

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES  
Wednesday, December 7, 2016  
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Jeff Bury, Manel Camps (Provost rep.), Gina Dent (CCI Chair), David Draper, Suresh Lodha, Onuttom Narayan, Roxy Power (NTSF Rep.), Tonya Ritola , Beth Stephens, John Tamkun, (Chair), Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Lynn Westerkamp, Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst).

Absent: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Tias Webster (SUA Rep.).

**I. Announcements**

Chair Tamkun briefed members on the UCEP meeting this week, which focused on online courses and examinations. CEP members would like to have a discussion on the success of online Mathematics courses offered through ILTI. UCSC's Mathematics Department is offering these courses, but not all faculty agree that they provide a comparable educational experience with face-to-face instruction..

The Enrollment Management Working Group should produce a report at the end of fall quarter for review by Senate committees during winter quarter. Acting VPAA Martin Berger has taken over chairing the working group.

**Consent Agenda:**

Approval of response to the mid-cycle review of Spanish Studies will be confirmed via email.

**II. Criteria for Reviewing Colleges**

Last year, during the revision of the [Academic Programs and Units Policy](#) and Procedures Governing Establishment, Disestablishment and Change, CEP wanted to review the Colleges as an academic unit. Colleges play an important academic role for our students. The program statements for Colleges placed emphasis on recruitment over academic content. Many changes to academic courses such as Writing and Core were handled via the course approval process. Neither resources nor impact on student progress to major degree was taken into consideration.

Last year VPAA Lee asked CEP to submit specific criteria the committee would like for a review. Here are the potential criteria based on what is asked of academic departments:

- Advising Issues (Is the system we have the best for our students?)
- UCUES or other surveys
- Majors/ Minors/Certificates/Honors/Scholars Program routine review
- Core Course/Residential Life
- Faculty Participation & Governance
- Undergraduate Writing Curriculum (Members would like information on UCSD's College system delivery of their writing curriculum.)

Members are in agreement that the Colleges should be reviewed routinely based on the academic role they provide undergraduate instruction and are interested in having an external body review our

programs, but this may not be appropriate for all colleges. Additionally, if the college course(s) are standardized, the program statement process may be all that is required.

Program Statements for the Colleges will be delayed until the College 1 course offering content is determined. After the course is designed and approved, CEP will contact colleges for program statement submission.

Chair Tamkun will consult with SEC on moving forward with Core and the lower-division writing curriculum.

### **III. Program Statement Review Orientation**

Chair Tamkun and Staff Analyst Wrangell walked members through the process of accessing the Online Curriculum Approval System database.

### **IV. Follow Up on Course Repetition Policy**

Members approved the draft response, which will be sent out later this week.

### **V. Possible Consultations for Winter Quarter**

Members agreed to table this discussion until a budget proposal is submitted for review by the Humanities Division.

Discussion of possible consultation for the Winter quarter:

- VPDUE Richard Hughey
- Council of Provost Chair Elizabeth Abrams
- Writing Program Chair Heather Shearer

### **VI. Counting Credits for Double Major Clarification**

There has been some confusion on how to count credits when students declare double majors. CEP members reviewed the guide designed for Advisors by Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Advising Stacey Sketo-Rosener and past CEP committees. The regulations and the Advising guide have clear concise instructions. CEP would like clarity on double counting with faculty advisers who may be interpreting these credits differently. We would like to know if these rules are being followed for all departments/college advisors on campus for double majors. These rules are clear for two distinct majors, but not for majors with cross-over units, such as those in PbSci or SOE. In these cases, students could receive a double major by taking only one additional class; these majors would need to be restricted. During the Committee's discussion, members learned that practices across campus differ within departments and possibly divisions. What needs to be clarified by the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJ&E) is the following: Do the minimum credits refer to the campus minimum of 40 upper-division credits for a major or the minimum credits for upper division course requirements of a specific major (which may be significantly higher)?

Chair Tamkun will send a request to RJ&E and follow up in winter quarter.