

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, February 11, 2015**

**11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

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

Guests: Jan Burroughs (Preceptor Rep), Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Richard Hughey (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer)

**I. Announcements and Consent Agenda**

The minutes for January 28 were approved.

Program statements for Electrical Engineering, Languages and Applied Linguistics, LAAL Academic English, Latin, Literature, Spanish Studies, Biological Sciences, Social Sciences, and OPERS were approved.

The Chair noted that the Graduate Council decided last year that they did *not* want to include graduate program learning outcomes in the catalog, while CEP *did* agree to list undergraduate program learning outcomes. This inconsistency led to some confusion, and the committee would like to better coordinate how the program learning outcomes will be published with GC and with the VPAA. The VPAA will be invited to consult on this issue at a future meeting.

**II. Courses with Two GE Designations**

The 2013-2014 CEP discussed courses in Music, Theater Arts, Literature, History of Art and Visual Cultures, and others that could potentially carry two general education designations: the content of these courses is such that more than one GE might apply to the course. The committee considered whether students should be able to choose which GE designation such courses would satisfy on their transcripts. Last year's committee did not have enough time to reach a resolution on this issue. This year, the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections determined that SCR 10.2.3.1 would allow courses to bear two GE designations, though students would only be able to receive one GE.

This year's CEP received a request from a Dean requesting that some of the courses in his division carry multiple GE designations. Members were inclined to accept the Dean's arguments on the grounds that the intellectual and disciplinary nature of these courses naturally spans several GE designations, and that it would be unreasonable to make the instructors of these courses choose which GE should be associated with their course. Members were less inclined, however, to accept arguments for placing multiple GE designations on courses as a mechanism for increasing enrollments.

Members considered other questions that might arise if courses could bear multiple GE designations. The committee decided that, if such a course is repeatable for credit, then a student could claim both GEs from the same course, since the content of the course would change from quarter to quarter. The committee also wondered if having a course bear multiple GEs would make students *more or less* likely to take courses outside of their field of study; at least one goal of having a GE curriculum is to encourage students to get a broad education, and it is unclear if courses that bear multiple GE designations would increase or decrease the breadth of a student's education at UCSC.

Members also considered how this issue will be addressed in practical terms: would students somehow decide which GE they are fulfilling when enrolling, and if so, how would they do this? Could this process be done automatically, such that whichever GE was needed would be entered onto their transcript? The committee was unable to come up with clear answers to these questions, and feared that these courses may greatly increase workload at the level of the department, the Registrar's office, or the Senate office.

The committee decided that the reasons offered to allow courses to bear more than one GE were compelling, and that some small number of courses should be proposed as a pilot project. The GE designation for these courses could be handled as "special cases," but the committee hopes that keeping the number of such courses low would limit the amount of increased workload for staff, and would also encourage departments to only propose courses for this pilot that clearly merited bearing more than one GE designation. Members also noted that such a pilot could allow the committee to request data about the departments and divisions that these students come from, in order to determine whether these courses are encouraging students to take courses within or outside their field of study.

### **III. Anthropology Course Approval**

Members discussed a course proposal for a class in the Anthropology Department. Committee members agreed that the proposed content of the course was not appropriate, as the readings seemed to consist largely of the instructor's own work. The committee found that there was not sufficient diversity of sources to work from, and that it would be inappropriate to ask students to evaluate the instructor's work. The committee will respond that this course needs to be revised.

### **IV. Environmental Studies Program Statement**

The committee approved minor changes to the Environmental Studies program statement: one half of its DC sequence was cross-listed with EEB, a concentration that has been approved was added to the program statement, and AP credit can be used to fulfill the statistics requirement.

### **V. Computational Media Qualification Policy Request**

The Computational Media Department requested a change to their qualification policy such that Calculus will not be figured into a student's GPA for purposes of qualifying for the major, but that the GPA for other courses to qualify would be raised to 2.9. Such a change would keep the number of students qualifying to CMPS roughly even.

After discussing the issue, members did not find compelling reason to accept a GPA cutoff of 2.9 for qualification to the major. Such a high GPA simply was not predictive of success in the major. While CMPM presumably requested this cutoff to keep the number of students in their major at the level it currently is, CEP could find no education reason to set the GPA at this level, and found that doing so would merely prevent a group of students from declaring the major who would otherwise succeed. Members also expressed concern about the use of GPAs in this fashion given the inconsistency of grading throughout a department.

CEP will respond to CMPM, and offer them the choice of leaving their qualification policy as is or removing calculus from their GPA calculation but not raising the GPA for other courses to compensate.

The committee will also review this qualification policy in two years to study its effects on the population and diversity of the major.

Committee on Educational Policy, 2014 – 15