

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES

Wednesday, November 15, 2017
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Noriko Aso (CCI Chair, *ex-officio*), Jeff Bury, Ben Carson (Provost Rep.), Patrick Chuang, Joy Hagen (NTSF Rep.), Suresh Lodha, Onuttom Narayan, (Chair), Francis Nimmo, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Tonya Ritola, Megan Thomas, Nina Treadwell, Rob Wilson, Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Absent: None.

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton.

I. Announcements & Members Items

*The order of the agenda was changed to accommodate a member's schedule.

- *Consent Agenda*
All letters have been approved.
- CEP to Senate Vice-Chair re classroom capacity and LRDP
- CEP to Department Chairs re Curriculum Management Project
- CEP to Economics, ENVIS, Computer Engineering and Physics re Major Prep Criteria
- CEP approving History Intensive major

Program Statement Assignments

The process will be different from last year. Program statements that are expected to be uncomplicated will be reviewed by the CEP Chair working with the analysts. These will usually be placed on the consent agenda, unless the review concludes that discussion as an agenda item is needed. The other program statements are being assigned to the members to review. Each program statement will have a primary reviewer, who is expected to review the entire program statement and the admissions website if it is a screening major. Starting with the first meeting of the winter, every member should expect to see one program statement each week on the agenda for which they are the primary reviewer.

At the December 6 meeting CEP will review process which includes the following:

- Guidelines on how to use the OCA
- Comparing the admissions page criteria to the program statement criteria for majors with transfer screening
- If there are errors CEP will send clarification to Admissions

The Curriculum Management Project will be on the agenda for CEP's December 6 meeting. Possibilities for catalog structure and the organization of program statements will be discussed. During program statement review during the winter term, each statement will be compared with the templates approved on December 6, to confirm that the templates will work.

Announcements:

Chair Narayan stated that SEC was informed that the Student Housing West project would be going ahead, with family student housing and a childcare center planned to be placed in the meadow between Hagar and Coolidge. The project is intended to add 3000 more student beds. The split location for this project became necessary when the available land on the westside of the campus shrank from 50 acres to 12 acres because of environmental reasons. The 2020 LRDP is planning for growth to 28,000 students. There will be a forum on the LRDP tomorrow at the Stevenson Event Center at 3:00 p.m.

II. Pre-Consultation: CP/EVC Marlene Tromp's visit

CEP members suggested that the CP/EVC should be introduced to CEP's charge and the committee's mission.

Target items for discussion:

- Planning on providing guidelines for incentivize undergraduate teaching on campus: graduate growth or what budgetary considerations for higher enrollments are planned?
- 2 to 1 Transfer Admission mandate: update her that only 5 or 6 departments need to make adjustments and CEP made recommendations.
- Go over the Kresge Project, Academic Literacy Curriculum, introductory mathematics calculus courses, LRDP experience on campus with housing and classroom developments
- Membership of the Academic Planning Strategic Committee and representatives
- Strongly reinforce shared governance on the Academic Strategic Plan

III. Priority Enrollment

Members were asked to consider all groups that are given priority enrollment and whether these groups should continue to have this privilege. After the Chair summarized the category of groups, the largest group of students are those recommended by the DRC. This is followed by student athletes, who have to be given priority according to regental policy. The remaining students who get priority enrollment are approximately evenly divided between Honors Scholars and Regents Scholars on one hand, and Smith Scholars and similar groups, including EOP Bridge students, on the other.

Last year CEP did not approve priority enrollment for the Summer Engineering Bridge program. The committee made several requests for data on how this would enhance retention, but having received none, the committee decided not to approve the priority requested. Member Sanger noted that priority enrollment for EOP Bridge students does not affect upper division course enrollment. After discussion, the committee decided to leave the present practice unchanged.

IV. Senior Comprehensive Requirement

Background:

The Senior Comprehensive requirement was part of the grading process approved when UCSC was established. This has morphed into a comprehensive requirement that is not necessarily comprehensive, in the sense of tying together the students' study of the discipline during their undergraduate career. Some departments create a senior capstone experience for their majors. After the previous discussion of

this issue by CEP, members were given the opportunity to consult with faculty outside CEP about the advisability of making this requirement optional per department preference.

Discussion:

- There is an institutional argument to protect Senate oversight of the curriculum and provide a unique senior seminar experience.
- A Senior Seminar provides a unique experience in a small class, learning with other advanced students.
- What is the distinction between a comprehensive requirement and a capstone? Both are exit requirements for majors.
- The capstone requirement needs to be defined. It may not work well for a large major, e.g. a large seminar would not be meaningful, losing pedagogical value. The requirement should be rigorous and well defined.

Proposed Actions:

- 1) Leave as it is,
- 2) Create a two step process, allowing CEP to grant exceptions
- 3) Make this requirement optional with legislative changes

Members would like this to be a more formal process and suggest studying undergraduate survey data, and soliciting information from department chairs. A letter will be sent to all department chairs, and the responses will be considered in the winter term.

V. Bioengineering ERC report -- moved forward.

VI. Graduate Student Instructor (GSI Mentoring)

GSI's are supposed to have a designated faculty mentor, especially during summer. Part of the discussion addressed concerns with the physical presence of the faculty mentor. Members felt the mentor could check in via email or teleconference. Members pointed out the 7 mentoring criteria, which are the minimum expectations; it was felt that if these are observed, they should ensure the required standard of mentoring.

Summer Session is also concerned with the number of GSI's per faculty mentor.

Outcome:

- Mentors must follow the requirements for the seven criteria, be available, minimally by email or conference call
- CCI will create a document or form for GSI's to provide feedback on their experience
- CEP will recommend Summer Session hold a training for new GSI's
- CEP will point out that faculty are on 9 month appointments and summer session is a service to their department

- CEP has recommended no more than three GSIs per one faculty mentor, with the request for exceptions. The GSI form will be updated.
- CEP will point out the comparison between requirements for the Associate In and the Teaching Fellow titles, and ask whether the requirements are appropriate.

VII. F Grade in a Course Based on One Assignment – Moved forward.

Committee on Educational Policy, 2017 – 18