

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES**

**October 8, 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), Matt Palm (SUA Rep), Don Potts, Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Jon Ellis (Senate Service Scholar), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer).

### **I. Announcements and updates.**

Chair Padgett gave CEP an update from the recent UCEP orientation meeting. An educational effectiveness taskforce has been created which will report to the Undergraduate Education Planning Group. The taskforce was established to give departments guidance on developing educational objectives and goals for assessment of these. Another taskforce has been created to recognize UC students who were interned during World War II. Degrees may be awarded to those who had nearly finished theirs. Other students may receive some form of recognition for the work that they had completed. UCOP has provided an accountability framework report to the Academic Senate. CEP will be provided with the link to that document. The intent of the document is to improve transparency between UC and the public. This comes at a time when there is a nation-wide movement for institutions to give measures of success and to track them. The UC campuses are likely to be asked to respond to the report.

### **II. General Education Reform.**

CEP continued its discussion of general education reform. They discussed what goals they had for the upcoming forum. One goal could be to distinguish which topics would require the passage of new Senate Regulations. Another goal could be to make progress toward implementation guidelines for some aspects of the May pre-proposal.

The Committee discussed bringing to the forum draft requirements and pathways for discussion, and more detail on ways of learning (perhaps with a different name like skills and approaches or processes and practices). CEP would like to talk about the department feedback on disciplinary communication and divisional feedback on breadth requirements and the educational objectives for these. The Committee would also like to discuss the interdisciplinary topical cluster (ITC) idea to make faculty more aware of the possibilities. Members agreed that draft legislation would be written after the forum.

The Committee discussed what should be the content of the brief introduction and update portion of the forum. Members recommended that it be clearly stated what are the current requirements and how they would change. For example, the Introductory and Topical requirements would be replaced with Breadth Requirements and there would be fewer requirements overall. It was encouraged that an agenda for the forum be projected at the end of the introduction and that each section of the discussion close by summarizing the discussion. A reminder should be given as to how people may give further feedback after the forum.

CEP thinks it is important to make clear that changes to C1/C2 legislation are not being discussed presently although work is continuing around concerns that have been expressed to the Committee about frosh writing. The C1/C2 requirements became effective fall 2005. Work on these requirements continues to be refined. Chair Padgett recently met with provosts to discuss C1 in the core courses. Most provosts agree that it is difficult to fit into one quarter of core the college's academic thematic content and the C1 objectives. The ITC idea is of interest to a number of provosts for this reason. Consideration of the frosh writing experience must go beyond the core course, since half of the frosh writing requirement is WRIT 2. It was suggested that an exit study at the end of WRIT 2 could provide useful information on the course series.

The ITCs would not be required of all students. It does not appear that there is a need for legislation related to these. When ITCs are implemented it will be important to make clear that GE credit will be earned at the end of the full series of courses. Of course, students who complete a portion of the series receive academic credit for the courses completed but no GE credit.

CEP will discuss in the future how many breadth and/or ways of learning designations individual courses may satisfy. Last year's CEP thought that two should be the limit.

The idea was given that there could be a brief poll of forum attendees to quickly determine where people may or may not agree with certain requirements and that this could either shape the forum or lead to workshops to be held during November.

It was agreed that faculty, students, and staff are the audience for the forum. Departments and colleges will be asked to extend the invitation to students, staff, and non-Senate faculty. CEP meeting attendees were asked to spread the word in their circles. A special invitation will be sent to the administration and to chairs of Senate committees that may have a particular interest in GE reform.

The group agreed that the phrase Ways of Learning does not capture the distinction between something like a skill (e.g., Q or W requirement) versus content (e.g., current E requirement). The group was encouraged to email suggestions for new names for Ways of Learning to Chair Padgett. Other questions to be considered are whether ways of learning should be attached to only lower-division courses and whether every breadth course should be required to include one of the ways of learning.

### **III. Course approvals.**

Chair Padgett reviewed the undergraduate course approval process for members. Since the general education designations are CEP's purview, this is another area for members to focus on in particular. Members should question when a syllabus does not appear to fit the description for that GE. They were encouraged to consider whether the syllabus contains a workload appropriate to the credit value proposed for the course. According to Regulation, each credit should represent approximately three hours in and out of class.

There is a box on the course approval form regarding final exams because both UC Regulation (SR772) and Divisional Regulation (SCR8.3.1) specify that any exception to the final exam requirement must be approved by CEP. A justification should be provided with all requests for an exception to this Regulation.

Questions arose regarding course enrollment limits and class size issues. This topic was carried forward to a future meeting after the passage of GE legislation. Another future item that arose from the discussion is the need for on-going review of courses that carry GE designations.

## **VI. External Reviews.**

History of Consciousness: CEP discussed the External Review Committee (ERC) report and responses. Despite the lack of an undergraduate major program, History of Consciousness does a great deal of undergraduate teaching and wishes to provide courses that would satisfy the current W requirement or the proposed DC requirement. The review response was good news for the undergraduate program since faculty teaching increased at the undergraduate level. History of Consciousness could play a valuable role in developing interdisciplinary courses. TA assignments of their graduate students to other departments' courses should diminish with the increase of undergraduate teaching in the department. CEP will respond to the plan to increase use of graduate student instructors particularly for writing-intensive courses. CEP will re-enforce the importance of close attention to mentoring graduate students instructors. A draft response will be considered at the October 22 meeting.

It needs to be confirmed whether a graduate student instructor may be allowed to formally supervise the teaching assistants assigned to the course that he/she will teach.

Literature: Member Loisa Nygaard recused herself from the discussion. The Literature majors are built around a number of concentrations which include six courses each. Given the number of requirements for the major concentrations versus the number of faculty, only three or four courses are offered per year for some major concentrations, particularly those for non-English language concentrations. If only three courses are offered per year, students need to take all of these which can complicate their schedule and eliminates choice at the upper-division level. By the department's choice, the catalog does not make clear the number of courses on the books for each concentration since only two years of the department's courses appear in the catalog.

CEP wonders whether there are too many concentrations to the major given the number of courses offered annually. The Committee realized that agreement on use of TAS and on leave agreements are critical to maintaining all the concentrations that Literature has on the books. Concern was expressed about how internal faculty interactions may affect the undergraduate mission. The division dean has asked that the department reduce the number of concentrations and he plans to gradually decrease their allotment of TAS.

CEP was dissatisfied that the ERC did not answer their questions. They will consider what to request to be accomplished by the department within 18 months following this review. A draft response will be considered at the October 22 meeting.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy