

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

Wednesday, November 29, 2017
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Jeff Bury, Noriko Aso (CCI Chair, *ex-officio*), 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, Rob Wilson, Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Absent: Nina Treadwell.

Guest: CP/EVC Tromp and Associate Registrar Claxton.

I. Announcements & Members Items

The membership welcomed a new student representative, Burcu Birol, who will be joining CEP for winter and spring.

The Chair updated members on the Mathematics Department's response to our recommendations for large introductory mathematics courses. Responses from the department, dean and the VPAA will be reviewed in early winter quarter.

The Chair and sub-committee members attended a session to review the new Slug Success software and had serious concerns about it. The software has been designed to identify at-risk students and help coordinate communication between the college and departmental advisors.

Two departments did not agree with our responses to change their major qualification policy GPA. For one of them, few transfer students are actually accepting admission offers, and it is important for the campus to improve our yield.

Consent Agenda

The following responses were approved.

- CEP to VPDUE Summer Session Director re: GSI
- CEP to Department Chairs re Senior Comprehensive Requirement

II. Mid Cycle Report for Electrical Engineering

Members reviewed the mid-cycle report for the Electrical Engineering Department for any undergraduate issues that should be addressed at the time of the next self-study. Members agreed with the VPAA's recommendation for an eight-year review cycle. Members drafted questions for the next self-study based on the following concerns: undergraduate path time to degree has been streamlined to reduce the 5-year average, and the creation of their own disciplinary communication curriculum. Members would like to see feedback on the new structure. Student satisfaction was identified as an issue of concern, and CEP would like follow up on satisfaction with undergraduate students. Members also expressed concern about the 10% gender disparity and are recommending the department review other successful programs on campus. Examples might include specific programs (e.g. the Women in Physics

& Astrophysics program), outreach efforts to undecided majors, or a survey of existing majors to see if any specific gender-based impediments exist.

III. F Grade in a Course Based on One Assignment

Members were asked to consider: assuming that it is stated in the course syllabus, is it permissible to fail students based on their performance of a single assignment? Does such a policy have to be approved by CCI during the course approval process, and how can such a policy be approved if it is a change to an existing approved course?

Discussion summary:

- Prerequisite changes need to be approved by CCI at the time of the course approval process, if an existing course, then a course revision form must be requested with an updated syllabus concerning changes with grading scales
- Entry quizzes need to be approved by CCI as a course approval or revision, usually noted by entry admission by faculty (Not in the Catalog); additionally, departments needs to be informed about such assessment measures
- CCI and CEP will draft up a memo to inform departments and send out in early winter and work with the CITL on syllabus samples for faculty to reference

IV. Consultation with CP/EVC Tromp

After welcoming CP/EVC Tromp to our meeting, members introduced themselves.

The Chair gave a brief summary of CEP duties and authority with undergraduate curricular issues, concerns with classroom space and undergraduate first-year experiences.

During the consultation, CP/EVC Tromp agreed with CEP on the concern for the mandated transfer student/first year student ratio of 2:1. She felt it was important to get buy-in from the departments who could make changes.

She is currently developing a revenue stream, tapping into our alumni and fundraising or partnering with companies in the San Jose areas. She let members know the Strategic Academic Plan would be the faculty and campus community plan, based on the collective wisdom of students, staff and faculty. The consultants will put our ideas together into a cohesive plan.

She touched on the P3 housing plan for campus and how the housing office is looking into building housing outside of the Delaware Street facility or downtown to meet our growing student population needs.

There was a question raised on the LRDP process with regard to growing our enrollment to 28,000 and housing more students. Members wanted to understand why the campus must grow to this particular

enrollment. This is based on expectations from the state with growth of the campus, so the numbers could change again.

In closing, members thanked the CP/EVC for her visit and expressed the importance of quality for undergraduate education, including the need for smaller classrooms, which will enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience. Enrollment management is a broad issue. The physical space of the campus has not just impacted housing; all over campus, there are no study areas, and there is a shortage of seats in classrooms. Additionally, academic program space and faculty office space are oversubscribed.

V. Bioengineering ERC report- moved to a future agenda

VI. CCI Issues for CEP Clarification- moved to a future agenda

Committee on Educational Policy, 2017 – 18