

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, June 1, 2016
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Doris Ash, Faye Crosby, Matt Guthaus, Erica Halk (NTSF Rep.), Dee Hibbert-Jones, Seamus Howard (SUA Rep.), Sean Keilen (Provost Rep.), Matthew Mednick (staff), Tonya Ritola, Vanessa Sadsad (SUA Rep.), Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), John Tamkun, (Chair), Felicity Schaeffer, Susanna Wrangell (staff).

Absent: VPDUE Hughey and Articulation Officer Love.

Guests: Associate Registrar Claxton, Preceptor Representative Burroughs.

I. Announcements:

Today is the COC Social at 4 p.m. in Center for Adaptive Optics, where members can exchange information with new and returning members serving on Senate committees.

The survey on final exam schedule suggested time changes from three to two hours has been completed and will require senate review during fall quarter.

Consent agenda item approvals: Petitions: 1 GSI, 7 GE substitutions, 1 late add/drop, 5 other petition requests, 3 W grades and 1 grade option change.

The following correspondence:

Online Course Report Form

CEP to Oakes College re: Certificate Approval May 2016

CEP to Stevenson College re: Leadership 11A Course Approval

CEP to UNEX re: Early Education Certificate Renewal Response

CEP to VPAA Lee re: CMMU IRC Closure Meeting Response (Due Tuesday)

CEP to VPAA Lee re: Administrative Home Change for Games and Playable Media

II. Environmental Sciences B.S. Proposal

VPAA Lee is requesting Senate review for a proposal to establish a B.S. degree in Environmental Sciences. The major is a proposed collaboration between the Departments of Earth and Planetary Sciences (EPS) and the Ocean Sciences Departments, and will be an interdepartmental major administratively housed in EPS. As noted by VPAA Lee, internal letters of support are forthcoming. Our overall impression of the proposed major is highly favorable, and we believe that it will extend and complement existing undergraduate programs in Earth Sciences and Environmental Studies.

Here are our issues that need addressing:

- The proposal differentiates between the purpose of the major and the objectives of the major. Under the section called “purpose,” the proposal delineates four domains: hydrosphere, pollution & transport, global scale environment, and the atmosphere. Because the proposal says that the major will not have tracks (e.g., a hydrosphere track), the implication is that students should be competent in all these domains. The proposal does not clearly state how the departments will assess that competence of the majors in the domains. Perhaps the four domains are sub-areas of the “reservoirs” spoken of in the section outlining the assessment of PLO #1 (disciplinary knowledge)? Also, it was not clear from the description of the courses which courses will provide competence in which domains. CEP would like these points clarified.

- The committee agrees that students will need environmental sciences skills and knowledge in the future; we are curious, however, how these skills and the knowledge might inter-relate. Does environmental science use statistics in the same way, for example, as biology or psychology? Also, are there unique factors concerning how statistical analyses are used in environmental science? We have similar questions concerning communication. Presumably there are special skills for science communication--for example, making complicated ideas accessible to the layperson. How do the courses or course content help students achieve proficiencies (related to disciplinary knowledge and methodologies) specific to environmental sciences?
- CEP agrees with CPB, more is needed concerning the teaching of communication skills. As communication will be a core skill for the ESCI majors, we believe that more resources may need to be given to its development for writing resources and support.
- More substantively, CEP is worried about the number of courses that would be required for the major. A large number of courses (as many as 18) appear to be required for the major, but this was difficult to assess due to the ambiguity concerning the relationship between required courses and course prerequisites in the proposal. In general, CEP considers any course that is a pre- or co-requisite for a required course to be a de facto major requirement. CEP will request clarification on the number of lower and upper-division courses and credits that will be required for the typical student, as well as students who need additional foundational coursework (e.g. Math 2 and 3).
- Table (Appendix C) is difficult to interpret. For example, it appears that ESCI 160 is sometimes referred to as OCEA 160. The departments should carefully review this table.
- Sample academic plans should be provided for students with different levels of math and writing proficiencies, including both domestic and international students who do not satisfy ELWR prior to entry.
- CEP was concerned that some of the major requirements will be offered only once a year. How would this impact the progress of students who fail or must withdraw from a course for medical or other reasons?
- Recent external reviews of departments in the Division of Physical and Biological Sciences raised concerns about undergraduate advising. Will the departments be able to meet the needs of the anticipated number of students in the major?
- Both CEP and CPB will require stakeholder feedback from other departments that will be impacted by the ESCI major, including Chemistry, Mathematics, EE Biology, METX, and Environmental Studies. Note that no requirements or electives can be approved for the major without the explicit endorsement of the departments that offer these courses.
- The proposal gave the impression that the number of majors in the program may be limited by the number or capacity of key courses. Before approving the major, the departments must commit to accommodating all qualified students with the resources available at this time. It may not restrict the admission of students into the major or their ability to progress to degree based on perceived concerns about resource impaction.
- The approval of the major will be dependent on the submission and approval of proposals for all new courses and the catalog copy as well as a revised addendum for review during fall quarter.

III. Proposal to Expand Scope of Student Success Evaluation and Research Center

CEP reviewed the proposal from Interim Vice Provost of Student Success (VPSS) Padgett to expand the scope of the Student Success Evaluation And Research Center (SSERC). The newly established SSERC would engage in the research and evaluation of student success policies, units, programs, and initiatives and foster actionable research by UC Santa Cruz faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students to improve student success.

The proposal lacked a compelling justification for committing 0.5 faculty FTE to the Center. We question why the administration would allocate resources for this position, given the lack of clarity about their responsibilities and priorities. Members question why this work could not be conducted by IRAPS in the future; is it really necessary to generate a distinct center to carry out this research? CEP is concerned that a large percentage of the budget would be used to support temporary staff. Members would like to learn more about these positions and why they are necessary for the Center in response to VPSS Padgett.

IV. Council of Provosts College Core Proposal Finalize CEP Response

Before any final outcomes or discussions were held all members with conflicts were excused.

The draft response will be reviewed over email and will include the following:

- CEP continues to support the college core course requirement. The requirement should be limited to the fall quarter of the freshman year, with the size and number of associated credits determined by the educational objectives of the course and available funding.
- Core must be separated from the lower-division writing requirements, including C1, C2 and the courses that help students satisfy ELWR. The writing courses should be administered and taught preferably by the Writing Program, not the Colleges. These courses must focus on making writing outcomes their priority.
- The courses that satisfy the lower-division writing requirements should be vertically integrated with each other and the upper-division writing courses, including the courses that satisfy the disciplinary communication (DC) requirement.
- We do not support the mandatory linkage of the lower-division writing courses to a specific topic (e.g. the college themes) or quarter (winter of the first year) as proposed by the Provosts. This would have a disproportionate impact on students interested in STEM (and other) disciplines that require extensive lower-division coursework for admission to the major and timely progress to degree. In general, we believe that students should have much more flexibility in the scheduling and theme(s) of their writing courses. To the extent possible, students should be given the opportunity to take a C1/C2 course related to the theme of their college during the winter if they wish to do so. Ideally, students should be allowed to take these courses in or near their college to perpetuate the sense of community established in College 1.

CEP has spent a considerable amount of time discussing issues pertaining to the college core courses and lower-division writing requirements over the past two years. In addition to participating in the last external review of the Writing Program, we reviewed a recent survey of the core course lecturers and assessments of the Crown “experiment”; the core courses at Colleges 9 and 10; and the Multilingual Curriculum for international students. At the request of the Council of Provosts, we provided feedback on several options for revising the college course (variations of Core) courses. We have met with faculty and advisors in the School of Engineering and the Arts, Humanities, Physical and Biological Sciences and Social Sciences to discuss the lower-division writing requirements and their relationship to the core courses. Finally, we presented several oral and written reports to the Senate, including the proposal to modify Santa Cruz

Regulation (SCR) 10.5.2 that was approved by the Senate on May 18, 2016. CEP members will finalize the draft response next week.

V. Pre-Consultation with Disability Resource Center (DRC) Director Gubash

Due to a lack of time, no review of the consultation memo was held.

VI. Consultation with Disability Resource Center (DRC) Director Gubash

Members introduced themselves and had an engaged conversation with Director Gubash on the DRC's role in facilitating makeup exams and assignments for students with transient, intermittent or permanent health conditions. When does a health problem become serious enough to warrant DRC accommodations? What are faculty obligations?

VII. Post Consultation

The Director of the DRC has agreed to create a resource page on their website to inform instructors and students of policies surrounding accommodations for disabilities. Members would like information on:

- The kinds of illnesses or disabilities that are handled by the DRC versus other offices on campus (e.g. CARE or CAPS),
- Defining the role of the DRC for arranging the accommodation and relaying this information to the faculty.
- The information that is required from a student in order to receive accommodations, and
- Guidelines for faculty members to reference with regard to an unreasonable request.