

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

May 20, 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), Don Potts, Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

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

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

I. Announcements and updates.

At today's Senate Meeting CEP will propose amending Regulation to allow exemption from Topical requirements based on transfer credits as was the case prior to the passing of an amendment fall 2006. The Committee's proposal to amend SCR 6.5 on special approval courses will also be put before the Senate today.

At the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, the proposed increase to UC Presidential powers was discussed (amendment to the Regents Standing Orders). The divisional Senate Chair will create a letter of response based on the extensive feedback given by the Senate standing committees. The responses submitted made basically the same primary points as did CEP. The committees do not see a budget crisis as an emergency. They request that Senate consultation be conducted in the normal way. In the campus response, UCSC will strongly request that the divisions of the Academic Senate have time to review a revised proposal before action is taken.

At a forum recently sponsored by the Santa Cruz Faculty Association on current budget cuts, graduate students expressed concern about the plan to increase the cost for medical insurance by approximately thirty percent, one-third of which would be paid by students. Undergraduates at the forum discussed their attempts to meet with UC President Yudof and UCSC Social Sciences Dean Kamieniecki. As of the forum, attempts to meet had been unsuccessful. Faculty from various divisions gave feedback regarding budget cuts. According to the CEP member in attendance at the forum, the turmoil expressed by social sciences faculty far exceeded any other division. The impact of the layoffs in Community Studies and Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS) was raised.

SUA Representative Palm informed CEP that since the forum, Dean Kamieniecki has met twice with students. There had been no student on his budget advisory committee but Dean Kamieniecki supports the addition of a student to that committee. At the second meeting, students from both Communities Studies and LALS were in attendance and discussed their concerns about the impact on their degree programs. The Student Union Assembly (SUA) is working with UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal and has invited President Yudof to join the meeting.

CEP discussed the partially on-line course Anthropology 3, Introduction to Archaeology, and reapproved it for three more years on the condition that a common, in-person final be added.

CEP considered a request to make an exception to the text of the catalog rights policy by setting the catalog year for a group of students who will first enroll at UCSC during fall 2009 back to catalog year 2008-09 (students who have satisfied IGETC). The policy says "Catalog year will initially be set for the first year of enrollment at UCSC". CEP does not think that exceptions should be made to this policy. The Committee then discussed whether a waiver of the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement could be made for incoming students who satisfied the IGETC agreement. However, CRJE responded to an earlier inquiry from CEP, indicating that CEP may not make GE exception decisions for groups of students and that the wording of Senate Regulations indicates that students are to initiate petitions for exceptions with their colleges. Given this, CEP does not find that there is an alternative to transfer students making individual decisions regarding the DC requirement. In any case, students would do well to complete the DC requirement recommended by their department. It may be that there is not an option to satisfy DC available during 2009-10 in which case students may decide to wait until 2010-11, to petition to substitute a course for the DC requirement, or to request an older catalog year within the limits defined in the catalog rights policy.

The Committee planned for the consultation with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Galloway to occur later in today's meeting. Both University Extension certifications and external review process will be discussed. CEP discussed what should be expected of the appointed faculty advisors and would like them to attest to the quality of the certification program and to answer certain questions for CEP.

A topic for discussion with the VPAA is the amount of time between external reviews. Divisional Regulation says that CEP shall review the degree programs at least every five years. However, there is a new trend to move departments with a non-problematic external review to an 8-year cycle for the next review. CEP needs to decide whether to propose a change to Regulation to extend the time in order to have the option to stay coupled with the external review time table. Alternatively, CEP could review undergraduate programs separately from the external review, such as for those departments on a longer review cycle. For departments on an 8-year cycle, CEP discussed reviewing at least the larger majors more frequently, perhaps at the mid-point (4 years). CEP discussed whether 8 years was too long between reviews of the undergraduate programs and agreed to make notes for next year's committee to carry the topic further.

CEP would like to ask different questions for the department prepared self-study, including questions related to retention, availability of the Major and of GE courses to interested students, and identification of successes and challenges for students. The Committee will raise their concern that undergraduate topics do not get the same attention by the External Review Committees (ERC) as other topics. CEP discussed the idea of an internal review of the undergraduate program prior to the complete external review (1-2 years prior) to allow for outcome results to be considered at the ERC visit. Given the amount of work involved, looking at just the larger departments seemed a possible compromise. It was noted that four years is just enough time for one cohort of students to complete their degrees. The Committee recognized

that a longer, more detailed review is not likely to be popular with departments since it could mean more work over a longer period of time.

II. General Education (GE) Topics.

CEP discussed the current version of the goals statements intended to be sent with the draft GE guidelines to course and Major sponsoring units for feedback. For Creative Process, the Committee discussed whether to require an open showing, open rehearsal, or public performance. Members commented that to require these of all courses to satisfy the Creative Process requirement could be costly and labor intensive, and that it seems a lot to require of all students in a two-credit course. Whether to add or substitute peer review as an option (not requirement) for sharing the work publicly was discussed. The Committee continued to support that departments may propose that auditions and performances be required for their classes, but CEP does not want to require these for all Creative Process courses.

III. Catalog Topics.

This week's catalog topics were carried forward due to a lack of time.

IV. Community Studies oversight.

CEP was not given time to consider the actions proposed by Social Sciences Dean Kamieniecki before they were made, specifically the lay-off decisions for administrative and academic staff. The Committee would like to know specifics about what Community Studies needs to maintain the field studies program as it is now. Dean Kamieniecki indicated that the fees returned from Summer Session enrollments could cover the field studies staff at the department's choosing. However, those funds have been going to other costs of the program. The School of Engineering shared administrative staffing model was discussed. Although the Social Sciences Dean mentions that other department in the Social Sciences division have optional field studies programs and could help with the needs of Community Studies majors, no department has confirmed willingness to take this on and it is not clear that any of those departments have the resources to sustain the Community Studies field program in its current form (30 required credits per Major). CEP thinks that the decisions made for Community Studies are academic in effect, not merely budgetary, and should not have happened without proper consultation. CEP's response will be completed by email.

V. Student Directed Seminar concern.

Discussion of the student directed seminar will be continued via email due to lack of time. Based on recent email exchanges, members are inclined to deny the request for a student directed seminar on the topic of pornography.

VI. Consultation on University Extension (UNEX) and external reviews.

CEP consulted with Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and University Extension Galloway, Assistant to the Provost of Extension Cailin Caulfield, and Planning and Budget Office Principle Analyst Betsy Moses.

UNEX certificates were discussed. CEP would like programs to identify the changes made since the last CEP review and to include the equivalent of current catalog copy (list of requirements and course descriptions). CEP asked that UNEX first establish the existence of a UCSC faculty advisor and that this person write something short for the review, including how engaged they have been with the certificate program. Advisors from another university may need to be involved due to lack of expertise at UCSC.

Presently, only new course proposals or those with significant changes come to campus for review by academic department chairs. All others are reviewed by the VPAA. CEP asked what their role in the UNEX curriculum should be in the opinion of the VPAA. From the campus, UNEX wants to know that classes are of a UC level. This would include XSC courses (courses available to UC students for UC credit) and 300-400 level courses through departmental review. UNEX also oversees concurrent enrollment in UCSC courses and offers continuing education credits specified by an institute or a foundation that controls a particular profession such as through credentialing. UNEX has articulation agreements for some professional credit courses. The 200-level courses are graduate level. Proposals for these are rare and would need the approval of the Graduate Council.

VPAA Galloway works with UNEX directors of certificate programs to confirm that students are learning something that amounts to a coherent curriculum. The VPAA indicated that UNEX programs do not compete with community colleges for students. Ninety percent of UNEX enrollees have a BA and one-third hold a Ph.D. Enrollees are looking for UC quality. These professions are interested in adapting their skills as the market changes. New curriculum is defined by the trends and needs of the Silicon Valley. Continuous review of courses occurs (enrollments, evaluations of the instructors). The question of lack of humanities programs among the certificate programs was raised. Presently there is only one humanities component—western civilization. The VPAA noted that there is a lot of competition in the areas of arts and humanities in the community colleges, at San Jose State University, through adult education programs and cultural center offerings, and through parks and recreation programming. Additionally these areas had too high a cost factor for UNEX to sustain. For every \$1 brought in, the average cost was \$1.82.

The production cycle of UNEX was described for CEP. UNEX has a four-quarter production cycle. A graph of the current production calendar was provided. It was made clear that UNEX cannot meet the campus general catalog and course approval deadlines. It was also clear that UNEX cannot wait the same periods of time for CEP review as does the rest of the campus. The next CEP may want to consider moving some amount of the UNEX work to its subcommittees. The VPAA notes that the topics with the heavier workload are likely to be economics, engineering, and bioengineering, plus some work in education and applied natural sciences (bioscience).

CEP will provide written feedback from this discussion to VPAA Galloway who will respond with a proposal to CEP for consideration regarding changes to review of UNEX certificates. The VPAA requested a short meeting with CEP in the fall (15 minutes). This CEP will pass that request on to the next Committee.

The second topic for discussion with the VPAA was external reviews. In light of the lack of attention by ERCs to undergraduate topics, CEP asked the VPAA about a member of CEP being involved with the ERC team—such as meeting with them early on in their visit. The VPAA will work to create a meeting in which the Senate may be involved but cautioned that it would need to be short due to the many demands on the ERC's time during their two-day visit. She added that some of the questions posed by CEP for addition to the external review charge are out of the ERC's scope, and asked CEP to focus on questions that the ERC can deal with in the time that they are here. She asked that lists of question not be long and suggested keeping to 3 issues. The VPAA recommended that CEP give more context on the issues behind the questions that they want added to the charge such as what it is that CEP is concerned about on that topic. The VPAA indicated that she could use support from CEP to get departments to focus on educational effectiveness and learning objectives. Department are often not successful in getting students to participate in the required ERC meeting with undergraduates. One department brings in a senior seminar group to meet with the ERC.

CEP brought the VPAA's attention to the divisional Senate Regulation that says that CEP is to review undergraduate Majors and Minors at least every 5 years. They discussed the topics listed earlier in this meeting for discussion such as mid-cycle reviews, and their dilemma of whether to propose a revision to the Regulation. The VPAA suggested that CEP might become more involved in setting mid-cycle questions as one way to have a level of review between the external reviews.

The VPAA encouraged that Senate letters include more assessment, commenting that some Senate letters tend to provide mainly a summary. She also encouraged the Senate to give more assessment at the point of commenting on the draft charge. CEP encouraged her to raise these suggestions with the Senate leadership.

CEP requested that more data be included with the self-study to help them in assessing program effectiveness--retention numbers, for example. The VPAA noted that the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) makes certain new reports possible, such as on retention, that could easily be added to the self-study. This report is thought to be a good summary and includes student perspective. She encouraged CEP to consider other forms of data that could be made available by Planning and Budget or Institutional Research as part of the self-study.

CEP will write to the VPAA with a summary of this discussion.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy