

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, October 19, 2011  
Kerr Hall Room 307, 11 a.m.-1:30 p.m.**

Present: Mark Anderson, William Dunbar, Joel Ferguson, Melissa Gwyn , Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex officio*), Justin Riordan (SUA Rep ), Stephen Sweat (NSTF Rep), James Wilson, Susanna Wrangell (Staff), Eileen Zurbriggen (Chair).

Absent: Peter Young, Provost Rep. has not been appointed yet.

Guests: Cher Bergeon (Academic Preceptor Designee), Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Richard Hughey (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Associate Director of Admissions).

**I. Announcements: None.**

Minutes of October 5 were approved with minor changes.

**II. Approval of Letters**

CEP members reviewed and approved the following letters on: the Economics Department's request to disestablish the Dual-Degree Program, the Economics Mid-Cycle Review Report, the Writing Program external review deferral and BOARS. Minor changes were requested for the BOARS letter.

**III. Classroom Time Slot Change Proposal**

CEP continued the discussion from last week and received another informal proposal from the VPDUE that would provide one additional timeslot per week without cutting classroom time at all. Chancellor's Undergraduate Internship Program (CUIP) students this year expressed dismay about this proposal but last year's group approved the 60 minute proposal over the Saturday class offering. SUA Representative Riordan informed CEP that most students were against cutting classroom time, but if they had to choose between the different options presented last year it would be the proposal that we are considering now (i.e, 60 minutes, starting at 8 a.m.) due to dining hall hours, busing services, and child care concerns. The Metro has cut night owl service so there is limited bus service at night as well. Students last year were opposed to cutting to 50 minutes. Members discussed whether there is truly a need for more large lecture classroom space. The consensus of the committee was that there is such a need, but it was also noted that systematic data on this would be more convincing than anecdotal data. If we go forward with this, it will be important to stress that this is a cost neutral proposal; it is not being implemented to cut costs. Several members spoke against the proposal, noting that it would mean that less material was covered, that students would have less "face time" with professors, and that it would likely be difficult for faculty to change their lectures. Senate regulations do not dictate the number of minutes in the classroom, only the overall workload. Faculty could add online or other components (e.g., review sessions) that would not reduce contact time with faculty. Some material could also be presented asynchronously (e.g., lectures or multi-media material that is presented online). The members took a straw vote on the proposal; the results are: Opposed: one

Unsure: three

Support: four

Chair Zurbriggen will send the response to SEC.

#### IV. External Review discussions

##### Languages

The report from the External Review Committee (ERC) praised the Language Program for its excellent delivery of languages to the undergraduate population. Overall, undergraduate students are pleased with existing courses on campus but would benefit from more upper-division course offerings.

The committee discussed including the following points in the response letter:

- Applaud the outstanding work the Language Program has done, given their budget
- Program's rationale for developing into a department appears to have a tenuous connection with student needs
- In addition, as the department evolves and as ladder-rank faculty are hired instead of lecturers, it might be difficult to continue to teach the same number of courses (ladder-rank faculty teach fewer courses and may teach upper-division courses in the new major instead of the lower division courses that serve the campus more broadly)
- ERC recognized that students are well served with the current Language Program's instruction including heritage learners and those requiring a language for graduate school
- CEP is concerned with the current language instruction due to a lack of funding from other programs that are served by this unit
- ERC did not support reducing the number of languages taught
- ERC did not support the traditional enrollment management mechanism
- LP should try offering first- and second-year language courses over the summer, and using the UC Language Consortium or other online resources to provide access to less commonly taught languages
- CEP will request a list of courses that will be taught for the closure meeting

##### Art

After a brief discussion in which members could ask clarifying questions of member Gwyn, she recused herself from the discussion. From the self study these are the issues of concern.

1. To what extent does enrollment remain a driving force in the department's decision-making process, which the 2006 ERC termed "a negative strategy for strong program development"?
2. To what extent has the department addressed the 2006 ERC's concerns that faculty "regional research ties" argue for new hires that reflect "greater geographic and cultural exposure and diversity"?
3. As VPAA Lee asked in his 26 September 2009 letter to you: "Are there any suggestions for maintaining capacity in the major in the face of the budget situation?"
4. What impact will the creation of the MFA program have on the undergraduate curriculum? The committee discussed several issues here. One is a capacity issue. Will the department be able to continue to meet the needs of its undergraduates, if it diverts resources to a new MFA program. Note that the department is already impacted. The second issue concerns the narrow nature of the new proposed program: Social and Environmental Practices. The committee expressed concern if the department evolves in a direction that supports this new theme (and hires people whose research interests are focused in this way), this could adversely impact undergraduate

education. We would welcome the ERC's comments on how to protect the undergraduate major, if the department moves in this direction.

5. Are there ways that the department can use graduate level curriculum offerings to enhance undergraduate education (particularly with the goal of improving undergraduate analytical skills)?

A final draft will be circulated by email for committee approval.

#### **V. Final Exam Change for Spanish for Spanish Speakers SS 61 Courses**

The committee considered a request to approve a common final exam for SpSS 61 Spanish for Spanish Speakers courses. Committee members noted that it makes sense, from an instructor's point of view, to want to have a common final exam, but that there are severe logistical challenges related to the shortage of classroom spaces and the difficulty for students if many such common finals were scheduled. For this reason, we don't currently have common final exams. CEP was willing to allow an exception to be made for this class, as a test case. However, CEP members found the request problematic in that students would be informed late in the quarter of a final exam change and did not approve. CEP will respond to the Language Program and ask them to propose the exam change for next quarter and CEP will likely approve for Winter quarter, if the request is made this quarter. Members agreed to delegate the response to Chair Zurbriggen with the condition that it is on an experimental trial only due to lack of space and scheduling issues.

#### **VI. Continuation of discussion of DQ Policies, Admissions Policies**

Carried forward due to lack of time.

#### **VII. Senate Regulation SR 610 Residency**

Moved to a future agenda due to lack of time.

So Attests,

Eileen Zurbriggen, Chair

Committee on Educational Policy