

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**May 12, 2010**

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

Present: Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Cormac Flanagan, Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Jimin Lee, Roxanne Monnet (Staff), Eric Porter, Deanna Shemek (Provost Rep), John Tamkun (Chair), Peter Young, Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Justin Riordan (SUA Rep).

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

**I. Announcements.**

Update from recent meetings by Chair Tamkun will be carried forward to next week.

The Community Studies teach-out plan for the term of the suspension of the major will be on next week's agenda.

**II. Catalog topics.**

Economics: The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed the Disciplinary Communication (DC) proposal for the Economics, Business Management Economics, and Global Economics majors. CEP is aware of the challenges faced by the department and the efforts that they have made to think creatively about how best to serve their students. The current proposal has a number of strengths, but also has some problems that will need to be addressed before it can be approved. CEP feedback concerns the original proposal (what is referred to as "Plan B" in the April 28 memo). They will not comment on "Plan A" of the April 28 memo because there is not enough detailed information to allow us to evaluate the pedagogy. CEP would be happy to review a detailed proposal of this sort if your department would like to submit one in the future.

The overall strategy of the "Plan B" proposal--to split the DC curriculum across three upper-division courses chosen from a varied menu, with writing instruction occurring in separate 1, 2 or 3-unit sections--seems viable in principle. Centralizing the writing instruction takes the burden off of the ladder-rank faculty who instruct the upper-division courses and, in theory, could result in higher quality, and more consistent, DC instruction. There is a certain challenge in teaching a section in which students are working on assignments from a wide variety of courses, but assuming that these assignments share enough common features, this overall structure seems workable. CEP does, however, need more information about the sections, including course approval forms (because these are new courses). What material will be covered in these sections? Will there be readings? How will students be evaluated? CEP also needs more information about the assignments themselves. Because the plan is to allow a wide variety of 5-unit upper-division

courses to qualify for the DC designation, CEP will recommend that the department develop a template concerning the writing assignments that each instructor can include in his/her syllabus.

CEP is also concerned with ensuring the quality of instruction for the writing sections. Undergraduate tutors can be a valued addition to a DC curriculum, but they cannot be tasked with providing the bulk of the instruction and feedback in writing. This role should be taken by ladder-rank faculty, lecturers, and/or graduate student teaching assistants. It is not clear in the current version of the proposal the precise role that undergraduate tutors will play. Also, given that the April 28 memo notes that English is not the first language for many of the Economics graduate students, it is important that the department ensure that graduate student TAs are carefully selected and adequately trained and supported.

The original proposal mentioned the Intensive Economics Capstone course as one possibility for satisfying the DC. In order for CEP to approve this as an acceptable option, a syllabus is needed and a description of how the course meets the DC requirements (e.g., number of pages, cumulatively, feedback, instruction in writing, etc.).

CEP applauds the department's creative thinking in incorporating the highly functional Toastmaster's Club as one possibility for partially satisfying the DC. This seems like an excellent idea. CEP's only comment was that students taking this option would seem to be doing much more than one credit's worth of work (i.e., much more than 30 hours). If this is, indeed, the case, the department might consider increasing the number of credits that students earn for this experience. Moreover, as currently formulated in the proposal, students pursuing the Toastmaster's option in the department would be doing far more presentation work than students in any other department that is incorporating presentations into their DC. The department might consider reducing the Toastmaster requirements that will be required to partially satisfy the DC (e.g., perhaps only one quarter's participation would suffice), if this can be accomplished without compromising the structure of the Toastmaster's Club, which has for years been a highly successful learning opportunity for students.

The committee is open to the possibility of a proposal in which the DC (in part or full) is satisfied by courses taken outside of the major-sponsoring department (no transfer credit is permitted). However, there would need to be a pedagogical justification for such a plan. How, specifically, will these "outside" courses allow students to gain the communication skills necessary within the discipline of Economics? Specific courses would need to be listed (along with justifications), and letters of support from the course-sponsoring agencies/departments must be provided, indicating that they are willing to accept Economics students into these courses.

Once this information is available, CEP anticipated being able to provide provisional approval for a two-year period (2010-2012). The committee requests that the department assess the implementation of this plan after one year, and provide a follow-up report to CEP by October 1, 2011. As part of this assessment, CEP will invite the department to take some time next year to again consider the big picture and the pedagogical goals of the DC requirement. One of the main goals of moving from the Writing-Intensive requirement to the DC was to give departments the opportunity to think deeply about the ways in which communication in their discipline occurs and to shape their writing/communications curriculum in ways that are targeted towards the

needs of their majors. The Committee was struck by the fact that the current proposal provided only a broad statement about the Economics educational objectives (i.e., "to improve the effectiveness of [students'] written communications"). It seems likely that there are much more specific objectives, practices, and standards concerning communications in the discipline (and those are quite different for the two different spheres that Business Economics and Economics majors are planning to join). Moreover, the curriculum doubtless already provides some instruction for majors concerning how to communicate as economists. A plan that builds on the instruction that is already provided, rather than starting from scratch, might require fewer additional resources.

CEP reviewed the requested changes to text in the Economics admissions policy and decided that the word "slightly" should not be added because it was unclear. Other than that, the changes to the admissions policy text were approved. CEP approved the additional stipulation for the field studies program that students have at least junior standing. As requested CEP will add the names of Economics combined major to the program statement, however, CEP will list the names as they were approved (as they appear elsewhere in the catalog) which puts the lead department first. CEP needs confirmation of support of both involved departments for proposed changes to combined majors, and needs to know whether Economics supports the DC proposed by LALS for that combined major. All other proposed changes to your program statement were found to be text revisions without significant impact to requirements and were approved.

Psychology: CEP was impressed with the amount of thought and effort put into the Psychology Department's DC proposal. The request that students take PSYCH 100, Research Methods, and one senior seminar was approved conceptually. Half of the writing would occur in each course. In the seminar courses, students usually write a research paper with a draft. However, CEP found that they needed the specific course syllabi to approve the specific course that would satisfy the major since it seemed that they differed considerably. The Committee will want to confirm the cumulativeness of writing in each course, for example. It was proposed that the Cognitive Sciences Majors satisfy the DC in the same way as all other Psychology Majors. After answering questions, Member Zurbriggen recused herself from the discussion. CEP approved the DC proposal conceptually and that Chair Tamkun may review the individual syllabi to consider which will be published in the catalog for the DC.

Biology: Chair Tamkun recused himself from the discussion of the Biology DC proposals. Pending the several clarifications discussed by the committee at its May 5 meeting, the MCD Biology proposal is approved. The list for courses for the Neuroscience DC is the same as for MCDB plus two courses. BIOL 141L includes lab reports and an oral presentation. BIOE 182 appears to be 7-8 pages plus rewrites. Some of the rewriting is on one-page documents. This course appears thin of the 18 pages (plus student presentation of research). Before approving, the department will need to commit to increasing the writing to the required minimum. For the BMB major, many of the classes are also put forward for the general Biology BS DC. CHEM 195C (a senior thesis under faculty supervision) was an additional option, including the drafts, it appears that the minimum writing will be met. BIOL 186L was included as well and it was indicated that the course will be modified to include the writing mentioned in the proposal for the courses in the lab list. CEP is awaiting a response from EE Biology on BIOE 108. For the Health Sciences major, students complete a two credit human physiology course with two, 4-5

page papers. They also complete BIOE 189, an internship, for which they write a 10 page term paper under a faculty sponsor. CEP approved this DC. For the Plant Sciences DC it appears that BIOE 107 and 109 are being proposed, if that is the case, the request will be approved.

CEP considered and approved the name change of the Health Sciences BS to Human Biology, and the name change of the Neuroscience and Behavior BS to Neuroscience. It was noted that there is very little different between the MCDB BS and Neuroscience BS. With the recent request to reduce the lab requirement from two to one, there are only two distinct courses. Perhaps it would be more appropriate as a concentration to the MCDB major. CEP supported the request to discontinuation of the BA in Neuroscience and Behavior.

The Committee considered the rationale given with the request to prohibit certain combinations of double majors and approved the request. Indeed, there is significant overlap among these degrees and to state which cannot be taken together in the catalog should save a significant amount of staff time to demonstration to students which combinations are not possible anyway. The committee approved the request.

CEP had no objections to the requests to change chemistry labs and the required Physics courses, and to replace the calculus requirement with statistics.

The departments have requested to change the lab requirements from two upper-division labs (10 credits) to one lab plus BIOL 100K which is a two-credit course (7 credits total). Approval forms for BIOL 100K have not yet been submitted. CEP is inclined to approve the request. Concern was expressed at the thought of this being required for continuing students, given the potential impact on the timely completion of their degree.

Chemistry: CEP approved removal of BIOL 20 from the Biochemistry concentration to the BS and the word change from emphasis to concentration. The restructuring of the degree requirement language is also fine with CEP. The Committee identified one typo in the text conversion--that the requirement to take one of the CHEM 146 series was dropped in the conversion from the Chemistry BS requirements and was restored by CEP. The request to remove planners from the catalog is not to CEP's preference, however, since provision of planners is not a requirement, CEP approved the request.

The Committee discussed the request to change the sequencing and prerequisites of the CHEM 1A courses. A number of concerns were raised at the initial discussion of this request such as: will students be adequately prepared to enter CHEM 1B given the Chemistry placement exam is optional? Since CHEM 1B will no longer be a prerequisite to CHEM 1C, how will students know whether they are ready for CHEM 1C? What will be the change to the success rate in CHEM 1M since it will no longer be co-requisite to CHEM 1B? Is it fine for a student to take CHEM 1M and 1N in the same quarter? CEP needs confirmation that affected departments have had the opportunity to give feedback to the plan before it can be approved. The department responded strongly that they think the proposal is in the best interest of the students and that the concerns expressed here are not truly issues given the content planned for each of the courses. CEP will respond that the proposal is less than ideal for the students and that the Committee hopes the situation will be reversed when resources become available to offer the courses more often, but that request will be approved while not endorsed, pending confirmation of consultation with affected departments.

The request to change the BMB major disqualification policy will be carried forward to the meeting at which other disqualification policy requests will be discussed.

**Computer Sciences:** The DC proposals for both the Computer Science and Computer Game Design majors were discussed. Although CEP's overall impression of both proposals was positive, a few issues need to be clarified before they can be approved. CEP supported the proposal to allow students to satisfy the Computer Game Design Major DC requirement by taking CMPS 170, 171, and 172. One potential problem is that the total amount of writing in these courses--including both individual and group projects--is limited to as few as 24 pages. This is slightly below the 25 page minimum needed to satisfy the DC requirement (see page 3). Furthermore, the Committee treats group writing as an alternative form of disciplinary communication that reduces the minimum individual writing requirement from 25 to 18 pages. Before approving the Computer Game Design proposal, CEP needs confirmation that all students will complete a minimum of 25 pages of writing (including at least 18 pages of individual writing) in CMPS 170/171/172. CEP also supported the plan to offer multiple pathways by which Computer Science majors can satisfy the DC requirement including CMPS 132/132DC; CMPS 180/180DC; a senior thesis (CMPS195) or an upper-division elective (CMPE 185 or CMPS 115). CEP tentatively approved these DC options with the following conditions:

- CMPS 180DC and CMPS 132DC must be approved as new courses; note that "DC" must be replaced with a standard single-letter suffix.
- CMPE must confirm that they support the request to allow CMPS majors to satisfy the DC requirement by taking CMPE185.
- The department must confirm that students will the minimum writing in all future offerings of the DC courses. It appears that much of the writing in CMPS 115 is done as part of team. CEP treats collaborative assignments as an alternative form of disciplinary communication that reduces the individual writing requirement from 25 to 18 pages of individual writing.

### **III. Repeating failed courses.**

Santa Cruz Regulation A9.4.1 indicates that college permission is needed for a student attempt a course more than twice. The regulation is not being enforced. Were it to be enforced, students would move to other degrees in a more timely fashion than is currently the case for some students who are repeatedly failing required classes. The regulation is difficult to enforce given the current structure of AIS. It is recognized that the colleges should not necessarily be the ones to decide on the basis by which a student should be approved or denied to repeat a course more than twice. Department policies to disqualify students from the major do not prevent students from enrolling in courses that are not restricted to majors. The result is an unnecessary impact on course capacity and longer time to degree for some students. CEP supported that departments form policies to advise the colleges on when to allow students to repeat courses more than twice. Nonetheless, there is currently not a mechanism to prevent undeclared students from repeating courses at this time.

### **IV. Compendium.**

CEP considered the proposed new Compendium for UC education. They agreed that when there are degree titles that are unique within the UC system, there should be systemwide Academic

Senate review for the creation or discontinuation of those degrees. Members were invited to give further feedback by email. A draft letter will be discussed next week.

**V. Transfer students.**

CEP recognized the confusion that will be caused for incoming transfer students as we enter the first year of the new GE requirements. Since these students have been working on the old GEs, CEP decided to make an exception to its catalog rights policy, which says that students will be set to the catalog year at which they enter UCSC, and will set the students to an earlier catalog year to prevent their needing to see the college to make such changes.

The Committee considered whether to set them to catalog year 2008-09 which would necessitate that they fulfill the writing-intensive (W) requirement if they had not satisfied the IGETC or to 2009-10 which would require that IGETC-satisfied students complete the DC unless they see their colleges for a change of catalog year. At this point it is anticipated to be far easier for students to find ways to satisfy the DC than the W, without petition to CEP for a GE substitution. Any one of these approaches will cause work for some people to change catalog year and/or file petitions. For this year since ~50 percent of the entering transfer students are IGETC satisfied, CEP decided to opt for 2008-09. The arrangement of an exception to catalog year at entry is expected to be temporary. Eventually transfers students whether IGETC satisfied or not will be satisfying their DC through their major requirements.

**VI. Arts FTE transfer.**

Discussion of the proposed faculty FTE transfer from the Art Department was carried forward due to lack of time.

**VII. SUA survey.**

Discussion of the SUE student survey was carried forward.

So attest,

John Tamkun, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy