

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, January 25, 2017
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, Tonya Ritola, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Beth Stephens, John Tamkun, (Chair), Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Lynn Westerkamp, Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst).

Absent: Leslie Lopez (NTSF Rep.), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep).

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

I. Announcements

CEP received word that a proposal for Writing and the College Core Curriculum with budget proposal should be ready in the next two weeks from the Humanities Division.

II. Presentation of Undergraduate Student Migration through Major Data

Chair Tamkun provided a brief presentation on student migration data using the UC Davis' visualization Ribbon tool. Information can be parsed out by demographic and other key indicators that may be useful to CEP in making a determination on what information to request from departments seeking a status for impaction.

III. Program Statements: School of Engineering Divisional Statement

The School of Engineering Division is proposing many changes to admissions and proposed majors and double majors for all engineering majors with undergraduate degrees: Technology Management, Computer Science, Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Bioengineering, and Computational Media will be affected by this change in policy. SOE is proposing proposed majors who will need to pass any two of the following classes:

Math 19A or 20A and one of the following:

Chem 1A, CMPE 12, 13, 16, CMPS 5J, 11,12A, 12B Math 19B.

Most of the courses listed are in the qualification policy for many of the majors.

Before any formal discussion or decisions were made, Member Lodha recused himself.

CEP finds the request for pre majors reasonable and approves. Declaring the double major restrictions does not seem reasonable but our regulations do not oppose the request by the School. Each major needs to have a specific set of course listed due to overlap but allowing for flexibility with student schedules. The appeal process needs to be clear with consistent language for all majors and tracked. Students who declare after the 7th quarter must appeal as the campus deadline to declare a major is after the 6th quarter. CEP will request clarification for declaring

the major after the deadline and confirmation that all departments in the school support these changes to their programs. Students who cannot complete the qualification courses due to capacity, the Division should consult on waitlists. Members will also address impacts on diversity and what specific steps to take to mitigate this.

IV. Computer Sciences Program Statement: move forward to next mtg. 2/1/17

V. Proposed Summer Salary Adjustments

The VPDUE's office is proposing to change the summer session salary for faculty members. CEP has reviewed the proposal to change how instructors teaching in Summer Session are compensated, and had deep reservations. The proposal highlights cost savings and graduate student support, but is silent about the cost in terms of the loss of experienced instructors, and the inevitable reduction in the quality of instruction that will ensue. In view of the inadequate time to consider this proposal carefully, and the fact that people have already responded to the call for summer instructors (with the current compensation formula), CEP will respond for changes to Summer Session compensation be deferred until Summer 2018.

These are our comments for the response to the Senate Chair:

- The financial information provided with this proposal is not sufficient to evaluate the magnitude of the problem. It is stated that the increased cost of providing instruction was greater than the increased revenue from higher student enrollment. What was the difference between the two? If Summer Session incurred a net loss in 2016, what was the amount of the loss, and how does it compare to the profit in Summer 2015? Do these numbers include the money that Summer Session returns to the campus, because this is clearly profit for the university? Several cost-cutting measures are included in the proposal, and all of them may not be necessary to save the required amount of money, but it is not possible to decide if they are until the financial picture is more complete.
- Other solutions to the financial problems of Summer Session should be considered. Is it possible to stop offering courses with low enrollment, or use a different compensation formula for these courses? UCLA Summer Session mainly offers courses targeted at high school students (without a tuition discount like UCSC) or GE courses, for which a Graduate Student Instructor may do a fine job.
- In general, we are concerned about the financial incentive for departments to steer students towards Summer Session, an incentive that is increased as departmental budgets re cut. If Summer Session is — by design — to rely increasingly on GSI's, this becomes even more questionable. We believe that it would be appropriate for departmental advisors to have to tell students who they are advising to take courses in the summer about the department's financial interest in this decision.
- Graduate student instructors are supposed to be mentored by faculty when they are assigned responsibility for a course. We doubt that this requirement can be met if a large number of

courses are taught by GSI's in the summer, when most ladder rank faculty are off duty (or contracted to perform specific tasks), unless they are provided additional compensation for this task.

- Even with adequate mentoring, we believe that most courses are unsuitable to be taught in a compressed session (less than 10 weeks) by an inexperienced instructor such as a GSI. We would also like to remind departments that many major qualification policies were approved by CEP on condition that the qualification courses would be taught by experienced instructors. CEP will monitor the situation in this regard, and may withdraw approval for courses that are being taught by instructors who cannot teach the content satisfactorily.

We will note the "Course release + 25%" and "Course release + 30%" names confusing. After some

effort we realized that compensation of an amount equal to 1.25 or 1.3 course releases was being proposed, rather than an actual course release and additional compensation. This wording should be made clear or re-written.