

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES
Wednesday, May 27, 2015
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

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

Absent: Matt Guthaus, Mat Hufft (SUA Rep.).

Guest: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), VPDUE Hughey, Preceptor Rep. Boroughs

I. Announcements and Consent Agenda

The Earth and Planetary Sciences department requested a modification of their Disciplinary Communication (DC) policy, such that one course that currently satisfies half of the DC requirement will instead carry another GE designation instead. As there are other options to satisfy the DC requirement, this change seems to have minimal impact on the ability of students to satisfy this requirement. This change was approved.

Chair Tamkun briefed members on the recent Senate Executive Committee meeting, which contained a discussion of the University's bid to continue its contract to help administer the NASA Ames facility's academic mission as well as a presentation of the Governor's May budget revision. Several of the components of the "Committee of Two" agreement will require action from CEP in the following academic year, including assisting departments in reducing the number of credits required for degrees, establishing three-year degree plans, and establishing greater focus on online education.

Members approved drafts of various correspondence, including their responses to History 60, the CLST subject area, Economics 186, the proposed Academic Integrity Policy, and an email to faculty regarding grading options and exam scheduling. The committee will continue its work on its response to the VPAA about the Games and Playable Media B.A. proposal.

II. BIOE 151D & 159D

The Ecology and Evolutionary Biology department has requested course revisions for 151D and 159D, changing these field study courses from five credits to four credits. UCSC does not have any four credit courses, though other UC campuses do. Members noted that these courses may put some constraints on scheduling, and may affect the ability of students to create schedules if many such courses are approved. In the context of only these two courses, however, there did not seem to be reason to worry about scheduling issues.

Some members were concerned about the "false precision" of having a course listed at four credits rather than five, noting that it is difficult to accurately measure how much time students are devoting to coursework. Other members noted, however, that it is appropriate for CEP to rely on faculty members to determine how much work students are expected to do for a course and set the credit hours accordingly.

Other members noted that this change could possibly affect degree requirements, and that the department should ensure that this would not slow anyone en route to completing the major. Other

members noted that this course is cross-listed with ENVS 151. If the department can ensure that these changes will not affect time to degree or the ENVS department, members will approve this change.

III. UNEX Certificate Renewals

Members discussed the five-year renewals of three UNEX certificates: Administrative & Executive Assistant, Business Administration, and Marketing Management. These programs had already been approved and endorsed by the Economics Department. While the committee noted that these programs seemed to be successful, it was unclear from the materials provided whether the program contained any revisions from external advisory committees. The committee approved these renewals, but asked for these programs to track changes in the future.

IV. Consultation with Jaye Padgett

Members invited Professor Padgett to discuss data requests that might be useful to the committee. Members were particularly interested in using this data to assist in qualification policy reports, determining bottlenecks, course sequencing, inconsistencies related to grading within a course, the number and fate of students who do not qualify for the major, the number of appeals to qualify for the major and number of appeals granted, diversity, and so on.

Professor Padgett expressed interest in helping to work on the “Challenge 45” program, which would greatly reduce the number of credit hours required to graduate. CEP agreed to take up this issue next year, inviting departments to respond to how they could implement this or explain why it would be infeasible. Some committee members suggested bringing up the number of credits required in the context of external reviews. There was consensus that this proposal would require buy-in from as many disciplines as possible, and that all stakeholders on campus should be involved. All parties agreed that this is an area where the interests of CEP and the Student Success Steering Committee overlap.

The committee discussed the fact that the first cohort of students covered by major qualification policies will be graduating next year. CEP will be asking departments for reports about how these policies are functioning, but recognizes that such data gathering may constitute a burden on these departments. Professor Padgett expressed hope that some of his data can be automatically generated by new systems purchased by the Student Success Steering Committee. Professor Padgett also agreed to work with the committee to draft these requests to departments and locate the relevant questions to gather appropriate data about how students are affected by qualification policies. The committee noted that, even if data about qualifications, drop-outs, and appeals can be automated, it will still be difficult to determine in which cases students were turned away for academic reasons, turned away for bureaucratic or space reasons, or changed majors for reasons of personal interest. In spite of these difficulties, the committee looks forward to a fruitful collaboration with the Student Success Steering Committee in the following year to better evaluate the effects of the major qualification policies.

V. College Core and the Multilingual Curriculum

The committee completed its discussion of the proposed multilingual curriculum and college core classes for international students. CEP has already approved the courses for the multilingual curriculum, and expects to see proposals for college core courses shortly. The committee understands the importance of these courses to the international students who require additional writing and language help, and also believes that the college core experience plays important roles in community building and introducing

students to the University. The committee also expressed concern, however, that they were being asked to make major decisions about these courses at the end of the academic year. As these college core courses will be offered in the fall, decisions about staffing and planning will have to be made at the last minute, much to the unease of the instructors who may be teaching these courses. The committee also noted that many of the features of these courses aimed at international students may be beneficial for local, non-ELWR students, but time constraints prevent the committee from addressing this issue in more depth.

The committee agreed that there is not time to address these issues fully, and that any decisions it makes will be for this coming academic year only. Members agreed to review course proposals from the colleges with the aim of not having these students enroll in a C1 course prior to satisfying the ELWR. The committee will have to review the various proposals from the colleges, of course, and strongly suggest that the colleges have a plan for these students should these two-credit courses not be approved. There was consensus, however, that sending these students into normal core classes before they have satisfied the ELWR is not in their best interests pedagogically and is contrary to UC policy.

At this point, conflicted members (Shearer, Crosby, Keilen, Power) left the room. The committee decided it would not be possible to ask the colleges to develop a single course type for these international students, but would instead encourage the college to do what they deem to be in the best interests of these students, with the recommendation that these students not take C1 until they have satisfied ELWR. The committee agreed to approve the multilingual curriculum for one year, and will be prepared to review course proposals from individual colleges for two-credit classes to accommodate these students.

VI. Program Statement Letter

Members reviewed the letter to be sent to departments from the Registrar's office about program statements and suggested some changes. The committee requested that language be added about the importance of course planners, that the requirement that track changes be used be moved to the top, and that the language be simplified as much as possible.

VII. Biology Minor

The committee discussed the biology minor, which has been left out of the catalog for the last several years. There is, however, a page on the department's website that lists requirements for a minor that have not been approved by CEP, and many students seem to be working toward this minor. The committee decided to allow students who are in good standing complete the minor with the advertised (but unapproved) requirements. For years in which the minor was not in the catalog, the committee will accept minors that either a) meet the old catalog requirements, or b) are advertised on the web. The committee will communicate this to the Registrar's office, divisional and departmental advising, and the VPAA.