

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

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

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

Absent: Dee Hibbert-Jones, Seamus Howard (SUA Rep.), Articulation Officer Love.

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

I. Announcements:

Chair Tamkun apprised members of the upcoming spring quarter Senate Meeting on Wednesday, May 18, 2016 at 2:30 p.m. in the Stevenson Event Center. CEP has not received an update proposal on the undergraduate writing curriculum from the Council of Provosts.

From this week's CAB/SEC meeting members discussed the re-design for the College Core course and the creation of an enrollment management group for our campus.

CEP has received the preliminary data report for the Multilingual Curriculum designed for international students and members will be reviewing next week.

Members' homework for next week's meeting is to report back any best practices or guidance with course approvals to hand off to the new Committee on Courses of Instruction.

CEP received a late request from UNEX for program certificate renewals in Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Education: Supervision and Administration and Instructional Design and Delivery. Members agreed it was too late in the quarter to review changes that were not tracked in the documents and will defer renewal until fall 2016. CEP will request the proposals be re-submitted with track changes and review at one of the first meetings of fall.

Consent agenda approvals:

Petitions: 7 Graduate Student Instructors (GSI). Program Statement for Computer Engineering (CMPE).

Community Studies (CMMU) is approved after re-wording for letter grade option only for major requirements.

II. Follow Up Criteria for Non-Degree Programs

Committee members clearly defined when a collection of courses with a specific purpose should undergo a review. Examples include the Multilingual Curriculum for F1 Visa holders and the Council of Provost's proposal to revise the Core courses and their relationship to the lower-division writing requirements.

Here are the criteria CEP will submit to the VPAA's Office with regard to updating the Policy on Academic Programs and Units: Establishment, Disestablishment and Change.

Draft Non-degree program definitions

Sample Certificate Program Proposal Criteria:

1. *Collection of 2 or more courses (if new courses, proposal must be approved first, then course approval process follows)*
2. *Comparable certificate of value at another institution or professional development*
3. *Student demand*
4. *Resources*
5. *Pathway sample for awarding of certificate*
6. *Impact on time to degree*
7. *Review with program statement for catalog*
8. *Appears in catalog but not on transcript*

Sample Other non-degree curriculum Example: MLC

- Justification or collection of course for a specific purpose with a concrete goal
- Dean support as well as resources if needed
- Course sequencing including pre-requisites
- Course constants that are shared in the collection
- List courses with descriptions and have a visual diagram if possible
- If proposed courses submit course approval forms and syllabi with proposal, course approval process follows after approval
- Resource Implications
- Assessment and learning outcomes for student work
- Data on performance rate
- Stakeholder/relevant party consultations
- Sunset/review date
- Appears in catalog(courses are part of student's transcript)
- Required for graduation optional

These programs can be reviewed annually as part of the program statement process and will require non-degree programs to be listed in the catalog but will not appear on a student's transcript.

III. Discussion of Supporting Information that should Accompany Proposals for New Undergraduate Programs

VPAA Lee has given CEP the opportunity to more clearly define the information needed to thoroughly review proposals for new majors. Members considered several options for departments to adopt for course pathways through a major. If possible, CEP encourages departments to work within their divisions for a major map report produced by Data Warehouse or use an excel spreadsheet listing the courses, prerequisites, and course frequencies. CEP is also interested in developed tracks for different entering writing/math proficiencies.

IV. Recommendations from RJ&E Concerning Appendix C: Student Grade Appeal Process

Committee members found RJ&E recommendations to be unproblematic but have concerns over conforming changes in language. Members approved minimal changes this year, and CEP will review Appendix C again in fall quarter for more extensive conforming changes to language.

V. Repeat Policy for "Stretch" College Core Courses 80C & D and 80A

Registrar Sanger has requested an interpretation of the repeat for grade improvement regulation 9.1.8.

"If a student passes College 80C and then fails College 80D, should they be able to take College 80A for grade improvement, or should they take College 80D again?"

After a brief discussion, CEP members agreed this was a complex issue. Although both 80A and 80D satisfy the C1 general education requirement, we do not view the two courses as equivalent. Thus, a student who passes 80A after receiving a grade of C minus or below in 80D will not receive credit for grade replacement. If a student or

their college believes that an exception is justified, these requests should be handled via the petition process on a case-by-case basis.

VI. Pre Consultation with Disability Resource Center Director Gubash

Members discussed possible issues around areas of concern for makeup exams in preparation for our consultation with DRC Director Gubash. CEP will send a pre-consultation memo invitation with the following questions of interest:

- We would like to know more about 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?
- We would also appreciate your perspective on the relevance of Title IX and the ADA on campus policies about making up work or examinations missed due to illness or injury.

VII. CEP input on Challenge 45 Comprehensive Review

Chair Tamkun and VPDUE Hughey walked members through the process. Members are tasked with reviewing department feedback on reducing upper-division credits in their majors; completing the response form; and commenting on whether the department provided a good faith effort.