

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

November 7, 2007

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

Present: Russ Flegal, David Helmbold, Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex officio), Roxanne Monnet (ASO Staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF), Kip Tellez, Jack Vevea.

Absent: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), Joel Ferguson (Provost Rep).

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

I. Announcements and updates.

Members were reminded to give their feedback regarding the student petition discussed from last week's meeting to the CEP Chair. A quorum has not yet responded.

Chair Padgett reviewed for CEP the meeting he attended with UC President Dynes from last Thursday. He noted that other UCs generally ask for start-up funding for professional schools from UCOP after which campuses fund the schools. President Dynes thinks that UCSC is not doing a good job of tapping into Silicon Valley opportunities. He is personally against the BOARS proposal to change current admissions criteria for frosh. He is concerned about how the public will respond, given that admissions criteria will be less transparent after the proposed reforms.

Chair Padgett met with Politics faculty regarding the writing-intensive requirement. They are planning to give a proposal to CEP for consideration.

He also met with the undergraduate directors of the Humanities Division regarding writing and GE reform. They will work with their departments to encourage proposals for meeting the writing-intensive requirement in their majors. With regard to GE reform, they want to talk more about the distinctions between IH and T.

Chair Padgett apprised CEP regarding the recent UCEP meeting. UCEP was asked to look at a proposal to change residency requirements, given long-distance education. Residency means that X units must be completed at a particular UC campus to get a degree from that location. UCEP discussed how much of the last 35-45 credits should be taken on-line. It is their thinking that time on-campus is significantly valuable to the quality of their UC experience and that residency requirements may need to be changed to limit what portion of total coursework could be taken on-line. UCEP considered the Board of Admissions and Relations to Schools (BOARS) proposal to change frosh eligibility requirements. Although it is obvious that BOARS

has worked hard on the proposal and cares strongly about the goals that led to this proposal, the opinion of UCEP was very mixed.

The Pandemic Planning Committee met last week. They are working to get plans from administrative units to develop an understanding of what the departments would do if there were campus closures of various lengths. The faculty on that committee are working on a sample plan that could be a template for the academic departments. The question was raised as to when CEP should be involved in the development of plans. Since CEP's concerns are rather specific (such as whether students get credit for work when a quarter is interrupted) when to involve the Committee depends on the question. CEP thinks that they should be contacted either before or in conjunction with departments, depending on the situation and urgent need for response.

II. Minutes. The October 17 minutes were accepted as amended.

III. External Reviews.

Literature draft charge: Member Nygaard recused herself from the discussion. CEP noted that it was unusual that Literature included a faculty survey with their self-study. There appear to be significant rifts in the faculty. In the faculty surveys a consensus emerged that, while Literature courses themselves are excellent, Literature's major programs sometimes do not succeed in terms of course sequencing and depth. In addition, due to workload growth, students are being assigned less writing and getting less feedback on their writing. CEP found the dean's draft charge to be unusual. He thinks the curriculum is not in balance with the number of areas of the faculty and wants fewer tracks to the major. He has given the department a deadline by which to make these changes and is threatening to take away Temporary Academic Staffing funds. CEP would like to ask the External Review Committee how well sequenced, coherent, and deep are the curricular tracks, especial for modern literature, creative writing, and English writing and literature. The Committee would like the External Review Committee to think about how restructuring may help with lack of classes, reduction of writing, and reduction of feedback to students with regard to writing. CEP wonders whether some of the tracks in the major could be eliminated.

Math: A draft response was considered by CEP. Collegiality among the faculty appears to have improved since the last review. CEP's additional questions will mainly relate to the service courses offered. A question will be added regarding other unit service courses in this area. CEP wonders if so much of the undergraduate (?) teaching is given to lecturers that the core faculty have become disengaged from their majors. The Committee will ask whether the computational math track should be retained. The template writing for majors question will be included.

Ocean Sciences: The Department of Ocean Sciences does not offer an undergraduate major. It was noted that for their last review CEP commented that there was no question in the charge regarding undergraduate curriculum. CEP will ask that a question be added this time.

Such a question will also be added to the Astronomy and Astrophysics draft charge response.

Politics: Review documents indicate that the Legal Studies Major appears to be popular. Legal studies and Politics have had some of the highest rates of growth on campus. CEP raised a question about the sustainability of Legal Studies since it is heavily reliant on lecturers. CEP will ask that a question be added to the charge regarding this. A question will also be raised regarding writing for their majors. Politics cancelled their W course because of the workload required to sustain both it and their senior capstone course, which focuses on research (involves the production of a research paper??). A draft letter will be circulated via email.

IV. Preparation for the November 9 Senate Meeting.

CEP discussed points to be made in an oral presentation at the November 9 Senate Meeting regarding general education reform. The primary goal of the report will be to lay out a plan for the year. At the very least, CEP would like to have clear educational objectives for a new GE system by the end of this academic year.

The Committee gave feedback to the presentation that will be used to introduce the proposed Honors legislation at Friday's Senate Meeting and discussed strategies for the meeting. CEP voted that they would support the removal of the text calling for schools to be handled separately from the rest of the campus if it is deemed necessary in order for the rest of the Honors legislation to be passed by the Senate. Since CEP prefers to retain this distinction, the change would be handled by way of a friendly amendment at the Senate meeting if this point seems to be dragging down the discussion.

VPDUE Ladusaw relayed points from his visit to the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid on the topic of an Honors Program for UCSC. It was noted that UC Berkeley has only designations such as those proposed in CEP's legislation and is calling it their Honors Program. Viewed in that light, passage of the legislation on Friday would mean that UCSC has a campuswide Honors Program equivalent to UC Berkeley's. The next step will be to add curricular content.

V. Proposal for Reform of UC Freshman Eligibility Policy.

CEP considered a draft response to the BOARs proposal to change UC frosh eligibility for review criteria. The letter was accepted with minor modification.

VI. GE Reform.

This topic was carried forward due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy