

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

May 13, 2009

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

Present: Linda Burman-Hall, Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), 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), Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions), Stacey Sketo-Rosener (Advising Coordinator)

I. Announcements, updates, and minutes.

Chair Padgett reviewed yesterday's Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting for CEP. SEC met first with the Chancellor's cabinet (CabSEC). They discussed the faculty salaries report created by a subcommittee of SEC. This report will be received by the Senate at next week's Senate Meeting. Also at the Senate Meeting, the Committee on Faculty Welfare plans to introduce a Resolution on the UC Retirement Program to ask the UC President and the Regents to make a public commitment to UCRP. The Resolution may also ask that the UC treasurer make certain funding information available either on their public web site or to divisional Academic Senates. The proposed change to the Regents Standing Orders to give the UC President more independent powers in areas of furloughs and pay-cuts was also discussed. The upcoming student fee increase of 9.3 percent was discussed. After the CabSEC portion of the meeting, SEC discussed the Humanities Division department chair letter on narrative evaluations. Next year's CEP will be asked to present SEC with a list of options regarding changes to narrative evaluations, weighing their educational benefits against their effect on workload and budget. A letter by the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) regarding the idea for a School of Management was discussed. The letter suggests that the administration discontinue work toward the school.

For fall quarter ~3500 prospective students and 475 transfer students submitted their intent to register forms (SIRs). The number of frosh SIRs was lower than UCSC was aiming for (3950 was the desired number, predicting that 20-25 percent would not yield to attend in the fall). A second batch of admissions offers was recently sent and ~100 additional students are anticipated to SIR from this effort. Several other UCs fell below their targets. Approximately 3200-3250 entering frosh are expected to attend in the fall from the total number who submitted SIRs.

Draft responses for the Cognitive Sciences BS proposal and for discontinuation of the Dual Degree Engineering Program with UC Berkeley (UCB) were discussed. In the Cognitive Sciences response CEP will provide examples of admissions and appeal policies for consideration. Both letters were approved as amended for sending. The Dual Degree

Engineering letter will be copied to CAFA and will raise the point that degree programs named in the catalog should not be removed before the decision to discontinue has been made.

Members will be asked to assist with follow up on catalog topics over the week.

The Minutes for March 18 were accepted as amended.

II. General Education (GE) Topics.

MCD Biology students use the combination of BIOL 130L and 189 to satisfy the writing-intensive (W) requirement (7 credits). Assuming this becomes a combination used for the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement, the department is wondering whether it might also fulfill the 2-credit Service Learning requirement, assuming the content is found to sufficiently fit that designation. CEP discussed whether to allow DC to overlap with other GE designations. Textual analysis is also a logical topic to allow for overlap with the DC requirement. Members responded that when a DC requirement is satisfied with just 5 credits, approval to overlap with another GE designation should be rare. Although when a DC is spread over greater than 5 credits the idea of overlap seemed more acceptable, approval needs further CEP discussion as to which are the appropriate GE designations for overlap. CEP speculated that such requests would not come up often because by the time students reach the upper-division, they will likely have satisfied the content of their GEs earlier in their career. Since it seems likely that courses for DC requirements will also satisfy major requirements for a number of departments (most?), CEP considered whether these courses should also be used to satisfy GEs. They decided that consideration should occur on a case by case basis, standing on this principle that too much overlap of requirement can dilute the content for one of the requirements to be satisfied. This topic will continue at a future meeting.

Members considered a draft letter to go to course and Major sponsoring units with draft GE descriptions and educational goals, asking for GE course proposals and DC proposals for Majors. CEP decided to ask for feedback to the draft goals by October 19, and for GE course proposals and DC proposals by December 1. Discussion of the draft letter will continue at the next meeting.

Time permitting, CEP will invite college provosts to a meeting to discuss Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters (ITC) that are in progress.

III. Pre-consultation discussion – VPAA Galloway.

Due to lack of time, Chair Padgett requested that members send to him by email their suggested talking points for next week's consultation with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

IV. Proposed Amendment to Standing Order 100.4-100.4(xx)

SEC discussed the proposed change to Regents Standing Orders to increase the UC President's powers to institute furloughs and pay cuts at yesterday's meeting. It was noted that in the 1990s employees received salary cuts, clearly demonstrating that there are procedures already in place

to implement pay cuts. SEC found that the language of the proposal is unclear. It appears that certain campuses could be targeted and others not. The Chancellor of UCB would like to be able to administer furloughs at his campus differently than he is able to in current policy. SEC does not support that one campus or the UC President should be allowed to declare furloughs on some campuses and not others and does not support that such changes should be permitted without the support of the chancellors of the affected campuses.

What constitutes an emergency was not clearly explained. SEC thinks that something like a pandemic is truly an emergency. However, financial “emergencies” tend to be slow-moving and more predictable, and it is not clear that they would need to be addressed in a matter of days as would be the case for a pandemic or other natural emergency. Although the document says that the Senate was consulted, that was not the case at the point of writing of the document.

CEP agreed with SEC’s points. The proposal also does not indicate when an emergency is over. The Committee raised the point that suspending general policies seems extremely dangerous and found the wording of proposed Regents Standing Order 100.4xx, paragraph 2, to be extremely troubling. They want to know the meaning of “applicable” in this paragraph and wondered whether the language would allow the UC President to fully set aside other Regental Orders and Senate Bylaws and Regulations. No analysis was provided with the proposal.

CEP strongly disagrees that budget crises are analogous to an emergency. Even the current budget situation developed over considerable time. Concern was raised that this proposal could encourage the UC President to allow things to wait too long before they are effectively addressed because his/her emergency powers allow for a financial out.

V. EVC Work Group on Undergraduate Academic Advising Final Report.

CEP reviewed the report produced by the 2009 Undergraduate Advising Workgroup. The report reflects intensive deliberations and contains some thoughtful recommendations--for example, about simplifying the major declaration process, and ways to bridge shortfalls in advising staff that can occur in departments and colleges. The report also responds to the issues and questions raised in the detailed charge it was given. Nonetheless, CEP finds itself in sympathy with the basic thrust of CPB’s comments on this document in its letter of May 8, 2009, of which the committee received a copy.

While CPB was incorrect in its characterization of the membership of the committee (they did not have the committee list and charge when they wrote their letter which states that the committee seemed to be made up of advisers, whereas in point of fact there were no undergraduate advisers on it), CEP shares its broader concerns about the committee’s constitution. CEP agrees that the committee should have included some undergraduate representation and also feels that the input of a staff adviser would have been highly desirable. While the work group did consult with staff advisers, CEP still believes that at least one representative of this group among its membership could have added concreteness to some of its discussions.

CEP further feels that as the campus moves to adapt and improve its current advising system, it would do better to start from the bottom up, by asking what students are lacking and how they can better be served, rather than from the top down, by looking, for example, at hiring practices and bureaucratic structures (though these matter, too).

CEP also wants to stress in their response the centrality of undergraduate advising to the campus's academic mission and how crucial it is to the efficient use of campus and state resources. In the current situation, marked by gaping budgetary shortfalls and actual or looming cuts to administrative and academic units, undergraduate advising has become more important than ever before. Many majors have responded to the strain of growing student numbers in the face of stable or declining faculty resources by instituting minimum requirements for entry into the major or policies for disqualifying students who fail to perform up to a certain standard. Quite a few majors now require that students complete several courses before they can even declare the major. The problem is further exacerbated by the fact that more and more upper-division (and even some lower-division) courses are being closed to non-majors. This means that students who get off track may well have difficulty completing their degrees: they may need extra time beyond the usual four years, or fail to graduate at all. Good advising cannot solve all these problems, but it can certainly make it easier for students to negotiate our increasingly complex systems for getting into the courses, majors, and programs of study. Finally, there is a close correlation between the quality and availability of advising and campus retention rates, which UCSC is trying hard to improve.

Thus however tempting or even inevitable cuts to the campus advising system may seem, if the cuts are not enacted wisely, reductions in this area could waste far more resources (often invisible) than they conserve. That said, CEP agrees that advising could be streamlined and improved. But if the campus hopes to identify areas where potential savings could be realized and, ideally, coupled with improvements, it could best be served by a committee with a 1) wider representation (including students and staff advisers as well as at least one person conversant with potential possibilities for improving advising support from the AIS system); 2) a narrower, more targeted charge; and 3) a focus on student needs rather than bureaucratic structures.

The Committee's letter of response will be finalized by email.

VII. Community Studies.

The Committee briefly discussed what initial feedback to give to the department, division, and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Galloway on the proposal to change oversight of Community Studies. CEP will make clear that these decisions appear equivalent to the disestablishment of the department and discontinuation of the Major, not merely changing of oversight. CEP feels strongly that the dean's major decisions regarding Community Studies should be reversed pending appropriate Senate consultation.

It has not been made clear what is going on with regard to changes in the Community Studies staffing. Information from the department (not included in the dean's letter) indicates that the manager position will be cut and that the manager of Sociology will take on Community Studies. The undergraduate and graduate advisors (partial FTEs) will be moved under Sociology. The

undergraduate advisor is currently funded .25 by summer field study revenue. The Community Studies front-line department assistant position will be cut. The field study coordinator position will be cut immediately and the director position will be cut over 2 years. These latter two positions are academic.

CEP will note in its response that the field study program is too intrinsic to the Community Studies Major to be treated as optional. Thirty credits of field study are required for the degree.

CEP members voted to send a message to Social Sciences Dean Kamieniecki immediately, indicating that the actions he has taken are tantamount to making a decision about the curriculum and department, without the required consultation.

VIII. Student Directed Seminar concern.

Discussion of the student directed seminar with controversial content will be carried forward due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy