approved (5 credit courses). For the 3 credit courses (AMS 10A and 20A), the Committee recognized that a manual process will probably be necessary (or CEP petitions) to move students into AMS 10/20 mid-stream, if students should decide that they want or need the 5 credit course after the deadline to swap courses has passed. None of these four courses will be included in the list of course equivalencies used for repeat for grade replacement at this time since they have not been reviewed for like content, and since two of the four will not carry

enough credits. Understanding these limitations and the potential need for CEP petitions to swap from 10A/20A to 10/20, AMS 10A/20A were approved.

CEP began its discussion of the proposal for a Minor in Applied Mathematics, and will continue it at a future meeting.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy