

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

**November 5, 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), Jaye Padgett (Chair), Don Potts, Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep), Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Loisa Nygaard, Matthew Palm (SUA Rep).

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

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

Chair Padgett updated CEP on the status of the UC Common Calendar. UC is under pressure from UCOP to have conforming start dates for each quarter. Last year CEP considered calendars for 2010-2016. Standardization of religious holidays in the calendar is thought to be a good idea. CEP found no issues with fall or spring start dates in these years of the calendar. However, winter quarter proposed start dates would be problematic in some years. At UCSC there is normally at least one working day of the quarter before the day that classes begin after the winter closure. This day allows students to meet certain needs such as advising meetings, dorm move in, issues with enrolling in classes, orientations, books and materials purchasing, resolution of enrollment holds, access to Financial Aid and Registrar's Office, etc. Also, placement exams are offered at the beginning of the quarter for students who did not test prior to winter closure. Faculty need the time for staff support and potential issues with technology, etc. The Common Calendar will always start on a Monday. CEP would like instruction to start on Tuesday in certain years. For example, one year the quarter is proposed to start the same day as classes start. CEP wonders whether the concerns of undergrad education been addressed or if the maintenance of a common calendar is for administrative convenience. CEP asked that a request go to the UC President for an exception to allow for a different winter start date. Vice Provost of Student Affairs (VPSA) McGinty decided that UCSC will conform with the Common Calendar start dates and did not put forward a request for exception. The reason for her decision was not given. However, the VPSA did pledge to find ways to solve or ameliorate CEP's concern in subsequent years before the "perfect storm" year of 2016 when classes are proposed to start the day that the quarter starts. One idea is for Baytree Bookstore to open on the weekend before the start of the quarter. CEP would like to know which other campuses have winter closures and how they will manage these issues. Chair Padgett will prepare a letter to the CP/EVC expressing concerns and asking that the campus plan ahead.

The group was informed that the recently circulated article regarding suspension of a writing requirement at UCLA was erroneous. In fact, UCLA has only suspended an option of satisfying a general education seminar requirement by means of taking a second Writing II course. They did this because the campus does not currently have enough capacity in Writing II. This one option for satisfaction of the general education requirement was suspended for continuing students only. UCLA hopes to reinstate it in the near future for new students.

Chair Padgett reviewed the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting for CEP. UCSC and collaborators are pursuing investing \$100M (through a master developer) to buy properties at the NASA-Ames site to enhance research opportunities. The plan is that no money will need to come from UCSC for this project. Due to changing laws, the agreement needs to be finalized before the end of 2008. After that time only monetary agreements between government and industry will be allowed, no more in-kind agreements. If this endeavor succeeds there may be regular University courses on site. SEC discussed the bad state budget situation. Already this year UC is down 5 percent in real dollars over last fiscal year. Mid-year cuts are expected. UCSC may be cut as much as \$2M in one time funds which could become a permanent cut next year. There is great concern about the budget picture for next year. Student fees may rise again, maybe even mid-year. UC overenrolled by 10K students with respect to funded student FTE; several hundred of those students are at UCSC. Although UCSC decided to overenroll for 2008-09, due to a lack of funding it will need to reconsider that approach in upcoming years.

The recent UCEP meeting was reviewed for the group. On-line Title IX compliance was discussed. Not all campuses are fully compliant with the training requirements. The Senate has been asked for advice. Significant consequences to faculty and departments have been proposed. Feedback indicates that the on-line program needs to be improved. UC is aware of the need for improvement and for work on technology issues. Having the local campus Title IX representative give a presentation is an alternative to the on-line method and is thought to be more interesting.

A new business plan from University Office of Education Abroad Programs (UOEAP) will be coming to the Senate for comment. UOEAP continues to have significant budget challenges. Faculty EAP directors at other sites are likely to be cut and/or consolidated to save costs. More EAP cost will be born by student fees, balanced with measures to make it possible for financial aid eligible students to participate.

VPDUE Ladusaw apprised CEP of the fall third week student census. Frosh enrollments are up by 260 students (118 above target) for a total of 3,968. Transfer student numbers totaled 872, up 82 over last year (32 above target). Graduate student enrollments were at 310, down 30 (40 below target). This quarter there are 14,575 undergraduates and 1,410 graduate students for a campus total of 15,985 (415 above the funded 15,560). Fall 07 there were 15,246 students (14 below the funded 15,260). Admissions has been aiming for 3,700 incoming frosh in recent years. They will recommend to Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Klinger that the target be reduced to 3,500, allowing for more funding at the upper-division level. Given the last two years of particularly large frosh classes, there will be an increased need for classes at the UD level in the upcoming two years. This year's incoming frosh class was larger than anticipated in part because UC was not aware that CalPoly had stopped taking applications before UC's offers were extended, which probably affected UCSC's yield rate.

Minutes for October 8 and 15 were accepted as amended.

## **II. Math Placement Exam.**

The Math Department's request to change the placement exam was discussed. The Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) supervises math placement exams, per their charge. CPE would like CEP's input to the Math Department's request.

Math wants to prevent students from failing math courses by directing students to classes at the appropriate level as soon as possible. With this in mind, the Math Department has proposed to limit the number of times that students may take the placement exam during their academic career at UCSC to three. They are also proposing that after a student fails a course they may not place out of it by retaking the placement exam. It is important to note that placing into a certain course does not equal mastery of all of the materials for the prerequisite course. These placement exams are intended solely for course placement and not designed for course satisfaction. Thus the courses are not designed to be akin to credit by petition for math courses.

If any student wants to take a math class they must either place into the course or pass prerequisite courses. If a student scores below 12 (of 60), he/she is not eligible to take any math course at UCSC and instead must take a class elsewhere. If a student scores between 12-20, he/she needs to take Math 2 before any other math course. A score between 21-30 places a student in Math 3 (pre-calculus) and a score between 31-40 demonstrates that a student is ready for calculus (11A or 19A). Students with higher scores may place into Math 19B or 20. Presently there is no limit on the number of times that a student may take the placement exam. With enough attempts most students eventually move into at least Math 3. This can be problematic since, according to research by Learning Support Services Director Cordova, students who score 25 or lower are highly likely to fail Math 3. Given this, CEP agrees that it is better for students to take the lower-level course.

CEP supports the Math Department's proposal but wonders why they chose three attempts at the exam as the limit. The Committee will recommend to CPE in their response that the department consider whether students should be required to take a class after one or two attempts at the exam. CPE will also recommend an appeal process.

The Committee was reminded that students may take the Analytical Writing Placement Exam only once before taking a course to support them in satisfying the Entry-Level Writing Requirement.

### **III. General Education Reform.**

Members found last week's Forum on General Education Reform to be a success.

CEP discussed holding brown bag workshops in November to gather more input on specific topics. Announcements will go to Senators, colleges, and departments. The workshops will be open to all.

Members were asked to review their divisions' DC responses again to determine whether the departments are trying to move in the direction of the DC guidelines. Members should look to see how well departments are succeeding in reaching their DC goals and whether the departments' resource needs are clear from the responses. Departments need to say what they need in the context of their educational goals for their majors.

One topic for a brown bag workshop will be further consideration of breadth requirements. From nearly all the feedback received, there seems to be general recognition among the faculty that the current system needs to change. Division-oriented breadth seems less interesting to everyone than things like "practices and proficiencies" and the Interdisciplinary Topical Cluster

(ITC) idea. CEP discussed dropping breadth and going with courses in substantive areas with each course satisfying only one requirement. The Committee speculates that this will be clearer to the campus community and that a one-dimensional system will be simpler to understand. Many comments received in recent weeks seem to fit with these ideas.

A second theme for a brown bag workshop that emerged from feedback received at and after the forum is the interest in finding ways to get people to approach problems from more than one discipline. The ITCs intend to do this. College 8's idea for an ITC is moving forward. In that example, the ITC will bridge CORE and Writ 2 (in collaboration with the Writing Program).

#### **IV. External reviews.**

Politics: CEP considered the draft response to politics. Politics indicated that they will be updating their response to the request for a Disciplinary Communication (DC) statement within a couple of weeks. With minor changes the letter was confirmed as ready for sending.

Sociology: CEP discussed the External Review Committee (ERC) report and responses of the dean and department. Some of CEP's questions did not get addressed by the ERC including the questions related to the service learning program and new minor. Sociology has not responded to CEP's request for a DC statement. On-going concern was evident in the review documents about TA workload. The ERC recommended that the undergraduate advisor position be increased to a full FTE. Although the department wants to add service learning as a requirement to the major, resources would be needed to make that happen. Sociology has a 3.0 GPA gating into the major. In their response, CEP will ask how that is working. The Committee would like to know who is being kept out and where those students go. A draft will be considered at the November 19 meeting.

VPDUE Ladusaw shared that TA allocation methodology from UCOP to the campuses is currently under review. A new methodology is on the table. The proposal will come to the Senate for review. Many years ago the number of TAships to campuses was given based on the number of grad students, not the number of students being taught. Allocations since have increased from that point based on growth.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy