

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

September 24, 2008

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), Don Potts, Shawn Riley (SUA Rep).

Absent: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), John Ellis (Senate Service Scholar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Associate Director of Admissions).

I. Introductions, Announcements, and Meeting Overview.

Meeting attendees introduced themselves and explained their role in connection with CEP. Chair Padgett reviewed the Committee's charge for the group and gave some announcements from over the summer. The Governor recently signed a state budget which calls for a \$4.5M cut from UC. No further cuts are planned for this year. The UC President has not yet released his budget decisions so a budget has not moved from UCOP to the campuses. Due to the long-standing budget deficit, UCSC's branch of University Extension cut the Science Illustration Program and the English Language Institute. These were selected because they losing the most money per student.

Members were asked to consider volunteering to be a faculty representative on the Academic Information Systems (AIS) steering committee which meets monthly at most (at the Delaware complex on Tuesdays from 3 -5 p.m.) Attendance is necessary only when there is a faculty topic for discussion. Member Don Potts volunteered. It was noted that since there will not be another major upgrade to AIS for 4-5 years, changes made now could be in place for at least that long. Registrar Hunt-Carter informed the group that a batch grading option is being added to the system presently and that it is hoped that there will be more options for student lists soon. The evaluation process is being looked at to see how it can be folded into AIS as well.

It was announced that WebCT (the current course management system) will be reviewed this year. There may be issues that CEP will want to voice on, in addition to other Senate committees already considering the topic.

The Committee's communication process was reviewed. Meeting attendees agreed to raise their hands and be called on, in order to help keep the meetings to the agenda.

The group was apprised of the plan for a Forum on General Education Reform on Wednesday, October 29, 3-5 p.m., in Colleges 9/10 Multipurpose Room and asked to attend if at all possible.

II. Confidentiality and consultation statements.

The 2007 confidentiality and consultation statements were reviewed. To improve clarity on the process, the statement “outside of committee discussions” will be added after “attributed” under point number two of the confidentiality statement. With this change, the confidentiality statement was approved for use during 2008-09. The Consultation statement was approved without change.

III. General Education Reform.

Chair Padgett reviewed the GE Reform pre-proposal with the Committee. He also discussed the letters that went to divisions and departments in late August requesting educational objectives and the recent letter to provosts regarding Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters (ITC). Members were asked to spend time this week coming more up to speed on the pre-proposal and the letters to complete discussion of the pre-proposal and begin further planning at the next meeting.

CEP was made aware that UCSC has a deadline next year from WASC to produce educational objectives. This adds further reason for reform of our 25 year old GE system.

One can make distinctions between having educational objectives, attaching those objectives to outcome statements, and determining methods for continual assessment of how well the outcomes have been reached. The current reform effort is focused on the first of these goals. A major goal of the current reform process is to clarify the expectations of general education at UCSC. A related goal is to develop mechanisms to conduct regular review of courses to prevent the drift away from defined objectives that can occur over time. The present process is intended, in part, to uncover what educational goals the faculty hold as most important for UCSC. Once those goals are clear, the next step is to consider ways to ensure that the curriculum continues to reflect those goals over time.

Discussion occurred regarding the writing requirements now and in the future. Members were reminded that teaching writing in courses that satisfy the Writing-Intensive Requirement (W) should not be viewed as more of what students should get via the Composition Requirements (C1-C2). The W requirement is intended to be writing in the discipline where students receive substantive feedback about what a good argument in a particular discipline looks like and what the conventions of writing in that discipline are. It is widely thought among the faculty that students are coming to their W courses less prepared for formal writing than in the past. It may be that students, when not provided with some expectations for their writing in a class, return to what they have learned about writing via composition and creative writing courses. A clear articulation of expectations for writing at the start of a class can go a long way toward student development.

The pre-proposal calls for more support for writing across the curriculum, including support to faculty on teaching writing in their discipline, and support to students via peer tutoring. The current writing curriculum simply does not receive the resources needed for students to get as much as they can from the courses they take. Additionally student practice in writing has diminished as writing has been removed from other upper-division courses due to workload.

One member pointed out that some disciplines are increasingly dissatisfied with the preparedness of students to write in that discipline. The idea was discussed that this should lead to a re-evaluation of the educational objectives (or outcome goals) of the C1/C2 courses, and that perhaps there should be C1/C2 sections tailored to students of certain broad disciplinary areas.

It was noted that the pre-proposal calls for reconstruction of the college core course either within or independent of an ITC. An ITC may be linked to C1/C2 and to a college, but that is not required. However, there are advantages to having an ITC that links to both. There is much to consider with regard to the logistics of ITCs. For example, since students will have other demands on their schedules when participating in an ITC, these courses will likely need to be unordered. Discussion on ITC will continue next week.

Members were made aware of the timeline toward the October forum and the submission of legislation for the first winter quarter Senate Meeting.

IV. Issues list for 2008-09/member items.

A list of issues and possible topics for CEP for 2008-09 was provided to the group. The list will be discussed next week. Members were invited to bring their topics of interest to the Committee for consideration.

III. External reviews.

The Committee was given an overview of the external review process. Members accepted the annual assignment list. It was agreed that when a member's home department is under review, they will have the opportunity to give initial input and answer questions, if they so choose, after which they will recuse themselves from the discussion.

IV. Subcommittee assignments.

Members considered and accepted the subcommittee assignment list for the year.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy