

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY****MINUTES****Wednesday, March 14, 2012****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, Susanna Wrangell (Staff), Peter Young, Eileen Zurbriggen (Chair).

Absent: Justin Riordan (SUA Rep.), Provost Representative.

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

**I. Announcements:**

Chair Zurbriggen updated members on this week's SEC meeting. Topics that were discussed included the campus demonstration, the Memorial to the UC Regents and the revised BOARS transfer proposal. The demonstration was small and relatively uneventful. Chair Zurbriggen reminded senators to vote on the Memorial; which will advise the regents to advocate for a better commitment to future funding of higher education. BOARS submitted a revised transfer proposal and CAFA has some concerns that BOARS did not address in regards to the revision. Major mapping is an unusable state for many majors, although every department has one major map that has been updated by Ryan. There would need to be department staff training so they could learn how to do their own majors. The Faculty Salary report is also on the Senate web site and in Senate Source this quarter.

Sub-committee members were reminded that course approvals for next Fall have arrived and they should schedule to meet with Associate Registrar Claxton.

Director of Admissions McCawley informed CEP of the record number of freshman applicants for next year, there were about 33,000. UCSC will send out offers to 19,942 applicants tonight which should allow for admitting 3700 students for next year's class. This year's admission rate is going to be 61% compared to last year's 68%, indicating greater selectivity. Transfer students will be notified this weekend.

**Credit for ENVS 65 and ENVS 165**

Chair Zurbriggen changed the order of the agenda to accommodate a last minute course approval question on the new offering of ENVS 65 (spring 2012) and ENVS 165 (Fall 2011). These courses cover essentially the same material, but at different levels. CEP members discussed the possibilities of allowing students to get credit for both. Members decided that it did not make sense pedagogically to allow a student to take a lower division course that covered essentially the same material, if they already have taken the upper division courses. In other words, you should not be able to get credit for ENVS 65 if you have already taken ENVS 165. On the other hand, it might make sense for a student who had taken the lower division course to want to delve deeper into the material in the upper division course. The committee still had concerns if the actual content of the course was very similar. However, CEP will leave it to ENVS to decide if students can get credit in ENVS 165 after already taking ENVS 65. Syllabi should be very clear about these issues. AIS can be programmed to disallow credit for ENVS 65 if there is already credit for ENVS 165, but not programmed to disallow the student even enrolling in ENVS 65. This may lead to confusion. Ideally, AIS will be changed so as to prevent students from enrolling in a class that they won't get credit for. There was a discussion about whether it is a

good use of teaching resources to teach two very similar courses at two levels, but CEP will leave it to departments to make these decisions.

Members approved the response to the VPAA on the remaining faculty CMMU FTE Transfers with two minor corrections.

Approval of minutes for January 25 and February 1, 2012 will be carried out via email.

## **II. BOARS Transfer Proposal Due April 27.**

CEP members held a discussion on the BOARS Transfer revised proposal and felt that the revisions addressed their concerns and is going in the right direction for the System. However, members found there are still some confusing issues with various student options, such as the associate degrees. BOARS placed authority for changes at the divisional level. Members were concerned with page 27, by the single message for Community College students preparing for their majors. These students will be given comprehensive review, but only the strongest prepared applicants for the major will be selected. The language has now been revised giving each campus the right to choose the applicant based on the individual major requirements for that department at that campus. CEP members stressed the importance for each campus to have autonomy for transfer admissions. The proposal states that the ASSIST website will be reworked and there is an unknown factor how this will affect the work load in the future for admissions staff. Members welcomed this proposal as many transfer students arrive on campus and are disappointed because they are not prepared for their major and this delays their graduation plans and is more costly. This proposal speaks of two pathways that a transfer student can choose: either IGETC, or for science majors SIGETC, or an AA degree certificate from the community college based on articulation agreements with UC campuses. The timeline for implementation seems a little unrealistic -- BOARS would like this to be in place by May 2013.

Points for the response:

- Reiterate that we support the goal of transfer student preparation and success
- Good that the focus now is on "preparation for the major" rather than "complete degree in two years"
- Campus autonomy in making admissions decisions is important and we are glad that it has been stressed more in the revised proposal; however, there are some places that seem to prescribe specific campus selection procedures and not allow for autonomy. This should be clarified.
- A parallel tension exists between the "strongest evidence of preparation" criteria and the principle of comprehensive review. If campuses are required to admit the applicants with the strongest evidence of preparation for their proposed major, this implies that all of the other factors that comprise comprehensive review are given no weight. Slight wording changes might clarify this.
- The third pathway seems to provide less access for students (admitted through this pathway only if space permits). If true, this should be very transparent for students. Also, what about students whose proposed major advises the third pathway? Will they be disadvantaged in admission?
- Minimum grade point average was confusing. The proposal states that "The minimum GPA should not serve as the dividing line between admission and non-admission, and should allow for a reasonable range of applicants to be considered via Comprehensive Review." Does this mean that students below the minimum GPA may be considered for admission? Under what circumstances? Or does it mean that no student below the

minimum GPA will be admitted, but that being above the minimum GPA does not guarantee admission?

- Committee was unclear about the rationale for capping the campus GPA requirement at 3.0.
- Timeline might be ambitious and workload for campuses has not been adequately addressed.

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) requested CEP co-sign on the request to departments in preparing courses for community college student transfers. CEP members decided to opt out at this time and meet with the CAFA Chair in the future if necessary.

The letter had confusing language referencing admission to the campus and then admission to the majors (CEP policy). Members were uncomfortable with not being in the deliberation process and would like to meet with CAFA first on this issue. Members felt that admissions criteria are not in CEP's purview; however, declaring the major is in our purview and CEP should have communication with CAFA about this. Chair Zurbruggen will communicate with CAFA Chair Gordon.

### **III. Disqualification Policy and Admission to the Major Policy**

The committee discussed major disqualification policies. RJ&E can only advise judgment on the URJ policy ruling on disqualification from a major, taking a legalistic perspective. CEP's concern is what is the best policy for undergraduate education and students. CEP members discussed several relevant issues. Some students just don't make it in some majors, but if they find this out late in their career they cannot graduate with any degree. Some departments seem reluctant to give up their disqualification policies; however, other campuses in the system use admissions requirements which are pedagogically sound. Departments are varying in their responses. The CEP Engineering representative will help revise the CE department's statement to make it more operational with what really works for the undergraduates, and will try to have it ready by spring quarter for review.

Members discussed the option for a general studies major on campus, but wanted to know what students thought about this, this could be a possible question for the spring opinion poll survey. Departments cannot remove a student from a major after 10 quarters, they would not be able to start and complete another major in less than four years.

Some admissions to the major policies have been approved without any data concerning how the requirements relate to student success (i.e., no pedagogical justification). In one case where limited resources were used as the justification, this was not quantified in any detailed way, nor did CPB weigh in, to our knowledge. CEP does not support having a GPA limiting enrollment or only teaching the cream of the crop.

CEP will continue this discussion next week.

### **IV. Policy Regarding Disciplinary Communication (DC) Substitution Requests move forward due to lack of time.**

### **V. Program Statements move forward due to lack of time.**

**So attests,**

**Eileen Zurbriggen, Chair**  
**Committee on Educational Policy**