

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**February 10, 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), the second student position is currently vacant.

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

**I. Announcements and Updates.**

The School of Engineering department chairs wrote to the Senate Chair to ask that the Senate take up elimination of narrative evaluations, making them the third division to make such a request within a year.

Disciplinary Communication (DC) consultant Carol Freeman has a number of interesting thoughts to share in response to the DC proposals. She would be happy to work with Economics on their proposal. The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) welcomed this offer. Chair Tamkun will contact the department to discuss their collaborating with Carol.

The minutes from October 28 were accepted.

**II. Oral report to Senate.**

CEP discussed points to be made during the oral report on general education (GE) reform at today's Senate Meeting. Of the ~700 proposals received, 150 involve new courses. CEP was impressed by how far the faculty has come in making the new GE system work already. In addition to having fewer requirements, the new GE system does not depend on gateway courses to majors being open to non-majors needing to satisfy their GEs.

**III. Pre-consultation discussion.**

In advance of the consultation with the Humanities Division Dean Georges Van Den Abbeele, CEP finalized talking points on the Advisory Task Force Report (ATFR) based on last week's discussion.

The report is causing great concern among the Languages Program who has sent multiple letters to CEP in recent months. The Language Program and Writing Program are more vulnerable than most other units in the Humanities Division because they have very few ladder-ranked faculty.

The Committee wanted to know what capacity analysis has occurred of student need for language courses. Students must take a language for admission into the University. It is beneficial for them to be able to consider continuing that language when they arrive, rather than creating situations where they have forgotten some amount of what they learned in high school and must repeat it.

#### **IV. Cross-Cultural Analysis GE proposals.**

CEP continued its discussion on Cross-Cultural Analysis (CC) GE proposals. They considered whether proposals needed to focus on one nationality versus the nationalities of a larger region such as a continent. Although broadening to a continent seemed fine, the course content should give more focus to a particular culture to have sufficient depth.

#### **V. Consultation with Humanities Division Dean.**

Humanities Division Dean Georges Van Den Abbeele requested to meet with CEP to discuss the ATFR. The Committee commended the Dean and taskforce for a thoughtful report and for seeking broad campus input early in their planning process. Dean Van Den Abbeele confirmed that the report is not an action plan or formal proposal, and that proposals will come out of the broad consultation process that is occurring. He said that the report does not necessarily mirror his thinking and was developed by faculty and staff. The dean would like to know policy implications and processes to be followed for the options described in the proposal.

CEP underscored that changes to languages offerings and the Writing Program would have broad implications for the campus and that they wanted to know what plans there were for consultation across campus. The Dean indicated the need to meet with Senate Committees to discuss any changes to these programs and recently met with the Chair of the Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS) Department to discuss their curricular needs for languages.

The current financial structure of the Humanities Division leaves most flexibility in the areas of language and writing curriculum. Other small pots of flexible budget areas were targeted as much as possible last year. The amount of cuts to units will depend on the numbers of Senate faculty retiring. Some areas are already close to falling below critical mass. The Dean expressed the possible need for a central solution rather than there being a balancing act between divisions for such things as math, languages, and writing.

CEP raised the need for high-quality instruction in languages and writing, and concern about a significant shift to use of Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). When asked about training of TAs and GSIs, the Dean mentioned the Writing Program course.

The Writing Program will move to more temporary staffing in light of one retirement, in order to contribute toward the division's cost cutting measures. He is waiting to hear from Languages regarding their curricular plan.

The Dean asked CEP to give feedback as to whether it made more sense to have only one instructor teaching courses for particular languages in order to offer more languages or whether it

made more sense to offer more depth in fewer languages (and have more than one person teaching those languages). CEP said that they would consider this question and respond to the dean after the meeting. He indicated that Russian and Portuguese are at risk because they are not required for any degree. He talked with the LALS Chair to understand why Portuguese is not an option for that degree. He shared that Portuguese is the 6<sup>th</sup> most commonly spoken in the world.

CEP asked whether there was concern about the ability to sustain the curriculum for the proposed Jewish Studies BA. The Dean responded that there is a critical mass in the department in order to mount it and that if a major requires a language (Hebrew in this case), it becomes a higher priority for that language offering to be sustained.

On the topic of administrative restructuring, the Dean said that he would put curricular concerns first, before thinking about the structures.

The timeline for the ATFR was discussed. Students, staff, and faculty were asked to respond by February 15, either through their units or via the web direct to the dean. March 1 is the Senate's deadline. Perhaps by mid-April there could be a strategic response. The Humanities Divisional budget response is on their web site. The Budget Advisory Group and CPB are considering it.

## **VI. Humanities Advisory Task Force on Reconstitution Report.**

CEP discussed the consultation with the Humanities Division Dean and continued its discussion of the Humanities Advisory Task Force on Report (ATFR). After providing information and answering questions, members, representatives, and guests from the Humanities Division recused themselves from the discussion.

In its response CEP will remind the dean about the Senate process for the various things that could happen as an outcome of topics raised in the report: FTE transfers, change of degree oversight, changes to degrees requirements or offerings. A reminder will be included for the need to consult with departments who have language requirements. The Committee will repeat its request to understand the impact on undergraduate education before changes occur. The need for solid teaching assistant and graduate student instructor training will be mentioned, particularly for skill building courses such as language and writing courses.

Aspects of the proposal are not specific solely to the Humanities Division. CEP would like to know how other areas of campus will be given the opportunity to give feedback and how the question of campus responsibility for shared needs will be raised.

Languages: CEP did not understand the logic of allowing a course that becomes a requirement in the future to drive which language courses will be offered. However, this seems likely to resolve itself as long as there is a continued focus on requiring that course sponsoring units be consulted before courses become required for Majors, to ensure capacity planning, and to allow for the unit/division to consider the impact to language offerings overall. In their response CEP will underscore the need for language courses to be open to all students, not only those who are required to take them for their majors. Such limitations would prohibit student involvement in Education Abroad Programs, and to augment what they took in High School for future careers.

To the Dean's question of whether to have fewer languages offered but two year's of content or more languages some of which would have only one year of content, CEP understands the logic of offering no less than a year of any language but one year does provide important benefits and enrichment, and gets students ready for EAP. CEP did not feel prepared to answer this question fully for the dean with the time available to consider the question before the response letter is due, and the desire to consult those who teach language prior to giving an opinion.

Writing Program: CEP will reaffirm the need for stable funding to the Writing Program to ensure that students satisfy their ELWR and C1/C2 requirements in a timely fashion (to avoid being barred from enrollment at the 5<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> quarter).

For either languages or writing to move to being under the VPDUE, it may be necessary to create a "division of undergraduate education" to bring them into the course approval process. To have writing and college core together makes more sense than the current arrangement of the Writing Program within one division. However, if writing and/or languages do shift, it seems inevitable that some funding will also leave the Humanities Division to support them. CEP would like the dean to describe a way that the decision could be made that would work for these programs and for the Humanities Division.

## **VII. Discussion of course review process**

Chair Tamkun's idea for an electronic form for review of the GE proposals was discussed. He would import the information into a FileMakerPro database for management. A sample was provided. The group was asked to consider the form and draft checklists, and to send their comments around via email by Tuesday.

So attests,

John Tamkun, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy