

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

Present: Anthony Ballesteros (SUA Rep.), Jeff Bury, Manel Camps (Provost Rep.), Leslie Lopez (NTSF Rep.), 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), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Absent: Gina Dent (CCI Chair), David Draper.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Ethan Hutchinson (Preceptor Rep.), CM Project Managers Stacy Gustafson and Don Moonshine.

I. Pre Consultation Discussion – VPDUE

Members are not in favor of changing the course withdrawal policy but will consider updating the guidelines after consultation with VPDUE Hughey. Students do have the option to take a W for a class as long as they request it by the deadline.

II. Consultation with VPDUE Hughey on Course Withdrawals (W) Grades

VPDUE Hughey expressed his concerns with the large increase in W requests from students. There are many academic or personal reasons why students may need to withdraw from a course. There are no universal guidelines on how many W's should appear on a student's record, but two seems like a reasonable number, with the students self-selecting no more than one per quarter. Some withdrawals may be due to students' self-perception of low performance in a class; rather than meeting with a faculty member about course performance, some students simply withdraw from courses. All members agreed that it is a student's right to self-select a W for a course, but we would like to create some other process after the sixth week of instruction when students request a late W. Members could not reach a decision and will have to do some research for discussion at a future meeting. Members would like more faculty involvement in the process. Often, when a student plans to withdraw from a course, faculty are not aware a student has withdrawn until placing grades in AIS and the student already has a W and may have continued to attend lectures. Faculty would like to ensure that students who are considering a W are sufficiently advised.

III. Post-Consultation Discussion

- CEP wants to have faculty consultation when a student needs to ask for a W in a course.
- If a large number of students are withdrawing, this diagnostic shows there is something wrong with the course.
- Students do not plan to take a course for a W
- Instructors are not part of the process after the deadline; when entering grades the instructor will see a W in the grade holder place.

Follow up: Create Sub-Committee to look at options

Solicit information from the DRC

Chair Tamkun will look at data

IV. Classroom and Lecture Availability Student Survey

CEP student representative Jessica Xu, who is also the Vice President of Academic Affairs of the Student Union Assembly, is charged with facilitating the Classroom and Lecture Availability Student Survey. She wanted to involve CEP in the development of questions for the spring student survey. CEP members engaged during our meeting and added more questions to the survey.

V. Announcements

The SEC meeting agenda included a discussion on international education and the planning for 2040 that every UC campus must submit this spring. An informal proposal was sent out on changes to College Core and will be reviewed via the established review process. The College Provosts will be explaining justification for Core at the March 8 Senate Meeting (\$600,000 is the estimate).

VI. Pre Consultation Discussion – Campus Curricular Management Leaders

- Collecting information to determine requirements, what are the requirements of this software system, first survey, directed toward this, and will be circulated to faculty.
- CEP should structure the undergraduate program statement and Graduate Council for the graduate programs.
- Create a clear definition of The Senate Role/ Curricular Management Role.

VII. Consultation with Curricular Management(CM) Leaders

Don Moonshine and Stacey Gustafson introduced themselves as did the committee members before their consultation began. This is a very large scope project and is based on a list of priorities endorsed by the ABOG group on campus for improving system efficiencies for the catalog, course planning and approval and curriculum leaves.

There will be two phases to the project and will require Senate input.

Phase 1 Revamping the Online Curriculum Approval System

This online system does not have a workflow into the AIS system, so there are problems with manual data entry. The plan is for an automated interface if possible. Otherwise another system may have to be adopted.

The General Catalog also lacks an automated interface and most of the work is manual data entry, is hard to navigate and not searchable.

Phase 2: Campus Curriculum Leave and Planning System

Currently housed in a FileMakerPro platform and cannot interface with an enterprise system. The Registrar's wish is to integrate with AIS (PeopleSoft) if possible. Otherwise technology will be purchased to meet the campus needs. The scheduling software currently in use will not be changed.

The CM group welcomes senate input and faculty participation on their committees for program statement development and course descriptions.

The CM group will create manuals to use the software for all members of the campus community: Senate staff, faculty, department, divisional, and college staff.

VIII. Post Consultation Discussion Moved to March 15 meeting.

IX. Chair Tamkun called an Executive Session on Writing & Core

Members briefly discussed concern with delays in implementing changes to the undergraduate writing curriculum.