

**Committee on Educational Policy**  
**Minutes**  
**Wednesday, November 30, 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*), Stephen Sweat (NSTF Rep), James Wilson, Peter Young, Susanna Wrangell (Staff), Eileen Zurbriggen (Chair).

Absent: Justin Riordan (SUA Rep), Provost Rep., waiting on appointment.

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:**

There were no announcements and members approved the minutes of October 26, 2011 and November 2, 2011 with minor corrections to both.

**II. Pre - Consultation CP/EVC Galloway**

Chair Zurbriggen and members discussed strategy for CP/EVC Galloway's consultation later this morning.

**III. Consultation with CP/EVC Galloway**

CP/EVC Galloway joined the CEP meeting for a consultation on her "Five for 2015" goals and how CEP can help facilitate these in regard to the committee's purview. CEP members discussed issues of student retention, completion of a degree in four years, the campus becoming a Hispanic Serving Institution, creating courses or a program based on Critical Race & Ethnicity, and streamlining major requirements. Bridge funds and summer session courses were also discussed. CP/EVC Galloway mentioned that a report on retention data will be distributed to Senate committees for review and comment in the near future. This is a more extensive report than was available in the past, and will break down the retention numbers for various sub-groups (by year, ethnicity, GPA, and other categories). One positive note is that we do not currently have a large gap between majority and underrepresented students in terms of retention. Concerning the goal of 4-year degree completion, one major factor is course capacity, and we are currently at or near our maximum capacity. This is a resource issue, and it may be exacerbated if the state's trigger cuts take place and these are pushed to the campuses. If we can expand summer session, that may help with capacity issues. The plan is to give divisions and departments more power to choose which courses will be offered in the major, which will allow them to prioritize courses that will get students through the major in a timely fashion.

**IV. Post Consultation Discussion**

CEP members thanked CP/EVC Galloway for consulting with the committee. CEP members held a discussion on expanded use of Summer Session which is not to be viewed as the sole means of increasing the number of students who complete their degree in 4 years, but just one of the prongs to the solution. Although Summer Session offers options for students to choose from, it may also offer challenges for some students financially and not be available for students who have to work in the summer to earn the funds that will allow them to return in fall quarter. But for students who live in the area year round, with a year lease, it could help them to graduate on time or early. In some cases, the decrease in time to degree might be substantial. For instance, a physics major must take the required

courses in sequence, so if taking one summer course helps them to stay on sequence, this would allow them to graduate in four years instead of falling behind by an entire year. There was a concern about the quality of teaching, and the perhaps dramatic reduction in the percentage of courses taken with ladder rank faculty, should students take many courses in Summer Session. It was suggested that many of our Summer Session graduate student instructors are more experienced than in the past. Another suggestion was to consider whether a 10-week summer session would work better and make the courses more directly comparable to those in the academic year.

This is also extra money for a graduate student and additional resources for graduate education support (i.e., it is a separate budget from the academic year TAS money).

## **V. Review Report on Changing Catalog Year for Students**

After a short break, CEP discussed the report on changing the catalog year for returning students. In 1993, our campus adopted a catalog rights policy that students had rights in place at the time of their admission unless they had a break in their career. Last year, re-admits would have a problem with the new GEs becoming effective Fall 2010. Last year CEP approved temporary authority for college advisors to change catalog year for students who return to UCSC after a leave of absence. Guest Bergeon reported to committee members on the success of changing catalog rights and the challenges advisers faced. Last year a total of 110 students requested the need to change their catalog year. There are a couple of advantages for the colleges to make this decision; it allows advisers to help with recommending courses students can take while away for credit. In some cases the student only comes back for one quarter, knowing ahead of time which GE requirements to follow, this helps the student plan financially and transfer credit via admissions. The college advisors are requesting an extension of authority to set a requirement term no earlier than the students initial term of admission. CEP members voted unanimously to approve an extension for the college advisors to approve catalog year changes for another two years. The issue of a permanent cut off date for all students to switch to the new GEs , with appropriate advanced notice to stakeholders, will be placed on a future agenda. CEP will send an approval letter.

## **VI. Continuing Discussion of DQ Policies, Admissions Policies**

Chair Zurbriggen assigned each member two majors to review and report on at the meeting today. CEP will be reviewing entry into a major and discuss inviting departments to re-examine their requirements. Before CEP members could create any reasonable guidelines or advice for departments to adopt, members all agreed that clarification from the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (CRJ&E) was needed on what UCRJ's ruling means to our campus. Chair Zurbriggen and Analyst Wrangell will draft up necessary questions and request a consultation with the committee.

Questions from our discussion:

- Can a department have a disqualification policy? As long as it falls within the guidelines of the systemwide SRC900, is this allowable?
- There are some pieces of the regulations that refer to progress toward degree, what criteria are there that we can specify per degree audit? Percentage of a major or degree by a specific time for students to follow, such as by the students junior year.
- If the School of Engineering (SOE changes to a major DQ policy that is identical to the academic standards of SR 900, will there still be problems with students who don't qualify early in their career, by sophomore year?
- How are the departments using disqualification policies and why? Why would a department want to disqualify a student in their senior year, if they have passed all the courses to that point?

So attests,  
Eileen Zurbriggen, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy