

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES
Wednesday, April 22, 2015
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Faye Crosby, Matt Guthaus, Mark Krumholz, Mary Beth Pudup, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Heather Shearer, John Tamkun (Chair), Max Hufft (SUA Rep.), Roxi Power (NSTF Rep.), Susanna Wrangell (staff), Barak Krakauer (staff),

Absent: Alicia Malmberg (SUA Rep.), Sean Keilen

Guests: Jan Burroughs (Preceptor Rep.), Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Richard Hughey (VPDUE)

I. Announcements and Consent Agenda

Committee members approved the revised program statement for the Environmental Studies Department.

Members discussed the closure meetings for Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology and Mathematics; at both meetings, CEP's concerns about undergraduate advising were discussed at length.

II. Consultation with Games and Playable Media B.A. Faculty

CEP raised several issues related to the proposal for the Games and Playable Media B.A. including concern about vagueness with respect to how students will qualify, how transfer students will be admitted, support from other departments (such as Computer Science), the sample curriculum plan that suggests that students take their GE classes in their final year, the prerequisite structure, and the senior capstone project course sequence.

Members consulted with Robin Hunicke and Noah Wardrip-Fruin, the faculty members who proposed the Games and Playable Media B.A. CEP was impressed by the vision of the proposal, and discussed its concerns with the faculty members. CEP continued to provide continuing, informal advice about this proposal, with the understanding that this advice is intended to provide timely feedback, and that such advice is not intended to signal the necessary or sufficient conditions of approval for the program. The committee will also update its prerequisite map and continue to clarify other issues related to the major, so as to be able to work with the VPAA in resolving the status of the proposal.

III. Accessible Information Technology Plan

Committee members reviewed a draft five-year plan to implement a policy to make all electronic materials accessible to students with disabilities, including those who use assistive technologies. Doing so would put UCSC in compliance with federal law and UC policy. While committee members agreed that electronic materials should be accessible in this fashion, some concerns with this plan were voiced. Specifically, CEP expressed concern that making electronic materials accessible is a campus responsibility, and this proposal seems to place all responsibility on faculty members. While faculty members need to play a role in making their material accessible, it is not realistic for them to become experts in web design and accessibility. Faculty members should be provided with the support necessary to make sure their posted material is accessible; while the current plan calls for informational and group

sessions to educate faculty members about the policy, CEP members would prefer to see more concrete descriptions of how they will be supported in this plan. The committee will draft a response to Chair Brenneis that expresses these concerns.

IV. Academic Calendar

CEP reviewed the proposed calendar for the 2015-16 academic year. Some members expressed concern that, in the Winter quarter, classes end on a Monday, and finals begin on Tuesday; having finals begin in this fashion seems disruptive, and it would be preferable to not have that Monday class. Doing so, however, would reduce the number of instructional Mondays, which is already fewer than the number of days of instruction for other days of the week due to holidays. Members will continue discussion of this issue next week.

V. Multilingual Curriculum

The committee discussed a collection of reading and writing courses for non-native speakers that is meant to address issues on campus with the current writing curriculum, which was developed to teach writing to native English speakers. This new proposal would require international students to test into a course along a sequence intended to build academic English proficiency prior to satisfying the University writing requirements. Because this issue intersects with previous discussions the committee has undertaken related to C1, C2, ELWR, and College Core classes, CEP decided to discuss these courses in depth and in the context of the writing environment on campus.

Committee members were inclined to recommend that the students who take at least one of these courses delay taking their College Core class until their second year; doing so would ensure that these courses serve their intended function of providing the preparatory writing instruction required for these students to perform better in their other writing classes. Doing so, however, may somewhat interfere with the “cohort building” role of College Core classes. Committee members discussed the historical reasons for College Core classes fulfilling the C1 (and, in the case of some sections, C2) requirement (along with ELWR). Committee members will continue to discuss these issues with the College Provosts and other stakeholders.

If these courses are funded from the tuition of international students, it seems appropriate to provide this kind of additional support; ideally, this support should also be extended to native students as well, some of whom are also non-native speakers that could benefit from this sequence. If this were to happen, however, the campus would need to determine the fiscal costs associated with this series of courses, and also monitor who they effect the esprit de corps that the colleges attempt to achieve. The discussion of the roll-out of these courses also provides an opportunity to study the role of the colleges more broadly; this may be a good time to determine the mission of the colleges and their effectiveness.

The committee will continue to discuss this issue at its next meeting.

