

**Committee on Educational Policy
Minutes
Wednesday, April 10, 2013
Kerr Hall Room 307, 11 a.m.-1:30 p.m.**

Present: Mark Anderson, Olof Einarsdottir, Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Tracy Larrabee (Chair), Ronnie Lipschutinz (Provost Rep.), Ted Warburton, Jim Wilson, Susanna Wrangell (staff), Jim Zachos.

Absent: Lora Bartlett, Max Hufft (SUA Rep.), Stephen Sweat (NSTF Rep.).

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 Larrabee attended the Coursera Conference where the emphasis is on open access for anyone to educational information. Daphne Kohler a Stanford Professor, will be here early on the day of the Forum in the Stevenson fireside Lounge to answer questions about Coursera.

UCOE initiative meeting is this weekend, Chair Larrabee will report back to members next week. Gateway courses are targeted for this venue and Coursera is not, their courses are hybrid and for a more broader audience interested in an institution's specific special topics that their reputation is based on.

Chair Larrabee reported on the UCEP Meeting and will be the vice chair next year: Points covered included:

- State Senate Bills 520 & 547
- Policy on Approving Systemwide Courses
- Course Articulation for the system between campuses.
- For online courses, UCOE will be sending out a call in May.
- Assembly Bill 944

Members approved the consent agenda which included the following program statements:

Art:

Engineering: None.

Humanities:

PBSci: Earth and Planetary Sciences,

Social Sciences:

Removed for discussion: Engineering: SOE School statement, AMS, BENG, BME, CMPE, CMPS, EE, and TIM

For each department request:

- Removal of all references to the SOE GPA calculation, these must be department standards
- Remind departments (all not just SOE) about the importance of articulation for transfers
- List out specific courses for transfers to complete for the major requirements
- Reference the AIS GPA standard for major qualification policies

AMS: Send reminder on stakeholder confirmation.

BENG: Revised qualification policy and program statement – Approved.

BME: Removing BIO 100K as a requirement, but must be enrolled with BIO 100, it is listed as concurrent enrollment requirement, the Biology Department would like to keep as many seats for their majors, request the departments meet to solve this enrollment problem. Stakeholder confirmation with Biology and Chemistry is needed.

CMPE: Request a specific number of course requirements to declare, it appears a student would only need to take one course, pass and then declare the major. Based on the pre-calculus requirement students maybe passed the deadline to declare. The request to remove several courses (listed in discussion below) from the major is approved, but the department will need to work on articulation of CMPE 13/L with Articulation Officer Love.

CMPS: Request a specific number of course requirements to declare, it appears a student would only need to take one course, pass and then declare the major, like CMPE.

EE: Remove SOE GPA reference.

TIM: Remove SOE GPA reference, and admission to the major is listed twice, members will continue at another meeting.

Supplemental course form pulled off the consent agenda for revisions.

II. Program Statement Review Psychology Department

CEP previously reviewed Psychology with regard to changes in their major requirements. Now there is a question of one course, that has for many years, been restricted to majors only, it may have been overlooked at the time the department's qualification policy request was approved. Psychology 10 is a course that is restricted to declared majors, but students who enter this year and fail this course can take another to substitute and receive the necessary grade and are allowed to declare. However, for those who do fail, the appeals process seems to be missing from the program statement. Associate Registrar Claxton spoke with the department and a revised program statement with the appeals process added back in and will be submitted in the OCA. The department has also submitted a course revision form to remove the restriction. CEP sub-committee members will re-view for approval after the program statement revision is submitted in the OCA.

III. UNEX Certificate Guidelines and Instructor Qualification Requirements

There has been some confusion on who can approve an instructor to teach UNEX certificate courses. With turnover in both the UNEX and the Academic Senate, members reviewed the process and requested feedback from previous approvers on campus. It appears the process is working, but UNEX needs a quicker turn around time. Members discussed adding a paragraph to the UNEX certificate form as past approves felt enough information was provided for both the courses and the instructor of record. The descriptive paragraph would be helpful to first time reviewers. CEP will suggest the following:

“Please delegate this UNEX certificate instructor approval to the instructor in your department with this expertise. We would request your response by xcxcxxx.”

IV. Program Statement Review Computer Engineering Department

The Computer Engineering (CMPE) department is changing one of their major requirements from two courses to just one, CMPE 13, as the only C programming language course for CMPE majors to take. Before any decision was made, Chair Larrabee and VPDUE Hughey recused themselves. CEP members reviewed both arguments from the Associate Dean of SOE and the CE department in their deliberation. The CE department put forth compelling arguments that

taking CMPE 13/L provides stronger background to the C programming language than the current alternatives, and furthermore, that CMPE 13/L is a better preparation for upper division courses and graduate work for their majors. The Associate Dean provided arguments that this change would make it more difficult for students to change majors. CEP members feel that the CE faculty are best qualified to assess which courses will best prepare their students to move through the major, and that this concern outweighs the inconvenience to those students wishing to change from CE to CS or vice versa. CEP members strongly believe the department should have purview of their curriculum and support removing CMPE 12A/L and CMPS 5J/CMPS 11. However prior to final approval, the CE department must address several issues:

- CEP recommends the CE department work with Articulation Officer Love to articulate courses for transfer students. Currently, there are no Community College courses that articulate with CMPE 13/L. CMPE 13/L is placed in the freshman year in your major planners, which is untenable without articulation. While the lack of articulation is being resolved, CEP would like to know how CE will accommodate students who do not have CMPE 13/L in the major screening process.
- The transfer student section of the program statement needs to be updated. More specifically, CEP would like to see accurate and clear course requirements for transfer students listed and have references to the SOE website removed. We understand there are other references to the SOE site pertaining to majors for which the following language seems appropriate: Additional information on SOE policies can be found on the web pages at www.soe.ucsc.edu.

CEP members discussed the request for the implementation of a pre-major. CEP members do not endorse this request, but we do understand the impetus for this request. Members believe the same goals can be accomplished within existing functionality that exists in the Academic Information System (AIS). The campus already supports proposed majors and declared majors, and pre-majors would add unnecessary bureaucracy for our students. CEP suggests consulting with the Office of the Register (and the Office of Admissions for incoming undergraduates) in order to achieve the advising goals and enrollment-gating that the department seeks.

V. Program Learning Outcomes VPAA Request

Members discussed the future senate oversight necessary for WASC reviews with regard to learning outcomes established by our campus. Members agreed to the following outcomes:

CEP currently reviews every department program statement; CEP agrees that a department committed to Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) has to make it clear that these outcomes are important with regard to success in their discipline, and the appropriate place to do this is the program statement. CEP agrees that having the PLOs in the program statement would help communicate to students what the department expectations are and fulfill the WASC requirement.

CEP believes, that as we start using the new course approval supplemental form (complete with core topics and minimum required proficiencies for each course) that departments post course core topics and required proficiencies on a departmental or divisional basis. We have had repeated requests from undergraduates for this sort of public listing, and we believe it is compatible with the WASC process. CEP will recommend each department or division be encouraged to produce online resources for students to reference.

VI. Disciplinary Communication (DC) Curriculum and Individual Majors

CEP received a request from an individual major student who wanted to create his own DC plan. The advisers currently recommend students take courses with this designation and not substitute for the requirement. CEP will send a communication to preceptors advising students to use the approved DC courses that blend with the proposed individual major.

Committee on Educational Policy 2012 - 13