

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

October 1, 2008

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

Present: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep), 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), Eileen Zurbriggen.

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

I. Committee only discussion.

Meeting in closed session, CEP confirmed that it would like to continue the practice of considering the list of standing invitees to committee meetings now and again at the beginning of winter quarter. They were reminded that they may opt to meet in closed session as they should so choose. Members underscored that the guests listed below are invaluable to the Committee's work and appreciate their willingness to attend. The Committee voted to invite the following standing guests for fall quarter: Margie Claxton, Elaine Kihara, Bill Ladusaw, Barbara Love, and Michael McCawley. By agreement with COC, Jon Ellis, this year's Senate Service Scholar will be a guest to CEP during fall quarter.

II. Announcements, updates, and minutes.

The above mentioned guests were invited to join the meeting.

It was announced that CEP does not presently have a provost representative.

The Senate Executive Session met yesterday. Chair Padgett gave the following announcements from that meeting. The October Senate Meeting has been cancelled. An email will go to Senators asking them to save the date for the Forum on GE Reform scheduled for Wednesday, October 29, 3-5 p.m., in Colleges 9/10 Multipurpose Room. Searches are continuing for the deans of engineering and arts. Planning has begun for UCSC's first capital campaign. Ten houses remain available in Ranchview Terrace stage 1. It is not clear when stage 2 would come to be, in light of decreased demand, probably due to the high cost per unit. Employee contributions to UC Retirement will resume next year after 18 years without employee contribution. The report of the joint Senate/administration taskforce on faculty salaries is now available. Committees may give feedback to the recommendations made in the report. The Senate and administration agreed on the accuracy of the data. The difference between the UCs in faculty salaries appears to be related to what happens with off-scale salaries. The revised salary scales approved by the Regents brought hope that UCSC would move closer to the other campuses. However, other campuses did not follow the encouragement to reduce use of off-scale salaries and continued to give them. The recommendation for an across the board salary

increase for faculty is not currently supported by the administration. In any case, a change in the culture of department thinking on off-scale salaries appears to be necessary to bring UCSC closer to the other UC campuses. The administration will continue to consult with the Senate and broader campus. Regarding the Regent's four-year plan to increase faculty salaries, year 1 occurred but years 2-4 are off the table in light of this year's budget situation and the speculation on what the budget picture will be like next year.

Chair Padgett wrote to Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Alison Galloway regarding the closure of the Science Illustration Program by University Extension to ask whether there is talk about another organization adopting the program. VPAA Galloway indicated that they are working on a business plan to take it to other groups who may be interested in taking responsibility for this program.

The minutes from September 24 were accepted as amended.

III. General Education Reform.

CEP's May 2008 pre-proposal was quickly reviewed for the Committee. The group was informed of the plan to have a forum on October 29 and to bring GE legislation before the Senate at the first winter quarter Senate meeting.

Before the forum, CEP needs to sort out of what needs to be in Senate Regulation versus CEP policy. For example, the Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters (ITC) idea may not need to be in the legislation. Beyond the formal Regulations, CEP needs to develop clearly understandable and detailed information on elements of GE reform such as the educational objectives for disciplinary communication, breadth, and ways of learning.

Meeting attendees noted that there is a sense among the colleges that ITCs will radically change the Core Course curriculum. The plan discussed thus far by CEP is for the ITCs to be optional and the format flexible with regard to college or department involvement and which GEs would be associated with them. CEP will work to give more assurance of this at the forum. The potential benefits of a connection between colleges and departments may be clearer if spelled out at the forum such as with bullets or a question-and-answer document. One question is whether students should be required to complete all courses of a cluster before receiving the associated GE credit, such that students who satisfy only portions of the cluster would be limited to academic credit for that work without GE satisfaction. UCLA's program, now 10 years old, is a good resource. In the future CEP will discuss how participation in an ITC may be noted in student records, beyond what faculty may put in the course description of narrative evaluations.

The Committee considered what topics related to writing might be part of their legislative proposal. Last year's Committee thought that the C1/C2 Regulations needed no change. Their thinking was that review and assessment needs to be done regularly, as with all parts of GE, but that the educational objectives of C1/C2 have not changed since they were implemented in 2005-06. No other suggestions for legislation were raised for consideration in the area of writing other than the on-going topic of changing the Writing-intensive Requirement to a Disciplinary Communication requirement.

Now that UCSC is in its fourth year since the current C1/C2 guidelines were implemented, CEP thinks it is an appropriate time to assess whether the educational objectives are being met. Prior to further assessment on the present situation CEP will consider the written guidelines at a future meeting this year, after the Forum and GE legislation is submitted.

IV. Senior Comprehensive Requirement.

CEP considered the current senior comprehensive requirement and CEP's 2004 report, in light of a recent request for CEP to waive this requirement for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB). Members were reminded that CEP does not have the authority to waive this requirement and that a change in the Regulation would be necessary.

In discussing BMB's request, CEP found that it was not made on a pedagogical basis. It lacked an argument that might lead the current CEP to reconsider the recommendations of the 2004 report. The main points of the request hit on the older thinking that this requirement existed due to UCSC's lack of grades, that other universities with grading systems comparable to ours do not have a like requirement, and the workload implications. The current CEP upholds the thinking articulated in the 2004 report as far as this being an important experience for students that should be retained for its value in drawing together their learning into a senior experience.

Current practices across campus for satisfying the capstone requirement were briefly discussed. The various experiences offered among the Majors are far from equivalent experiences with regard to their educational value. The better options educationally tend to be quite labor intensive. Multiple choice style exams do not have high educational value as a rule, which is why CEP encouraged departments to move away from such exams in the 2004 report. Some departments have made the recommended changes. CEP would like to see the campus make more progress in moving away from such exams.

The Committee noted that only the higher performing BMB majors are given the opportunity to participate in a senior seminar (honors option) whereas the balance of the students are expected to take the GRE and earn a qualifying score typical of what is the low bar for acceptance to graduate schools. It is thought that there may be a significant number of migrating students from the BMB Major to the MCD Biology Major, perhaps due to being limited to these two options. CEP will suggest that the BMB sponsors either reconsider the threshold of their GRE score to something that is not the same as what they expect for students to get into graduate school, or add other options for students who are not honors students nor heading to graduate school (the latter being only the top portion of their majors). For example, some departments allow passing of certain graduate courses as a means of satisfying their capstone requirement. It was noted that repeated taking of the GRE may be prohibitive for some students due to the cost.

The Committee voted not to reconsider the legislation. However, they will keep in mind the natural extension of this requirement to consideration of GE Reform overall such as its being a part of the educational objectives discussion by departments. CEP could encourage them to consider ways that they would feel good about students' fulfilling the educational objectives of their senior capstone.

They recommended that the sponsors of the BMB Major be informed that CEP will not take on reconsideration of the Regulation this year and that related topics must come after the GE work this year. As time permits CEP would like to assess campuswide progress toward the recommendations of their 2004 report on exit requirements.

Chair Padgett will work with the department to find preferable and economical options to accommodate the BMB majors.

The Committee was reminded that BMB falls between the Departments of Chemistry and MCD Biology and needs to be on a regular review cycle as are all Major programs. Perhaps this Major can be reviewed in conjunction with the external reviews of these departments.

V. Psychology request to defer external review.

The Committee considered the request to defer Psychology's external review for another year. CEP found the reasons given by the dean related to inclusion of newly hired faculty to be compelling and supported the request on that basis.

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

CEP continued their discussion of issues to consider this year, in addition to on-going items.

No meetings of the Pandemic Planning Committee are currently scheduled. This committee considers grave issues such as how to respond to diseases endemic across a large area that might affect UCSC. CEP's representative considers planning for how the academic side would respond and stretches to such things as how the current quarter in progress may be affected. An inquiry will be made regarding the status of the committee and to confirm that there remains a slot for a CEP member.

Other topics that were given a lower priority for the year included the status of narrative evaluations and consideration of any University Extension issues that went beyond routine.

Follow up review of UCSC's 2-3 on-line courses will occur at some point in the year and should not take much time.

CEP received a brief update from Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bill Ladusaw on programs toward an on-line student evaluation system. During spring 2008, a few faculty members ran an alpha pilot (not a real evaluation) which was found to be a success. An actual pilot will occur this quarter of a similar number of faculty participants. The VPDUE oversees the Center for Teaching Excellence, which is collaborating with Media Services and the Committee on Teaching on this project. There may be points in the year where the project could benefit from CEP's input.

The committee briefly discussed how to address the situation of posting of grade information that has been happening by pay-for-service vendors, and found that the topic brings up other

important issues such as honors, grade inflation, and grade equity. Some campuses are being proactive about publishing the information to ensure better accuracy, giving students access to grading practices information other than that which comes at a cost or may not provide reliable information.

CEP recognized that departments may benefit from having access to grading averages across campuses to better understand how they compare. It was noted that Princeton University has defined an overall percentage for issuing of the grade A. They post department-wide statistics, not course by course. Princeton recognized that upper-division courses tend to have higher grading than do lower-division. They seem to think that this change has been successful in reducing grade inflation and improving grade equity. CEP could collect department grade averages to share and/or post for this purpose, similar to how honors information was shared last year. The Registrar indicated that the information can easily be extracted from AIS. If CEP decided to post and/or share grade averages, they would establish guidelines such as excluding information for classes with enrollments smaller than a certain number. For CEP to take on the task of student assessment in the future, understanding distribution of grades would be essential. The Committee did not express interest in having this topic on their task list for the year, other than making faculty aware of grading issues which could be done by way of the annual letter to departments.

Representatives and guests asked CEP to consider adding to the list of tasks for the year development of a policy statement for student use of computers in class and consideration of ways to ensure equitable access to opportunities for excellence for undergraduates. Time permitting, the topics will be raised at a future meeting.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy