

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

December 2, 2009

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), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Eric Porter, John Tamkun (Chair), Peter Young, Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Michael Morrissey (SUA Rep), A provost rep has not yet been assigned to CEP.

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

I. Announcements and updates.

The Literature Department responded to CEP's letter regarding partially on-line course LTPR 177. Their response answered CEP's questions about the Wednesday sections, how the department will ensure that students are aware in advance of what is needed/expected of them technologically, and on the students' investment of time in the course. CEP appreciated knowing that the instructor will make use of only the free aspects of basic accounts with Second Life. The course was approved for one offering, after which CEP would like a report of how the offering went before it is approved for future offerings.

The department chair requests to discontinue the Narrative Evaluation System (NES) were discussed at the recent Senate Executive (SEC) meeting. SEC is considering options that might serve as a compromise between the all (NES required for all courses) or nothing (no narrative evaluations) discussions of the past. It has become clear that people want narrative evaluation compliance removed from the academic personnel review process.

Social Sciences Division Dean Kamieniecki has announced his intent to adopt an enrollment management plan that would reduce divisional course enrollments by 20 percent. CEP discussed the potential ramifications of this plan. The Committee has heard that most, if not all of the divisions, are making changes to course offerings due to budget constraints. If course enrollment is to be limit, requests should be made via the course revision process so that the limit is known to students. If course sponsoring units plan not to offer a course, they should request that it be cancelled or suspend, and not just stop scheduling it. Enrollment limits should not occur simply by requesting smaller rooms or reducing the number of offerings without consideration of the impact that may be caused to other departments, particular for courses required for majors. Such informal changes do not allow for appropriate academic planning. CEP recognized that reductions in Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) for teaching assistantships and lecturers is forcing course sponsoring units to reconsider whether to limit enrollment or modify course content. However, there could be a potentially catastrophic situation if UCSC does not offer the needed courses for its students, causing students to withdraw from the University or take longer to earn their degrees, and potential causing a further reduction in state funding by not enrolling the minimum required

enrollments or causing students to extend their time at UC beyond the window funded by the state. How to manage limits to majors will be discussed at a future meeting.

Members supported the plan for Chair Tamkun to visit the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) to discussion shared concerns such as course capacity.

II. Undergraduate Education Abroad Program.

CEP discussed the report of the joint Senate-Administration task Force on the Education Abroad Program. Education abroad is popular among UC students, and, in the opinion of the CEP, a valuable, frequently eye-opening, experience. Many students study abroad through the UC-run Education Abroad Program (EAP), though a significant number choose to use third-party providers instead. Since EAP provides such a valuable experience, CEP will respond that it feels (i) that it is important to maintain at least the core features of it, and (ii) that it continues to be available to all students, despite the challenging financial situation of the University.

One of the main changes discussed in the report, which has already been implemented, is that students on EAP will pay a separate EAP fee, rather than the usual Registration and Education Fees. While there may be financial advantages for EAP to do this, CEP expressed concern that the decoupling of the fees paid by EAP and non-EAP students could lead to the EAP fees becoming considerable greater. CEP noted, with some concern, that there is no mention in the report, of a policy that would try to keep EAP and non-EAP fees comparable. In particular, CEP would strongly oppose any attempt by the Office of the President to use EAP as a revenue-generating endeavor and, therefore, increase fees to "whatever the market will bear." EAP should be available to all UC students, not just the rich ones.

The Task Force recommended the establishment of UOEAP Governing Committee, including representation from the Academic Senate, to provide administrative and financial oversight. Academic oversight will presumably continue to be provided by the University Committee on International Education (UCIE). The Task Force strongly recommended that the Governing Committee substantially reduces the considerable costs of articulation (giving students UC credit for classes taken abroad) and in particular to "cease course by course articulation". While this would undoubtedly save money for the EAP program, CEP has two concerns. The first is that the burden of articulating courses taken by students will then fall on staff on the campuses, whose number was already reduced by budget cuts. Secondly, ceasing course by course articulation implies that students will only get transfer credit for EAP courses, which will not count towards the GPA. CEP learned that this is the case for students who study abroad with third party providers rather than EAP. Since the majority of students on EAP take a whole year, CEP was concerned that a significant fraction of their University courses would not get GPA credit.

One of the expenses of running the EAP program, and presumably a substantial one, is that most Study Centers have a UC faculty member full-time on site, the Study Center Director (SCD). It seems probable that the Governing Committee will recommend removal of at least some SCD's to make those programs economically viable. This, together with ceasing course by course articulation, implies that EAP will provide less of a "UC experience" for students studying abroad and will, in the future, provide services quite similar to those of third party providers.

This seems like a loss to UC students. To the extent possible, it seems preferable to maintain the "UC experience" within EAP.

III. GE Topics.

Yesterday was the deadline for course sponsoring units to submit proposals to add a new general education (GE) designation to a class for fall 2010.

CEP discussed last week's consultation with Arts Division Dean David Yager on the question of allowing students to choose between two General Education (GE) designations on a single course. The Committee found the consultation to be extremely valuable and that it helped them to better understand the reasons why some Arts faculty made this request.

CEP strongly supports interdisciplinarity in research and teaching and recognizes that UCSC is fortunate to have many faculty members who, by virtue of their training and expertise, can single-handedly provide multiple disciplinary perspectives in the classroom. As well, faculty have multiple and diverse identities that should be supported and celebrated. Students benefit tremendously from this rich variability, and, indeed, so do faculty. At no point in the (long) process of developing and implementing the new GE system was there ever any intent to communicate anything different.

CEP realized, however, that there can be unintended consequences from any action or policy, and after the consultation had a better appreciation for the fact that some faculty felt that the new policies (and paperwork) communicated the message that faculty must choose only one of their diverse perspectives, identities, or set of skills and expertise for each class that they teach. The directive to "Choose only one [box]" is particularly painful to some, as it seems to mirror the check boxes for race or ethnic identity that have marginalized and made invisible the many people with multiple racial/ethnic identities. CEP will apologize in its letter for this unintended consequence and take opportunity to restate CEP's commitment to diversity at all levels.

Both CEP and the campus as a whole had many discussions about placing multiple GE designations on a single course. The new regulations are fairly clear on this point, they were sent out two meeting before the final vote, and no serious objections were raised. However, despite what felt like a strong mandate against dual designations, CEP revisited this point several times during fall 2009 quarter, partly in response to faculty questions (from Arts faculty, as well as faculty in other divisions) and as part of a general discussion concerning policy decisions about GE that the 2008-09 CEP had made.

After these additional discussions it continues to be CEP's belief that placing multiple designations on a single course would have negative consequences that would be serious and far-reaching. The Committee thought that it would open the door to attempts (by some) to "game" the system by making some courses more attractive to students. CEP noted that most (not all) such courses would not be able to adequately address the learning objectives of both of their listed GE designations, with a resultant weakening of the overall GE experience. CEP expressed concern that allowing two GE designations would lead to requests for three, four, or more such designations, with the increasing likelihood that all designations would not be adequately

addressed in a 10-week course. The Committee was convinced that the logistical problems of allowing students to pick one or another designation are nearly insurmountable, and that even if these problems could be overcome, there would be a cascade of (foreseen and unforeseen) additional problems to address. For example, would UCSC want to allow a student to change their chosen designation months or years down the road? Also, it must be kept in mind that the single-designation system that CEP developed was intended not to accurately map the array of course offerings available to students but to ensure that students took courses with sufficient coverage in each of the designated areas. For these reasons, CEP was reluctant to make changes to the current policy.

CEP had previously suggested the option of allowing faculty to propose multiple designations and (assuming that CEP agrees that the course meets both sets of goals and objectives) letting CEP pick one designation based on capacity issues and the needs of the campus. Some of these decisions would be quite simple. For example, if a course was proposing both the Ethnicity & Race (ER) and Interpreting Arts and Media (IM) designations, but a prerequisite for the course carried the IM designation, it would make sense to apply the ER designation to the course under consideration. CEP continues to believe that this might be a workable compromise, and would encourage individual departments and faculty members to consider how the judicious application of GE designations can showcase and highlight the strengths of departments and faculty, while simultaneously providing needed service to the campus as a whole.

CEP will invite the Arts faculty to work with them to find ways to mitigate or eliminate any unintended messages about diversity or interdisciplinarity that might arise from the "no double designations" policy. In particular, CEP would welcome feedback on the following ideas that they generated. CEP is considering additional catalog copy that would state that GE designations define course content in the sense that these courses are guaranteed to focus on certain material or learning outcomes, but that the designations do not define what isn't in a course. For example, many courses at UCSC are centrally concerned with issues of ethnicity and race, and many more touch on these themes at least briefly, but (for various reasons) only some of these will carry the ER designation.

Second, CEP thinks it is appropriate (and helpful to students) for individual instructors to use individual course catalog descriptions to communicate details about course content and focus for all courses, including GE courses. For example, if a course carries the textual analysis (TA) designation and involves an analysis of ethnic identity themes in Chicana literature, it would be appropriate to include this information in the course description. Moreover, such information can be communicated in course syllabi and on departmental web sites.

Third, it is an option, in certain cases where an instructor believes that using only one GE designation would compromise the integrity of a course, simply to not give it any GE designation. But CEP hopes before making such a decision that the instructor and department would consider that such a decision would limit the number of opportunities for students to fulfill one of the GE requirements.

Finally, CEP wonders whether the Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters (ITCs) might provide a way for faculty who teach from a deeply interdisciplinary foundation to be recognized for that

contribution. The ITCs were initially conceptualized as a way to create interdisciplinarity through connecting several courses from different disciplinary perspectives. However, there is no reason why several interdisciplinary courses could not be brought together, as well. If faculty can think of several courses that focus on a unified theme and fit together in a coherent way, it would likely be possible to put multiple GE designations on the cluster as a whole. CEP will invite interested faculty to consult with them further on this possibility.

The draft response letter to Dean Yager will be circulated by email.

CEP discussed the significance of the dean signature on course approval forms. It is not clear whether the divisions confirm that input has been solicited from the stakeholders of courses proposed for change, limitation, or elimination. The dean's signature is not a funding guarantee for the course. Departments are generally expected to fund their courses from the allocation that they received annually. It is also not known whether divisions expect departments to include information on how courses fit into their curriculum as a whole. Senate Regulation put the pedagogy of the curriculum into the hands of departments, colleges, and the Senate. Thus the divisional role is not pedagogical, unless the course in question is a division-sponsored course in which case the dean is serving in the role of department chair. It may be that the divisional signature is no more than an acknowledgement that the division had the opportunity to consider the proposal before it went to CEP and to add comments for CEP consideration. A divisional signature is not requested on the minor course revision form at present which is the form used to suspend or cancel courses.

IV. Stakeholder maps.

CEP asked the Registrar last year to develop stakeholder maps to facilitate communication between units offering courses and those relying on courses offered by other units that are required for their course as either degree requirements, electives, or prerequisites to required courses. The Academic Information System (AIS) can identify courses required as prerequisites to other courses. However, unless a degree is in the degree audit system, major requirements cannot be tracked. Until the degree audit system is complete, the stakeholder maps may not catch all degrees or courses that depend on other units' courses.

CEP decided that the ability to use the stakeholder maps is so valuable to course and major sponsoring units' ability to plan the curriculum, that they will contact all units not using it at present to ask that they do.

V. Jewish Studies BA proposal.

CEP began its discussion of the proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Jewish Studies. The discussion will continue next week.

VI. Remote on-line instruction and residency.

CEP discussed the Report of the Senate Special Committee on On-line and Remote Instruction and Residency. The Committee was impressed by the special committee's thoughtful analysis of

this important topic. CEP agreed that UC should take full advantage of the opportunities provided by on-line and remote courses and programs, provided that they are evaluated by the Senate using the standards applied to other modes of instruction. CEP supported the eight recommendations given in the report.

IV. Consultation with VPDAAGalloway.

Vice Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs (VPDAA) Alison Galloway visited CEP to discuss the CEP's role in viewing University Extension (UNEX) certification programs. UNEX strives to develop courses that are UC quality and VPDAA Galloway expressed the need for Senate support for this type of assessment. She informed CEP that UNEX is near to being back on an even keel financially. If the financial situation can be solved, she sees a lot of potential for growth in the Silicon Valley. The certificate programs are a corner stone of their program. However, many had not been reviewed in very long time. Last year's CEP decided to review about five per year until they were caught up.

CEP expressed the need for more detailed information than what it has been receiving for new or revised certification programs. One of the CEP members is on an advisory board to a UNEX Certificate Program. What he has seen appeared to be snap-shop reviews, not comprehensive evaluation. In recent years, CEP has expressed the need for all certificate programs to have a UCSC Senate faculty member to provide a critical assessment of the program to CEP. One idea is for the UNEX program directors to prepare an abbreviated self-study for the faculty representative who would provide a short assessment for CEP with recommendations. An example from UC Davis was provided. However it does not ask about quality specifically whereas VPDAA is specifically interested in getting that sort of feedback from CEP.

Some certifications are in areas for which there is not a direct faculty member in the field at UCSC, such as clinical trails, however, CEP thinks that there should still be a willing party. It is best to have someone working in the field in order to get useful feedback to CEP but may not always be possible.

VPDAA Galloway provided documentation that demonstrated that UCSC's system of review and approval is more rigorous than on a number of other UC campuses. Since most other UC extension programs are on or very near to their overseeing campus, UCSC has a somewhat unique situation geographically. Given the lack of proximity, the Senate having a strong connection to the curriculum is essential.

The consultation with VPDAA Galloway will continue next week.

So attests,

John Tamkun, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy