

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

October 15, 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), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Don Potts, Shawn Riley (SUA Rep)

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

I. Announcements and updates.

The Psychology Department's request to defer their external review was approved by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

It is anticipated that Provost Ravi Rajan will join CEP as the provost representative in November.

Chair Padgett reviewed the recent SEC meeting for CEP. An effort is underway to acquire property on or around NASA-Ames. Santa Clara University, Foothill Community College, De Anza Community College, the Carnegie Institute and NASA-Ames are working with UCSC on this endeavor, which is being lead by UCSC. It is hoped that commercial developers will do the buying and building. It may be that no University funds will be required. A change in federal law that comes into effect after 2009 will make it less advantageous for private entities to make collaborative agreements with government agencies, putting this project on a fast track.

CalTeach and the Education Department are coordinating efforts to develop tracks through science majors that could lead to more science and math teachers in California. Chair Padgett and Analyst Monnet recently attended one of their planning meetings. Presently the Departments of Physics, MCD Biology, and Earth and Planetary Sciences are preparing new concentrations to their majors incorporating curriculum that would satisfy state criteria to prepare students for teaching credentials. They hope to submit their proposals for the upcoming catalog year. Such a concentration is already available in the Math Department.

Minutes from the October 1 meeting were accepted as amended.

II. General Education Reform.

Members were updated on the status of the GE Reform web site. Two of five divisions have responded thus far to CEP's request for criteria for a breadth requirement in their academic area. One or two more may be available prior to the forum.

The group briefly discussed elements of GE reform that may be attractive to alumni, especially the Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters (ITC). Funding would be useful for ITCs for such things as course relief or incentives for teaching or team teaching new courses. VPDUE Ladusaw apprised the Committee of efforts made already to keep University Relations aware of these topics as they move toward launching a comprehensive campaign. Chair Padgett will request a meet with Associate Vice Chancellor of Development Jennifer Svihus to discuss what CEP is working on.

CEP discussed SCR 10.2.2 that lays out the current breadth requirements at UCSC. It is CEP's current thinking that:

- SCR 10.2.2.1.a: The Introductory (I) requirements would be replaced with the envisioned Breadth (B) requirements;
- SCR 10.2.2.1.b: The Topical (T) requirements would be deleted;
- SCR 10.2.2.1.c: The Quantitative (Q) requirement would be retained in some form;
- SCR 10.2.2.1.d: The Composition (C1 and C2) requirements would be retained without change;
- SCR 10.2.2.1.e: The Writing-intensive (W) requirement would change to the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement;
- SCR 10.2.2.1.f: The Arts (A) requirement would fall under Breadth requirements;
- SCR 10.2.2.1.g: It is not yet clear how the Ethnic (E) requirement would change. It may be that one or two ways of learning replace this requirement.
- SCR 10.2.2.1.h will become unnecessary under the current thinking.

Since the forum is intended to further shape the thinking on what may need to be in Senate Regulations, CEP will not prepare draft legislation before the forum.

The Committee discussed the agenda for the forum. They agree that there is simply not enough time to discuss everything that may be of interest to the audience to the extent that discussion may be needed on those topics. With that in mind, CEP will consider holding brown bag workshops in November. The topics for these workshops would be determined from the discussion at the forum.

For the forum, there continues to be interest in focusing on present versus proposed requirements such as moving from the I and T requirements to B requirements, reducing the number of required GE courses, shifting from W to DC, etc.

The group considered how to determine whether there is basic support for the philosophy for the GE changes and how best to keep the forum discussion from shifting to topics that are not those that CEP wants to spend much time on at the forum. One possible approach would be to outline some principles such as a reasonable number of required courses, a plan that is not complicated, and a reminder that the plan is in flux (and evolving with continued feedback). It would be good to show the commonality of the Arts and Humanities divisional responses, and to spend some time on the ITCs without devoting a major portion of the forum to the topic.

The Arts division response was discussed. From the response, it seems that play/screen writing without performing would meet the arts breadth requirement, but that creative writing would be

excluded. CEP agrees that artistic media are distinct from textual media but would like the distinction to be more clearly defined.

Some topics surfacing in responses may be better placed on the ways of learning list than the breadth requirement list. For example, the question was asked whether visual interpretive skills could be one of the ways of learning.

CEP agrees that Arts made a strong case for two requirements. However, since one of the goals of GE reform at this time is to reduce the number of overall courses, to add another in arts moves the total back to nearly what it is at present.

In the discussion of how many requirements to put forth, CEP discussed whether there should be separate ways of learning requirements for quantitative skills and statistics or whether these could be collapsed into one. It was noted that many students come into UCSC with enough math to make them quantitatively literate but not having reach a desired level of statistical knowledge. The group also discussed whether it is good to split the current E requirement into two ways of learning requirements. It arose from the discussion that there are so many possible topics under the umbrella of the Ethnic requirement that is it difficult to bring them into one requirement. The Committee agrees that first they need to be clear on their educational priorities in this area. Is it living effectively in a multi-cultural American society versus global? Could the priority be simplified to Interaction across Difference or Intercultural Engagement? This may be a likely topic for a brown bag workshop.

The discussion on renaming of the ways of learning will continue. Perspectives and Practices, for example, fits with the idea that subjects like the E requirement are perspectives, while those like the Q requirement are practices. Cross-Cutting Categories or Fluencies were a couple of other suggestions.

Chair Padgett will circulate a draft of his presentation for the upcoming Forum on GE Reform by next Monday for discussion at next week's meeting.

One future task for CEP is to propose deletion of SCR 10.2.1 which related to students who arrived before 1986.

III. Course approval process.

Chair Padgett continued to review the course approval process for the Committee.

There is a separate form for cross-listed course requests. The requests need to justify why the course should be cross-listed. Cross-listed courses benefit students by allowing them to elect the subject area in their own major. Some faculty think that cross-listing courses is a useful way to bring courses from other departments to the attention of their majors. The question of how enrollments count was raised. Course enrollment counts go to the home department of Senate members regardless of the course sponsoring unit for the course. Enrollment counts for non-Senate faculty go to the course sponsoring unit.

Since discovery seminars are not being requested at this time the Committee did not discuss these courses at today's meeting.

The Student Directed Seminar form was discussed, including the need for Title IX training and for confirmation of any academic or non-academic disciplinary issues before these courses are approved.

Course revisions were discussed. Major revisions such as changes in basic course content, or in prerequisites or enrollment limits, require the regular course approval form. There is also a form for minor course revisions such as suspension of a course, reactivation of a suspended course under the same description and content, change in course description, and renumbering or renaming a course. The minor revision forms do not go through the division for a dean's signature.

The Committee would like to modify the course approval forms at some point this year. For example, it would be useful to have both the old and new catalog descriptions on the minor revision form.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy