

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

November 4, 2009

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

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

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

I. Updates and announcements.

There will be no Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) meeting next week due to the holiday.

Chair Tamkun apprised the Committee of meetings he attended since last week's CEP meeting: University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) via conference call, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, meetings on GE reform with the Councils of Department Chairs in the Arts and Physical and Biological Sciences, a meeting with the Commission on the Future, and a regular Senate Meeting. At the Senate Meeting no questions were raised on the oral report on the status of implementation of the new general education (GE) requirements. At the SEC meeting, the request from a group of department chairs in the Humanities Division to abolish the Narrative Evaluation System was discussed. An update was given on the status of the mail ballot on the October 19 Resolutions.

At yesterday's meeting with Arts department chairs on GE Reform, the Dean asked to meet with CEP. CEP will extend an invitation for mid-November. At today's meeting with department chairs in Physical and Biological Sciences, Chair Tamkun responded to a recent letter from a group of Astrophysics faculty that expressed concern over interpretation of certain GE designations. Chair Tamkun will be in touch with the coordinator of the Council of Provosts to ask whether they would like him to attend one of their meetings to give an update on GE reform.

The September 30 minutes were accepted.

II. UCEP Charge.

CEP discussed a proposal from UCEP to broaden its charge to including student welfare. Members recognized the importance of this topic, but expressed concern about whether it was realistic to add it to CEP's workload. The Committee delegated to Chair Tamkun the writing of CEP's response based on feedback received at this and last week's meetings.

III. Proposed changes to program/degree development process.

CEP discussed the proposed changes to the current process for establishment and disestablishment of departments and programs, and establishment, suspension, and discontinuation of degree programs. Following up on CEP feedback, over the summer then CEP Chair Padgett gave suggestions to Vice Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs (VPDAA) Alison Galloway on the process, asking for a process for suspension of degree programs and for review of Minor and Concentration proposals at the VPDAA level for financial considerations before they are forwarded to CEP. These requests were included in the proposed process changes. CEP raised one concern related to the lack of clarity on the “financial considerations” that would allow the administration to make decisions regarding the future of degrees and degree sponsoring units. Members were asked to give any additional feedback to the proposal to Chair Tamkun via email by Monday.

IV. General Education Topics.

CEP reviewed the course approval form (CAF) and course supplemental form, and a blank form with added detail on how to complete the forms for existing courses. The forms will be posted on the Committee’s public web site as a reference for course sponsoring units. The CAF asks proposers to select one GE designation. Colleges are permitted to check two boxes for core courses, since last year’s CEP decided that they may carry C1 or C2 plus one other GE designation.

CEP continued its discussion of departmental feedback about the new GE designations. The Committee decided to post and circulate revised FAQs this week and to post revised GE guidelines as soon as possible.

CEP confirmed that:

- The Textual Analysis and Interpretation (TA) requirement should be focused on the analysis of literary or written text. Courses focused on other media may fit better for the Interpreting Arts and Media (IM) designation. For the TA requirement students are to present persuasive arguments, not just analyze text.
- Courses approved to satisfy the Mathematical & Formal Reasoning (MF) requirement need not be math-based. The intent is to focus on students’ formal reasoning. When the courses are math-based, they do not need to be at the level of calculus. The math-based courses for the MF should be comparable or above the level of Math 3 (university level math).
- The Practice: Service Learning (PR-S) requirement was not meant to be purely experiential.
- The sole criteria of group projects was deemed as not sufficient to carry the Practice: Collaborative Endeavor (PR-E) designation.
- Both the Cross-cultural Analysis (CC) and Ethnicity and Race (ER) requirements have geographic restrictions. One is focused outside the United States; the other must be inclusive of the United States.

It is acceptable for topics outside of the geographic area to be included in the courses, but the courses must be substantially within the geographic location mentioned in the guidelines.

- The CC and ER requirements need not be focused solely on topics that are on-going in the present. Historically-grounded courses are acceptable, but the courses should not be entirely historical either.
- CEP will change the language of the guidelines to remove the reference to a global village.

CEP recognized that topics of gender and sexual orientation are also important, among other topics. The Committee welcomed faculty to put forward related topics for consideration, as long as the focus of the GE designation is maintained. For example, the topics gender and sexual orientation and the CC or ER requirements can be in concert with one another.

The topic of double designations on individual courses was again raised by faculty for CEP to reconsider. During the last two years, Senators strongly argued that they did not support double designations because it could lead to students selecting courses to get two designations rather than based on the course's content. CEP's original plan did not have this restriction but CEP was brought around to the thinking of these Senators and added the limitation to the proposal, after which it was voted in at the February 2009 Senate Meeting. CEP added a disclaimer to the Regulations to allow the Committee to approve exceptions. Such exceptions were anticipated to be rare. CEP acknowledged that some courses could fit into more than one designation but thought that one or the other designation would likely not receive sufficient attention during the ten-week course.

Departments may put forward proposals demonstrating that a course could fit into two designations, understanding that CEP would either give feedback that the fit was better for one or the other or might ask the department to pick a designation.

CEP discussed whether two designations may be on one course, from which students would select one. The Committee was strongly concerned that allowing this would cause an inability to use the information to plan capacity for the GE requirements and because the content toward one or both designations would likely be watered down. CEP added a statement for the FAQs giving the rationale behind the restriction on multiple designations to explain that CEP had responded to the Senate's voice to avoid gaming by not allowing more than one GE per course.

The FAQ revisions will go to members by email for confirmation.

Parameters for course articulation for the new GEs will be considered at a future meeting.

V. On-line course proposal and UCEP policy review.

CEP discussed the proposal to make LTPR 177A, "Race" in Early Modern Cultures, be an on-line course. A recent CEP decision decided that there must be some in-person contact between instructor and students, and a clear way of knowing that students are being assessed on their own work. In recent years, CEP has been approving on-line courses for a one-time offering to be followed by a review prior to additional offerings of the course.

The Committee found the need for more detail on course content in LTPR 177A, such as how the Wednesday discussion session will proceed, and how they will enhance student learning. CEP will ask whether there is a cost for a second-life account and whether the students will be expected to pay or will the program provide access. The Committee wants clarification on the student time investment for the course. Assuming the above questions are answered, CEP will support that the course be given one-time approval with a follow up review before further offerings occur.

CEP decided to add a question to the supplemental form for on-line courses asking what technological and other components that may involve additional costs to the student be included on the course approval form. The response to this question may make clear whether a course fee request needs to go to the miscellaneous fees committee.

CEP discussed UCEP's proposed policies and guidelines used for on-line courses. In response to the specific recommendations in the report, CEP thinks that any course approved at the systemwide level would need to be resubmitted CEP before UCSC students may receive credit. CEP supports simultaneous submission to UCEP and CEP, in theory—as long as the local process to approval is not short-circuited. CEP will provide a copy of their on-line course approval form with the response letter, along with the additional question adopted today on technological needs of the course (what will be provided versus what students will need to bring) and other costs. CEP will also inform UCEP of their practice that on-line courses receive one-time approval and a follow up review before further offerings of the course may occur, and will including their expectation that these courses must have a clear way to assess the individual work of the students and some in-person contact during the term.

Members delegated completion of the response letter to Chair Tamkun.

So attests,

John Tamkun, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy