

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

February 25, 2009

Wednesday, 11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Linda Burman-Hall, Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Dave Helmbold, Roxanne Monnet (ASO analyst), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Don Potts, Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor), Michael McCawley (Associate Director of Admissions).

I. Announcements, updates, and minutes.

The Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement passed unanimously at the February 18, 2009, Senate Meeting.

On January 28, CEP considered a course proposal for an upper-division course that would be taught in conjunction with a lower-division counterpart. Students in both courses would experience the same class lectures and would share much of the same work and readings. Before approving, the Committee wished to establish clearly that the educational objectives for the two courses are distinct. (The Committee noted that systemwide Senate Regulations preclude giving upper-division credit for merely doing more work in a lower-division class.) The Committee wrote to ask the instructor for clarification of the following: 1) number of hours/week of mandatory sections for upper-division students; 2) amount of distinct material presented to the upper-division students and how it is imparted (section, different readings or assignments); 3) a general description of the different educational objectives of the two courses; 4) any other relevant differences between the two courses. The Committee was satisfied with the instructor's responses and decided to approve the course.

Chair Padgett apprised CEP of his recent visit to the Council of Chairs meeting in the Humanities Division. Their feedback to the general education (GE) reform proposal was positive.

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) met yesterday. Chair Padgett gave the Committee on update from that meeting. The job description for the faculty assistant to the Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Klinger (CPEVC) for academic personnel decisions was discussed. SEC is concerned that this position makes substantive recommendations that are not reflected in the personnel file. Other campuses may have another person making the decisions such as a vice provost for academic affairs but that person has the final say on those decisions (rather than providing input for someone else's decision), and his/her decisions are part of the file. Faculty salaries were discussed at SEC. CPEVC Klinger supports a salary increase for some faculty and agrees with the need for a change in the culture of how faculty review one another. The salaries subcommittee considered potentially affected cases, but did not reach a unified recommendation on what would define a case as sufficient to merit an increase. SEC found the subcommittee's report to be confusing. They will continue to work toward a recommendation.

The Minutes from January 28 were accepted as amended, pending clarification on which level of Astronomy courses would be affected by their proposed change in allocation of teaching assistantships.

Director Jim Phillips of the Instructional Technology Group contacted Chair Padgett regarding electronic portfolios for courses. CEP expressed concern about what appears to be a type of assessment that CEP does not want to take up at this time. Concern was also noted that if student papers were posted it could lead to issues with plagiarism.

II. Disciplinary Communication next steps.

CEP decided to put a general statement for each Major program in the 2009-10 UCSC general catalog, indicating that a disciplinary communication (DC) requirement must be satisfied. Such a statement could say, "In addition to the above major requirements all students are required to satisfy the Disciplinary Communication requirement." By adding this statement, CEP ensures that students entering fall 2009 will be held to the requirement. This approach allows time for CEP to issue guidelines to Major-sponsoring units for feedback, for those units to submit DC proposals, and for CEP to review these for inclusion in the 2010-11 catalog.

The Committee left open the question of whether students who do not pass the DC portion of a class that carries the DC designation may receive a passing grade based on other content in the course.

All DC proposals will need to be approved by CEP, which probably will not be feasible until next fall. Additionally, time is needed to recruit staff for writing support and for the other forms of resource distribution that will occur in association with the allocation received from CPEVC Kliger. It was suggested that there be forums or brown bag meetings to discuss possible DC models. Departments needing outside support to ensure that their Majors satisfy the DC may need more time to implement the additional course offering(s).

CEP briefly discussed whether to form a subcommittee to draft a letter to Major-sponsoring units regarding DC guidelines. Subcommittees may be needed for the broader general education requirements if the complete GE reform proposal passes. CEP decided to wait for further action until after the March Senate Meeting in order to know whether it is solely the DC or all of GE for which subcommittees are needed.

III. Concurrent enrollment topics.

UCSC students are approved to take one UCSC course by enrolling through UC Santa Cruz Extension. Such enrollment falls under the Extension's program called "Concurrent Enrollment." Current policy allows the single course to be taken at any point during the student's UCSC career, but many students opt to take the course as their final course needed for graduation. The course that is completed is noted on an Extension transcript, and the Office of Admissions treats the course as a transfer course when posting the credit.

In the past the Office of Admissions has occasionally been asked to include a Concurrent Enrollment course in the UC/UCSC grade point average (GPA) computation when the student needed such action to be taken in order to graduate. There has been no consistent application of this action, and this approach was approved by CEP on a case-by-case basis.

CEP would like to see a consistent application of course work completed under the Concurrent Enrollment Program for UC Santa Cruz students. This action should include the transfer credits, grade, and grade points that the student has earned in the one allowable course they have completed.

In consultation with the Office of Admissions, CEP adopted the following policy at today's meeting:

1. Only Concurrent Enrollment course work completed since the student first enrolled at UC Santa Cruz falls under this policy.
2. Admissions will apply only the first course the student has completed under Concurrent Enrollment after matriculation at UCSC. If the student has completed multiple courses under the Concurrent Enrollment program, only the first course will be reviewed for transfer credit. If the student has completed multiple courses within the same term, a "term average" will be calculated for the purposes of applying to the GPA (see below).
3. In reviewing the course for transfer, Admissions will assign the appropriate unit credit, noting the grade earned for the individual course. The grade points will also be applied toward the UCSC/UC grade point average. For those cases where a "term average" needs to be calculated, the transfer credits will be limited to one course, but the grade points will be averaged between the courses completed. Appropriate grade points will be assigned to the letter grade in accordance with the scale used for regular UCSC course work, as noted in the general catalog.
4. The above action shall also be taken for students that have completed UC course work under another UC Extension's Concurrent Enrollment Program or its equivalent.

The "term average" approach to course transfer, for cases where students take more than one Concurrent Enrollment course, is designed to prevent efforts on the part of students to manipulate their GPAs by selecting the best grade among two or more courses. It is not likely to happen often that students attempt more than one Concurrent Enrollment course, given the clear policy statement against doing so. Unfortunately Extension cannot provide UCSC with information about a student's intention to do so before Concurrent Enrollment courses have been taken.

The Office of Admissions will work in conjunction with the Office of the Registrar to ensure this policy is applied consistently for all undergraduate students. This change will also be noted in the student handbook, *The Navigator*, and the UCSC *General Catalog* as appropriate. Any exceptions to the above policy would require the student to submit a petition for waiver or substitution to CEP.

IV. Catalog topics: Science Education concentrations.

A proposal for science education concentrations to the Majors in Earth Sciences and MCD Biology, and for a new Major in Physics Education was submitted to CEP. The Committee found the proposal to be very comprehensive, thorough, and well supported.

CEP wondered how courses that contain certain topics needed for the credentialing test will be monitored to stay on track with the necessary content. It was noted that the concentrations are very high in required credits, allowing very little time for upper-division electives before students hit their 180

limit. The Committee recognized that this is an issue for other approved Major programs and recognized the need for a policy on the size of Majors. Physics indicated that they opt for a new degree rather than a concentration because it will be too different than the other Majors that they offer, lacking key courses that should be part of a Physics Major.

It was noted that there is no mention of what would happen if CalTeach were significantly reduced or eliminated. Chair Padgett will discuss this with Physical and Biological Sciences Dean Thorsett.

The group had various questions regarding how the requirement for these degrees fit with credentialing expectations. Concern was expressed that single subject science degrees are too narrow, particularly in geosciences, to prepare graduates for teaching careers.

If a certain set of topics is met through the curriculum, students do not need to take the CSET exam. The proposed concentrations map students to the CSET standards, as is the case at many institutions across the nation. Students taking this curriculum would be more aware and experienced in teaching than other students with science majors in this area, generally speaking, and more likely to continue in a teaching career.

CalTeach Director Gretchen Andreasen, Education Department Chair Kip Tellez, and Education Professor Doris Fink will be invited to an upcoming CEP meeting to discuss the proposals further.

Once DC guidelines are issued, CEP will have a policy of expecting that all Major proposals address how the DC requirement will be satisfied.

V. March 6 Senate Meeting Presentation.

CEP discussed and gave feedback to the presentation that Chair Padgett will use at the March 6 Senate Meeting to introduce the legislation for general education (GE) reform (revision to SCR 10.2). Members were asked to distill the guideline paragraphs down to shorter descriptions and to draft information bullets for the presentation. A hand out will be provided at the Senate Meeting with the draft guidelines.

In the presentation, interdisciplinary topical clusters (ITC) will only be briefly referred to because they do not need legislation and since the description has not really changed from the draft proposal delivered to the Senate during spring of 2008.

Cowell, Crown, and Merrill colleges are actively considering formation of ITCs. College Eight is on track for theirs to begin in fall 2009.

CEP discussed what sorts of proposed revisions would be considered to be friendly amendments. The Committee confirmed that removal of the word mass before media would constitute a friendly amendment.

VI. University Extension Certificate Programs.

Further discussion on University Extension certificate program reviews was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

VII. Double counting guidelines.

Confirmation of double counting guidelines was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy