

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

November 26, 2008

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

Present: Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Dave Helmbold, Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Roxanne Monnet (ASO analyst), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Don Potts.

Absent: Linda Burman-Hall, Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Shawn Riley (SUA Rep), Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep), Eileen Zurbriggen.

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

I. Announcements, Updates, and Minutes.

Registrar Hunt-Carter and VPDUE Ladusaw have been working on the first implementation of University honors designations. This year's GPA thresholds are as follows: Summa cum laude: 3.91 for both SOE and the rest of the campus; Magna cum laude: 3.68 for SOE and 3.84 for the rest of the campus; Cum laude: 3.54 for SOE and 3.65 for the rest of the campus. These are the thresholds for 2008-09 for both University Honors and for the Dean's List.

Questions concerning Dean's honors for part-time students and students with certain disabilities were raised. Members from last year recalled that Dean's honors for part-time students was discussed and that part-time students are not eligible for Dean's honors. The Regulation would need to be changed to allow part-time students this type of honors.

Special consideration for honors for students with certain documented disabilities was not part of the discussions that occurred leading up to the Regulation that was passed last year. CEP will take this issue up at a later date.

The Registrar asked for input on how to advertise this year's thresholds and the associated FAQs information. The information will be on the Registrar's web site, email will be sent to advisors, a message will go to students via their portals, and a note will be posted at the faculty portal. It was recommended that there be a link from the catalog to the threshold information and from the top campus web page. CEP will send a letter to departments that includes honors thresholds with annual statistics and CEP's recommendations from last year for majors and colleges.

II. Disciplinary Communication Legislation.

CEP discussed whether to propose that SCR 10.2.1 be removed from the Senate Manual. Members supported the idea. This Regulation relates to students prior to 1986. The change was viewed as clean up. All former general catalogs are available as a reference regarding the requirements of that time, should students from prior to 1986 pursue completing their degrees in the future.

The Committee discussed draft legislation for a Disciplinary Communication (DC) Requirement to be put before the Senate at the first Senate Meeting in winter. They plan to propose other changes to general education requirements at the next Senate Meeting. After the legislation passes, CEP would issue guidelines. Courses proposed for the DC requirement would go through the usual course approval process.

CEP was reminded that it was never the intent of the current writing-intensive (W) requirement nor the proposed DC requirement to repeat the work of the C1/C2 requirements with regard to teaching grammar, punctuation, etc., and that the W (and proposed DC) are about teaching the conventions of writing in a particular discipline such as how to make good arguments. Members recognize the need to consider the effectiveness of the C1/C2 requirement and intend to give that topic attention this year but no legislative changes are viewed as necessary for the C1/C2 requirements.

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (CRJE) has set a December meeting to give feedback to CEP on the draft DC proposal. CEP will ask CRJE to set up an additional meeting in January in order to give feedback to the broader GE proposal.

The perspective was raised that some faculty members see the DC idea as a weakening of the W requirement. However, it is thought by many that the current W is already somewhat weak in light of lack of clarity on its intent and resource limitations at the department level. As currently implemented, it is weak in two respects: A lack of spaces in W courses means that a lot of students have to petition individually for an exception to the usual policy about the W. And even students who find space in regular W courses are not receiving instruction in the modes of writing and communication most relevant to their discipline(s), which was the original vision, but often in fields remote from their current work and future career plans.

Members were asked to review the DC responses from their divisions to determine whether the departments commented on resource needs and to be in touch with those departments about their needs as soon as possible.

III. Non-writing general education topics.

The Committee on Teaching (COT) has expressed the desire to be involved in GE reform efforts and asked how they could help. CEP wondered whether GE topics could be the focus of an upcoming Teaching and Learning Symposium such as has been sponsored by COT and the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) for a number of years. VPDUE Ladusaw indicated that it is uncertain whether there will be a symposium this year. He went on to apprise the Committee of the status of the hire for a new director for CTE. He and COT are in agreement that the recent search for this position failed. The top candidate accepted a position at another campus. Putting more resources to this area does not appear to be a high priority for divisional leadership perhaps due to the current budget outlook. How to maintain support for critical functions is being considered. There will be a call for someone to serve as an interim faculty director. In the short term, the VPDUE's Office is supporting the functions of CTE.

COT could aid in developing guidelines on how to teach GE courses and perhaps sponsor workshops to support teaching of the new GEs. Early spring is recommended as the best time

for workshops given the faculty and graduate-student recruitment efforts that take a lot of time in winter quarter.

The subcommittee to discuss topics related to the current E requirement were asked to meet and prepare recommendations for discussion at an upcoming CEP meeting.

The idea was raised at the most recent brown bag workshop that in the course of every GE course offering faculty would make clear to the students why the course is important.

In light of feedback received, CEP has shifted to being more interested in a one-dimensional approach to GE and continues to maintain its commitment to keeping the focus on what would be educationally valuable and interesting, not such questions as how to spread enrollments among divisions.

IV. UOEAP business plan.

CEP continued its discussion of the University Office of Education Abroad Programs (UOEAP) business plan. It is not clear from the document what will be the cost to campuses. CEP finds it impossible to effectively judge or assess the plan without knowing the campus implications. The Committee would need to see another proposal with more information regarding the fiscal impact to campuses before they could support the plan. The Committee found the shift of cost to students and differential pricing by site to be disturbing since students will be likely to choose programs based on cost rather than quality. As a separate point, the bureaucratic costs within the plan seem very high despite recent cuts to the Santa Barbara office. A draft response will be finalized via email.

V. External Review discussion.

Discussion of the Computer Sciences external review response was postponed to the December 3 meeting to allow time for CEP to consider the draft letter.

IV. Double Counting.

Discussion of double counting questions raised by advising staff was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy