

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

October 17, 2007

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

Present: Joel Ferguson (Provost Rep), Russ Flegal, David Helmbold, Roxanne Monnet (ASO Staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Kip Tellez, Jack Vevea.

Absent: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex officio), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Marlene Robinson (Awards and Honors Coordinator, VPDUE Office).

I. Announcements.

Chair Padgett and VPDUE Ladusaw met with Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Dave Kliger last week regarding joint CEP/Administration endeavors that may involve resources. CP/EVC Kliger indicated that proposals incorporating writing into the major curriculum in an intrinsic way would indeed have a chance of being funded.

Chancellor George Blumenthal and CP/EVC Kliger will visit CEP on January 30. The divisional academic deans will visit for a portion of CEP's November 28 meeting.

December 15 is the deadline for the administration to develop a master plan for faculty and staff housing.

II. Minutes. October 3 minutes accepted as amended.

III. Systemwide proposal for reduced size ELWR classes.

CEP discussed the proposal to modify Academic Senate Regulation 636 to reduce class size for ELWR courses to a cap of 20. Only 2-3 UC campuses do not meet that limit already. UCSC has been trying to hold to a limit of 20 but does not have a firm cap. UCEP has not been supportive of this proposal because it is an unfunded mandate. If this is funded, CEP wonders what will be cut to do so. The proposal also reduces flexibility at the campus level by requiring that the funds go to class size when another use, such as funding a peer tutor program, may better meet the goals of increasing the ELWR pass rate and having students pass it earlier. It is thought that about 95 percent of the ELWR core sections are at or below an enrollment of 20. The non-ELWR sections of Core often run at 25-26 students per section, maybe higher, in order to fund the lower number for ELWR sections. There is concern that a rigid cap may cause worse problems than having 21-22 students in occasional sections. For example, one college may need to send students to another college or to fund another section for an extremely small number of students.

CEP agrees that a low student-to-faculty ratio is better pedagogically but has the concerns expressed above. At UCSC ELWR needs are incorporated into University-level curriculum through college core courses. This is not the case at other UCs. For example, if the number of students in WRIT 20 and 21 sections must decrease, enrollments for WRIT 1 must rise.

Chair Padgett will draft a letter for immediate committee feedback.

IV. Honors: draft legislation.

CEP considered draft legislation to submit for Friday's legislation deadline for the November 9 Senate Meeting. CEP decided not to include a section related to part-time students at this time, in order to focus on the other portions. The Committee agreed that a minimum of 70 units must be taken at a UC campus for a student to be eligible for University Honors at graduation.

CEP will propose that thresholds for University Honors and the quarterly dean's list Schools at UCSC be calculated separately from the rest of campus. Presently this would apply only for the School of Engineering but the text of the legislation will not specify just that one School, in order to allow for future Schools to be developed at UCSC. This is consistent with what happened at UC Berkeley. With regard to double majors, if one of the majors is in a School they will be considered for University Honors within that School. An SOE student would be someone who has declared an SOE major by the end of the quarter for which the student is being considered for the Dean's list.

V. Process orientation.

New CEP members were apprised of the processes for course approvals, individual major petitions, and Committee input to external reviews.

CEP Chair reviewed for the Committee their role in the course approval process. Members were encouraged to watch to see that the unit value requested seems to fit the course plan, particularly with regard to five-unit permanent courses. Members should look to see if the supplemental page is sufficiently completed. They should focus attention on the general education designation requested in the proposal. Departments may not be as aware of the intent of GE courses. The Topical and Introductory GEs are intended to be lower-division and without prerequisites. They should give a window of perspective into the particular discipline. Since these are breadth courses they should not be overly specific. Topical courses should have an importance to society in the content. Members should watch for interview-only requests to be sure that the request is adequately justified. For example, an IH lower-division course would not be interview only unless there were unusually extenuating circumstances. Members should consider whether the limit on class size makes sense. Should a Topical course be limited to 25 students, for example? If there is a request to change prerequisites for an existing course, CEP should consider whether the proposed change was vetted through affected departments. Individual CEP subcommittees reviewing the course requests can make that decision, decide on questions to go back to the unit, or decide to bring it to the attention of the CEP chair for possible discussion at a CEP meeting. Both subcommittee members should agree on the decision. The final exam box is there because

Senate legislation asks CEP to approve situations where there would not be a final exam. If there is not an exam it should be justified.

Since individual majors do not have the benefits of pre-existing major, it is particularly important that there be a coherent program of study. One intent of the individual major option is for students to get degrees that are significantly different from other options provided at UCSC.

The list of external review assignments was accepted by the members.

VI. History of Consciousness draft charge.

CEP discussed the draft charge for the upcoming external review of the Department of History of Consciousness (HistCon). It was noted that this department does not have an undergraduate major or minor. In their self-study the HistCon faculty talk about increasing their commitment to UCSC's undergraduate mission. A notable problem is that many faculty in HistCon will be eligible to retire soon.

Included with the files was a letter from the Humanities Dean indicating that he wants to change the faculty teaching workload upward. CEP wonders in what ways HistCon could increase its support to undergraduate education while maintaining its graduate program, and how an increased undergraduate presence would benefit the graduate program. Since outside teaching assistant support appears to be diminishing as other units start and grow their graduate programs, HistCon having a larger undergraduate curriculum could aid in acquiring more TAs for HistCon graduate students.

What they propose to do with IH and W courses will need to go through CEP.

The designated committee member will send the Committee a draft letter for input and completion via email.

VII. GE Reform.

Carried forward due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy