

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

April 22, 2009

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

Present: Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Dave Helmbold, Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Roxanne Monnet (ASO analyst), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Don Potts, Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Linda Burman-Hall, Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Shawn Riley (SUA Rep).

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

I. Announcements, updates, and minutes.

Chair Padgett reviewed for CEP this week's meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with the Chancellor's cabinet (CabSEC), which was followed by a SEC meeting. The issues for the Community Studies Department were briefly discussed. SEC underscored that there has been insufficient Senate consultation and transparency on how the budget cuts would be made. CPB may do a white paper on the budget situation. SEC let the administration know that they are not clear on what the divisional cut decisions were based on nor do they think there was a good attempt to consider the effects of cuts on curricula. Some campuses have Senate committees at the level of academic divisions. This may be an idea for UCSC to consider since significant decisions are made on budget cuts at the divisional level. SEC discussed Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CPEVC) Klinger's workgroup on the academic personnel process. The variety of personnel cases that are delegated to the divisional deans may increase in type to such cases as recommendations on increases of up to 2.5 steps. Adjunct professor reviews, recalled emeriti, and certain research titles may no longer go to CAP. The idea was given in the report of moving faculty to an earlier submission deadline for personnel files such as August 1. There was encouragement in the report to reduce the number of outside letters solicited. The requirement for outside letters associated with mid-career reviews may be eliminated. There was encouragement to simplify the initial assistant professor review. The report recommended creation of a vice provost for academic personnel position rather than the two current layers (faculty advisor to the CPEVC in addition to the CPEVC review).

Professors Haraway and Reardon, and Provost Ferguson met with Chair Padgett to discuss an idea for a Crown Interdisciplinary Topical Cluster (ITC) on topics akin to science and justice and science and society.

A Senator recently wrote to Chair Padgett asking that CEP propose to the Senate that it be required that narrative evaluations accompany transcripts. Santa Cruz Regulation currently

allows students the choice of whether narratives are included but suggests that the default would be with narrative evaluations. The current practice is that there is no default. Students must select whether they want narratives or not. CEP decided that they will not have time to take up the topic this year. A member asked whether the transcript has a notation that a larger transcript is available. Registrar Hunt-Carter will confirm what is on the legend of the reduced transcript.

CEP discussed whether to repeal the fall 2006 legislation that eliminated the option for transfer students to be exempted from topical requirements with credits taken elsewhere. The Admissions Office has been articulating courses for Topical requirements since the legislation passed. With the passing of the new general education (GE) requirements, the remaining time for the Topical requirement is growing short. CEP thinks that it would be a better use of Admissions time to begin working toward the new GE curriculum than to continue to articulate courses for Topical requirements. At a future meeting CEP will work on a legislative proposal to modify the Regulation to allow for both course-to-course articulation and waiver of Topical requirements based on the number of transfer credits earned. Admissions would consider on a case by case basis whether it is better for a particular student to have credit waivers or course-to-course articulation. Students would not be allowed both options since a credit waiver would be based on the same courses that might otherwise be used for course-to-course articulation.

II. Catalog topics.

Earth Sciences: The science education concentration in Earth Sciences was discussed. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Galloway's letter mentions the need for clarity on the names (the department is Earth and Planetary Sciences, the degrees are Earth Sciences). Both the VPAA letter and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) letter mention the need to resolve what will happen to the concentration if CalTeach funding is eliminated. The section in the proposal on program discontinuance is not explicit about that would happen with the internship portion of the concentration in response to a potential budget cut to CalTeach. CEP will request a teach-out plan from the department and will ask for the divisional dean's feedback regarding CalTeach funding. Even if the state does not approve this concentration for satisfaction of the CSET, students taking the concentration will be well-prepared to take it. CEP plans to approve the concentration but will wait for the answers to their questions in the letter of response. Concern was expressed about transfer-student-specific issues such as whether they will arrive prepared to be able to complete the major in four years. With the revisions discussed here, the letter was approved for sending.

MCD Biology: It was noted that the BioEducation concentration gives a goal of increasing the pool of science education teachers but later in the proposal they indicate that they do not expect many majors in this track. CEP speculated that a primary reason for the low number may be the extremely heavy workload. Discussion on this concentration was carried forward to next week for the designated member to prepare to lead the discussion.

Education: A draft response to the proposal for the STEM Minor proposal was discussed. As noted above, the VPAA and CPB had concerns about what would happen to the Minor if Calteach funding were cut. CPB asked whether the program should be approved in light of this Minor not being a built from an existing Major (Education does not have an undergraduate

Major due to state law). It is not clear to CEP why a student would opt for the STEM Minor rather than one of the science education concentrations being proposed, or why students would not combine a science major and the existing Education Minor. CEP will also ask for a teach-out plan should CalTeach funding not be continued at some time in the future. After these revisions are made, the letter will be ready for sending.

Physics: CEP discussed the Physics Department requests for changes to the next general catalog

Physics has proposed that students be required to earn an average GPA of 2.7 in the Physics 5 series for entrance into a physics major. CEP supports Physics's desire to identify early students who may not succeed in physics majors and thinks that in the ideal scenario such students are provided with opportunities to help bring them to the level of competency needed to succeed; only when this fails must they seek a new pathway. CEP is glad that the department intends to provide advising to students who are in danger of not meeting the admissions requirement, and hopes the advising is approached in the above spirit.

Also in this spirit, and as an acknowledgement that thresholds such as 2.7 are arbitrary, CEP will ask the department to revise the final sentence of the proposed policy, "Students who are denied admission to the major under this criterion may appeal to the department chair, explaining any mitigating circumstances." In CEP's view it would be better to require students to undergo a process of advising at that point, whose *outcome* is either an alternative path to success or exclusion from the major.

For students for whom exclusion from the Major is the decision, CEP will suggest more detailed language about the appeals process and will provide a couple of existing examples from the General Catalog. In reference to repeating a course, the text needs to make clear that they are referring to a course not passed, since students cannot receive credit for a course taken more than once. CEP will ask them to substitute "pass" for "clear" in the language for the catalog.

CEP will ask the department whether they wish to amend the catalog language (requirements) for programming under the Applied Physics concentration to make it similar to the proposed new language (requirements) for programming in the Physics and Physics/Astrophysics Majors.

CEP would like Physics to give a reason for the proposed requirement that all courses be taken for a letter grade. Should the requirement be approved, CEP would expect that an appeals process exists so that students who had already taken a required course or two with P/NP grading before becoming interested in a physics major would not be barred from the major.

The growing trend of restricting entrance into Majors is an issue for next year's CEP due to a lack of time to take up the topic in the current year. It will be necessary to distinguish between restrictions implemented for advising reasons from those intended to limit the number of students in particular Majors. The Committee will need to consider appropriate policies for conditions on admission to majors.

III. SCR 6.5 on independent study.

CEP continued their work on a legislative proposal to revise SCR 6.5 on independent studies. The Committee discussed the range of individual/independent and field studies courses that students take (including group and individual tutorial). Currently SCR 6.5.2 does not include all types of special studies courses in use at UCSC and does not give much of a definition of tutorial versus field studies as they exist today. The Committee recognized that it would be beneficial to review and standardize the variety of independent studies course numbers being used. However, it is unlikely that they will have time to consider it further this year. For the proposed legislative revision CEP will remove course numbers since they change over time.

The Committee discussed how best to oversee students who want to take more than 7 credits of special studies courses. Any option is likely to mean more work somewhere on campus (the current Regulation which would have the colleges doing the review and approval is not being enforced). A disclaimer will be added to the independent studies form explaining to students what approvals are needed. This discussion will continue at a future meeting.

The text of SCR 6.5.7 is redundant with other sections of the Regulations on narrative evaluations. CEP will propose that it be eliminated.

- IV. UCSC Work Group on Undergraduate Academic Advising Final Report.**
- V. Economics external review stage 2 discussion.**
- VI. General Education topics.**
- VII. Student Directed Seminar proposal.**

Agenda items IV-VII were carried forward to a future agenda due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy