

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**October 28, 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), Michael Morrissey (SUA Rep), Matthew Palm (SUA Rep), Eric Porter, John Tamkun (Chair), Peter Young, Eileen Zurbriggen.

Absent: 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).

### **Executive Session**

During executive session CEP discussed the lack of a provost representative to CEP for this year. The Committee values provost input. Topics arise regularly in CEP meeting that benefit from provost feedback. Although CEP's workload is significant, the provost representative does not need to read all materials or attend all meetings in full. The representative could look at agendas and decide when to attend meetings or parts of meetings. If this becomes the adopted approach, CEP would also want to point out topics for which they think provost input is important. To maintain consistency, CEP preferred that the representative not change each quarter. The same concerns were raised about the idea of there being a representative for the provosts who is not a provost, such as a Senate faculty member from a college. CEP considered whether VPDUE Bill Ladusaw could fill the gap as an invited guest and decided that they preferred that the VPDUE visit CEP in his administrative role. Chair Tamkun will share this feedback with the Council of Provosts.

### **Regular Session**

#### **I. Updates and announcements.**

The Chair of the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) is visiting UCSC tomorrow and is available to meet with CEP members tomorrow at 10 a.m.

Chair Tamkun will be giving an oral report at today's Senate Meeting on the current status of GE reform and the timeline for review of proposals.

CEP discussed the Resolution that passed on the floor of the October 19 Special Senate Meeting related to use of instructional days for furlough days, as specified in the Senate Executive Committees letter over the weekend. One of the days proposed as a non-classroom instructional day in the resolution has passed. Three more are during Thanksgiving week. A mail ballot has been called on the resolutions that

passed at that meeting. In the meantime, it is not clear whether the resolution is active. Students are approaching the instructors indicating their belief that they do not have classes that week. CEP was in full agreement that there is not enough time to implement such a change for the week of Thanksgiving. There are many considerations, such as the schedule for academic support services—for example. Approval of courses, including the format of instruction, is under CEP's authority. CEP thinks that it is too late to make changes to the current quarter and confirmed that they need more time to consider possible options for later in the year. CEP's consideration will be pedagogically based and not limited to academic year 2009-10.

CEP will discuss VPDUE Ladusaw's letter on reading days at an upcoming meeting. Earlier in the quarter VPDUE Ladusaw confirmed that there was no urgency for discussion of his letter and that it was provided as information for future consideration. The Committee recognized that a challenge that needs attention is there only being one day between the last class of a quarter and finals week.

## **II. External Review Topics.**

Film and Digital Media (FDM): CEP considered the draft letter for the FDM Department's external review. The following sentences will be inserted: "The ERC commented on whether the program was focused too much on technical aspects as opposed to creative aspects and raised the issue of whether the GPA requirement is selecting for the qualities desired for students in their program. Is the department monitoring its course prerequisites and major admissions policies to ensure that they are selecting for students with creative potential. Is the department monitoring the curriculum prerequisites for a gateway into the major and ensuring that students who have the creative potential will be able to enter the major?" The letter was otherwise deemed ready to send.

History: The draft response to the History Department external review was discussed and approved for sending with minor text revisions.

Legal Studies: The draft response to the Legal Studies program ad hoc review was discussed. The letter was deemed to be ready for sending.

In their response to the Legal Studies ad hoc review, CPB asked whether the nature of the burden that administering the Legal Studies major imposes on Politics could be described more explicitly and precisely. Unfortunately, the ERC report did not do much to answer this question. For the closure meeting, CEP believes that it would be helpful if the Politics department could provide a more detailed answer to CPB's question. Is the burden primarily administrative? This seems to be one implication of the ERC recommendations, which prominently featured the need to hire a permanent Director for the program. How much of the burden is due to the demands of advising individual students? Although this was not stressed in the ERC report, if 13 Politics faculty are attempting to be the main source of advising to 131 majors, this does, indeed, seem burdensome. Or is the majority of the burden related to teaching workloads? Are Politics faculty unable to teach important Politics courses because they are drawn into teaching Legal Studies courses? Are Politics courses over-enrolled because they need to serve both Politics and Legal Studies majors? The ability to elucidate the exact nature of the problem is important because different solutions would be appropriate remedies for different types of burden.

The Committee at present does not have enough information to endorse any of the options they will pose in their letter (severely limiting the major, changing it into a minor or concentration, finding another sponsor, or suspending or discontinuing it) but will offer them for consideration nonetheless. More data concerning workload issues would seem to be necessary to make appropriate choices. CEP reiterates that it prefers that the campus find a way to keep the legal studies degree option.

### **III. GE Reform Topics.**

General Education (GE) feedback was discussed with the goal of finalizing guidelines this or next week. Informal feedback was received by the CEP Chair through the two division meetings that CEP representatives recently attended. CEP considered the following specific questions and will provide this feedback to course and major sponsoring units within the coming week.

May a GE designation (other than DC) be satisfied over multiple courses? CEP chooses to interpret “or equivalent” in SCR 10.2.3.1 (the new GE requirements) as applicable solely to transfer credits at this time. CEP decided not to allow GE courses to be satisfied over more than one course with the exception of the Disciplinary Communication requirement. They found the idea extremely cumbersome to track and thought that it could create a heavier workload for students if they needed to take multiple courses to meet a GE, which could happen due to capacity issues in some classes. That the Regulation allows for something different for the DC requirement demonstrates that it was seen differently than the other GEs in this regard. Regulation allows the DC to be satisfied with 1-3 courses. CEP acknowledged that the Committee may approve exceptions but expects that such approvals will be rare. An example from past practice was that taking 3, 2-credit studio arts courses could equal the Art requirement.

May a course that satisfies the Disciplinary Communication requirement carry another GE designation? CEP acknowledged that the SCR 10.2.3.1 allows them to approve overlap between the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement and another GE requirement. However, CEP upheld the last CEP’s decision to not approve overlapping GE designations, as a rule. The Committee is willing to consider very well-motivated cases, expecting that they will be rare. For example, a well-motivated case might be made to consider a second GE designation on a course that satisfies 1/3 to 1/2 of the DC requirement for a department’s majors. CEP does not intend to approve a second GE designation when the DC is satisfied in one course.

May senior seminars, theses, and capstone courses carry the Disciplinary Communication designation (DC)? CEP decided that as long as the guidelines for the DC are met, the committee is open to the DC requirement being satisfied through senior seminars, theses, or capstone courses. However, it should not be viewed as automatic that such courses will receive the DC designation. Procedures for satisfying the DC through senior seminars, theses, and capstone courses must be well-defined and consistently enforced. CEP will consider whether it is necessary to develop a special approval course number to demonstrate that the courses carry the DC. Departments are expected to provide DC options of sufficient capacity for all their majors. The C2 requirement is prerequisite for all DC designated courses to ensure that students get the preparatory writing prior to completing their DC requirement.

Will CEP consider group writing toward the DC? CEP upheld the last Committee’s thinking that 18 pages is generally enough for the departmental faculty to assess whether students have satisfied the

individual writing for the DC requirement. Group writing could be considered as one alternate form of disciplinary communication that would reduce the amount of individual writing from 25 to 18 pages.

#### **IV. UCEP charge change.**

CEP supports the proposal for UCEP to change the language of their charge to include student affairs, generally speaking. However, the Committee expressed concern about whether it is realistic for UCEP to add student affairs to its already heavy agenda, recognizing nonetheless that it is important to have someone looking at student welfare at the systemwide level of the Academic Senate. CEP wondered what was the significance of removing the word policy from UCEP's charge.

#### **V. Undergraduate workgroup.**

The undergraduate workgroup topic was carried forward to a future meeting due to lack of time.

So attests,

John Tamkun, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy