

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

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

Present: Jeff Bury, Manel Camps (Provost rep.), Suresh Lodha, Onuttom Narayan, Roxy Power (NTSF Rep.), Tonya Ritola, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Beth Stephens, John Tamkun, (Chair), Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Lynn Westerkamp, Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst).

Absent: Gina Dent (CCI Chair), David Draper, Tias Webster (SUA Rep.).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar).

I. Announcements

Chair Tamkun updated members on a recent SEC meeting and his meeting with VPDUE Hughey on College Core courses and the budget

Consent Agenda:

The CEP minutes of October 12, 19, and 26, 2016 were approved with adopted changes.

II. Priority Enrollment Requests

A variety of different groups currently have priority enrollment status. At present enrollment priority is determined by class standing (veterans, honors, regent scholar). In addition, AP Credit Exams can allow certain groups advanced standing. The committee discussed this issue together alongside a request to extend priority enrollment for the Summer Engineering Bridge participants in their first year.

Members were not convinced by the justification for the request and would like more information before making a decision.

CEP members want to know what criteria the DRC uses when making accommodations for students, specifically the types of disabilities that qualify a student for priority enrollment. Members are also interested in the criteria used by EOP program for priority enrollment. Committee Analysts will research and bring this information to the committee membership at a future meeting.

III. Final Exam Schedule

VPDUE Hughey requested review by CEP on the results of a survey that polled instructors on changing the final exam time from 3 to 2.5 hours. CEP was not able to review this last year, as it arrived too late in spring quarter. Many issues include large class size, where students are crammed into a lecture room without enough seats to accommodate the class. If the exam time is shortened, more time slots would be available during the day and would require more exams on the same day. This is problematic for all students, but especially for DRC students with accommodation needs. CEP did change the final exams from 4 to 5 days for fall and winter, but this could not be met for spring quarter due to graduation dates previously set in the past. CEP members unanimously agreed to keep the 3-hour exam time for now.

IV. Course Repetition Policy

Chair Tamkun and Member Narayan led the discussion of the regulation on repeating of courses for credit (Santa Cruz Senate Regulation 9.1.8) and the VPDUE's guidelines for the implementation of the regulation. Students may only repeat a course for credit if a grade of C-, D, D+, D-, or F are received. SCR 9.1.8 follows closely to the Senate Regulations [SCR 900.C.2](#), [778](#), [780.C.2](#) The committee has received an informal inquiry about repetition of courses, according to the Santa Cruz Regulation 9.1.8. During the discussion members agreed that students should be re-directed to another major after repeated fails; at times this can be challenging. Provosts have the authority to authorize more than one repeat of a course if there are extenuating circumstances (e.g. health or other serious personal issues). Provosts should consult with Department faculty and staff before approving a third or fourth take of a course.

SCR 9.1.8 is based on UC Legislative Ruling 6.11.C (clause 3), which concerns actions that effectively disqualify a student from the University even though they satisfy the minimum standards of Senate Regulation 900.A. SR 900.C allows for more stringent norms if they are based on regulations adopted by a Division and approved by the Assembly; SCR 9.1.8 satisfies this condition. SCR 9.1.8 is also in line at the systemwide level, as well as regulations on several other campuses, and is therefore perfectly in keeping with the norms of the University of California. CEP expects colleges will consider the student's likelihood of passing the courses, completing their major, or completing an alternate major, and that departmental recommendations be taken into consideration, as the ultimate decision rests with the College Provosts.

V. Enrollment Requirements for Impacted Major Courses

CEP members held the first round of discussion on how to create policy for departments who have reached capacity issues. At the School of Engineering (SOE), departments would like courses limited to SOE majors only. These requests create challenging workload issues for Registrar Office Staff who do an outstanding job accommodating such labor intensive requests, which are not automated. For a three-pass enrollment hold, each restriction must be built by staff; then, depending on the 1st, 2nd or 3rd pass, certain groups are manually added or removed (e.g. Majors). The enrollment holds for one course must be edited three times during the enrollment window and is a staff workload issue. At this time, this would be too laborious to extend to all SOE courses. Until the process is automated, these requests should be limited to a relatively small number of key courses. It is important to know what criteria qualifies courses for an impacted status. CEP will send a response to SOE that we cannot make any decisions without the outcome of the task force on major impactation status. CEP will continue to allow the enrollment restrictions approved for the 10 existing courses for the time being.

VI. Vice Provost for Student Success Jay Padgett Advising Request

The Vice Provost for Student Success Padgett has requested CEP's support in asking departments to provide alternate advising plans for undergraduate students based on their math and writing proficiencies. Currently, the departments submit plans as part of their catalog program statement. These plans can be numerous and complex depending on the student's individual skill level when admitted. Members are supportive of the outcome but are concerned that some departments may lack the expertise or resources to develop such plans. It is also difficult at this time to generate these plans without clarity on the pending changes to the lower-division writing and Core requirements. CEP may revisit this issue later this year.

VII. Criteria for Reviewing Colleges: moved to next week due to lack of time.

Committee on Educational Policy, 2016 - 17