

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday May 17, 2017  
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

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

Absent: Beth Stephens and Ethan Hutchinson (Preceptor Rep.).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar).

**I. Announcements:**

Chair Tamkin made the following announcements regarding meetings he attended:

**SEC Meeting Update**

- There was concerns over communication to both the campus community and Kerr Hall Staff around the May 1 Campus Closure and May 3 Kerr Hall occupation.
- Interim Student Success Vice Provost Padgett and Director Foster presented predictive analytics to committee members who expressed concerns about assigning scores and that advisors will rely too heavily on what is presented.

**Student Success Steering Committee meeting**

- Impaction policies were discussed concerning the Computer Science Majors.
- SUA Representative Xu gave a presentation on the results from the student survey.

The Senate Office received a friendly amendment to Regulation 10.2.1b, which clarifies the language for the division of authority between CCI and CEP and CEP members agree.

COC Social next week, May 25, at the Center for Adaptive Optics from 4 – 6 p.m.

CEP received a friendly amendment to Senate Regulation 10.5.2 changes from the VPDUE and CEP agrees to the changes.

Chair Tamkun met with CAFA earlier and answered questions regarding major admission policies.

**Consent Agenda:**

Program Statement Approvals

Engineering: Technology Management

Humanities: LAAL, Spanish, Spanish Studies, Spanish for Heritage Speakers, Applied Linguistics and Multilingualism, History, Jewish Studies.

Approved draft CEP minutes for April 5 and 12, 2017.

## **II. Environmental Studies Program Statement: major Transfer Screening Process**

Sub-committee members have concerns with the Department's major transfer screening policy changes. Members prepared for discussion by reading over the major transfer screening policy created by CEP working with the Admissions Director and Articulation Officer. Chair Tamkun provided background on the process and CEP's past practices for context.

### Background:

Major Transfer Screening process is a CEP policy that was created for departments with major qualification policies; CEP has stated that requirements for native students and transfer students should be equivalent. However, due to the complexity of articulation agreements and the California Community Colleges(CCC) lack of plus and minus grading scales, the reality is these are not always equivalent or equal. New proposals are submitted with program statements after the department meets with Admissions to help with any barriers and create a policy. When changes are proposed the requesting department works with Admissions and submits a request to CEP.

The Environmental Studies Department's major transfer screening policy has a small language change, which was an error and the impact created a large decrease in transfer students qualifying for the major. There was also a deviation between the catalog and program statement. The list of equivalent courses was incorrect, approved course substitutions did not include. ENV5 23/CHEM 1A. The approved language was ENV5 23 or introductory chemistry course. CEP will meet with the Department and VPDUE for a solution for this year's cohort.

CEP approved the following for the revised program statement: Transfer students section

- Remove Chem 1A and request the Department to review, add back in introductory chemistry course
- Remove AMS 7/L and Ocean Sciences 90

## **III Three Repeat Discussion for Department Guidelines**

The MCD Biology Department is requesting guidance about an unusual situation whereby a student has failed a course twice and insists on re-enrolling through Open Campus.

### Discussion

Does the department have to let this student take the class, based on priority for UCSC students?

- Normally instructor can deny admissions from open campus, so no
- Should the College weigh in? Yes, a Student needs to talk to an advisor, department or College for permission to take a course for a third time

Does the student need to appeal this decision to provost, like any other repeat per 9.1.8?

- Yes.
- For a non matriculated student this doesn't matter, but does apply to our students at UCSC, academic checks should not be circumvented, use the process in place
- 

If taking the course, from an UCSC instructor, should it satisfy the major requirements?

- Treat this student like any other in Open Campus, separate policies, recognizes different rules for a UCSC student versus an outside enrollee
- Should apply 9.1.8 in this case, student needs to get permission by Provost
- Yes it should, but the department can request student petition for appeal and the student must have the Provost approval for open enrollment.

#### Decision

- Senate regulation 9.1.8 applies here, this can be enforced through the paper form, so that a provost will sign instead of professors.
- A student must obtain permission from the instructor and provost of their college
- CEP requested the necessary form be updated by the UCSC Extension Registrar.

CEP confirmed with UNEX Dean Rogers and Registrar Cooper about updating the form for future Open Campus requests requiring a third attempt.

#### **IV. 180 Degree Credit Waiver**

In response to a request for a clarification from the VPDUE, CEP decided that students should still be able to petition CCI for a waiver of up to 2 of the 180 credits required to graduate. Although CEP felt that such petitions should be rare, they are now almost always approved. Both CCI and the VPDUE would therefore appreciate more clarity on the criteria that should be used to evaluate these waivers. Members want students to be advised that the requirement is 180 credits to graduate and should plan accordingly. There are many options for students to reach the requirement: summer session, community colleges, independent study. or an online course. Members would like to waive for extenuating circumstances only like a medical withdrawal, family crisis.

CEP will draft a policy with guidelines and solicit feedback from the advising community for a transfer period moving forward Spring 2018.

Suggestions for criteria:

- Students would fill out the petition request form to submit to their College and then CCI for review
- Justification should indicate that the student made a good faith effort to complete the 180 credit requirement

#### **V. Student Union Assembly Survey**

SUA Rep Jessica Xu presented the recent results of the student survey covering topics of interest to CEP, such as advising, course withdrawals and online courses. This was a significantly longer survey with 1862 participants, about 10% of student population. As for student advising, the perception is advising is centered around STEM majors, peer advising is not as helpful, the hours are inflexible, most students experienced a run-around with major and undergraduate advisors, when trying to understand graduation requirements. There was a low number of withdrawals from courses, most did not talk to the instructor before withdrawing. A majority of students have taken one online class, but most preferred in person dependant on the subject.

## **VI. Online Course Policy**

Earlier this year CEP members expressed concern over the number of online course offerings a department or program can host. Currently many lower division math courses are taught online via ILTI (UC Online: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative) and allow system wide enrollment. Members would like more input from the Mathematics Department on their courses offerings and success rates; based on the SUA student survey where students expressed dissatisfaction there is a concern for the need of input from the greater population of faculty on campus. What courses should be ideal on line and at what level would review be treated? In person courses are approved and only re-reviewed if a revision is requested, should online course be treated differently? Members could not come to a consensus on developing an online course policy without more research. There are larger concerns about the ILTI process providing funding without express permission of departments.

CEP will do a broader consultation and review this issue in depth next year. Several members suggested putting a guidance/policy document by early next fall.

## **VII. Continuing Discussion on Writing Program and the Council of Provosts College 1 Proposals**

The Senate Chair and CPB Chair are working on information on the Writing and Core Proposal's perspective budget due in a week or two. Chair Tamkun recommended going forward with the review and present CEPs pedagogical argument, what we find positive and value; and our concerns for the response. There was concern the proposal will continue to change if the committee waits to review until the Senate has a budget envelope. Members discussed the College 1 proposal only (not enough time to discuss both) and Chair Tamkun will draft up a response for members to review and comment on at next weeks's meeting.