

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

December 3, 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), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Don Potts, Ravi Rajan (Provost Rep), Eileen Zurbruggen.

Absent: Shawn Riley (SUA Rep).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Jon Ellis (Senate Service Scholar), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions), Stacey Sketo-Rosener (Coordinator of Academic Advising, VPDUE Office).

I. Announcements and updates.

Member Potts apprised the Committee of the recent UCEP meeting. UC is expecting a \$66M mid-year cut, and there could be a third cut this year. UCOP may propose to limit frosh enrollments. The UC Berkeley Chancellor proposed stratified fees in which UCB and UCLA would charge more. UCEP discussed the University Office of Education Abroad Program's (UOEAP) business plan. The UC President decided to cut UOEAP to \$38M. UCEP found that there was not enough information in the document to support the plan and decided that they cannot comment without seeing the full report. A more complete report is available and will be made available to UCEP very soon. Undergraduate research opportunities will be one of UCEP's foci for this year. Best practices for dealing with impacted majors at the campuses are also being discussed. The impact of increased use of lecturers is also on their agenda. There is pressure to complete the review of the School of Nursing at UCD. This school will be entirely privately funded, at about \$10M per year for at 10 years. The Taskforce on Undergraduate Effectiveness and UC President Yudof do not appear to be on the same page with regarding to accountability and assessment of undergraduate majors. The taskforce is trying to resist pressures for accountabilities that seem inappropriate. The taskforce thinks that accountability and assessment should be faculty designed and driven.

Chair Padgett reviewed yesterday's Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting for the Committee. The search for a dean of engineering continues. The search for a dean of arts is at the point of negotiating with the top candidates. The systemwide bond measure to seismically retrofit certain UC campuses are off the table presently due to the economy. Executive Vice Chancellor/Campus Provost Klinger agreed to some of the faculty salary taskforce recommendations in a meeting with the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Academic Personnel, and Senate leadership.

II. External Review Discussions.

Computer Engineering (CE): CEP considered a draft response to CE's external review and decided to recap a paragraph from the Computer Sciences letter regarding the possible combination of CE with Computer Sciences and Electrical Engineering. With that one change the letter was approved for sending.

Computer Sciences (CS): CEP considered the draft response to CS's external review. The letter was approved with minor text revisions.

Information Systems Management (ISM): CEP considered the draft response to ISM's external review and approved the letter for sending.

Theater Arts: A draft response to the TA external review was discussed and text revisions offered. The letter will be finalized via email.

The role of members at external review closure meetings was discussed. Members were reminded that their role at the meeting is to ensure that the issues raised by CEP get discussed. If CEP's letter of response to the review indicated things that need resolution, members should raise these for discussion. If the issues are not addressed adequately in the discussion, the member may ask that a request to the department go into the closure letter for consideration at a specified time such as the 18 month review. Members will briefly recap the closure meeting discussions for the Committee at future meetings.

III. Action Plan High-Level Indicators: Measuring our progress, next steps.

Discussion of the high-level indicators document was carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of time.

IV. Double counting questions.

CEP considered questions that arose in a recent meeting of department undergraduate advisors related to the Santa Cruz Division Regulations passed last spring that defined a minimum number of upper-division (UD) credits for each Major (40) and made allowance for some amount of overlapping coursework.

Advisors asked whether once a student could use one senior seminar or other approved course to satisfy the senior exit requirement for two different majors or must the senior exit requirement always be separate for each major, assuming the student had met the minimum UD credit requirements per major. CEP considered whether students should be allowed to count a senior capstone experience for more than one major. Although it is assumed that students must have unique experiences for each major, this is not a stated requirement in the Senate Regulations. CEP's 2005 report was referenced as a reminder that the thinking on the capstone requirement has changed since the institute of standard grading at UCSC. The current thinking is that capstones should be valuable educational experience. Such things as GRE scores should be discontinued as a way of satisfying one's capstone requirement. CEP underscored that a double major is understandable a great deal of extra work, and confirmed their thinking that one capstone should be required for each major. CEP realized that the need for unique capstones may limit what combination of double majors students may take. Although CEP does not feel inclined to approve exceptions to the need to complete one capstone per major, the Committee is willing to hear compelling cases where one capstone should be sufficient based on the interdisciplinary nature and scope of that capstone (involving faculty from both degree sponsoring units). It may be that a well-conceived interdisciplinary program could lead to one capstone experience in which case that should appear in the catalog and be an option to all students taking that combination of majors. The sponsoring units for both of the majors would need to be in support of the request. The second way to have an exception considered would be by individual student petition to CEP. Again, the case needs to be made that the capstone would have well-constructed educational value. It is expected that such individual petitions would be made in advance of the student completing the experience. The support of both degree-

sponsoring units would need to be included with the petition. Post-approval confirmation of both degree-sponsoring units would be needed.

Another question from the advising group was whether departments have discretion to identify classes that can not be double-counted by students completing a double major. The department would need to make a compelling case to CEP about the reasons such a restriction is needed prior to instituting the limitation which should be stated in the catalog.

The advisors asked whether departments could continue to have their own policies on which combinations for double majors would not be permitted. For example, Biology has not allowed students to double major in General Biology and Marine Biology. A compelling case would need to be made to CEP and the restriction should appear in the general catalog.

Chair Padgett will draft guidelines for discussion at next week's meeting eventually to be posted on the Committee's public web site.

V. SCR 6.5.6: Independent Studies.

Discussion on independent studies limits (SCR 6.5.6) was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

VI. GE Reform: non-writing general education requirements.

CEP continued their discussion of non-writing related general education (GE) reform topics by discussing a list of potential GE requirements such as: textual analysis, scientific inquiry, cross-cultural analysis, ethnicity and race, environment understanding, quantitative, statistics, visual/auditory/kinetic, and human behavior. What should be removed from or added to the list was discussed. An option to consider would be clustering required topics such as: public understanding of science and technologies, culture and diversity, broadening the environment, and ethics.

Whether courses should be permitted to satisfy more than one requirement was discussed. It is recognized that allowing a single GE course to satisfy two or more requirements would permit students to take fewer courses but that it would lead to students continuing to pick courses for the number of requirements the course satisfied rather than the course content.

Members were asked to send their list of requirement that they think everyone should take to Chair Padgett by Monday. He will create a document for discussion at the next meeting.

So Attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy