

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

May 27, 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)

I. Announcements, updates, and minutes.

At last Wednesday's Senate Meeting CEP's two pieces of legislation passed (allowance for transfer students to be exempt from their Topical requirements based on transfer credits and changes to special studies courses—SCR 6.5). CEP will write to the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (CRJE) to confirm whether they will wait for the outcome of the proposed appeal of SR 764 before proceeding to request a revised variance. CEP supports that Chair Padgett work independently with the Registrar's Office on updates to the independent study form and will write to departments to inform them of the changes.

Last week CEP extended approval of partially on-line Anthropology 3 for 3 additional years. Since then Chair Padgett learned that the teaching of the course will shift to a new instructor who does not want to teach it in the current format.

Crown College has proposed an Interdisciplinary Topical Cluster (ITC) that includes proposed course BME 83, The Genetic Revolution: Science and Technology. CEP received an earlier copy, asking for feedback on whether to propose a 2 or 3-credit course. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of the course carrying 2 versus 3 credits. There was speculation that students would enroll in 17 credits (three 5-credit classes plus BME 83) if the course were valued at 2 credits but that they would stick with 13 (two 5-credit classes plus BME 83) if the course were valued at 3 credits. That thinking did not reflect the majority of the Committee. It was decided that the preliminary feedback from CEP would ask the provost to consider this as a possibility but that CEP would leave the decision to the college of designing either a 2 or 3-credit course. CEP would like more detail on the changes to the core course in light of the addition of BME 83. The proposal still needs to go through the School of Engineering for approval. CEP vetted completion of the letter to Chair Padgett with no further review by them.

Earlier this quarter CEP discussed the Music Department request to discontinue the Western Music Minor. CEP decided to first solicit the input of the Art Division member of CEP who was absent from that meeting before making their final decision. The Art Division member has since given support for the content of CEP's draft letter. The letter includes a request that the remaining Minors be brought up to the 25 upper-division credit minimum, in accordance with divisional Senate Regulation.

CEP discussed the proposal for a Science, Technology, Education, and Math (STEM) Minor in the Education Department. CEP discussed and approved the Minor for one year, and will ask the

department to bring it up to the 25 upper-division credit minimum required by Regulation by the next catalog deadline.

The Committee discussed the recent lay-off of two long-standing lecturers in the Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS) Department. Rationale was not given as to why these lecturers were cut rather than others in the division, other than to protect programs that bring money into the division. New ladder-rank hires may explain the difference to some degree. CEP considered whether existing faculty are able to cover the courses that have been taught by these lecturers and wondered whether the department was given an opportunity to decide how they would take the budget cuts, speculating that the department may have made different suggestions on how to apply the cuts to better protect the curriculum. The decision does not match with the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor's request to deans to make the cuts as far from the classroom as possible. CEP would like the dean to work with the department to let them have some say in how they take budget cuts (such as volunteering to put off their PhD program). The possible damage to the undergraduate curriculum due to lack of replication of expertise in the existing faculty will be noted in CEP's response.

CEP will express their concern regarding the diversity issues that may result from this decision. It was noted that UCSC is quite close statistically to being designated as an Hispanic-serving institution. This year's entering class was 21 percent Hispanic/Latino. At 25 percent, campuses are designated as serving a particular underrepresented population. This is an important goal for UCSC to aspire to, particularly given the general population here. The decision in LALS has differential impacts on this population. The draft response letter will be circulated by email.

SUA Representative Palm announced to CEP the hunger strike of 40 students that started yesterday in response to the cuts to Community Studies and LALS, due to the disproportionate effects of these cuts on students from underrepresented backgrounds.

Discussion of the draft minutes for the April 1 meeting raised again the question of whether GEs should be allowed at the upper-division. It is not clear to CEP what the effect would be on capacity or time to degree of allowing GEs to be satisfied with upper-division coursework. If permitted on upper-division courses, will departments be more inclined to cancel large non-major GE courses? CEP recognized that this is an important topic to resolve in order to give departments guidance on planning their curriculum. The discussion will continue next week.

The minutes for April 1 and 29 were accepted, as amended.

II. Economics External Review.

CEP was apprised of the recent external review closure meeting in Economics. It was thought to be a productive and positive meeting. Most of the discussion was on the budget and the Economics Master's program. There was little discussion on undergraduate topics. The department chair did point out that there is a significant amount of staff time needed to manage the current comprehensive requirements, in answer to a recent question of CEP. Economics plans to work with VPDUE Ladusaw on ideas for increasing student diversity.

III. Catalog topics.

Economics Honor Major: The proposal for an honors major in Economics was discussed. CEP considered how the proposed Intensive Major relates to the proposed Combined Major in Economics

and Mathematics. There is a sense from the proposal that the Intensive Major will be for a different group of students. The Combined Major has more math and may be a place for students who choose to change from another math major or for students who are quantitatively based in Economics and want a different track than the others offered by Economics. The Intensive Major would be for their top achieving students, focused on continuing to graduate school.

CEP reaffirmed their recent decision to use the phrase Intensive Major and not Honors Major. The Committee recently asked the VPAA to change the language accordingly in the campus documents on programs, and CEP's definitions document will be updated. Presently CEP's definitions document lists Intensive Majors as separate degrees, distinct from concentrations which are defined as a track to an existing Major. However, like concentrations to a major, Intensive Majors appear on transcripts not diplomas and are listed in the chart of degrees with an "I" in the concentration column. Concern was expressed by a guest that, if intensive majors are listed as separate, the majority of all applicants will apply for these degree programs, when the majority will in the end do the general majors. However, Intensive Majors are very appealing for admissions purposes and have positive implications for retention. Rather than listing these Majors in the catalog degree chart and elsewhere as separate majors (though they are), they will continue to be listed in the concentration column with an "I" and additional text will be added to the catalog to make clear that these are Majors, explaining how they will appear on the transcript versus the diploma in order to be clear on how these degrees are recognized at the point of completion. Economics has indicated that if their Intensive Major is not approved to be on the diploma, they will produce a certificate for graduates of this program.

The Committee will comment in their response on distinction between "honors major" and "honors in the major" and that this distinction is not very clear in the proposal. A student may be enrolled in an Intensive Major and not get honors (terminological issue). CEP thinks that Economics' other tracks are also challenging and will confirm that the department intends to allow students of their other Majors to be eligible for honors. Economics could have a higher bar for honors in the Intensive Major. CEP sees the proposal as a blend of an honors major and honors in the major, given the requirement for 3.5 to get this degree. Students who fall short of the GPA threshold can get the regular Economics Major since the curriculum of the Intensive Major builds upon the regular major.

There was speculation that the department may have underestimated the number of students who will take the Major. However, the admissions GPA requirement may keep the numbers to the prediction. If more students do opt for the Intensive Major, CEP wonders whether there will be a workload issue for faculty to maintain the thesis option.

CEP does not support the request for a GPA requirement to graduate with the Intensive Major. UC has a 2.0 GPA requirement for graduation, which is required to satisfy any course for the Major by Senate Regulation. CEP thinks that it is too late at the point of graduation to be turning students away based on a >2.0 GPA threshold and recommends instead that they have an earlier disqualification policy.

In the past CEP has encouraged that there be honors curricula, and UCSC now has University and campus honors. VPDUE Ladusaw asked CEP's advice about departmental honor programs. CEP indicated that Intensive Major curricula may require more classes and classes of greater rigor but should not simply require a higher GPA to get into or complete the major.

Rather than publishing the requirement that students get 3.8 in Math 100A&B, CEP thinks that this option could be one outcome for students who appeal not to take Math 100M&N.

CEP was surprised that Economics is proposing the same comprehensive requirement for the Intensive Major as for their other majors. Students in the Intensive Major have research opportunities. CEP thinks that if these students are required to do individual research, the comprehensive requirement should be built on the research requirement. Additionally, having the same comprehensive requirement options as for the other majors does not match well the intent of an Intensive Major since one option is simply passing the final exam in certain core courses.

The option to begin coursework toward a Master's while an undergraduate was discussed. This is something that Economics allows in another area and it may be a good idea to extend this to their Intensive Major.

The draft response letter will be circulated by email.

Electrical Engineering: CEP discussed Electrical Engineering's (EE) request for a GPA threshold for entrance into the major. The request is for a 2.8 GPA. The Committee wondered why they selected this particular number. No justification was given for the request.

The list of courses for which students would need a 2.8 GPA seemed long. It was noted that the courses were mainly outside the school of Engineering. Since electrical engineering deals with the field of electricity, the foundations of which are in math and physics, it is understandable that the courses students take early in their degree are in those fields.

A member noted that EE had a GPA threshold for admissions in the past catalogs, but the threshold was removed from the general SoE section. It was also noted that many other campuses have a separate admissions process for their school of engineering.

CEP discussed that it is necessary for students to begin many of the engineering majors early due to the amount of required coursework. Yet, students are still finding their feet in the University and exploring new curricular areas as well. The Committee thinks that performance in initial courses is not necessarily the best indicator of how students will do when they find a major. CEP prefers that students be brought in for advising before they are barred from the major.

CEP was not ready to approve the request for a GPA threshold before having a rationale for the request, and some analysis of the situation that lead to the need for returning to a GPA threshold for admission. Regarding the appeals process, CEP does not encourage that students be asked to retake courses that they already passed and would like an appeals process that asked them to take another course. A draft letter will be circulated via email with questions for the department, indicating that the request will be reconsidered for catalog year 2010-11.

EE's text for honors in the major was approved to be added to the catalog.

Concern was expressed regarding whether there is a significant trend on campus toward excluding students by GPA rather than advising them, and about the lack of data associated with some of the requests that CEP sees. Last year, Chemistry was asked for evidence to support their request. CEP thinks that would be a good practice as a rule. If too many majors have GPA limits, what will happen to students who fall between the 2.0 minimum and the next minimum admissions threshold for a major? The committee will recommend that next year's CEP take up this topic. One approach would be to decide on questions and data needed and ask all Major sponsoring programs with admissions conditions to address those questions so that CEP may review whether the conditions are appropriate at this time.

For example, do the admissions criteria serve to meet the goals that lead to the restriction? For those with admissions policies approved because of impacted status, are those departments still impacted?

Community Studies: Discussion of the Community Studies request for catalog changes was carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

Physics Education: Discussion of the revised proposal for a Major in Physics Education was carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

IV. FTE transfer.

Discussion of the transfer of FTE associated with Luca de Alfaro from Computer Sciences to Computer Engineering was carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

V. Community Studies.

CEP reviewed the revised response letter to Social Sciences Dean Kamieniecki's proposal to change the oversight for Community Studies. The letter was approved for sending.

VI. Review Principles for Non-Resident Enrollments.

Discussion of the BOAR's proposal on review principles for non-resident enrollments was carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy