

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES
Wednesday, April 5, 2017
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Jeff Bury, David Draper on phone, , Suresh Lodha, Onuttom Narayan, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), John Tamkun, (Chair), Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Lynn Westerkamp, Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Absent: Anthony Ballesteros (SUA Rep.), Manel Camps (Provost Rep.), Gina Dent (CCI Chair), Leslie Lopez (NTSF Rep.), Tonya Ritola, Beth Stephens.

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

I. Announcements

Chair Tamkun extended the invitation for spring quarter to guest preceptor representative Ethan Hutchinson. Member Draper will be attending by phone due to a scheduling conflict.

There was a Student Success Steering Committee meeting this week where members of the Council of Provosts presented their Core course proposal. Chair Tamkun has requested permission for CEP to review this proposal out of established procedures; no decisions will be made before CEP has a consultation with the Council of Provosts Chair and VPDUE Hughey.

From this week's CAB/SEC meeting members are working on the framework for our campus growth proposal and forum on teaching evaluations.

Student Success Steering Sub-Committee on Predictive Analytics

- Chair Tamkun was concerned no undergraduate student representatives were at the meeting
- The records for data analysis are 2005-2010, which is troubling, and the data do not support the current grading system or new GEs and was based on disqualification policies rather than admission to the major policies.

Consent Agenda

Program Statements:

- Physics will be approved after stakeholder confirmation has been uploaded into the OCA.
- Earth & Planetary Sciences will be approved after the Bio-Education minor has been removed.
- Sustainability Minor will be place on an meeting agenda for discussion.
- Anthropology was approved.

II. Electrical Engineering Program Statement

Members reviewed the three-course capstone for EE129 A, B, C with the DC requirement applying to EE 129C. The Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) and CEP review DC curriculum and courses requests. CEP approves the DC curriculum as part of the program statement, and CCI reviews and makes sure the course(s) meet the DC requirements. Both must concur on each decision. CEP could approve the program statement with the new course as long it is part of the curriculum, as CCI reviews

and makes sure the course meets the DC requirements. Members reviewed the request and approved. CEP has approved EE 129A and senior thesis (EE 195) for DC or EE129A, B, & C.

III. Art Games Playable Media B.A. and Computer Game Design B.S. Revised MOUs

Members reviewed the final drafts and are concerned with the lack of clarity on the structure. Will the Arts Dean treat the Program Director like a chair of a department? The Committee is trying to understand how the Program Director will approve changes and receive resources with this model; however, the Computer Game Design B.S. resides in a department and should not have this structure.

IV. Curricular Management Project Follow Up

Members reviewed materials and realize that other committees should be a part of these sub-groups. Chair Tamkun will follow-up with the Senate Chair on a SEC agenda.

Here are the questions from our consultation with the Curricular Management Project Managers. There are three major areas for Senate engagement:

1. We would like to form a Senate requirement workgroup that will help shape the Curriculum Management Project. Between now and start of implementation (~October/November 2017), we need Senate members to make decisions on:
 - a. Specific information we need to collect on forms for program statements;
 - b. Validation and business rules, what business rules must be included here; and
 - c. Process and data workflow. What data collection does faculty require based on process or workflow (i.e. how many new courses)?
2. We would like someone from the Senate to join the vendor selection workgroup. This involves evaluating vendor responses to written questions and attending and evaluating product demos. We estimate the time commitment for this task to be between 25 to 45 hours total from April through the end of August.
3. As we get closer to implementation, we will need a Senate implementation workgroup, which could be the same or different members as the requirement workgroup above.

CEP Members need more information, what would faculty be signing up for, frequency of scheduled days, exact number of work groups or committees, meeting dates times, and time commitment.

V. Review Final draft Legislation for CEP Charge 13.17

Members reviewed and approved the removal of redundant language and the addition of a delegations policy.

VI. Review Conforming Changes to Santa Cruz Division Chapters

CEP will request RJ&E decide if these conforming changes to CEP duties shifting to the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) requires Senate approval or not. Members reviewed and made some changes.

VII. Senior Comprehensive Requirement Request to University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (URJ)

Members reviewed the request to UR&J about the variance with our Senior Comprehensive Requirement. Many departments have the D.C. as part of their senior comprehensive requirements and this may be opening a Pandora's Box but some departments may not wish to remove this requirement. Departments are conforming to this policy, but is this putting constraints on resources that could be used elsewhere. Members will send the request and then decide what the next steps moving forward will be. Members discussed sending out a letter to departments after the systemwide committee makes a determination.

VIII. Review the Council of Provost's Core/Writing Proposal

CEP has requested permission to review and provide informal feedback on this proposal, outside of the normal established process. Some members found the Core/ELWR required satisfaction rate shockingly low and are concerned the Colleges may be *defacto* adding an additional lower division requirement for first-year students.

While other members were supportive of this course, it is widely known that the quality of some College courses is quite different from those offered in the departments and that it varies among the Colleges. There needs to be uniform quality.

Members held a small discussion on a compromise: College Core courses could carry a GE; reading comprehension is noticeable in courses, and there is data to suggest students who learn to read discourse become better writers. A TA or PE-E general education designation may be appropriate. Adding 30 students to each section and lowering the units from 5 to 4 could be a compromise. No decision was made during the meeting; instead members will finish this discussion when the budget materials are submitted and CPB sends CEP a recommendation.

Members are supportive of separating ELWR from Core and not teach writing in the context of Core topics.