

**Committee on Educational Policy**  
**Minutes**  
**Wednesday, January 16, 2013**  
**Kerr Hall Room 307, 11 a.m.-1:30 p.m.**

Present: Mark Anderson, Lora Bartlett, Max Hufft (SUA Rep.), Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Olof Einarsson, Tracy Larrabee (Chair), Ronnie Lipschutz (Provost Rep.), Stephen Sweat (NSTF Rep.), Michael Tassio (Staff), Ted Warburton, James Wilson, Jim Zachos.

Absent: Susanna Wrangell (Staff).

Guests: Cher Bergeon (Academic Preceptor Designee), Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Mary-Beth Harhen (Senate Director), Richard Hughey (VPDUE), Stacey Keleher (Registrar's Office), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Director of Admissions).

**I. Announcements**

Chair Larrabee updated members on this week's SEC meeting. At SEC the deadline for responses for the Chancellor's Stewardship Review is next week and feed back is being requested. COC has three positions open and members are encouraged to make nominations.

Task Force Meetings: The task force on curriculum has met and are discussing a new structure for CEP, CAFA, CPE and COR, these committees are important as a group due to the overlapping work that each individual committee charge covers. VPDUE Hughey recommended that the COT also be included in this group. Chair Larrabee explained that most committees at other UCs meet less often, and do not include guests. Chair Larrabee expressed the importance of having guests. Additionally, CEPs often break courses out of CEP into its own committee. Chair Larrabee felt there might need to be more formal communication between particular committee meetings; in particular, one special meeting per quarter. We need to think about the problems we are trying to solve within the context of possible changes. Questions about guests on CEP came up and members were reminded that the committee can always hold an executive session. CEP's charge doesn't require guests to be present. At other UCs very high level staff/faculty committees in divisions move documents up to CEP's, which do not include guests (the guests, staff, are thereby included earlier in the process). Another area the task force is addressing is interdisciplinary research and cross-listed courses—both are apparently perceived as too difficult. Chair Larrabee gave an example of a department that asked her, specifically, to be traded to another department for the year. She approached her chair who said the trade was not possible for the practical reason of have too many faculty already on leave. A member suggested as UCSC grows, spreading the responsibilities of committees (for example of separating Courses from CEP) is a good way of getting more faculty participation on Senate committees; this will enhance shared governance. Having one committee thinking about issues, or just one ad hoc committee, limits the breadth of discussion. Chair Larrabee had one final question from the task force for members to report back on, how many have divisions with a divisional curriculum committee that reviews course proposals before being submitted to CEP? From the membership the responses included: committees in the department only, some have committees of Chairs that discuss the course offerings.

Another member suggestion for the task force, there are topics that are shared between CEP and GC; there are conversations that could be had together.

### Online Forum:

CEP and COT now have participants from all divisions but Arts. We have requests out to Art and are hopeful that we will have a representative. The participants include: tablet teaching, Alan Christy and digital histories; Brent Haddad, online course from a professor's perspective and the students.

A CEP member mentioned an article in today's paper about San Jose State offering low cost online courses for \$150, Analyst Wrangell will find the article and share with members. Chair Larrabee is preparing a letter to all faculty about what constitutes an online course and what forms are needed.

Chair Larrabee met with COC Chair Abrams about the importance of undergraduate directors serving on disqualification boards at colleges; she is preparing a letter sharing her experience on the Academic Standing Committee and the value of her experience that will then be circulated to Department Chairs.

Members approved the consent agenda which included the responses to ENV5 65 Online Course report and BMB/MCD Biology Qualification to Major Appeals process for denials.

The appeals letter will be removed from the consent agenda to reference during the discussion for items 3, 4, and 5.

## II. Presentation of the Online Curriculum Approval (OCA) System

Analyst Wrangell will post the presentation on the committee website for members to reference as they become familiar with the new online system. Stacey Keleher, from the Registrar's Office was one of the staff responsible for designing and building the system with help from staff at the School of Engineering. The project was jointly sponsored by the Senate, Registrar's Office and the VPDUE's Office. The System includes role level security, a viewing queue for each subcommittee member and a commenting field for members to approve or request more information.

Some comments and questions from the discussion:

- CEP and GC, as committees that review items, need to think about how to respond to agencies. It will be useful to discuss and decide on what sort of language in comments can be used regularly in response letters to streamline the process for the Senate analysts.
- What is the go-live date for Course Approvals?  
Response: The OCA team is attempting to have go-live for courses on February 4 or 5.
- How does OCA deal with late submissions?  
Response: the OCA currently isn't designed to not accept, for instance, late submissions. All documents are date stamped.
- What happens if CEP has made comments, and then a new statement is uploaded?  
Response: new statements can only be uploaded if sub-status of CEP allows agency to upload new docs.
- Who approves statements? Senate Analyst will do this after both members comments are in. After the program statement is approved, by both members, then the statement comes to the consent agenda. If any members have questions about statement in comments, then the statement needs to come to the full agenda. We will add sample statements, even when both members approve, on the full agenda; to ensure that members understand the process, and that CEP agree on what is acceptable in a statement—especially in regard to the transfer admission policy.
- When will members be in the system? Stacey: 1 to 2 weeks. Goal for CEP: **“We need to review all program statements by the end of Winter Quarter.”**

- Is there a rubric for members to use when reviewing statements? Response members should reference the check list and use our best judgment to ensure that policies in the statement are fair to students. If department says, these are the classes that a student should take, then CEP needs to ensure that the courses/sequences are in the statement.
- This is what we are reviewing: (1) What CAFA has collected from departments on what courses are satisfied for transfers; (2) the program statement itself; (3) the departmental website (this needs to be consistent with the statement).

There was a lot of discussion about the difference between websites and statements. CEP approves statements, but if the department or program website includes policies different from the statement, then the statement should not be approved.

### **III. Major Qualification**

Last year CEP made changes to majors with regard to admissions policies and eliminating late disqualification of a student in their junior or senior year. VPDUE Hughey shared his thoughts on standardizing the process and importance of major qualification policies.

As the campus processes major qualifications, there is more confusion around major GPA requirements. Some of the confusion is natural and now after almost two years, reviews will start being sent in and recommendations will need to be made. CEP members held discussions earlier in the year about what data the committee wanted to see with regard to GPA computation for those departments who request it. A single GPA (this can be implemented in AIS making it very easy for students to use) shows GPA levels (but how is it calculated?, what levels of GPA requirement are suitable for qualification in the major?—2.8, 2.7, etc., does it not matter for some degrees? What are the expectation levels?) Departments might have a definitive way for GPAs to be calculated, but then varying levels for departmental qualification. VPDUE Hughey is convinced that the best solution is to calculate major GPA the same way we calculate campus GPA. This can easily be implemented in AIS. The qualification GPA would be calculated within the frame of qualification courses for major.

What about counting Ws? CEP might say: we can't approve your qualification policy because (1) not using campus method for calculating GPA; (2) taking Ws into consideration when calculating GPA. CEP has approved, in recent years, a number of qualification policies that do not contain GPA calculation methods that are consistent. CEP is telling departments to do things differently than they have done them in the past. For example, Computer Engineering hosts a number of majors, and each have a GPA calculating software built in so students can check GPA in each major. This is a very useful tool for students and having one GPA will greatly reduce the burden advisors have in advising students in different majors. Members would like to take a look at comprehensive major qualification requirements, which CEP should consider in very near future. Three issues to consider here: (1) student success, (2) student access, (3) enrollment management. This might not be done this year, but the committee can start with the most impacted on campus.

This Qualification policy may not be in alignment with grading policy of the W, the senate analyst will consult with RJ&E on the interpretation of SCR 9.4.1. and the Systemwide regulation and policy on grading of Ws. If departments are incorporating the W in major qualification GPA, this might create problems for course repetition. Members held a discussion of language on counting of course offerings, the departments are referencing that students can only take a course once after a fail, which is in violation of our senate regulations on repeating of courses for credit or grade improvement. This is no longer necessary as AIS has been reconfigured not to allow multiple takes

of a failed course. Members also discussed how the policy will affect students and upper-division students. CEP members support the idea that the campus should have a method for calculating GPA and will continue the discussion at our next meeting on what the criteria should be.

#### **IV. Program Statement Review: Music Qualification Policy Request**

The Music Department has submitted a proposal for a qualification policy for Music majors for CEP to review. CEP members felt this may be a good qualification process but it is not well articulated in their proposal. Past successful graduates were made up of slightly over 20% who took Music 30A after their Junior year. For transfers who don't place into Music 30A, which is only offered in fall quarter, they still have an audition and an appeal if the department faculty member thinks a student shows promise, then they can still be admitted to the major, and would need to take Music 30A the following fall quarter of their second year. This is actually what happens with transfers, they don't take Music 30A their first quarter on campus. The main issues are with junior transfers not placing into Music 30A and are students sufficiently informed before deciding to come to UCSC for Music? Senate analyst will draft the letter and send to Articulation Officer Love for her additional comments and approval at our next meeting.

#### **V. Program Statement Review: Revised Economics Qualification Policy Request**

Economics has submitted a revised qualification to the major policy for CEP to review. The department is still requesting a GPA of 2.8, but has changed its policy on transfer students and is willing to accept ECON 1 & 2 and an equivalent courses in calculus and statistics based on those listed in ASSIST. CEP members found the policy difficult to understand and could not hold a discussion without more information. The problems with the proposal include: 1) repetition of courses language(redundant), 2) articulation is unfair to transfer students, 3) very high GPA, 4) Appeals process, 5) administrative process is not approved by Dean, 6) Impaction strategy.

For the mathematics courses the department is requiring, these would be equivalent to two-term sequence in calculus at a community college. Many community colleges do not have a two term sequence (roughly only 20 of 125 have two-term sequence). Students at Community College will have to take a longer series of courses. Transfer students might not qualify for another or the economics major. Special problems for any student thinking of Economics from our largest provider of transfer students, Cabrillo, where they do not have the second course. From the student perspective adding two extra courses leaves less time for student to decide whether or not they like the major. If the student gets into major and doesn't like it, they are very late in their career and may not be able to change their major.

Chair Larrabee will send an informal response to the department representative what CEP found acceptable and what needs to be changed.

##### *Summation of concerns:*

The second calculus course needs to be removed

Repetition of courses is not addressed

Articulation unfair to transfer students not equitable

Not consistent with other qualification policies

Very high required GPA 2.8

CEP has reason to be concerned about the appeals process

Administrative process is not approved by divisional Dean

Impaction strategy

Qualification policy requires additional course that might subtract from the time students are able to judge whether or not they like the major; if they don't, they will have little time to find another major

For Members this week:

- Send ideas about reorganizing teaching related committees to Chair Larrabee.
- Spread the word about our online forum.
- We need a member from the Arts to present at the forum.

Committee on Educational Policy 2012 - 13