

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

November 21, 2007

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

Present: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), 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, Jack Vevea.

Absent: Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF).

Guests: Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE).

I. Announcements and Updates.

The CEP chair reminded the Committee of the posthumous certificate and degree guidelines approved last year. Members gave support to the Chair to make exception to those policies as he deems appropriate.

VPDUE Bill Ladusaw shared with CEP his planned response regarding his three top goals in undergraduate education. These goals will be provided to the administration as part of the implementation studies follow up to the strategic budget workgroup. His goals include improvement of retention and graduation rates, reinstatement of a frosh/sophomore seminar program, and improvements needed for better curricular management. Members expressed their thinking that funding for an honors program and disciplinary communication should be among these priorities. A clarification was given that the seminars could be a required part of an honor's program as is the case for some other campuses. Members expressed their opinions that the last attempt at a frosh seminar series (Discovery Seminars) did not work and encouraged a different format. Although the frosh/sophomore seminars are a step in the right direction with regard to student contact with faculty, CEP does not want the need for writing support to get lost in this current prioritization process. Members were reminded of last year's CEP discussion on the topic of conditions for growth. It was recommended that the first two of the VPDUE's budgetary goals be rolled into one and that writing support be added to the list. CEP thinks that, although small classes are important, frosh/sophomore seminar classes are too specific of a request to be a top priority for them. It was noted that the larger question of class size and distribution across the curriculum still needs to be addressed.

II. Minutes. None available for review at this time.

III. Honors letter to departments.

CEP considered a draft letter to go to departments regarding Honors at UC Santa Cruz. Another version of the letter will be discussed at a future meeting. A draft proposal for a curricular honors program will be ready for CEP to consider in January.

IV. Response to External Review Documents.

Anthropology: CEP discussed the external review report, and department and division responses to the Anthropology external review. The External Review Committee (ERC) focused almost exclusively on the dean's questions and not much at all on CEP or CPB's questions. No response was given to CEP's first two questions and nothing regarding CPB's request regarding Silicon Valley. Neither undergraduate nor graduate program questions were addressed. The department's letter picked up some of the topics that the ERC did not. CEP would like to know how student's are responding to the new tracks and how they are affected by the change of resources. The department regrets the changes to quantity of writing in undergraduate classes caused by the reduction of TAS resources. CEP also asked for input regarding strategies to improve the imbalance between workload and resources. CEP discussed how to respond to the lack of consideration of their questions. CEP may request that the department do a further self-review on some of the questions and either provide answers by the closure meeting, if they already have data, or at a later date if they do not.

V. Talking points for consultation with Divisional Deans.

CEP supports that the draft disciplinary communication proposals be part of next week's discussion with the divisional deans. The Committee would also like the deans to be aware of CEP's plan to begin GE reform with department/division meetings in winter quarter. Other topics of importance for that consultation included issues with student ability to getting into needed classes, the importance of TA training, and concern regarding External Review Committees not answering CEP's questions. Members were asked to send their questions for the deans to Chair Padgett. He will circulate a set of proposed topics for discussion.

VI. Writing-intensive proposals.

CEP continued last week's conversation regarding disciplinary guidelines. It was noted that the new guidelines make this look more like a department requirement than a campus requirement. The Committee discussed the need for there to be clarity regarding who would be enforcing it as a graduation requirement, how to ensure that ELWR and C2 are satisfied prior to students taking the coursework, and who would have the authority to make decisions related to waivers and substitutions.

The need to review C2 guidelines arose again in the discussion. Members stressed that writing throughout one's coursework is essential preparation prior to taking the disciplinary communication course(s).

VII. Instructional Workload Proposal.

The discussion related to the instructional workload proposal was carried forward due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy