

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**MINUTES****Wednesday, November 02, 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), The Provost Rep., waiting on appointment, Michael McCawley (Associate Director of Admissions).

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

I. Announcements:

There was a CAB/SEC meeting this week and the curriculum mapping project and the classroom time changes proposal were discussed. The time slot changes will not necessarily be implemented any time soon, and not unless the Senate was in support. The Chancellor spoke of a comprehensive fund raising campaign, which has a variety of specific initiatives.

Approval of Minutes October 12, 2011 with minor corrections.

II. Approval of Letters

Language Program approved with minor corrections.

Art department letter will be revised and then sent out via email.

III. Continuation of discussion of DQ Policies, Admissions Policies

Members discussed the next steps on helping departments remove their disqualification policies or reconfigure them as admissions policies to the major. Some informal feedback from departments suggests there is some concern about a smooth transition from disqualification to major entry policies. Departments are faced with increased need and decreased support both in funding and staffing. Members reviewed the UCEP paper on Best Practices for Managing Impacted Majors. From the discussion, several problems on campus arose such as:

- Students who are advanced in standing (i.e., juniors or seniors) can be disqualified from some majors, and it is difficult to find another major this late
- Programs with multiple majors or degrees can disqualify from one major but the student is able to graduate to the next appropriate major with clear advising to the students -- perhaps this is a solution to the problem of being out-of-compliance with SR 900.
- Lack of communication between colleges and departments when students have taken the class twice before, fail and now try for a third time. This is a Senate regulation but is hard to enforce, because it is not implemented in AIS.
- Some students simply do not want to change majors, even with failing grades.
- Move towards requirements to enter the major (by passing certain lower division courses), rather than being disqualified later
- CEP will consult with CRJ&E on enforcing senate regulation, 9.1.8.

- Courses that continually fail the majority of students in a major, could departments provide more support for students in those courses, perhaps with help from Learning Support Services or advice from CEP?

Due to the need for more information, before CEP presents guidelines or additional tools for departments to use in eliminating the disqualification policies, there will not be a presentation at the fall Senate meeting. Chair Zurbriggen will meet or consult with individual departments, if requested, and report back to the committee at a future meeting to continue discussions.

IV. **Senate Regulation SR 610 Residency**

Members reviewed the proposed changes to Senate Regulation 610 – Residency. There was a ruling from UCR&J that would permit students to be recognized as “resident” on the basis of their enrollment at a UC campus of study, regardless of their physical location. After discussion, the committee decided to include the following points for the committee’s response:

- This proposed change seems very broad and seems to dilute what residency means. The committee worried that this was a big change, with perhaps unintended consequences, to deal with a specific problem (online courses)
- For online courses, a policy is needed, how many courses or years of courses would be acceptable?
- Members felt strongly that a policy is needed first for online courses before amending this Senate regulation.

Chair Zurbriggen will distribute the letter via email for committee approval.

V. **Review Appendix C**

VPAA Lee would like Senate comment on the draft of Appendix C under the policy for Academic Program Review Procedures. Here are the additions for the response letter:

- Members are happy to have a self study for these interdisciplinary programs, the wording seems to have a disjuncture between the graduate and undergraduate assessment review of the majors.
- CEP recommends that departments be given the opportunity to give their philosophy of their program for undergraduate majors (as they do for their graduate programs).
- Members felt the description should be like the graduate degree program:
“Describe the present and planned philosophy of the *undergraduate* degree program, including designated emphasis, collaborative, or interdisciplinary programs, addressing the following: ...”

VI. **Discussion: Best Practices regarding Impaction**

CEP members discussed how to discourage students who don’t do well in a major but don’t want to change majors. How does CEP assess how a department is impacted? Once a department is declared impacted, give it a sunset clause so CEP can review with the next program catalog statement. Is there a possibility that a designation of impaction might reward departments that simply aren’t using their resources well? How could this be determined. Members believe that judgments of impaction should be based on data.

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