

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, March 2, 2016
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

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

Absent: Matthew Mednick (staff), Felicity Schaeffer,

Guests: Associate Registrar Claxton, VPDUE Hughey, Preceptor Representative Burroughs, Articulation Officer Love.

I. Announcements:

Members reviewed an unusual petition request from a student who would like a double concentration notation on their transcript. Members decision was to approve these for stellar students only. It was determined that for this particular double major, the double concentrations would apply to each major and be advantageous for the student.

Consent Agenda Items:

The following program statements were approved: Theater Arts, AMS, Bioinformatics, Electrical Engineering, School of Engineering Statement and TIM(provided the new proposed changes to CMPS's prerequisite chain are not listed), CEP has determined these will not be approved for stakeholder departments this year.

Computer Engineering was pulled off for discussion on CEP's response to the department approval includes: removal of CMPE 80E as a major requirement, list of Robotics and advanced Robotics electives course list, changing CMPE 115 to CMPE 10, capstone sequence CMPS 115/116/117, a change in major transfer screening, allowing a GPA of 3.0 for transfer students who have completed fewer transferable courses and for transfer students who have completed all transferable courses a GPA of 2.8. For BANDT a GPA of 2.3 for those transfer students who complete all transferable courses and a GPA of 2.8 for those who complete fewer transferable courses.

The section for transfer students who qualify as Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAGS) will require updating and CEP will recommend the department work with the Admissions Office.

The draft minutes for February 3, and 10, 2016 were approved.

The following CEP responses for Kresge 79 and the Computer Science External Review response for closure meeting were approved.

II. Computer Science Department Program Statement

Computer Science was requesting a revision for their lower division course prerequisite pathway. While this maybe beneficial for their own students it would cause problems for students who need the courses for a stakeholder major, of which there are many. Before any discussion or decision was made Member Guthaus and VPDUE Hughey recused themselves. CEP members deliberated on the decision and all agreed to wait another year before putting this forward. Many major qualification policies will need to be revised as well as CMPS. Clarification is needed regarding the major declaration deadline; the grade of D- is missing as well under the *Declaration of the Computer Science Majors* heading. CEP will have to wait to send this response until the new B.S./M.S. proposal is approved by Graduate Council and the B.S. requirements reviewed by

CEP. Course approvals for CMPS 6C, 6J, 6P, and 50 are now ready for review by the sub-committees. There was a call for a vote to wait or approve, members voted 5:1 to wait on approval and review next year.

III. Time Slots: Finals Schedule Block Change

Last week members agreed to further discuss changes in the schedule of final exams from 3 to 2 hours and 4 to 5 days. Some members could not make a determination without data analysis of the proposed changes; other members had no opinion as their disciplines did not have final exams, only a final paper. Most felt the fifth day would add one more time slot schedule and be helpful for students. Members realized this was more about accommodating students and ADA compliance. Is three hours just an arbitrary number or could the Senate compromise to two hours and forty-five minutes or two hours and thirty minutes? Members were not convinced this was driven by student needs and requested if faculty could opt in for the change, this would impact Registrar Office staff due to the manual process and instead requested the VPDUE facilitate a faculty survey and find out the exact number of rooms needed for exams. CEP will send their response to Chair Brenneis.

IV. Response to Computer Engineering for Pilot of Seat-less Class Sections

The Committee on Teaching (COT) has responded to our request for feedback; conflicted Member Guthaus and VPDUE Hughey recused themselves before the discussion and decision making processes. CEP members are hesitant to establish a new precedent setting process without further investigation. Members considered this as a pilot with the possibility of a sunset date but agreed with the COT that the department is well intentioned in providing a non-conventional course offering in response to a lack of room capacity. While both committees agree that recorded lectures can be pedagogically useful for students who miss a lecture and or want to review the material, it lacks the interactive component that is a proven strategy for learning. COT supports innovations such as “flipped” courses and other various online education experiments that are built around pedagogically sound principles of learning.

CEP commends the department for providing data based on both section offerings, which comparatively had the same outcome. It is unclear if students have an option, in other words, can they choose the seat less section or is it the only offering they can take for the quarter to avoid delaying progress to degree. This seems problematic, administratively more classes should be available for students to enroll in, as we are in the business of education. CEP concluded this is not the optimal learning environment, but the Department is well intentioned in trying to solve enrollment and space issues.

CEP members approved the Computer Engineering Department’s seat less pilot through spring quarter. The approval is conditional and CEP is requesting the department for data sets that include demographic information on women, and second generation students by Fall 2016.

V. List of Questions for CEP Consultations with Divisions about Lower-Division requirements

Members discussed additions to the list and which will be finalized next week.

VI. Next Steps and Timeline for Submission of COP Non Degree Academic Program Process

Discussion of the draft letter to the COP about submission of their non-degree program to the VPAA’s office for routing to the Senate. Non-recused members reviewed draft and should comment on the letter by Thursday, 5 p.m.