

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES
Wednesday, November 05, 2014
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

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

Absent: Provost Rep., Max Hufft (SUA Rep.)

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

I. Announcements and Consent Agenda

Members approved the consent agenda items, which included the draft external review closure meeting letters for Physics and Mathematics. The minutes of the October 22 meeting were also approved.

II. Education Department Request for External Review Deferral

The Department Chair and Social Sciences Dean have requested a deferral of the Education Department external review due to changes currently underway to address various issues in the department. The committee discussed whether such a deferral would be appropriate given the state of the department. CEP determined that it would be better to have an external perspective on the structural and personnel issues that face the department as soon as possible, especially in light of the number of undergraduate minors and the fact that the education department is a service unit for many other undergraduate programs. The committee decided to recommend against an external review deferral.

III. Stakeholder Maps

CEP is often in the position of reviewing requests for revisions or cancellations for courses that are listed as pre-requisites for other courses. In many cases, changing one course will affect enrollment and student preparation in other classes down the chain a pre-requisites; these other classes may exist in other departments that had not been consulted about this change. In the interest of being more careful about these cases, CEP considered whether to include in course revisions a review of “stakeholder maps,” which are reports generated through AIS that list the pre-, post-, and co-requisites of the courses in question.

The committee reviewed a few examples of these stakeholder maps and found them somewhat difficult to read. The reports use abbreviations that are somewhat unintuitive, but the Registrar has offered to work with the Data Warehouse Team to implement changes and create a version of the stakeholder map that includes longer and more readable descriptions of the data. The committee determined that these maps should be used when making changes to courses for cancellation or revision which may include changing the pre-requisite: these reports can be generated by a department manager and included in the Online Curriculum Approval (OCA) portal when submitting a proposed course revision and the department could include a copy of correspondence with affected department chairs.

Because the Registrar’s office is in the processing of switching its data management systems from AIS to Infoview, the committee decided to wait until this change has taken place to make its final determination on this matter. At that time, the committee will review stakeholder maps generated through Infoview and change its course revision process appropriately.

IV. Chancellor's Graduate Student Teaching Fellows: Approve Exception

The Graduate Division has awarded several graduate students to serve as Chancellor's Graduate Student Teaching Fellows, who will be designated to teach undergraduate classes. One of these awardees is scheduled to teach a class, even though (contrary to CEP regulations for Graduate Student Instructors) the graduate student in question has no formal teaching experience. The student appears to have expertise in this area of research for the course topic, but has not taught or been a TA for a course. CEP members discussed his ability to teach the subject matter and determined that there was not enough information to approve and make this precedent setting. Members found the student's record to be stellar and will request a more detailed mentoring plan from the student's faculty mentor and discuss this issue next week.

V. External Review

Electrical Engineering (EE) Department:

CEP discussed the external review of the Electrical Engineering Department and were particularly concerned about issues related to time to completion for the major; only one current major is set to complete the degree in four years. One reason for this is that the main gateway course for the major, EE 101, is often not taken until their third year, which does not leave enough time to complete the major. This delay in taking EE 101 is sometimes caused by students not having sufficient math preparation, which would make it impossible them to begin their physics classes until their second year. This, however, is not the only problem, as many students are *not* in this position but still cannot make it through the physics sequence in a timely fashion. This issue should be examined more closely. Perhaps the LSOE that EE intends to hire could also teach a track of this Physics sequence that starts in Winter Quarter.

CEP also noted that the percentage of female majors is well below the School of Engineering average, and that, according to undergraduate surveys, there is low satisfaction for the quality of courses. CEP would like to determine what the department is doing to address these issues at the closure meeting.

VI. External Review

Technology Management (TM) Department

CEP discussed the external review of the Technology Department and were primarily concerned about the intellectual focus of the major and its reliance on a single non-SOE lecturer. Though the department constitutes a key link to Silicon Valley and its majors seem to be highly satisfied, CEP remains worried about the precarious nature of its BS degree and notes that the department's expansion plans do not seem to be focused on expanding its major. The committee noted that there needs to be greater articulation between TM's ambitious plans as a department and its undergraduate major, and that any action with respect to the future of the department should put such articulation high on the list of priorities.

VII. C Minus Grading

CEP continued its discussion of about the C- grade. Every other UC offers a C- grade (and most also offer D+ and D- as well). If UCSC were to implement a C- grading option, then additional decisions would have to be made about the "pass cutoff" and other issues related to how a C- would count for credit. At many campuses (Berkeley, Davis, Merced, and San Diego), a C- would count as a pass. Since, at UCSC, a C is the minimum passing grade, the committee would have to determine whether a C-

would also count as a passing grade; if so, the C- grade could be thought of as a grading option available to some students who would otherwise get a C. If, on the other hand, a C- would not be a passing grade, then the C- grading option should be thought of as a grade available to some students who currently receive a D.

The campus must also decide whether a C- grade should count toward degree satisfaction, prerequisite satisfaction, GE satisfaction, transfer articulation, GPA calculation, and course repeatability. It is possible that departments would change their qualification policies in light of these changes as well. The committee will continue to discuss these issues in light of data from other campuses and attempt to make a determination about how to best implement a C- grading option.

Committee on Educational Policy, 2014 - 15