

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

April 8, 2009

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

Present: Linda Burman-Hall, Dave Helmbold, Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Roxanne Monnet (ASO analyst), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Don Potts, Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Shawn Riley (SUA Rep).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE).

I. Announcements, updates, and minutes.

Chair Padgett reviewed the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting for CEP. SEC was made aware this week that the Social Sciences Dean Kamieniecki has informed the Community Studies Department that he plans to lay off much of their staff. There is concern that this move effectively disestablishes the department and discontinues the major while the process for making such changes has not been followed. The Senate has not yet been consulted. SEC agreed that the usual process must be followed to either discontinue the major or disestablish the department. It has been indicated by the Dean that another department would provide oversight for the degree but it is not clear whether any of the other departments in social sciences have agreed to absorb the work of the faculty. The Senate Chair wrote to the dean with a reminder of process. No change was proposed to the graduate program. This week SEC also discussed budget cuts to divisions, none of which are finalized at this time. While it may appear that some divisions are receiving a greater cut, because the cuts have been taken over two years, the situation is largely equal in percentage across the divisions. The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (CRJE) has proposed a change to Bylaw 11 regarding the election process to allow for the extension of the deadline. This came in response to this year's situation of there being no nominees by the initial deadline. SEC did not like the idea of an extra deadline and preferred the current default process with the addition of a range of dates for the nomination period rather than the current 14 days. The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) is working on a report to the Senate regarding the University of California Retirement Program (UCRP). CFW wants disclosure of the costs to maintain UCRP, particularly those that would affect what the University versus employees are required to contribute in upcoming years. Since the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) is not as interested in obtaining the information, our local CFW is working on a Resolution on UCRP for the May Senate Meeting.

CEP was apprised of the recent University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) meeting by Chair Padgett. There will be a 9.3 percent increase in fees for students for next year. Differential fees for business and engineering students are being considered. The UC President made a statement that furloughs (faculty and staff), and salary reductions needs to be on the table for consideration due to the size of the budget cut this year and projected for next year, and that the University and Academic Senate need to discuss what the rules would be for considering and carrying out such cuts. Multi-campus Research Units (MRU) are being reviewed this year. An invitation for new bids went out and proposals are in. Requests received total five times more than the funds that are available. UCEP continued its discussion of a white paper on research for undergraduates. They decided only to aim to create a

document for the public to give reasons why the research university concept is good for undergraduate education. The topic of textbook affordability was discussed, particularly the four laws sitting in Sacramento, two of which are currently active. Senate Bill 386 would require that faculty disclose conflicts of interest (if proposing to use their own textbook). Faculty would need to do a cost-benefit analysis to compare a new edition of a book to the previous edition. The bill intends to encourage faculty to think about whether the new edition is important. More timely ordering will be expected since that can make a difference in the price. Faculty will be asked to go for the unbundled versions or justify why they need the bundle (that the various things in the bundle will be used). Senate Bill 216 is less extreme but asks the faculty to describe the new content of a textbook when proposing to use a new edition. UCEP and CEP agree that this should not turn into a dictate to faculty of what to teach in their courses. CEP agrees that faculty need to strive to keep textbook costs down but thinks that the associated work for faculty needs to be reasonable.

It is challenging to get faculty to order textbooks early. It does not help that staffing to order textbooks is long gone for most departments. CEP discussed whether to make a statement on the need to plan ahead and to consider alternate ideas such as Textbookflix, more books on reserve, and not opting for bundles that are non-essential. A member indicated that some items may be owned by departments for check out. CEP discussed issuing a one page summary to provide faculty with ways to ameliorate textbook costs to students, and plans to finalize it before the end of the quarter.

The minutes for February 28 and March 4 were accepted as amended. One point of the February 28 minutes needs to be confirmed with Associate Director of Admissions McCawley before the minutes are final.

II. External Review of Computer Sciences.

CEP discussed the External Review for the Computer Sciences (CS) Department. Member Helmbold was available to answer questions, then recused himself from the discussion. The department chair at the closure meeting was not the chair that was involved with the external review. The External Review Committee (ERC) report was very short. The ERC did not consider either the undergraduate program or CEP's specific questions. There were two general themes to the ERC's report. The report discussed whether the three-department structure should be changed and implications of combining CS with Computer Engineering (CE) and Electrical Engineering (EE). Although it may improve the stature of the programs and strengthen the graduate program, the department is uneasy about the idea. When asked at the closure meeting what was the primary goal of the department the chair answered that that it is to be a top-ranked program. Nothing concrete was spelled out in the supporting documents nor at the meeting. The second part of the discussion was about the climate of the department. Questions of student attrition and difficulty moving from one degree program to another were raised. Diversity was also raised as an issue. Receipt of an NSF award that would involve improving diversity of the graduate program was noted at the meeting. Although nothing specific was mentioned regarding undergraduates, it is thought that improved diversity in the graduate program is likely to aid in attracting and retaining a diverse group of undergraduates as well. Concern was raised at the meeting about gender issues and retention. As a separate matter, departmental discussion of the major focused on its role as a gateway into graduate school. There was less discussion about those who would not be going to graduate school. In response to being asked about plans for increased faculty interaction with students, the answer was that they need to make time for faculty to work in Silicon Valley, in order to recruit and retain faculty. This response was found to be consistent with student comments that many faculty are unavailable. At the closure meeting, the department was encouraged to create a goal statement for those who would not go on to graduate school.

It was noted that CS does not want to pursue ABET certification. Although CS was not historically an Engineering-type of department at UCSC, it is slowly changing in that direction. To go for ABET accreditation would require a look at topics such as gender and other diversity issues. CE and EE are accredited. CS's focus on the graduate program reflects their workload in that area. CS is the second highest grantor of Doctorates on campus, as well as for Master's degrees per year. UCSC differs from usual engineering schools most of which are commodity producers at the undergraduate level. UCSC's difference may be due to the newness of the school. CEP noted that building at the graduate level usually leads to positive changes in the undergraduate programs. At present an alumna is working with the School of Engineering's (SoE) associate dean on the topics of recruitment and retention.

III. Catalog topics.

Discussion of the draft response to the proposal for a STEM Minor in the Education Department will be carried forward until CEP has feedback from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB).

Science education concentration: In discussion of the proposal for a BioEducation concentration to the general biology major, CEP expressed concern about the number of required upper-division (UD) courses. The Committee discussed whether the list of required course was a good mix to prepare students for high school teaching. Concern was also expressed that only one upper-division biology lab course would be required. It was noted that this was ameliorated somewhat by the requirement of two chemistry labs and an environmental geology lab but that nonetheless, student who wish to teach primarily in biology would benefit more lab work in the field. The contradiction between the goal of needing more science teachers and expecting that very few students would take this degree was noted. For the reasons given above, CEP will ask the department to rethink the required course list. A draft response will be considered at a future meeting. If reducing the overall number of courses is too difficult to successfully negotiate among the faculty, the department might consider making it a new major to make it more accessible, as the Physics Department is considering.

Literature Language Request: CEP considered a draft response to Literature's request for a language requirement. The letter was approved for sending.

Legal Studies: CEP discussed the requirement that students take Legal Studies 10 before students may major in Legal Studies. The request is similar to the requirement that was instituted last year for Politics. Many courses for the Legal Studies Major are taught by non-Senate faculty. Nonetheless, the proposal is not to pare down the major, but to ensure that students have some preparation prior to declaring. The rationale suggests that Legal Studies 10 would be prerequisite to the UD curriculum. However, some of those UD courses are also required for Politics Majors who do not need to take that course. CEP wonders whether it will become an issue that the course is taught only once per year. The department may need to reconsider restricting some courses to Majors to ensure that students who are waiting to take Legal Studies 10 have some courses available to them so that this new requirement does not form a bottleneck.

Discussion of Film and Digital Media's catalog request was carried forward due to lack of time.

IV. SCR 6.5 on special studies.

Further discussion on SCR 6.5 was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

V. College 8 Interdisciplinary Topical Cluster (ITC)

Discussion of College 8's proposal for an ITC was carried forward until the needed documentation is provided by the college.

VI. Disciplinary Communication and General Education topics.

Chair Padgett will send email to members with details for their assignment for this week to draft goals for specific GE designations for discussion at the next meeting.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy