

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

**June 3, 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, Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep).

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

I. Announcements, updates, and minutes.

All UC campuses responded negatively to the proposal to modify Regents Standing Order 100 to increase the UC President's powers to institute pay cuts and furloughs. Campus responses were sent to the Academic Council of the UC Academic Senate. The strongest feelings expressed by the campuses centered around the absence of a sunset clause and the need to separate the nature of an emergency from that of a budgetary disaster. The proposal will go before the Regents in July with no further Senate review.

The Academic Council endorsed that Senate Regulation (SR) 764 be rescinded. SR 764 limits the credits of special studies courses (independent studies, etc.) that students may take per quarter. The proposal will go to the UC campuses for consideration in the fall.

Chair Padgett reviewed for the Committee the recent University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) meeting. In light of the legislation that did not pass for the state of California on May 19, UC can expect on the order of 17 percent less state funding than last year. It is not known at this time how the cuts will be distributed across the UC campuses. On May 26 another significant cut was announced for the current year. Employee pay-cuts appear to be necessary given the projected size of the cut. UC Administrators decided on a 5 percent pay cut for themselves. The recent fee increase to students was 9.3 percent. Another sizeable increase in student fees may occur. The Governor has proposed that CalGrants be eliminated. It is anticipated that 200K students statewide would be affected by the elimination of Calgrants. One-third of all UC students currently have CalGrants. The BOARS principles on non-resident enrollment were discussed by UCEP. BOARS thinks that UC should not focus on non-resident enrollments as a source of revenue. UCEP felt that there should be a clear upper limit on the number of non-resident students. According to VPDUE Ladusaw, if UC raises the non-resident fees above the recently approved fee increases, UC's costs will be more than some of the top-ranked liberal arts institutions in the U.S., some of whom guarantee that their students will graduate without school loans. The Science and Math Initiative (SMI) was discussed by UCEP. Each campus has been receiving \$250K. There is talk at systemwide of divesting UC of this initiative, leaving the future of the existing programs to the campuses to support. For UCSC, this raised uncertainty about continued funding for CalTeach. UCEP continued their discussion of a white paper on the value of research for undergraduates. It will likely go to campuses later this month.

CEP supports the draft letter to the Dean of Social Sciences regarding the recent lay-offs of two Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS) lecturers and the need for it to be demonstrated to CEP that discontinuation of these lecturers will not negatively impact LALS's ability to offer their Major.

The minutes for April 8, 15, and 22 were accepted as amended.

III. Catalog topics.

The CEP letter to departments and colleges asking for input to general education guidelines and proposals for courses will go out today.

LALS writing-intensive (W) sequence: Recently CEP provided feedback to LALS regarding their proposal that LALS 100A combined with a 2-credit course with additional writing be allowed to satisfy the W requirement. In the 2-credit course, students would receive more assistance in developing their writing and attend required weekly discussion sections. Students taking the sequence would complete 9 papers, whereas those taking LALS 100A complete 3 papers. Given the format of the pre-paper, assigned homeworks, and rewrites based on feedback, the course content was acceptable to CEP for the W designation. CEP did not approve the request for P/NP since they do not approve P/NP status for courses of this type at the upper-division level. Since the last discussion CEP learned that the proposed 2-credit course would be conducted by trained undergraduates. CEP does not approve courses in which the instructor of record will not be present. The idea will be offered to the department that they create a 7-credit course (LALS 100W) which would be a combination of LALS 100A and the additional 2-credit coursework.

Economics honors major proposal: CEP discussed a draft response to the proposal for an economics honors major and approved the letter for sending. CEP asked that it be called an intensive major rather than honors major, that the senior research seminar be the comprehensive requirement, and denied the request for an exit requirement based on GPA.

Community Studies: The Community Studies Department has proposed that their Major have no lower-division requirements. This concerned CEP who thinks that it is important for there to be lower-division requirements for majors in order for students to have the opportunity to try out a major earlier in their academic career.

Course 100 was proposed to be by interview only as a way of ensuring that students are placed into the appropriate 100 level course. CEP found the criteria for how students are placed in these courses to be less than explicit and will ask for an explanation of what students should do if they get into a 100 course that is not the right fit for their interests. CEP approved the dropping of the Introduction general education designation from their 100 series courses. Proposed new course 101 would take some of the material from the current course 102. Course 102, Field Study Preparation, would have new content. Four concentrations were proposed for which students may take courses from outside the department. CEP will ask for a list of the upper-division courses that may be used for each concentration, indicating that a certain number of these must be taken in Community Studies. CEP denied the request for lower-division courses to be allowed to substitute for upper-division requirements.

The text for the admission into the Major raised concern for CEP. The proposed text appears to include criteria that should not be used as the basis for selecting students. This is clearly not the intent of the policy. Nonetheless, CEP is concerned that it could be read as an expectation that students reveal

matters of privacy. The Committee will ask that it be reworded. In the admissions text “and” should change to “or”.

A draft response will be circulated by email. CEP recognized that finalization of some of the necessary changes will not be possible until catalog year 2010-11.

Physics Education Major: The proposal for a Major in Physics Education was discussed. It appeared to CEP that graduates of this Major would be well prepared to teach in either math or physics. The Committee will remind the department that the process for discontinuation of a degree program is not a simple departmental decision and will provide them with the reference to the policy. CEP supports the request but will await feedback from the Committee on Planning and Budget before sending their decision.

BioEducation concentration: The Committee discussed the department’s response to CEP’s letter regarding the BioEducation concentration to their BA. CEP thinks that for people who will go into teaching, more lab courses should be required than are contained in the proposal. In their response, the MCD Biology Department pointed out that the general Biology BA only requires one lab course. It was noted that students in this concentration will also have a lab course in Earth sciences, and thus have more lab instruction than in the general Biology BA. However, CEP would prefer that the lab work be in biology since that would be the subject matter taught by these graduates. The Committee asked whether they might group the electives to fit the CSET criteria by development of new courses, resulting in meeting the CSET requirements in fewer courses. The department responded with concern about the impact that would be caused for other departments by expecting that new courses be developed in their subject areas. CEP asked whether the proposed content would prepare students sufficiently for teaching jobs or whether the curriculum needs to be broader. The department did not propose solutions to CEP’s questions of how the degree can be better designed to teach to the CSET and how more lab courses could be added while reducing the overall number of requirements at the same time. Meeting these requests does not appear doable at this time for the department. Whether this degree option will be sufficiently accessible to transfer students was not made clear. CEP voted to approve this concentration despite its not meeting all of their interests, seeing it as a contribution toward development of good science teachers for K-12, albeit significantly limited in number. The Committee will reiterate in their response to the department the areas that they would like worked on in the future, so that this concentration will be more doable for students.

III. Stakeholder map.

Registrar Hunt-Carter updated CEP on progress toward development of the stakeholder maps for courses. There are now three databases: one that looks at courses that are degree requirements, another that focuses on courses that are the prerequisite to other required courses, and the third lists courses that use another course as a prerequisite. It is anticipated that the maps will be completed this summer. An update will be given to CEP in the fall. CEP underscored the importance of making these maps available soon since they are likely to have significant value for upcoming curricular planning across campus, in light of heavily constrained budgets.

IV. FTE transfers.

CEP considered the request to transfer the FTE of Professor Luca de Alfaro from Computer Engineering to Computer Sciences. Member Helmbold was available to provide information and answer questions. He then recused himself from the discussion. The Committee found the request to be well founded on

teaching and intellectual grounds. The change would have a positive effect on one of the curricular sequences offered by Computer Sciences since they have limited academic staffing in that area at present. CEP supported the request.

V. Review Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment.

CEP considered the principles for admission of non-resident students that were sent by BOARS to the Divisions of the UC Academic Senate for feedback. UCEP and CEP agree that the reasons that UC would admit non-resident students as a targeted audience should be educational, not economic. CEP recognizes that non-resident students bring a more global view which is an important consideration, especially since education abroad opportunities are becoming too costly for more students.

UCSC has not pursued a goal of admitting non-resident students and cannot afford to actively do so. CEP is not comfortable with UC turning away California students in order to make room for non-residents students based on budgetary considerations. The Committee thinks that campuses should not be penalized for maintaining a focus on admitting California residents. CEP agrees with UCEP that the percentage of non-resident students should be kept low to keep the space for California students. As far as admissions goals for UCSC, CEP thinks that the campus should focus on becoming a Hispanic/Latino serving institution since the campus is so close to achieving that status. Non-resident students will probably not help to reach that designation given the Hispanic/Latino diversity ratios in other states versus California.

VI. Waiver of C1.

Discussion of waiver of the C1 requirement for students who take C2 out of sequence was carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy