

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

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

Absent: Lora Bartlett, 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**

The Online Curriculum Approval system (OCA) is going live this week and members will start reviewing program statements for our meeting on February 6.

Chair Larrabee updated members on this week's SEC meeting where members discussed; today's Online Education Forum and Don Rothman's memorial, which was a moving and inspirational event and has been recorded for those who could not attend. UC Relations will be contacting Alumni for feedback on online education and graduate growth. SEC received a report from the Committee on International Education (CIE) that reported UCSC's need to improve enrollments of International students our campus is lagging with regard to our sister campuses. UCSC need to improve numbers in enrollment, there was success with applications this year, our numbers tripled, but we are still very low in comparison to other campuses. CAFA will be working to revise the current policy and has requested data on yield and net rate. The CIE report on International students is on the senate website for anyone interested. The Senate committee has finished their review of the Office of Research, CEP was not asked to opine on the external review.

Chair Larrabee met with Economics Chair Carl Walsh and Economics Professor Dobkin for the next steps needed to revise their qualification policy, there was some confusion on how CCC courses articulate, Tracy suggested articulating abstract reasoning courses and contacting Articulation Officer Love. Both were open to taking a cohort from the past and seeing predictive measures. A revised request should be coming, Analyst Wrangell will follow up.

Chair Larrabee met with Campus Counsel, Carole Rossi for intellectual property rights with regard to courses and course content. Faculty members do have rights, and they own anything published on line or in print. Her office is working on who can edit your work and how to prevent this. Analyst Wrangell will follow up in two weeks.

Chair Larrabee wanted to acknowledge Jim Bierman for creating the first online course offered at UCSC. His course, Hamlet Conundrums is available but needs to be rewritten to host on eCommons. Chair Larrabee requested members to send any ideas for applying for grant money to make this course viable again. She will send the URL to the course to members in our agenda for next week's meeting. VPDUE Hughey is interested in helping and will communicate with the Arts Division.

Members approved the consent agenda which included the minutes from January 9 and 16, 2013.

## **II. Art Closure Meeting Debrief**

Member Wilson reported back to the committee on the outcome of the Art Department External Review closure meeting where the group discussed and answered CEP's concerns. Generally, the exchange of ideas was transparent and thoughtful. Here are the answers to CEP's questions addressing the following:

- Undergraduate curriculum has just been revised and now includes a foundation series students take before the upper division courses, but there is no access to classes for non-majors or GEs and the department is thinking a large lecture could be offered online.
- Workload issues were discussed and one faculty member had at one time sponsored 92 independent studies.
- Dean Yager would like CEP to review the policy on GSI's so MFA students could teach undergrads before receiving their degree.
- There was a brief discussion about creating a Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) degree.

## **III. Comments on Campus-Wide Purchase of Software for Plagiarism**

EVC Galloway is asking for senate comments on purchasing a campus-wide resource license for plagiarism. At the last Dean's Advisory Committee meeting it was reported to be an increasing problem. Members held a discussion about the uses of this type of software; they will basically keep your paper or will charge students to check if they will be caught. A license can be set up for the students to check themselves or just for the faculty to submit, this would be less double dipping in cost. Members recognized the possibility that, with clear policies and standardization of practices, there could be increased demand for campus-wide responsibility, both at the student and Senate levels; for example, if rates of plagiarism suddenly spike upward, the Academic Senate would need to respond with educational initiatives and outreach programs.

There was also broad acknowledgement that this kind of tool may be especially useful as our campus continues to address distance learning and online instruction environments where issues of scalability and oversight may be particularly challenging to issues of academic honesty. Those members who were in favor of purchasing the software were hoping that any license we acquired would allow students to submit text to see how it would be rated (because we find the idea of the company providing the software making money from our students as they sell the complementary service untenable). Finally, it is useful to note that student representatives to CEP advised us that many California secondary schools already use online software tools to combat plagiarism, so many students have experienced this type and style of academic accountability. For most members, a pilot program would be welcomed.

Other members, however, viewed this proposal more skeptically, raising important considerations and questions regarding costs/benefits and differential levels of concern across campus units. For the response:

CEP recommends that more data and information be obtained prior to purchase or pilot program:  
Size and scope: How big is the problem? Where is the problem? What data exists currently for describing rates of plagiarism at our campus?

- Policies and practices: How does this software work at comparable universities? What new policies and/or practices would need to be put into place prior to deployment? Could some departments or divisions “opt out”? Some members suggested that some other UCs that have invested in anti-plagiarism software have since terminated their contracts. If this is true (and we do not know for sure that it is), it would be useful to know why a sister campus would make this choice.
- Survey need: Is this a perceived need or are faculty and staff requesting more tools for dealing with this issue? What is the threshold for justifying the cost?
- Funding models: What is the actual cost of this service? Would there be any savings if some departments or divisions “opt out”?

Comments are due February 15. Member Warburton will draft the response.

#### **IV. Review Course 191 Descriptions in Catalog**

CEP received a request from the Academic Personnel Office (APO) for CEP to review consistency in language for courses that offer undergraduate teaching assistance for credit. A student reported she had been asked by a department to T.A. more than once for credit, these courses are designed to offer students the opportunity to help with planning and instruction of a course, but only once, then they must be paid. Originally, CEP approved the language for these course descriptions to include that these were meant to be a teaching practicum course experience for interested juniors or seniors. However, in the catalog there are similar course descriptions for courses numbered 189 or 191 and some are repeatable. Before any major changes can be made, departments would need to be informed. The descriptions for these types of courses should all say they cannot be repeated for credit. These are not good for students, it is a problem, both for students who would like this teaching practicum experience and budgetary implications for departments. Members will take up the discussion again after reviewing the 189 course descriptions.

- Members question the added value for students taking the course for credit more than one time from a pedagogical point of view.

#### **V. LALS Request for Additional Major Breadth Requirement “M”**

CEP has received a request from the Chair of LALS requesting the need to add a breadth requirement of “M” for media research methods. The faculty determined this was necessary for their student’s to be properly prepared in the future. This seems to be a simple change of major requirements. CEP will send a response to the department, asking if these are just an addition to major requirement to make the changes on their program statement and submit the revised document on the OCA website. CEP will also clarify what the department is requesting, it appears students should take two of these courses from a list of pre-existing courses, of which there are twelve.

## **VI. Exam Policy and Final Papers**

CEP members will discuss how to handle submission of final papers in lieu of a final exam and what should be put in the exam policy for faculty and students to reference in the catalog. When other UCs change an exam date, it is approved as long as the exam is offered on both dates. Most UCs don't allow papers due the week before finals. What percentage of a grade is CEP willing to allow when a paper is due as a final? What percentage would be considered unacceptable? A paper assigned in lieu of final exam, for instance in the UCB policy, students have the option of turning it in early or at the scheduled exam time in the schedule of classes. CEP would need to inform Faculty about this addition to the policy. CEP members felt that a paper worth 30 – 33% seems to be a number that comes up a lot as being a major part of a grade for a paper to be a final. This cheats students out of their educational experience when other faculty requests the final paper to be due on the 10<sup>th</sup> week, the last week of instruction, when they are supposed to be due per the final exam schedule. Analyst Wrangell will draft of a revised policy using the UCB model for discussion at a future meeting.

## **VII. Major Qualification**

Members continued their discussion and Chair Larrabee went into more detail to debrief members on her meeting with members of the Economics Department. The department is legitimately concerned with students who cannot make it in the major and how to help re-direct them into a new major. The department still wants to have two courses in calculus as a major requirement and Chair Larrabee also encouraged them to offer an articulating abstract reasoning course. She did ask the Economics Department to use the AIS method for GPA calculation, so, in the future, there would be a button in AIS for departments to press to check the grade point average over the UCSC required courses only. The Computer Science Department (CMPS) is also interested in using the AIS GPA calculator for their students. AIS will need a modification and the Registrar's Office is working on this now. Certain courses will fall within the major qualification, and only these will be used for GPA calculations. Member Hunt-Carter will report on progress at a future meeting.