

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, April 12, 2017  
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Anthony Ballesteros (SUA Rep.), Jeff Bury, Manel Camps (Provost Rep.), David Draper (on phone), Suresh Lodha, Leslie Lopez (NTSF Rep.), Onuttom Narayan, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Tonya Ritola, John Tamkun, (Chair), Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Lynn Westerkamp, Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst).

Absent: Gina Dent (CCI Chair), Beth Stephens, Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Ethan Hutchinson (Preceptor Rep.).

**I. Announcements:**

Chair Tamkun apprised members that Council of Provosts Chair Abrams will be consulting with CEP next week during our meeting. CEP will invite VPDUE Hughey to a meeting after reviewing the full proposal.

**Consent Agenda**

**BENG:** the program has requested formal removal of the concentration in Assistive Technology: Cognitive/Perceptual. Stakeholder approval from MCD or MTEX is missing. New course BME 105 is in the OCA for CCI review. The program has expressed concern with questionable labs (BIOL 110L, 115L), for undergraduates. There are numerous typos to be corrected.

**Chemistry and Biochemistry :** There is a notation requiring students to have a faculty member sign off on a cover sheet for the Senior Thesis for DC credit. This seems confusing, suggesting some students would get credit over others. CEP will recommend a notation on the course number or change the Senior Thesis course number so students will not have to petition CCI. CCI has not reviewed the requested courses in the programs statement, DC requests for the following courses have not been submitted: Chem 122, 194, and 195 for DC revision.

**BMB:** Approved.

**Mathematics:** Approved.

**MCD Biology:** Members will review with the EEB Biology Program statement. EEB has made changes to their DC curriculum and must confer with MCD Biology on revisions to EEB, 107 and 109, which satisfy the Biology B.S. major. MCD is also requesting to limit enrollment in upper division labs (BIOL 100L, 101L, 105L, 109L, 115L, 120L, 121L) to MCD affiliated majors only.

**Physical & Biological Sciences Division Statement:** Approved.

**Sociology:** Approved.

**Humanities Division:** Approved.

## **II. Computer Engineering Request to Continue Seatless Sections**

Members reviewed the request from the Computer Engineering department to provide seatless sections earlier this year. Before CEP members made a decision, more information was requested. While the department did address most of the committee's concerns, members were not ready to approve this type of course offering as a precedent for every department on campus with enrollment issues. Members are willing to compromise with any department facing this situation, but permission must be asked from CEP first with the projected large enrollment for the school term. Members agreed this could be appropriate in rare cases. These seatless offerings are not uncommon at other UCs, but this is not optimal instruction for undergraduate students. CEP would consider on a case-by-case basis for emergency enrollment situations, providing specific data for the course. CEP will respond to Computer Engineering for future offerings.

## **III. Revised Guide for Managing Curricular Capacity**

Acting Vice Provost for Academic Affairs has revised the policy guide for managing curricular capacity and program enrollment based on feedback and consultation from the Senate and campus administrators. Members found this version improved and appreciate the VPAA's effort to improve the policy. Members want Departments to be aware this could take up to one year to complete the process. Member will cover the following areas in our response:

- “Managing Program Enrollment” section: the first two items state joint approval by the Senate and the CP/EVC is required. The footnote states that “the establishment of qualification criteria and admissions standards... for the purpose of limiting enrollment requires CP/EVC approval.” As explained in our response to the first draft, we believe that this is incorrect, and these items are entirely in the Senate's purview.
- CEP would prefer to control the number of students in an impacted major at the time of admission to the campus and therefore suggest that the items in Managing Program Enrollment should be reordered, with gating at the admissions level (through CAFA) coming first. Alternatively, because the appropriate solution may be different for different programs, they should be unranked.
- The large amount of data that a department must provide is still a concern according to the section “Template for Impacted Program Status Petition”, departments do not have access to most of the required information. Departments should be free to provide data that they think is sufficient to establish impacted status. After the administration and Senate committees review, additional data from the department can be requested.
- A letter from the Dean forwarding the department's impactation request, detailing additional resources the Dean is willing to provide in the near future.
- When a program being declared as impacted has an effect on diversity, we recommend that comments from CAAD should also be obtained.

#### **IV. Computer Science Department Petition for “Impacted” Status**

Even though the policy is currently under review, the Acting VPAA Berger has requested the Senate to consider the Computer Science Department petition to designate their B.A. and B.S. programs as impacted. With member Lodha recused, members reviewed the Computer Science Department’s impaction status petition. CEP appreciates that the CS Department is working with a very difficult situation, having been caught -- like Computer Science departments across the country -- by a huge surge in student demand. CEP urges the Dean, VPAA and CP/EVC to work with the department to see what additional resources are needed and can be provided.

We believe that it is possible that the CS Department will merit impaction status in the near future and therefore endorse the department’s second request: “insertion into the UCSC application and admissions documents, literature and web pages of a statement to the effect that the choice of major may be taken into account in the admission process for UCSC.” At the same time, we feel that the CS Department petition has failed to establish that impaction status is warranted now; therefore, their first request -- to have their academic programs immediately declared as being impacted -- must be rejected.

It is well known that the CS Department courses have suffered from long waitlists this year, with many students unable to enroll in essential courses. However, this may have been because of inefficiencies in curricular offerings. In order to make their case properly, the CS Department must provide an analysis of their “carrying capacity.”

The Dean’s letter does not state what steps have been taken to remedy the lack of resources in 2016-17, and what steps are imminent, or if he agrees with the CS Department for an impaction status.

CEP was also encouraged by the statement on the first page of the petition: “The good news consists in the existence of admission criteria into the CS major that are guided by student success considerations and which, if adopted, would lead to a very minor reduction in the number of students who successfully graduate, while steeply reducing the number of students who fail to graduate.” CEP has always been receptive to major qualification criteria that are based on student success. CEP reviewed a proposal from the CS Department to upgrade their major qualification criteria this year but could not approve it because it was not accompanied by any supporting data; this can be resubmitted with data in 2017-18.

In summary, CEP urges the CS Department to explore options based on student success to mitigate and perhaps solve their problems, and present proposals to the Academic Senate. Such steps -- and the recently approved first-year gating policy for BSOE -- may obviate any need for impaction status

#### **V. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)**

Members reviewed the request from UCEP to review and respond to the following questions. We considered the possible modification of campus policies to increase the number of students that enroll in ILTI courses. We believe that the limited cross-campus enrollment in these courses is due primarily to a lack of student interest in online courses as opposed to overly restrictive campus policies. Our thoughts about the specific policies are provided below.

1. A requirement that all entering UC freshman and transfer students complete 12 units prior to enrolling in a course offered at another UC campus.

*UCSC considers waivers of this requirement for individual students. We do not believe that this requirement poses a significant barrier to students who wish to take ILTI courses.*

2. A requirement at some campuses that UC seniors to take all of their last quarter of courses on the home campus.

*This requirement is not applicable to our campus*

3. A requirement that students be enrolled in at least 12 units on their home campus, before they are eligible to take a course at another UC campus. (Santa Cruz and Davis allow student enrollment with less than 12 units)

*At UCSC allows participation in ILTI courses if enrolled in 10 units for full time students and 5 credits for part-time students.*

4. A requirement that a student be “full-time” to be eligible to take an online course offered at another UC campus. Campuses are “counting units” for financial aid purposes BEFORE invoking the #of units rule. Thus it is possible to restrict a student from participation/enrollment in online courses offered at other UCs until 12 credits are reached. Full-Time is a status, determined by admissions unless a student petitions for part-time status. The burden of financial aid assurance should not be placed on the enrollment system.

*We allow students enrolled in as few as 5 units to enroll in an online course offered at another UC campus.*

5. An eligibility requirement based on “good academic standing” from grades in the immediately preceding term. This requirement causes a significant delay in approving student enrollment, as grades and GPAs have to be calculated *before* students are approved for enrollment. Some campuses, such as Riverside, withhold approval until term grades are received.

*N/A Eligibility is based on prior quarter standing approval.*

6. Requirement that the enrollment be “approved” by the student's’ home campus before the student is allowed into the course; there is great variability in both the *time* this process can take as well as the flexibility. For students who are not approved when the term opens, this is an impediment as they can’t get in and see the syllabus, assignments, and understand how to use the LMS for the course.)

*Our campus does not have this requirement. Students only need approval by the college if they do not meet eligibility requirements. Perhaps we should introduce this requirement: it is our understanding that prerequisites for courses are not being checked by ILTI for students on other campuses; if this is correct, it may be a violation of Senate Regulation 542.*

7. Campus variability in adherence to the 2-week add/drop period. One campus (Irvine) closes enrollment after week 1 of instruction, significantly limiting student access to courses on that campus, and impacting students at that campus interested in taking a course at another UC campus.

*Any student can enroll with instructor approval after day 8. If the course is synchronous, missing a week of work might pose significant challenges.*

8. A restriction that students may only be enrolled in 1 course at another UC campus each term during the Academic Year.

*UCSC students can take a course at another UC campus every quarter as long as they continue to meet eligibility requirements.*

9. A requirement that each online course be reviewed and approved by each UC campus to determine the type of credit (GE, pre-major and/or major) each course will earn. Senate regulation 744 states if four (4) campuses provide GE, premajor and/or major credit, the remaining five (5) campuses can offer the same type of credit.

*The Committee on Courses of Instruction has the final authority for the approval of these courses. We also note that Regulation 477 (not 744!) allows campuses to opt out when a course is approved by four or more campuses.*

After reviewing these questions, we realize that UCSC is more lenient than other campuses, and we will be making some changes.

#### **VI. Continue Council of Provost's Core/Writing Proposal Discussion**

Members continued their discussion from last week, finalizing questions to send to the Council of Provosts Chair to prepare for our consultation next week. Members will review the finalized questions by Friday so these can be sent out before the end of the day.

#### **VII. Review Disciplinary Communication Applications – moved to next week**