

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 26, 2012  
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Mark Anderson, Lora Bartlett, Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Olof Einarsdottir, Maria Jennings (SUA Rep.), Tracy Larrabee (Chair), Ronnie Lipschutz (Provost Rep.), Stephen Sweat (NSTF Rep.), Ted Warburton, James Wilson, Susanna Wrangell (staff).

Absent: Jim Zachos .

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

**Executive Session**

Chair Larrabee apprised voting members of the committee's role and involvement in undergraduate education. Guiding principles for the year are based on transparency with the campus community including, but not limited to, the Registrar's Office, Departments, Divisions, Students and other senate committees. Members voted to invite the following standing guests for fall quarter 2012: Richard Hughey (Vice-Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education), Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Cher Bergeon (Academic Preceptor Designee, -Coordinator of Advisers for the Colleges), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), and Michael McCawley (Director of Admissions). Members would like the guests to attend at 11:30 a.m. for fall quarter this year. The committee approved the changes to sub-committee member duties, designating the approval of routine petition decisions, GSI and UTA requests, to the Chair. Any new precedent setting procedures will always be brought to the full committee for discussion.

**I. Introductions, Announcements and Meeting Overview**

Chair Larrabee called the meeting to order after the executive session and introductions were made. Chair Larrabee had members introduce themselves to the guests and extended the invitation for the quarter to attend at 11:30 a.m. The Chair apprised the guests of the correspondence work load which represents the official record of our discussion and stressed confidentiality in the meetings so that our work will be properly represented. This year's committee does not have an engineering representative and Chair Larrabee will present any issues for the School that may come up during the year. There was no objection from the guests on attending a half hour later. There was a Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting this week and agenda items of concern are the report on Rebenching and the two task forces on Academic Structures and Pedagogy. SEC members were apprised by Chair Konopelski of the adoption of Google Docs for review of minutes and correspondence by the Senate Office.

**II. Confidentiality and consultation Statements.**

CEP members reviewed the draft confidentiality and consultation statements; no additions were submitted. Both statements were approved as written and will be posted on both the public website and under Member Handbook on the committee website for quick reference.

**III. Committee Charge, routine activities, and past practices**

During executive session, members were apprised of the committee's charge and routine activities and past practices. Chair Larrabee gave a general outline of member responsibilities and committee workload and went over the committee website as a resource for members to reference undergraduate issues during the year .

#### **IV. External Reviews**

Members reviewed the external review process overall and CEP's specific procedures. There are three senate committees involved in this process: CEP, CPB and GC. The role of CEP is to insure that undergraduate education issues are being properly highlighted during the external review process and that the undergraduate experience is of the quality UCSC desires. There are two stages to each review. In the first stage, the committee may add comments and questions to the Universal Charge letter that the external reviewers will receive. After the external review, CEP drafts a response; this is Stage 2. The full committee will discuss each stage, and there will be a lead committee member who will draft the response. The draft response will be sent to the analyst who will post it in Google Docs for review, comment and approval. After the external review is conducted and responses are submitted, a closure meeting is held. The CEP member who leads the review discussion for a particular department's external review will attend the closure meeting and report back to the committee. CEP's response letters will be sent under the Chair's name on behalf of the Committee. A draft list of assignments was presented and discussed.

#### **V. Subcommittee assignments**

Members reviewed the list for subcommittee assignments for external reviews, program statements, course approvals, etc.

#### **VI. General Education Topics**

Chair Larrabee apprised the committee of changes for approving general education requirement courses. During the last two years, up to four members had to approve a course with one of the new general education requirements based on a member's past expertise. Both the Senate and the Registrar's Office expect few if any new course approvals being submitted for general education requirements. This year the sub-committees will approve any general education requirement courses that are submitted. If any members have concerns, they should consult with the CEP chair, analyst and Associate Registrar Claxton. Members unanimously voted to approve these changes to procedures: There are guidelines to help make the determination for approval of these courses, which have been used for the last two years. Members discussed the new admissions policies and how undergraduate education is affected and the draft legislation for SCR 9.8.1 that is being reviewed by Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJ&E) (drafted by last year's committee). If the legislation is approved by RJ&E, it will not come to this committee for re-drafting or approval. The legislation would not allow a student to enroll in a course for a third time without permission from their college, and the legislation would allow the counting of the W as an attempt. Analyst Wrangell will put the draft legislation under FYI in the next committee agenda packet. VPDUE Hughey apprised members of the upgrade to the Degree Audit function in AIS for students to access and help in preparation for the declaration of a major. He updated members on the Honors Program, which in the future, CEP will review and request progress reports on; one is due fall quarter, 2013. He is also looking into the "wait list" function in AIS and will be soliciting the campus population for feedback, and briefly touched on the funding for the DC requirement and welcomes creating a process with CEP for allocating these funds where needed.

**VII. Course Approval Process**

Members reviewed the sub committee assignments and will be working closely with CEP Guest Associate Registrar Claxton. Chair Larrabee would like to re-examine course approval forms and the approval process. The Committee membership confirmed the Dean's authority for course approvals is for funding purposes and the Senate is the approving body for curriculum. Members may wish to update the form to more clearly reflect the Dean's role at a future committee meeting. The process for CEP members is currently paper based and a large volume of new and revised courses are received by Associate Registrar Claxton's Office all year long. The Registrar's office will be moving towards an electronic system that will be implemented later this year. Registrar Hunt-Carter and CEP reaffirmed their commitments to approve catalog statements and course approvals in a timely manner to avoid impacting the production of the catalog and schedule of classes. Chair Larrabee, Analyst Wrangell, Registrar Hunt-Carter and Associate Registrar Claxton will meet on the exact dates course approvals and program statements must be approved by and will be presented as a future agenda item for discussion.

**VIII. Petition Approval Process**

The committee unanimously agreed to delegate decisions to the Chair based on past precedent. Any unusual petitions will be brought to the full committee.

**IX. Items/topics list for 2012 -13 /Members Items**

Further discussion for topics has been moved to a future meeting. One CEP member would like to review the possibilities for more writing in the discipline courses to benefit our students. Writing skills are a concern for members on undergraduate education. Students cannot get this concept over a ten week period due to the structure of our writing on our campus and this does come with experience. Some courses do require three drafts of each assignment with peer review and, while beneficial, it is labor intensive. For this year the committee wants to review the learning outcomes of our courses in which to develop criteria and guidelines for future data analysis. .

Committee on Educational Policy, 2012 – 13