

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES
Wednesday, October 22, 2014
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

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

Absent: Provost Rep., Mark Krumholz.

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

I. Announcements and Consent Agenda

Members approved the consent agenda items, including the draft responses for Anthropology and Computer Engineering external review. The minutes of October 8, 2014 were approved with corrections.

II. Course Approval Supplemental Form

Former CEP members created suggestions for changing the course approval supplemental form. Members agreed that the form should be simplified and made into a check list, and that the form should not ask for information that cannot be found in the course syllabus. Members agree that such a form would help reduce delays and streamline the process for approval. Members agreed to request information about the Program Learning Outcomes required for WASC review. Members discussed the possibility that some courses do not align as a specific source of data to address learning outcomes but others will. A sub-committee was formed and will create the check list form and present to the committee at our November 5 meeting.

III. External Reviews:

Writing Program

Members finished up their discussion and agreed that CEP's supplemental questions for the charge to the external review committee were not addressed. These questions will be included in the draft response and will be approved at our next meeting. CEP members agreed that the overall review was positive, as all units are working together cooperatively. Writing is a campus-wide issue and the Writing Program serves the entire campus community; perhaps it should be housed under the VPDUE and not the Humanities Division. Chair Tamkun apprised members of the C1 and C2 writing requirements and felt it may be appropriate for CEP to send out a memo to faculty with a chart of the writing curriculum and the consequences students face if they do not satisfy ELWR by their fifth quarter.

Literature:

Both the external review committee and the department addressed CEP's greatest concern, namely, the rise in enrollments in upper-division courses and the corresponding loss of direct contact between students and ladder-rank faculty. The problem is complicated by the fact that enrollment has been rising most significantly in two of the major's concentrations: modern and English-language literature. The ERC recommended that the department reevaluate its aversion to "vertical integration" in the major and require pre-requisites for upper-division courses, and CEP is interested in the department's response to this issue. CEP is encouraged by the new attention that the Department is giving to the organization of the undergraduate major and suggests that questions be raised in the closure meeting about the status of the proposal for a restructured major, the options for creating more small seminars, and whether the department stands by its previous stance that course-sequencing is not appropriate for the literature major. CEP also noted that undergraduates seem dissatisfied with the quality of instruction by Teaching

Assistants, and would like to ask whether LIT 201 (“Pedagogy of Literature”) should continue to be taught by a graduate student.

Before any decisions were reached, Member Keilen recused himself.

Mathematics

The ERC shared CEP’s concerns with regards to advising. Many undergraduates did not understand the curriculum pathway, and the division’s new, centralized advising scheme seems to be inadequate address this confusion. If the divisional advising is not working, can peer advising be introduced as an augmentation? The ERC acknowledges that the small department cannot offer a robust curriculum, and course sequences cannot be taught each year, causing delays for students in the completion their degrees. The ERC stated that the department should not be teaching Math 2 or 3, and that students should be sent the the community college instead. However, many CCC courses fill up, and seats are not available for our students. The proximity of our closest CCC is still quite a distance from UCSC. Furthermore, members questioned whether it was appropriate to simply not offer a class that is essential for so many UC students. Members wondered whether the department or the division has given a thought on the impact of removing Math 2 or 3 on campus. This external review was incomplete at the time of review as the Dean and Department’s responses were missing; members will finalize the draft at a future meeting.

IV. VPAA Request: Bioengineering Oversight Administrative Home Change

Interim Dean Konopelski is requesting an administrative home change for Bioengineering. The Division recommends that the Biomolecular Engineering Department serve as the new administrative home, and there are no negative resource or curricular concerns. Members held a brief discussion on this issue and decided the issue was unproblematic and approved the recommendation for the oversight change.