

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

June 11, 2008

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

Present: 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.

Absent: Larissa Adams (SUA Rep), Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), Jack Vevea.

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

I. Announcements and updates.

Professor of American Studies Kimberly Lau will be provost of Oakes College effective July 1. No other changes in college provosts are expected for 2008-09.

Chair Padgett updated CEP on last week's visits to each division's Council of Chairs meeting to discuss general education (GE) reform. Departmental undergraduate directors also attended the meetings, and the CEP member for whom it was their home division. At the meeting in the Social Sciences Division, those present seemed interested and generally supportive of the points made in the GE Reform pre-proposal. One faculty member expressed concern as to whether definition of educational objectives would lead to some form of standardized accountability. CEP underscored that this is not their intention. The discussion in the Humanities Division was quite varied, with a lot of discussion on writing requirements. There was some discussion on the overlap between arts and humanities. At these meetings the CEP Chair asked for the divisions' assistance to develop educational objectives and, at the department level, objectives for disciplinary communication. Divisions were reminded that CEP does not intend that the new GE requirements be categorized by division but, rather, by content. CEP will consider this next year. Those in attendance at the School of Engineering meeting were also generally positive and supportive about the proposal. At more than one of these meetings the request was made for a more concrete proposal to consider. CEP will be certain to provide one prior to the Senate Meeting Call at which legislation would go before the Senate. CEP asked the divisions to give feedback to the pre-proposal by mid-October, in order for the next version of the proposal to well-represent the thinking of UCSC's faculty.

Chair Padgett met with College 8 Provost Ravi Rajan, Earth and Planetary Sciences Chair Paul Koch, and Professor of Engineering Ali Shakouri. The group is developing a topical course cluster on sustainability. The Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology has expressed an interest but their representative was unable to attend the meeting. The group has ideas for courses in the cluster in social sciences, humanities, and physical and biological sciences. All three courses would be linked to writing and offered in the same year. There are possible connections to engineering as well, such as in renewable energy. Entry Level Writing Requirement non-satisfied students who enroll in a topical course cluster would have the option of as few as 13 credits in their first quarter, 8 of which would be

associated with the topical cluster. College 8 is proposing to require the topical course cluster for its students. Given space limitations, the courses would probably need to be limited to College 8 students. The proposed change to the College 8 Core Course has the support of the college faculty and their writing instructors. The goal is to have the topical course cluster in sustainability available for fall 2009.

Chair Padgett extended the invitation for a year-end committee social. Details will follow via email.

The group was apprised of CEP member changes expected for 2008-09. Outgoing members and representatives were thanked. Guests were thanked for their on-going support to the Committee.

Members were asked to give feedback to the student survey data conducted last month through the annual student election process. The survey drew 3,700 responses. Members found that the responses fell in the mid-range and that the individual comments provided the most useful information, albeit anecdotal. It was also noticed that the charts do not necessarily fit with the individual comments. Students listed a wide range of courses in answer to the questions regarding which course they got the most out of at UCSC. The Ethnic and Art general education designations got the most positive support via this survey. They want more hands-on opportunities, career training, and internship opportunities. They want more diversity, writing experience, language learning, and speech classes. And they want their fellow students to be more academically motivated. CEP agreed to make the data available to others who might be interested and will consider what and how to list information on the public web page. It is important that the exact wording of the survey questions be considered when interpreting the data.

The Committee finalized the text of a letter to the Registrar requesting that a stakeholder map be created of undergraduate degree program reliance on courses sponsored outside that department. The point of this map would be to ensure that all affected units are notified in a timely fashion of changes to the courses required for their degree programs. A consideration related to pre-professional school preparation will be added. VPDUE Ladusaw reminded the Committee that some years ago the pre-professional advising office was created. One of their tasks is to work to ensure that students have access to the courses they need to enter particular pre-professional programs. For example, students need to get into anatomy classes in order to be prepared for pharmacology programs.

II. Minutes. The minutes for April 30, May 7, 14, 21, 28, and June 4 were accepted as amended.

III. Catalog Topics.

CEP finalized catalog text for the new honors designations, and in response to the recently voted in changes to the Regulations for majors and minors (SCR 10.4).

The most recent changes submitted by the Math Department to their proposed disqualification policy were discussed and approved. CEP's response will point out to the department that there is a potential for issues associated with transfer curriculum that they will need to consider.

IV. Summer work.

The Committee discussed work that may occur over the summer. The CEP Chair will work on a letter to colleges, divisions, and departments asking for input by early fall to aid in defining breadth in their areas, and for disciplinary communication educational objectives. Individual major petitions as well as other petitions and course approval reviews will continue to be reviewed by Chair Padgett over the summer, as much as is possible.

V. Strategic Action Plan.

CEP discussed the Strategic Action Plan created by the Administration in consultation with the academic divisions. The plan was recently submitted to the Senate for input. The Senate requested an action plan in response to the Strategic Implementation Plan that it considered last year. This document is provided as a response to the Senate's request.

The Chairs of CEP, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, Committee on Academic Personnel, Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Committee on Faculty Welfare are commenting on the document. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) will forward committee feedback to the administration and request that a revised draft be submitted to the Senate by September for next year's committees to consider. Committees uniformly responded that the plan was received too late to give adequate consideration to the document. At SEC the discussion of the plan tended to be negative. Although it is good that the document lays out goals, which is long overdue, the process of trying to find quantifiable measures inevitably brings out disconnections between the implementation and the initial goals.

The plan indicated an intent to maintain high quality undergraduate education but did not address the resource shortfalls that already exist and are likely to worsen. The plan seems to be completely decoupled from enrollment changes that happened in recent years or are likely to occur in the future.

It was not clear to the Committee whether the document is intended primarily for internal or external purposes. The measures given do not seem to fit the text for the stated goals. These factors made it hard to know how to comment effectively. An outcomes document should not focus solely what one is good at unless the document is intended entirely for external use. If the document is to have internal value, it should address areas where UCSC wants improve along with associated goals and benchmarks.

CEP would like to see goals that are more particular to UCSC. For example, it may be that in the future the topical course clusters discussed in CEP's GE Reform pre-proposal would be something fairly unique to UCSC to be measured as one demonstration of success. It was suggested that increasing the effectiveness of large lecture courses be a stated goal and that there be defined measures of what the class size experience for students is, with targets for improvement. Student evaluations from various sizes of classes may be one opportunity for assessment of the general level of learning, as would some form of student self assessment over time.

As with goals, the Committee recommended that there be measures that tap into UCSC's strengths, in addition to some standard measures such as the number of students who have gone to professional and graduate schools, and the number of students who do research while here. The plan should consider

why a measure is selected and what will be done with the results. When a measure is listed, a benchmark for that measure should also be given.

It was noted that the bar for undergraduate success is set very low in the plan. VPDUE Ladusaw shared the perspective that a document written with educational effectiveness in mind would look different from one written with academic engagement in mind. For example, to determine educational effectiveness, a goal may be to reach a certain stated minimum level whereas goals that work toward greater academic engagement may logically indicate such things as percentages of students being exposed to certain opportunities or reaching defined bars of proven success. When stating indicators of positive success, required benchmarks should not be established unless the necessary support and funding is in place to make those benchmarks reachable. As an example, a goal that the majority of students in every major have the opportunity to do research with faculty would be a positive indication of success whereas requiring that such a goal be reached would have significant financial costs.

If the plan is to provide resources to departments in a differential way, the plan needs to define what the criteria are for making such decisions. CEP would like to caution the administration that some of our stronger programs do not have comparative programs so would not be included in certain rankings such as NRC and that interdisciplinary programs in particular would not necessarily be in such rankings. Using such rankings as the sole criteria to define highly-visible departments may draw faculty focus away from current attempts at interdisciplinary research groups, such as new areas for potential graduate research at UCSC.

A draft will be circulated to members via email for immediate feedback.

VI. Disqualification policy.

CEP will finalize the modified text of their disqualification policy by email this week for posting on the public web site.

VII. Undergraduate program review practices and issues.

The Committee briefly discussed whether to provide feedback to the undergraduate program review practices at UCSC. A committee member noted having heard from a department that they did not get certain letters prior to external review closure meetings and would like to include feedback on the importance of departments and divisions coming to these meetings fully informed of the feedback given. It was suggested that a summary of historical teaching in departments be included as an addendum to the self study. Members would like to encourage that the external reviews not occur during winter quarter due to other demands unique to that term, such as faculty recruitments and graduate admissions.

CEP made a list of possible ways to ensure that better attention be given to undergraduate programs through the review process. Ideas included: CEP involvement in external review committee visits as happens on some UC campuses or perhaps a Senate representative or VPDUE involvement in the external review committee visits; a separate, internal review of the undergraduate programs, as happens at UCSD (it is not clear whether it would be preferable for this to occur before or after the rest of the external review); possibly a process more like the three UC campuses that are organized more from the

Senate than the administration. There was not sufficient time to consider whether any of these ideas would be recommendations of CEP at this time.

VIII. Lapsed incompletes for students on leave.

Since the discussion at last week's meeting was not in favor of a change in Senate legislation allowing more time to resolve Incomplete grades nor allowance of more time for students on leave, CEP tabled further discussion until new interest is expressed on the matter.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy