

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

October 24, 2007

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

Present: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), Joel Ferguson (Provost Rep), David Helmbold, Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex officio), Roxanne Monnet (ASO Staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF), Kip Tellez.

Absent: Russ Flegal, Jack Vevea.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Barbara Love, Michael McCawley (Acting Director of Admissions).

I. Announcements.

Members confirmed their support for the response letter to the draft charge for History of Consciousness. The Committee agreed that the name of the member who is lead for the discussion will go on the external review-related letters this year on behalf of the Committee.

An additional agenda item was discussed: priority enrollment for veterans. CEP was given access to Senate Bill 272 which was recently signed by Governor Schwarzenegger. The Committee decided to support veterans being given priority enrollment. The Registrar will work with the Chair of CEP on the logistical details associated with this. The view was expressed that it would be desirable to extend this privilege to anyone who could prove having risked their lives for the betterment of others.

The feedback from the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections to the draft Honor legislation was discussed. Chair Padgett will circulate a revision that will need immediate feedback to meet Friday's agenda deadline.

II. Minutes. The October 10 minutes accepted as amended.

III. GE Reform.

Chair Padgett reminded CEP of the timeline required for a major revision to general education requirements for this year. To be prepared for the April Senate Meeting, the April 10 legislative deadline must be met. CEP should have its proposal finalized by the end of winter quarter including legislation in draft with justification. The goal for this quarter is to ask the important questions and list possible solutions that would be developed into talking points for meetings with departments to occur during winter quarter.

The Committee discussed draft questions intended to begin the process of gathering department input. CEP has an underlying desire to have a coherent and transparent GE system that is simpler than the current system.

CEP would like to minimize how GEs restrict the choices of the students. They want the system to be no more complex than it has to be and to focus on what students are supposed to get out of the particular GE requirement. The Committee will make a list of principles and will further discuss what are the minimum and maximum of how much GE requirements should constrain student choices.

Members were asked to formulate a response to these questions: What kinds of people are we trying to produce through our GE system? What should they know and/or be able to do? Chair Padgett will send a prompt via email for feedback by Monday. He will compile and resend the responses for consideration next week.

The Committee discussed what data would be useful to them. They would like to see information on the other UCs and possibly on the comparison 8 institutions. Chair Padgett will request support to get comparable Senate legislation, charts with an overview of GE systems, and blurbs like those from our catalog, schedule of classes, and Navigator that explains the system, and rationales for those systems, if they exist. VPDUE Ladusaw will work with Chair Padgett to create a short reader for the committee regarding GE systems.

IV. Proposal for Reform of UC Freshman Eligibility Policy.

CEP had an initial discussion regarding the proposal for reform of UC freshman eligibility policy in preparation for the Chair's discussion at next Tuesday's Senate Executive Committee.

The proposed changes were described in brief to the Committee. Chair Padgett explained for CEP that "people entitled for review" as described in the proposal do not necessarily get into a UC. A-G courses must be satisfied. The change here is that they would not all need to be met by the end of 11th grade. The balance would need to be completed during the time after UC application and prior to beginning course work at a UC campus.

The Committee discussed the implications of having a lower minimum GPA (2.8). Since the current 3.0 minimum GPA is honors weighted and that weighting would go away with the acceptance of this proposal, the GPAs are basically the same except that students will not be favored for having taken honors course work. It was noted that UC went up to the 3.0 GPA because UC was admitting more than the 12.5 percent.

The change to test requirements for admissions was discussed. Subject exams would not be required. The data available does not demonstrate that the subject exams are good indicators for success. CEP supports these no longer being required. The GPA seems to be the best indicator for first-year success. CEP wonders if the change to the GPA required for admissions will mean that some students will get admitted who are less likely to meet the minimum expectations for first-year students and whether there will be adequate support services for these students.

It was speculated that an increase in the number of those entitled to review will also increase the number of people deselected through campus comprehensive review, worsening state confusion as to who gets into a UC.

CEP found parts of the proposal to be somewhat incoherent and had concerns as to whether it would be clear to those involved in admissions. The proposal is far less transparent about what potential students need to do to get into a UC.

CEP thinks that the elimination of statewide eligibility criteria may increase dissatisfaction in the State if the UC system cannot clearly explain why applicants did not get accepted.

V. External Reviews.

Discussion of the History of Art and Visual Culture draft external review charge will be carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

Computer Engineering: CEP found the universal charge to be largely sufficient, given VPAA Galloway's added questions. The group agrees there is no reason to respond.

Discussion of the Computer Science draft external review charge will be carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

VI. C2 exception update.

Chair Padgett apprised the Committee of a past CEP decision to enforce the Regulation that says that students must fulfill the C2 requirement before starting classes in their 7th quarter. Students were given one quarter grace (fall 2007) due to challenges in getting ready to notify affected students.

Approximately 38 students have not fulfilled their C2 despite having had the extra quarter. Of these, ~31 did not get the advising that the other ~6 students did. CEP agreed to another quarter for those 31 and to enforcement of the Regulation for the other 6. It is not clear why these students did not appear on the list when printed in the spring but did when printed at the beginning of fall. The 6 will be barred effective winter 2008. Those not allowed to enroll may fulfill their C2 with a course from another institution or they could seek portfolio review for their C2, if they act in a timely fashion and assuming their writing level is sufficient.

UCSC has been working with community colleges to demonstrate that our core courses should be considered as equivalent to English 1A. This is expected to be a continuing issue. UCSC Admissions will attempt to put something into ASSIST indicating our core courses as equivalent to English 1A.

The question was raised as to whether the core courses are doing what is expected for a composition course? CEP would like to see the current community college standards for English 1A in order to compare them with our core courses.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy