

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY Annual Report 2005-06

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy worked on a broad range of programmatic, general education, retention, policy, planning, course, and program review topics during the 2005-06 year, and also considered numerous petitions, course revisions, and catalog statements.

Summary Issues for Faculty

1. Consider ways in which your program may help undergraduate retention.
<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPretention1495.pdf>
2. Ensure all faculty members are aware of the undergraduate final examination policy, in particular closed week. <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/exampolicy.pdf>
3. If your program does not include any courses carrying the writing-intensive ('W') general education designation, consider whether or not a multi-course sequence does or could provide disciplinary writing instruction for your majors.
4. Consider CEP's program definition document as a basis for new or revised programs.
<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/ugradprograms2.pdf>

Programs

Academic program development and continuous improvement are important responsibilities of the Academic Senate. The range of degree programs and concentrations available at UCSC are a critical component in student decisions to enter and remain at UCSC through graduation. Thus, it is an on-going task to the Senate, administration, departments, programs, and individual faculty to seek to develop new programs and variants, improve existing programs, and even retire outdated programs.

Computer Science: The Committee endorsed one new degree program, the B.S. in *Computer Science: Computer Game Design*. The new major is an interdisciplinary collaboration with many departments and divisions. The establishment brought considerable positive press to UCSC, and is the first new major since 2003-04.

Literature: The Committee approved two new literature concentrations, first discussed in 2004-05, *Literature (Literature and Film)*, and *Literature (Critical Theory)*. These also increase the level of choice for one of the larger majors, and provide our students with additional opportunities for interdisciplinary study.

Program Definitions: The Committee developed a summary of its recognized types of undergraduate academic programs, as well as the establishment and disestablishment processes. CEP hopes that the four-page document (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/ugradprograms2.pdf>) will help faculty and programs consider new ways to configure their courses to serve the needs of our students. The document defines majors, combined majors, individual majors, double majors,

minors, honors majors or intensive majors, concentrations, bachelor/graduate programs, area studies, and honors in the major/college honors.

Consideration of the program definitions, and inquiries by Interim Dean of Humanities Gary Lease, led to the policy decision that new concentrations will not be printed on diplomas, though existing literature concentrations will continue to be included. Also, CEP adopted uniform standards and guidelines for the various "area studies" sections of the catalog.

(<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/areastudies.pdf>)

Honors: Writing the program definitions document highlighted one pending issue for the Committee. Divisional Regulation 11.3 indicates that colleges and programs electing to award Honors must provide criteria to CEP for review and approval. We are not presently aware of any such repository, and the 2005-06 and 2006-07 CEP Chairs recently wrote to departments, programs, divisions, and colleges requesting information on honors that they give. The 2006-07 CEP plans to review the responses as an aspect of campuswide Honors and Honors Program development.

Other: The Committee provided preliminary advice on a planned B.S. in Bioengineering, and the Chair provided informal advice to several possible programs. The Committee provided feedback to VPAA Galloway concerning the campus process for approving academic program variants that do not require changes in resource allocation. The Committee, based on discussion within the Senate Executive Committee, decided that the minors in Journalism and in Composition and Rhetoric should remain suspended, rather than be disestablished, pending completion of the search for a new Dean of Humanities. The Committee approved the Psychology Department's change from a comprehensive examination to a senior seminar. The Committee endorsed formation of the Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics. The Committee approved an exception to the 25-credit requirement for the Computer Technology minor.

General Education

Quantitative course requirement: CEP completed the first comprehensive review of the quantitative ('Q') course requirement in over 20 years. With input from many programs, the Committee came to a consensus on approval of courses satisfying Regulation 10.2.2.1.C:

"Quantitative course. One five-credit hour course or the equivalent that entails use of advanced algebra, statistics, or calculus is required. The course may be offered by any unit but should teach, not just evaluate, mathematical skill."

In evaluating each course, the Committee considered the level of mathematics used in the course (advanced algebra and above), whether or not there was individual assessment of the development of mathematical skill--such as by examination, and how consistency is maintained between offerings of the courses.

CEP would like to commend the efforts of the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, which delivers the largest non-major quantitative course curriculum. The department performed an internal review of all of its 'Q' courses, and created a departmental policy concerning these courses. Astronomy and Astrophysics adds, with CEP approval, geometric reasoning, spherical geometry,

and multi-step problem-solving as appropriate for ‘Q’ courses, with the presumption that all quantitative material stresses understanding rather than rote manipulation of formulae. With regards to assessment, Astronomy and Astrophysics has established that, for their courses, 25 percent of examination points must be quantitative. To ensure consistency, the department will maintain a file of quizzes and examinations so that the Chair may ensure that new instructors are aware of course expectations.

Ocean Sciences faculty used this opportunity to reconsider the pedagogy of their quantitative course, Ocean Sciences 1, which was redesigned for the ‘Q’ designation in 2001. The quantitative component was previously concentrated in the experimental sections and homework problems. The faculty decided to integrate the material in the lectures, and to have 25 percent of each midterm and final examination be quantitative, thus assuring individual assessment. The department and CEP expect that these changes will better serve the students and the campus.

Writing-Intensive course requirement: The Committee is increasingly concerned about capacity within writing-intensive (‘W’) courses. CEP began the year with a survey of programs concerning capacity within ‘W’ courses, and the ways in which majors received disciplinary writing instruction. Many majors incorporate ‘W’ courses into their requirements, and others have a relatively standard set of courses for which students may petition for ‘W’ satisfaction, usually with additional writing and one-on-one instruction. Most of the remaining majors do include considerable disciplinary writing instruction, but do not (or have ceased to) offer a ‘W’ course. The relevant Regulation is 10.2.2.E:

“Writing-intensive course. One five-credit course or the equivalent that provides instruction and substantial practice in writing within the context of any academic subject.”

The original intent, which CEP strongly endorses but does not currently enforce, was for students to receive writing instruction within an academic subject relevant to their academic objectives (such as in the major or a closely related major), rather than just any available subject within the Academy. To better enable programs to incorporate satisfaction of the ‘W’ within major requirements, CEP worked with one program (the Health Sciences B.S.) to define a sequence of two courses with an associated prerequisite for satisfying the ‘W’ requirement. Programs that wish to pursue this possibility are encouraged to discuss course design with the Chair of CEP, and to create a proposal that includes 1) a clear articulation of the writing instruction and practice that does or will take place in each course; 2) an explanation of how the combination provides appropriate disciplinary writing training; and 3) how consistency between offerings will be maintained. CEP has informally discussed such possibilities with two other programs, and encourages more majors to consider this option.

CEP hopes that divisions will take special account of the instructional needs of ‘W’ courses when allocating teaching assistant positions, especially in those divisions that do not offer many ‘W’ courses. A realignment of resources applied to general education instruction toward ‘W’ courses, even with their higher cost per enrollment, would greatly serve our curriculum and students.

Transfer students and General Education Requirements: One half of our transfer students complete the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) at a community college, and

thus receive a waiver of campus general education requirements. This percentage will grow with the implementation of SciGETC, which allows the deferment of 2 requirements for students pursuing course-intensive majors. For the remaining students, topical course requirements cannot be articulated to previous course work but are waived based on credit counts. Current policies and practices result in many petitions from individual students, both for waiver and for substitution. Also for students who do not satisfy IGETC, the writing-intensive requirement may not be satisfied by transfer work, which has also generated a number of petitions. Such petitions can be a barrier to good academic planning by students and generate workload for students, advising staff, and faculty (as well as for CEP).

CEP proposed to the Senate that the campus-only nature of these two requirements be removed, thus permitting it to articulate, for example, courses at other UC campuses as being appropriate for topical credit or disciplinary writing instruction. This was defeated in a close floor vote, though discussion endorsed the use of case-by-case petitions. Next year's CEP will need to consider this issue, most likely separating the issues of topical course treatment and writing-intensive course treatment.

Composition requirement: The Committee adopted guidelines for the articulation of courses satisfying the revised requirements in English composition (C1 and C2).

General education restructuring: A subcommittee worked with Professor John Isbister to re-examine the possibility of general education concentrations, a component of the (failed) 1999 reform proposal. The discussion led to the conclusion that a comprehensive review of general education may be appropriate for the coming year, and thus adopting a single component of the 1999 proposal may not be the best course for reforming our general education program. The topic is expected to be continued in 2006-07, and may also touch on the many issues surrounding Introduction to the Discipline, Arts, and Topical courses, including objectives, transfer, and differentiation.

Retention and Graduation

The Committee studied the issue of undergraduate retention and graduation rates in collaboration with the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education William Ladusaw, and Director of Institutional Research Julian Fernald. CEP's report on the matter was presented to the Division at the spring meeting (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPretention1495.pdf>).

UCSC's first-year and second-year retention rates have been steadily improving, with high correlation to increasing selectivity. For students entering in 2003, the two-year retention rate (the percentage of students to continue on to a third year) reached 79 percent. UCSC's six-year graduation rate should be positively affected by these changes because one of the most important factors in graduation rates is retention between the second and third year. UCSC's 1999 six-year graduation rate (the percentage of students who graduate before the fall of the seventh year) was 70 percent, while the systemwide graduation rate was 80 percent (well above the national average six-year graduation rate for public institutions).

The most important observations include that the lower retention rates in the first and second year are the primary difference between UCSC's graduation rates and the systemwide graduation rate; that UCSC does better than expected in retaining and graduating students with GPAs in the lower quintile of the UC-eligible (those ranked just above the 87.5 percentile of California high school students); and that UCSC does less than expected in retaining and graduating students with the highest high school GPAs.

The report makes three recommendations:

1. Adopt a campus goal of achieving a 6-year graduation rate of 80 percent by 2012.
2. Adopt a campus goal of achieving a 2-year retention rate of 86 percent by 2010.
3. Create a taskforce with representation across the campus to ensure continuing focus on retention, graduation, and their improvement.

The report also includes action items related to four areas: admissions and financial aid; academic program preparation and selection; student mentoring, advising and monitoring; and campus unit and program assessment. These action items, without supporting discussion, include:

1. Admissions and Financial Aid
 - Provide resources to strengthen admissions outreach and yield programs.
 - Increase resources available for financial aid.
 - Encourage the entire campus community to participate in attracting qualified students to UCSC.
2. Academic program preparation and selection
 - Consider strengthening the general education system to include a goal of major exploration and education.
 - Require programs to clearly articulate their degree objectives and ensure that students are aware of a variety of career opportunities after completion of the degree.
 - Encourage programs to examine their curricula to ensure that students can engage with material of interest and challenge in the first year, preferably in small groups.
 - Investigate how performance in major preparation and gateway courses, including writing, mathematics, languages, physics and chemistry, is related to retention and graduation.
 - Achieve awareness of developing trends in student major interest and ensure that UCSC has an appropriate and excellent portfolio of degree objectives.
 - Monitor curricular bottlenecks and ensure that first and second year students have priority in key lower-division courses (in progress).
 - Encourage programs to develop Honors Majors, Intensive Majors, BS/MS, and undergraduate research programs to ensure that top students have an outlet for their excellence. These programs should stretch down into the first and second year to have an effect on retention of top (and other) students.
3. Student mentoring, advising and monitoring
 - Colleges and Student Affairs should actively consider mechanisms for assisting the development of academically-focused communities surrounding degrees or clusters of related degrees.

- Programs should consider development of community-building activities and organizations among their majors, especially first-year and second-year students.
 - Maintain and expand the use of advising clusters to ensure that the advisers know a potential degree objective for every entering student (in progress).
 - Simplify the major declaration process and advance the major declaration deadline to ensure students receive the advising most appropriate to their goals (in progress).
 - Modify the minimum progress standards to catch potential problems early (complete).
 - Modify the maximum progress standards to remove administrative hurdles to pursuing credit-intensive majors and double majors (complete).
 - Reconsider the double counting rule for double major and major/minor combinations, as such restrict the opportunities for high-achieving students.
 - Reconsider the quarterly exception process for high course loads (complete).
4. Campus unit and program assessment
- Automate the collection and distribution of program-specific retention and degree statistics, including comparative benchmarks.
 - Incorporate retention and graduation rates as a major part of the external review process.
 - Develop tools for analyzing and reporting curricular and other bottlenecks, and engage programs in discovering ways to overcome them.
 - Focus annual reports and assessments on BA, BS, and BM degrees granted.

The Division indicated its strong support for continued Senate and Administrative focus on undergraduate retention and graduation rates by unanimously adopting a resolution calling for the incorporation of retention and graduation in academic and budgetary planning and evaluation; establishment of a task force on retention; and program-by-program review of ways to improve retention with particular attention to students seeking academic challenge in the lower division.
<http://senate.ucsc.edu/resolutions/CEPretentionResol.pdf>

Policies

The Committee revised a considerable number of policies related to undergraduate education and UCSC Extension.

Minimum progress: In winter, the Senate approved a change in Regulation 6.2.2 on minimum progress for undergraduates. The new Regulation uniformly expects students to complete 36 credits per academic year. Previously, expectations were lower for the initial years and higher for the later years. The new system is expected to enable better monitoring of at-risk students during the first and second years, positively affecting graduation rates.
<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPreg622SCP1478.pdf>

Progress beyond 180 credits: Regulation 6.2.4 indicates that, after the fourth year, students need college authorization to exceed 180 credits. Following previous CEP policy, approval in most cases is routine. Hence this Regulation provides needless bureaucracy to transfer students and students with course-intensive academic plans. CEP has requested that colleges provide automatic and automated approval for completing up to 225 credits within five years (135 credits within three years for junior transfer students), requiring petitions only for students wishing to complete higher-

credit academic plans within five years. Based on experience with this policy, a future CEP may wish to modify the Regulation. This is part of our effort to reduce hurdles for high-achieving students in an effort to improve graduation rates. <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPunityyear.pdf>

Maximum credit load: Regulation 6.1.2 indicates that students need college authorization to carry 19 or more credits in a quarter. Colleges extend automatic approval for 19 credits after the first year. Authorization is routinely given, and CEP has requested that the Academic Information System extend fully automatic approval to students maintaining a 3.0 GPA to carry up to 22 credits after the first quarter at UCSC, and that colleges individually review requests to carry more than 22 credits and requests from students with lower GPAs. This is part of our effort to reduce hurdles for high-achieving students in an effort to improve graduation rates. <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEP19unit.pdf>

Minimum credit load: Regulation 6.1.2 also indicates that students need college authorization to carry fewer than 15 credits. Colleges routinely permit 12 credits (also the minimum for full-time status) for students with good academic standing and progress. The Committee has solicited comments from the colleges so that it may consider more rigorous standards for permitting students to carry fewer than 15 credits. Such a change may improve progress toward a degree.

Closed week/Final Exam Policy: The Committee regularly receives concerns about final examinations that have been surreptitiously moved to the last week of classes (“closed week”), moved to alternative times, or canceled. The Committee implemented new procedures for the movement of final examination times. Requests to move final examinations must come from the sponsoring department with Chair support by the fifth week of a quarter, address student needs, and receive CEP approval. The Committee revised the statement on final examinations in *The Navigator* and *The Schedule of Classes* to make clear student responsibility in being aware of the final examination schedule at the time of course selection. <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/exampolicy.pdf>

UCSC Extension: The Committee commented on the UCSC Extension Taskforce report during fall quarter. In spring, based on this report and working with VP/Dean Cathy Sandeen, the Committee approved new process flows for continuing education course approvals and instructor approvals, as well as continuing education certificates. Perhaps most importantly, the Committee and Dean agreed on the type and frequency of reports to CEP and to campus departments. UCSC Extension is one of our campus’ most visible educational programs. CEP is tasked with Senate oversight of all matters related to UCSC Extension (Bylaw 13.7.6), but for many years had not been asked for advice or requested information concerning these programs. It is hoped that these new processes will be the start of a much closer relationship between campus faculty and the continuing education programs, to the benefit of all. CEP and CPB have agreed to work closely in the coming years on issues concerning the budgetary aspects of UCSC Extension. <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/UNEXpacket.pdf>

Cross-listed courses: The Committee approved permanency in course cross-listing, removing the step of annual approval. The Committee determined that it would be appropriate for a future CEP to study the purposes and practices of cross listing, and also expressed concern about the anomalous treatment of enrollment workload for cross-listed courses (for Senate faculty, this accrues to the

faculty member's home department; for non-Senate faculty, this accrues according to a student's enrollment section). <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/Cross%20Listing.pdf>

Graduate student instructors: The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and the Coordinating Committee for Graduate Affairs (CCGA), with considerable campus consultation, created a joint statement on graduate student instruction. This may see systemwide distribution and adoption in 2006-07, with resulting changes in the process of appointing graduate student instructors.

Summer Session: UC, UCSC, and CEP all have significant work to do related to the normalization of summer quarter. UCEP provided the following recommendations to the Academic Planning Council, which endorsed and forwarded them to UC Provost Rory Hume.

- Campuses should begin reviewing and evaluating how their summer session models interact with their overall educational goals.
- The appropriate Senate committees should evaluate whether the 3-, 5-, and 6-week courses offered during summer session are "substantively equivalent" to the 10-week quarter or 15-week semester courses offered during the regular year.
- Campuses should review the services available to students on each campus to ensure that the cost and availability of housing, tutorial help, library hours, and health services are equivalent to the regular academic year.
- The University should engage in serious study, campus by campus, of strategies to develop summer enrollment and faculty participation in instruction.
- Consider integrating the Office or Division of Summer Session with the Office or Division of Undergraduate Studies.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/council/ac.summer.session.0706.pdf>

Academic integrity: The Committee has previously determined that instructors may override student Withdraw (W) grades as part of the academic sanctions associated with an academic integrity case. This year, the Committee determined that dropped courses can be reinstated on a student's transcript for similar purposes by petition to CEP from the instructor with comment from the Provost.

Planning

Professional school pre-proposals: The Committee reviewed the several professional school pre-proposals submitted to the Senate. CEP was disappointed by the lack of integration of undergraduate, graduate, and professional education in the proposals. The Committee did not endorse any proposal for this reason.

Planning process: CEP Chair Hughey, CPB Chair Koch, Graduate Council Chair Schumm, and Division Chair Crosby worked together to better articulate a process for committee collaboration with respect to the 10-year plan updates. There has historically been less than optimal communication and consultation between the committees, most often the passing of memos rather than collaboration. This group attempted to define a process for the current planning efforts that would more fully implement the close collaboration specified in committee charges. Due to time

constraints, full implementation of the planned process was not possible, though CEP remains hopeful that this discussion will lead to a greater degree of collaboration between the various committees.

Divisional Plan Update Responses

CEP responded to each of the academic divisional plan updates, and found several cross-cutting issues related to undergraduate education and research.

Objectives: Several plans do not clearly articulate the mission of the respective academic division, and how that mission integrates with campus goals. It is important for all units—programs, departments, divisions, and the campus—to be clear about their purpose and direction. This idea is being incorporated in the revised departmental external review process, but is also important for divisions and the campus.

Metrics: Many of the divisional plans include a focus on enrollments. At the undergraduate level, CEP is very interested in the level of degree production (degrees awarded rather than estimated number of majors), as well as the distinction among enrollment satisfying major requirements (the most critical to maintain), due to general education requirements, and elective credit. CEP would like to see, as a result of this planning process, a consistent and more articulated set of such measures for all programs and divisions.

Workload and Teaching Assistant Distribution: The Committee generally wondered how teaching assistant and instructional workload may be more efficiently allocated within divisions and among divisions. Also, CEP is interested in mechanisms that might encourage (rather than discourage, as at present) inter-departmental and inter-divisional teaching. These issues of workload and resource allocation are particularly important for the lower-division courses required of all students (e.g., writing), the majority of majors (e.g., mathematics and statistics), or many majors (e.g., basic science and languages).

Non-Senate Faculty and Graduate Student Instruction: Several divisions indicated plans to increase the use of non-Senate faculty and graduate student instructors in delivering the curriculum. CEP would like these divisions to articulate a philosophy of the use of non-research instructors. CEP does note that in many disciplines part-time faculty can bring additional expertise from the practicing world, and is not opposed to these proposals. However, CEP would like to know what impacts, positive or negative, these strategies may have on the curriculum, and how these impacts will be monitored.

Summer Session: Only one of the divisional plans included a strategy for state-supported summer session. That strategy was one of reserving resources in anticipation of campus development of a strategy.

Courses

On-line courses: The Committee adopted a policy that on-line courses must include a mechanism for individual student assessment, such as, but not restricted to, an in-person or proctored final. The

Committee also approved several innovative teaching arrangements, such as two-room teaching and collaborative distance-learning teaching. The Committee encourages such experimentation, and also requested student feedback be gathered specifically concerning the experimental aspects of the delivery of instruction. Over time, these responses will be used to evaluate policies and publish best practices.

Enrollment: The current enrollment system provides priority based on class year, with seniors having the highest priority. Unfortunately, this means that the introductory courses for some majors are full before first- and second-year students interested in those majors may enroll. CEP and the Registrar provided programs the ability to reserve seats in such courses for first-year students beginning fall 2006. Over the coming year, based on these experiences, the Committee, Registrar, and interested departments will further explore these capabilities within the Academic Information System.

External Reviews

The Committee responded to four external reviews (American studies, environmental studies, science communication, and physics). The Committee commented on charges for six external reviews (arts, electrical engineering, ecology and evolutionary biology, Latino and Latin American studies, molecular, cell & developmental biology, and the writing program). Also, the Committee commented on and strongly endorsed VPAA Galloway's proposal to modify the review process to ensure it is valuable for all parties concerned.

A continuing issue with respect to the external review process is the availability of comprehensible and complete data on programs and departments. Although more data is now provided centrally to units working on their self-studies, CEP found the current data and format to insufficiently support substantive data-driven program review by either the unit or the external reviewers.

Other Work

The Committee met 33 times in 2005-06, including a half-day orientation at the start of the year. The Committee co-sponsored a campuswide forum on retention, with 75 attendees, primarily staff and students.

Subcommittees reviewed 209 new courses, 1,008 course revisions, 63 program statements, and 19 individual majors. The full Committee discussed many of the significant proposed degree changes, most of which were approved, but two of which were withdrawn for further consideration by the program faculty to address issues raised by the Committee. The Chair completed the first CEP review of the undergraduate parts of the "white pages" of the catalog. This section includes much academic information, and has largely evolved with minimal Senate supervision. Future revisions to these pages will involve CEP, as with other undergraduate sections of the catalog. Academic Editor Margie Claxton provided seamless coordination for these reviews, among her many other duties. The Committee expresses its great appreciation for her expertise and efforts.

The Chair reviewed 644 petitions. Major categories included:

- Writing-Intensive Course substitutions (158). The Committee especially thanks Sarah-Hope Parmeter of the Writing Program, who as the non-Senate teaching faculty representative in fall

reviewed these petitions. With great dedication, she continued during winter and spring, even after her term on CEP was complete.

- Other general education waivers and substitutions (130). Most often involving the Topical or Introduction to the Discipline courses.
- Modification of letter-grade option to meet the 75 percent requirement (11). These most often occurred for transfer students who took courses designated as P/NP only. Modification to AIS should provide better tracking of these cases. Students were required to fully change the most recent quarter(s) that would address this problem. Petitions to change letter-grade status for other reasons were routinely denied.
- Miscellaneous other requests to change the grade option (59).
- Late add and drop requests (220). Some categories of late add and other AIS issues are now delegated to the Registrar. Late drop requests without documentation of AIS errors were generally denied, unless there is other compelling evidence.
- Late instructor-initiated grade change requests are now delegated to the Registrar.
- Miscellaneous other petitions (66). Most were requests to waive <1 credit in order to graduate.

The Committee was tremendously well advised by its regularly-invited guests, Cher Bergeon of the Council of College Preceptors, Academic Editor Margie Claxton, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education William Ladusaw, Articulation Officer Barbara Love, and Associate Director of Admissions Michael McCawley.

Roxanne Monnet joined the Committee in September as the new CEP analyst. With no time for training or orientation, Roxanne jumped into the rapids of CEP's daily and weekly torrent of business with aplomb and perseverance. It has been the Committee's and Chair's pleasure to work with Roxanne, and we hope she will continue to lend her expertise for many years to come.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Heather Bullock

Jorge Hankamer (S)

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex-officio*

Tracy Larrabee

Anatole Leikin

Jaye Padgett (F, W)

John Tamkun

Richard Hughey, Chair

Floyd Amuchie, SUA representative

Pedro Castillo, Provosts' representative

Tim Fitzmaurice, NSTF representative (W, S)

Sarah-Hope Parmeter, NSTF representative (F)

August 31, 2006