

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

May 28, 2008

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

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

Absent: Kip Tellez.

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

I. Announcements and updates.

Chair Padgett reviewed the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting for CEP. At Friday's Senate Meeting there will be an oral report on faculty salaries given by a subcommittee of SEC (Chairs of CAP, CPB, and CFW). Recently SEC leaders met with CP/EVC Kliger and Chancellor Blumenthal regarding their report and associated recommendations. The response was very mixed. In response to the report, a joint Senate-Administration Task Force on Salaries has been created. An action plan is expected by June 30. Senate committees are being asked to respond to the strategic action plan, which is the plan to implement the strategic academic plan reviewed last year. CEP will consider it next week.

The Politics Department responded to CEP's letter regarding their request to require lower-division courses before students may declare the major (not a formal pre-major). In its letter Politics requested to rescind the proposal for pre-declaration coursework, in light of the external review report that raised questions about the Legal Studies Major. The department speculates that they should consider something similar for Legal Studies and suggested that they do both at the same time. Chair Padgett encouraged them to reconsider rescinding the original request and has not heard back.

II. Minutes. The April 23 minutes were accepted as amended.

III. Draft Presentation for Friday's Senate Meeting.

Chair Padgett showed a sketch of the oral presentation intended for Friday's Senate Meeting on the topic of GE Reform and CEP's pre-proposal. It was agreed to use the slides mostly for visuals and give most information orally, since the intent is to introduce the written report.

Meeting attendees recommended that Chair Padgett preemptively address writing early in the presentation so that the conversation can then turn to the other topics.

In the upcoming meetings with divisions, Chair Padgett plans to request that they work on educational objectives for the relevant areas of the GE requirements that fit with their division by mid-October. CEP gave its support for this plan. A reminder will be sent in the fall. The Committee considered the best ways to proceed to get feedback on their pre-proposal. One idea, specific to disciplinary communication (DC), is to ask the departments via the divisional Council of Chairs to work with their deans to spell out their DC objectives and what resources would be needed. This feedback would aid CEP in getting a proposal together for CPB's consideration in the fall.

IV. Catalog Topics.

Bioengineering: CEP continued its discussion regarding Bioengineering's request to organize their Major into three concentrations. Some of the upper-division courses would not be listed in the catalog. Students would receive individualized faculty advising, in which they would develop a list of four upper-division electives. The catalog would refer students to a set of electives which will be found on the web, not in the catalog. It appears that there is currently a shortage of 1-2 courses for the Bioelectronics concentration. The needed courses are expected to be available soon, since a search for a faculty member in this area is underway. Students in this concentration will have 35 required courses, including all GEs. This number excludes the required labs for some of the courses. Since the existing major requires 37 courses, the revision is slightly better as far as demand on student time. It is not clear to CEP how many of these courses are needed for accreditation.

Students cannot get the degree with the minimum required credits of 180. CEP expressed concern regarding the workload and its impact on student retention, recognizing that this is not the only extremely heavy Major on campus. A topic for future discussion would be the addition of a note in the catalog regarding the need for students to carry heavy workloads some quarters. CEP speculates that time to degree may be another concern.

GISIS Minor proposal: CEP considered the response from Sociology to CEP's April letter. The department addressed all of CEP's points. CEP considered the proposed requirement of a B average or higher for courses in the Minor. CEP expressed concern regarding this proposed policy and did not approve it. According to UC policy a grade of C or higher counts as passing for the purpose of degree requirements.

V. Disqualification policy.

Discussion of CEP's disqualification from Major policy will be discussed at a future meeting due to lack of time.

VI. Late grades (Z grades).

University Registrar Hunt-Carter presented data to CEP showing percentages of grades received late. The information demonstrated that there is only a 75 percent probability that grades will be in on time. It was noted that the numbers of late grades may actually be higher than they appear

in the data since the ones given here do not include grades that are in pending mode in the system.

Issuance of late grades may have significant implications for students because colleges cannot give timely advice to students who are not doing well. Even waiting one week after the grades are due is problematic. In reality, students do not necessarily know before they start their winter quarter classes whether they may be on academic probation or academic disqualification. It is difficult to make these assessments before the start of the next quarter even when grades are on time, particularly between winter and spring.

Not having the grades on time it is a disservice to all involved. Financial aid is held for some students until their situation and associated enrollment is resolved. Additionally, Dean's list determinations will likely be made later due to late grades. The Registrar's Office waits until 95 percent of the grades are in before running the academic action report, which is now about 3 weeks past the deadline.

It was noted that there are still issues with instructors remembering to hit the Submit button.

CEP discussed what to do to notify faculty of the extent and implication of the situation. The Committee thinks that the implications of late grades are more serious than those of late narrative evaluations and will consider writing to the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Executive Vice Chancellor to request that consideration be given to the responsibility to submit timely grades.

There is a sense that timeliness of submitting grades has been slipping over recent years. When AIS initially came into use, there was a discussion regarding who would monitor the grading. Departments were encouraged to do it now that they had the tools. The reminder emails to faculty were discontinued.

CEP discussed reinstatement of the email reminders to faculty on a quarterly basis, perhaps with a follow-up that would go to the department chair and dean if the faculty member is more than 2 days late.

In light of speculation that the lateness is due in part to the fact that it is more work to give letter grades than P/NP grades, CEP discussed the timing of finals versus the grading deadline. Registrar Hunt-Carter reminded the Committee that UCSC gives more time between the end of finals and grades being due than any other UC.

The Committee discussed when it is appropriate for a Z grade to be issued. The Z grade is a form of notation. It is for certain extraordinary situations and should not be used with regularity. It should not be used in lieu of issuing timely grades. It should not be used in lieu of Incomplete grades. It should not be used for outstanding work associated with a student's having taken concurrent or sequential courses.

Chair Padgett will prepare a draft letter to department chairs for CEP consideration.

VII. Undergraduate program review practices and issues.

Discussion of undergraduate program review practices and issues will be carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy