

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES

Wednesday, November 8, 2017  
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Noriko Aso (CCI Chair, *ex-officio*), Jeff Bury, Ben Carson (Provost Rep.), Suresh Lodha, Onuttom Narayan, (Chair), Tonya Ritola, Megan Thomas, Rob Wilson, Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Absent: Patrick Chuang, Joy Hagen (NTSF Rep.), Francis Nimmo, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Nina Treadwell.

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton.

### **I. Announcements**

Chair Narayan informed the committee that UCEP has been told that students at some campuses who are suspended on disciplinary grounds are taking courses at other UCs. There is no Senate regulation that forbids this. The Academic Council and perhaps UCEP will look into whether any changes in Senate regulations concerning this issue are desirable.

At the SEC meeting, CEP and GC were asked to write to department chairs summarizing the progress with regard to a new online catalog and course approval system, giving departments a chance to opine before CEP reaches decisions on December 6.

The Senate will hold a LRDP forum on Thursday, November 16. CEP will forward its correspondence regarding the Kresge Project and the Academic Literacy Curriculum to the Senate vice-chair, emphasizing that additional classroom space that reflects departments curricular needs and desires is essential for any growth.

A task force will be looking over proposed changes to retiree health benefits. No changes are proposed to be implemented until July 2019.

#### Consent agenda

The minutes for October 25, 2017 and the draft legislation for the December Senate meeting were approved.

Member Carson expressed his views on future issues pertaining to the Academic Literacy Curriculum proposal and on the addition of a general education requirement to the College 1 course.

### **II. Proposed History Intensive Major**

VPAA Lee is requesting Senate review of the draft proposal to establish an intensive major in History. As noted by VPAA Lee, no additional faculty FTE or staff is required, and Dean Stovall confirms the proposed new major does not require new resource allocation. Members found the proposal to be excellent and the department is following a recommendation from their last external review. Members are approving the intensive major and will recommend the department specify the learning outcomes

(which are vague) based on those established for the History major. CPB is in agreement with CEP on approval.

### **III. External Review for History – Stage 2**

The lead sub-committee member summarized the ERC report. Overall, the outcome for the department's external review was positive. The major has a very strong undergraduate program. Sub committee members presented the following concerns for the closure meeting discussion.

1. The ERC recommends that the German Studies program be converted to a minor and moved to the literature program because it has not had majors during the past several years and therefore does not justify the use of departmental resources. What is the department's response to this suggestion?
2. The ERC recommends that the graduate and undergraduate programs might work better in tandem. They suggest that this might be accomplished by (1) enrolling some of the top students in graduate seminars; and (2) considering the adoption of the 4+1 BA/MA. While the Department addresses item #2 (the 4+1 component) in its response, it does not address item #1 (co-enrollment). This should be addressed.
3. The ERC notes that undergraduates are concerned about the scheduling of discussion sections due to many overlapping sections, and recommends that the department create a curriculum committee to more effectively schedule discussion sections. The department has stated it will not pursue the ERC's recommendation. CEP wishes to know how this significant concern will be addressed.
4. Is it possible for the department to have each TA teach 3 discussion sections with 20 students each instead of 2 with 30 students each? This would be a slight workload increase, but would make the smallest rooms (which will not be in short supply next year) usable for sections, resulting in easier scheduling.
5. How does the department plan to deal with the ERC's recommendation, in response to the department's request, that the 26 major advising pathways be organized into three categories (area, temporal, and cross-regional thematic) to facilitate student advising and scheduling?

Members will finalize the questions by the end of the day.

### **IV. External Review for Music – Stage 2**

Overall, the ERC responded directly to CEP's original questions concerning (1) undergraduate fees; (2) the undergraduate minors (Electronic Music, which is highly impacted; Jazz, which is severely under-enrolled; and General Music, which is up and coming and possibly sustainable); (3) TA preparation to teach undergraduates; and (4) confusion about undergraduate degree requirements.

CEP had the following issues for the closure meeting:

1. Fees for Individual Lessons should be minimized, and a strategy to achieve this is needed.
2. TA training needs to be handled better, in partnership with the Graduate Division or the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning where appropriate.
3. The ERC recommends the department discontinue or rethink its jazz minor, but the department and the dean do not wish to discontinue it. CEP approves the continuation of the minor while the Curriculum Re-Evaluation Project is going on.
4. More work is needed on relations with Unit 18 lecturers.
5. CEP strongly supports the ERC's recommendations to increase the percentage appointment of two technical staff.
6. The results of the Curriculum Re-Evaluation Project should be reported in the department's next program statement.

#### **V. Mid cycle Review for Mathematics**

The VPAA is requesting review of the mid cycle report for the Mathematics Department. Members reviewed the VPAA's recommendation for a six year cycle and agree. Members have the following additional information to add for the next departmental self-study.

1. The department should discuss how far it has been able to follow CEP's recommendations regarding class sizes and discussion sections for Math 19AB and Math 23AB.
2. The department should discuss how far it has been able to follow CEP's recommendations regarding the offering of online courses in Math 19AB and 23A.
3. Many other UC campuses are employing online courses to teach Math 2 and Math 3, with small discussion sections to provide assistance to students. The department should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this option, and whether UCSC has considered following this path.
4. The department should discuss whether students who seem to be placed into more advanced mathematics courses by ALEKS are fully prepared to undertake more advanced courses in PSci and SOE majors where mathematics courses are required for the degree? Is there anything to be learnt from the assessment experience of comparable UCs?

## **VI. Major prep criteria: Computer Engineering, Economics, Environmental Studies and Physics**

To prepare for the discussion on major qualification criteria members reviewed requests and responses from Computer Engineering, Economics and Physics. The request from Environmental Studies concerns transfer students comparing new requirements in the existing program statement.

### Physics

(Chair Narayan was recused from this part of the discussion.)

Members discussed the nuances of 2.7 and 2.70 GPA, which meets the goal but 2.69 will round to 2.7. We want this to be 2.67 and anything higher can be rounded up to meet the 2.7 GPA cut off.

Chair pro tem Ritola will send out a letter clarifying this to the department.

Environmental Studies: The Department would like to make a change in their chemistry requirement; which was written as introductory chemistry which does not meet the major's requirement. Chemistry 1A or a general chemistry requirement is widely articulated across the California Community Colleges system. Members are in favor of this change and approved.

Economics: The response from the Department was confusing, CEP will request what the department is proposing to do and then reach a decision.

### Computer Engineering:

This is a complicated major transfer screening policy. Frosh entering UCSC take 6 Major Qualification Policy (MQP) courses with a GPA of 2.8. Transfer students can enter UCSC two ways: either they complete at least 5 MQP courses with a GPA of 3.0, or all 11 MQP courses with a GPA of 2.8.

The department proposes that transfer students should, like students entering UCSC as frosh, have to complete at least 6 MQP courses with a GPA of 2.8, but not fail more than one of these courses. CEP approved the course requirement, but felt that the restriction on failing courses — which is dropped for other majors — should not be introduced for Computer Engineering. CEP also felt that describing the requirement as 6 courses or 36 credits is confusing, and only courses should be specified.

## **VII. Assignment of Member Tasks – Time permitting**

CEP has various items that need preliminary work before they can be brought to the full committee and will be outlined and assigned by the chair.

Possible items to be assigned are:

- Double counting of credits for double majors: *CEP Chair Narayan.*
- How has graduate growth impacted undergraduate education? Are GSI's being mentored adequately? Should there be a policy about this? *Members will discuss at our next meeting.*
- Systemwide practice regarding discussion sessions and TA ratios in the context of the campus class time reduction. *Member Thomas.*

- Review W and P/NP grades from other campuses for request to VPDUE Hughey. *Member Lodha.*
- GE availability, how are we doing? *CCI will look at this issue.*
- Follow up of the DCs with departments, how are we doing? *Member Ritola.*