

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**November 18, 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 representative 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.**

Assistant Chancellor Ashish Sahni asked whether there CEP wants to have a representative on the Chancellor's executive committee on sustainability and climate change. CEP considered the scope of the committee and could not find curricular connections that might warrant a CEP representative. While CEP will not send a member, it stands ready to work with the committee on any undergraduate curricular or educational policy topics.

At the November 6 meeting of the Chancellor's Cabinet and Senate Executive Committee (CabSEC) the administrative workgroups established by Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Dave Kliger was discussed. In particular for CEP, the workgroup on undergraduate curriculum, chaired by Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Bill Ladusaw, will include the chairs of CEP and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB). To date, that workgroup has not met. UCOP feedback to the UCSC October 19 Senate Resolutions was discussed. Legal council to the UC Regents does not think that non-classroom instructional days used as furlough days is a subject under the authority of the Senate. The response indicated the thinking that, because furloughs are involved, it is a UC President matter given delegation by the UC Regents. However, if changing the format of classes is involved, such as to have a portion of a class delivered during what UC Berkeley has called podium days, the approval falls within CEP's authority over undergraduates course approvals.

VPDUE Ladusaw discussed with CEP a request for information to go to departments, largely in response to the request of divisional deans and departments who have raised the need to better understand where their efforts to support the general education (GE) curriculum is most needed.

An update to the GE frequently asked questions and course approval form revisions went to course sponsoring units and divisions this week. Blank forms and a tutorial version of the supplemental form have been added to CEP's web page.

CEP discussed whether classes must hold public performances or showings to be eligible for the Practices: Creative Endeavor (PR-C) requirement, or whether a performance or showing within the confines of the class is sufficient. The Committee was reminded of last year's CEP response that classes needed to mount something open to the class, at least but that if there is a public performance, it is fine for there to be auditions. The current CEP agreed with that decision.

Chair Tamkun met with the dean and department chairs with the School of Engineering on November 5. They expressed their desire that there be no allowance for double designations based on Senate Meeting discussions and the justification for the proposal for new GEs that was voted last March.

This week Chair Tamkun met with a group of Astronomy and Astrophysics faculty who had concerns about their interpretation that all Mathematical and Formal Reasoning (MF) courses would require math. He clarified that only when the course proposed for an MF designation is a math course does it need to be taught at or above the level of Math 3 (pre-calculus). He also clarified that GE courses can be interdisciplinary.

A group of Senate committee chairs and the Senate Chair meet with the Council of Deans. GE reform was raised. It was a fairly positive discussion. The deans would welcome more interactions with the Committee and would like help on better understand the capacity needs. Chair Tamkun asked if there were big issues to that they would be putting forward to CEP this year in light of budget issues--topics that could affect the health or viability of programs.

The response to the proposed procedure changes for establish/disestablish of departments, and establish/discontinue of degrees will be submitted Tuesday. Members were asked to submit their final feedback by Monday.

## **II. Differential fees.**

CEP discussed UC President Yudof's proposal for differential fees for undergraduate programs in business and engineering. The Committee expressed serious reservations about the proposal, which would reverse a long-standing practice of charging undergraduates the same fees regardless of their major, campus, or professional goals.

The proposal presents several justifications for the introduction of differential fees, including the high cost of instruction in business and engineering and the high earning potential of students who major in these fields. CED did not find these arguments compelling due to the lack of supporting data concerning instructional costs and salaries in business and engineering relative to other disciplines. Furthermore, CEP did not believe that it would be appropriate to adopt differential fees merely because they are common at other institutions.

As noted in the proposal, relatively little research has been done on the impact of differential fees at other institutions. Anecdotal information suggests that differential fees will have a disproportionate effect on under-represented minorities on the campus. CEP was also concerned that the introduction of differential fees will lead students from low-income and middle-class backgrounds to choose a major based on their financial status, as opposed to their interests and

abilities. It seems premature to consider this proposal in the absence of a clear understanding of its impact on recruitment, retention, and diversity.

CEP did not believe that there is a compelling reason to introduce differential fees for undergraduate programs in business and engineering at this time. The relatively small amount of additional revenue that will be generated by this proposal does not appear to justify its negative impact on students and their families.

CEP is unanimously opposed to the proposal. They think that all majors should be open to all qualified students.

The response letter will be finalized by email.

### **III. General Education Topics.**

CEP discussed the two consultations to happen later in the meeting. Writing Program senior lecturer Carol Freeman has been appointed to work with departments on their Disciplinary Communication (DC) proposals. She has requested feedback from CEP to ensure that what she would relay to departments are ideas that CEP would support.

Last year the Senate campaigned to the administration for financial support of the DC requirement such as for restoration of a writing tutor program, teaching assistant augmentation in some areas, availability of expertise in course and faculty development, and for teaching assistant and tutor training programs. Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CPEVC) Dave Klinger awarded \$300K to be administered through the VPDUE office. The augmentation of TAs for DC seems likely to not be significantly felt as a benefit to departments since their TA allocations were recently cut due to the current state budget crisis. The other two areas--tutors and expertise and management—should feel like new resources to departments since it is many years since there was support of this type for the writing-intensive requirement. It was noted that infrastructure for the tutor program is a significant process to hire, place, and track students across campus.

At the upcoming Senate Meeting, Chair Tamkun will give an oral report updating the Senate on GE reform. The newly posted FAQs and course forms will be mentioned as well as the recent divisional consultations, DC proposals and GE feedback received, and the recent consultation with the deans. The Senate will be reminded that CEP is working to clarify the GE guidelines, working within the new legislation.

The Committee discussed today's consultation with Arts Division Dean David Yager. Chair Tamkun apprised CEP of his meeting on Monday with Dean Yager Chair and the chair of History of Arts and Visual Culture (HAVC) and the arts dean on Monday to answer their GE reform related questions. Certain Arts Division faculty feel strongly that they have some courses that equally satisfy two designations. Concerns about impact on workloads, tracking, and capacity planning were also raised in Monday's meeting. Since the December 1 submission deadline is fast approaching, Chair Tamkun asked that they proceed to submit their proposals requesting both designations, allowing CEP to discuss the topic in the coming weeks.

They asked that CEP consider the option to allow a course to carry two designations from which a student should choose one. CEP was reminded that even with the current topical courses that carry two possible topical designations students are not making a selection. The default is set in AIS to look for at the first designation in the list and only moved on to the second when the student has already satisfied the first.

CEP discussed the idea of having two courses taught concurrently with different designations on each course. Concern was remain over the content being diluting for one or both designations, the basis for which students would select courses, and on workload to manage issues related to student confusion and petitions for students who desire to retroactively change which GE the course satisfied. The option would need to be available to add departments. CEP found more challenges to the idea of student choice designations than gains.

#### **IV. Senate Regulation 764 on special studies courses.**

CEP discussed and supported the proposal to repeal Senate Regulation (SR) 764 which limits the number of special studies credits that students may take in a term. It was at the recommendation of UCSC's CEP that the topic was raised in the University Committee of Educational Policy (UCEP) who put the proposal before the Academic Council. The current CEP upheld the recommendation of the last CEP that SR 764 should be repealed, recognizing that each UC campus has different thoughts on the limits that should be imposed for these courses.

At the May 2009 Senate Meeting, the Santa Cruz Division of the Senate voted in support of CEP's proposal which defines limits on special studies courses for UCSC undergraduates (SCR 6.5). If SR 764 is not repealed, UCSC must proceed to request an update to the variance that is on record with systemwide.

#### **V. Consultation with Carol Freeman.**

With the support of CEP, former Director of the Writing Program and former CEP Chair Carol Freeman has been appointed by VPDUE Ladusaw to facilitate the implementation of the DC requirement. Dr. Freeman visited CEP to seek input on how best to be useful in the process. She indicated to CEP that she saw a lot of possibility in working with departments after CEP's initial review of the DC proposals, such as to find ways to ensure that the work students do toward the DC will be cumulative. She has ideas for major sponsoring units to create guides on writing in particular disciplines. She will be working on tutor and TA training programs to support department DC offerings.

Some proposals seem likely to come to CEP with resource requests. Major sponsoring units have been asking how much support is available to them in developing and sustaining their DC offerings.

Some units will propose that senior theses satisfy the requirement. Since thesis is defined differently from unit to unit, and possibly down to individual faculty members, expectations for theses and how to ensure consistency will need to be considered.

Units have asked how student satisfaction of the DC will occur. CEP has confirmed that the degree audit system tracks for all degree requirements as listed in the catalog, including GEs and the DC specifically.

CEP will be looking the DC proposals for cumulativity of the writing work, particularly when the requirement will be satisfied over multiple courses.

Dr. Freeman offer to review any or all DC proposals at CEP's request.

## **VI. Consultation with Arts Division Dean.**

Arts Division Dean David Yager was invited to CEP at his request to discuss the idea of student choice of GE designation from multiple designations for the same course.

Some faculty members in his division feel strongly that it would be an inappropriate misrepresentation of their courses to select between GE designations for courses that would thorough satisfy more than one designation, such as Interpreting Arts and Media (IM) and Ethnicity and Race. They think that to separate out one does not reflect on how the course was built or is taught, and that here is no way of separating out the content in some cases. Their reasons are pedagogical; they find the content to be too integrated to separate.

CEP asked in what ways it defeats the purpose of the course to select one designation. The course content need not change as long as the course meeting the criteria for the selected designation. The selection for a designation can be based on a number things. CEP encouraged that the faculty think about the department's curriculum rather than the specific course, and offer a balance of GE designations. However, if the department prefers, the faculty could propose the course for multiple categories and allow CEP to choose which seems most appropriate.

Dean Yager confirmed that this is a symbolic matter for some arts faculty who do not want to appear to not meet a certain GE designations when the courses do. The Committee indicated that was not their intent that a department be defined by the GEs that it offers or does not offer. CEP affirmed that they do not want to marginalize faculty. The Committee appreciated the work that the Arts faculty have done to give CEP feedback.

Reasons for the single-designation rule were explained to Dean Yager. Originally CEP has a longer list of designations but received very strong feedback that the number of requires needed to be fewer than the current GE system. Faculty in department meetings, forums, and at Senate Meetings underscored their thinking that when courses carry more than one designation, some students take them only to get more than one requirement "out of the way". CEP thinks that when there are two designations on a 10 week course, one or both of the designations does not get sufficient attention toward meeting the educational objectives for that GE designation. In light of the one-designation rule, CEP anticipated that the curriculum would touch on the GE topics in many courses where there are not designations attached. Not having everything marked with GEs reflects coherence between the curriculum overall and the foci of UCSC's general education.

CEP discussed whether to include a statement in the catalog to indicate that the designations do not reflect all places where GE related topics reside in the curriculum, perhaps indicating that students will find that some courses include significant content in an area of another GE designation. Departments could include such statement about their curriculum in the catalog.

CEP will consider the points raised by Dean Yager today and will respond in the coming weeks.

## **VII. Stakeholder map.**

The Registrar's update on development of stakeholder maps for courses was carried forward to a future agenda due to lack of time.

So attests,

John Tamkun, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy