

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES****February 3, 2010****Wednesday, 11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Holly Cordova (NSTF Rep), Cormac Flanagan, Jimin Lee, Roxanne Monnet (Staff), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Eric Porter, Deanna Shemek (Provost Rep), John Tamkun (Chair), Peter Young, Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*).

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.

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) members were asked to create checklists for the general education (GE) designations that they were recently assigned. The current plan is for these to be discussed at the next meeting.

CEP's oral report for the upcoming Senate Meeting was discussed. Statistics on what was provided for each designation will be displayed in chart form. Chair Tamkun will apprise the Senate of the review process that is underway for the proposals and review the timetable. Capacity will be mentioned.

Chair Tamkun apprised CEP of recent meetings including the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) meeting, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and CabSEC (Chancellor's Cabinet plus SEC). At UCEP, Chair Tamkun learned that the UC Working Groups on the Future of UC will give initial recommendations to the Senate by March for feedback to go to the Regents for their May meeting. A second round of recommendations will be issued in June. These will come to the Senate in the fall for input. Transfer credit, articulation agreements, and EAP credit were also discussed by UCEP, specifically, how to make it easier for students to get credit for their non-UC courses. A systemwide taskforce may be formed on the topic.

Legislation to make narrative evaluations optional was discussed at the recent SEC meeting. Two weeks ago Tamkun gave feedback to SEC based on the brief discussion CEP had in December, including CEP's desire for student feedback, their idea for a student survey, and opinion about either taking the evaluations seriously or not having them at all. Physical and Biological Sciences Division department chairs wrote asking for elimination of the narratives. SEC's current document now looks like a discussion document without specific proposals. It will be issued to the Senate as a heads up and opportunity for discussion to understand where current interests lie. SUA Representative Palm offered to assist with a survey and reviewed the success of the recent survey about library hours. They used Survey Monkey. CEP again underscored the need for student input, preferably by survey, before progress is made toward changes to the Narrative Evaluation System.

II. Humanities Advisory Task Force Report (ATFR).

CEP discussed the Humanities Division reconstitution report (ATFR), in preparation for their February 10 consultation with Humanities Dean Georges Van Den Abbeele.

The Committee thought that the report gave a rare opportunity to give earlier feedback before proposals were initiated. The various scenarios and ramifications laid out in the document were helpful to CEP. Data about the number of students making various degree choices will be very important for the division to consider, as will the need to consider how particular scenarios may affect other divisions.

In their meeting with Dean Van Den Abbeele, CEP will confirm that this process does not supersede the planning process around review of departments and degrees. Dean Van Den Abbeele has indicated that he does not want any degree programs to go away, although the administration of some may change. He will be meeting with a number of Senate committees regarding the report. Since the Jewish Studies BS degree is in proposal form at this time, it could not be fully considered by the taskforce.

CEP will ask that the impact of the change to each Major be considered. Major sponsoring units and the Dean should work with Vice Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs (VPDAA) Galloway on charters or Memoranda of Understanding as appropriate, including when it seems appropriate to have faculty bylaws that would define who the principle faculty for curriculum as different from that of a currently existing department. Reconfiguration of graduate programs has implications for undergraduate courses through Teaching Assistant appointments.

With regard to limiting access to language courses for students not needing the courses for their major requirements, neither the Language Program nor CEP want to see such limits on who may enroll. Learning new languages is very important for students for a number of reasons, one of which is preparation for the Education Abroad Program.

CEP will ask the Dean about the level of consultation being solicited in response to the ATFR.

The discussion will continue next week.

CEP decided that having the option to give feedback to proposals for suspension or discontinuation of graduate degree programs was very important, to ensure that the impact to undergraduates is considered. Chair Tamkun will discuss this with VPDAA Galloway and Graduate Council Chair Carter and report back.

At a future meeting, CEP would like to discuss what percentage of teaching for a department by non-Senate faculty and graduate student instructors is appropriate for the balance of the curriculum.

III. Disciplinary Communication proposals

Discussion of the Disciplinary Communication (DC) proposals was carried forward to a future meeting. In the meantime, Writing Program member and DC consultant Carol Freeman will look at all of the DC proposals to consider resource implications.

IV. Cross-cultural analysis proposals.

Discussion of Cross-Cultural Analysis GE proposals was carried forward due to lack of time.

V. Ethnicity and Race GE proposals.

Discussion of Ethnicity and Race GE proposals was carried forward due to lack of time.

VI. Practices requirement GE proposals.

CEP held an initial discussion of a subset of proposals for the Practices: Creative Process (PR-C) requirement, Practices: Collaborative Endeavor (PR-E), and Practices: Service Learning (PR-S) GE requirements.

It was noted that for PR-C courses, a “performance venue” must occur but it need not be a public performance.

To qualify for the PR-E requirement more was needed than simply having group work in a course. Students need to be given instruction on how to do collaborative work, for example.

PR-S courses must have service learning that ties back in to their academic, not just experiential learning. For example, beach clean up alone would be experiential, whereas also considering the topic of beach clean up from an academic perspective is service learning. Likewise for internships which are experiential but do not necessarily have a tie back into academics. Courses that are solely observational would also not meet the educational objectives for this requirement, because here the student is not providing any service.

VII. Perspectives requirement GE proposals.

CEP held an initial discussion of a subset of proposals for the Perspectives in Environmental Awareness (PE-E), Perspectives in Human Behavior (PE-H), and Perspectives in Technology and Society (PE-T) GE requirements.

In PE-H courses students should gain knowledge about human behavior specifically, not just focus on something else that has an effect on human behavior without giving substantial content to the understanding of the human behavior. For example, an infectious disease may cause a change in human behavior but discussing the disease alone with mention of its effect on human behavior is not sufficient for this GE designation. A substantial portion would have to be on something that is not classic biology.

PE-T courses should not be solely focused on technology. The guidelines are that the curriculum relate to sociological issues as well. Students should know the technologies and critique them.

So attests,

John Tamkun, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy