

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTESWednesday, October 11, 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, Suresh Lodha, Onuttom Narayan, (Chair), Francis Nimmo, Tonya Ritola, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), 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 and IRAPS Director Julian Fernald.

**I. Announcements**

- The Chair of UC Regents visited UCSC and met with SEC. He had comments about how the university's value to the state could be better explained. SEC members were able to educate him on issues for our campus, but several points remained unresolved.
- Chair Narayan informed CEP that a proposal on impactation was likely to be submitted in the near future for the Computer Science Department. The committee would have to consider what is the limiting factor on enrollment and if it can be solved. If the number of students has to be limited, should this be done at the time of admission to UCSC or later?

## Consent Agenda Items:

Hereafter, the timeline for approval of CEP letters will be Monday if there are no significant comments or requests to hold the letter. (Silence will be considered as consent.) If there are significant comments or a request to hold the letter, it will be on the consent agenda for Wednesday.

## Approved letters:

- o VPDUE re Transfer Student Admissions Request
- o AVC Sketo-Rosener re: students unqualified to declare major
- o Admissions Director re: Sociology
- o Admissions Director re: Delegation Policy (AP/IBH Exam) was changed from one semester to one year notice. Background: After the agenda was finalized, Chair Narayan was informed by the UCSC BOARS representative (a CAFA member) that a policy was under consideration to impose a rule on all campuses, so that there could be no change in the course requirements for transfer students to be admitted without at least two years notice. CEP Chair/CAFA Chair will write a response to BOARS stating that the proposed policy will inhibit UCSC from achieving the 2:1 ratio as imposed on the campus and request that the policy be changed to require a minimum of one year's notice, with local committees to decide when two-year notice should be required for adequate preparation by the transfer students.
- o Revised External Review Assignments accepted.

- Member Issues  
None raised at this meeting, but members are encouraged to email the Chair with any topics.

## **II. Online Course Policy**

IRAPS Director Julian Fernald provided a short presentation on online courses. Members discussed an appropriate policy for online courses -- e.g. the number of offerings per year that a department can sponsor -- if one is needed. This report was based on online introductory mathematics courses.

CEP membership is concerned on the effectiveness of teaching online courses, especially for introductory undergraduate courses. There is no cost savings associated with an online course as compared to a face-to-face class of the same size.

Director Fernald was requested by various individuals (Dean, Associate Dean, CEP Chair) to analyze regarding how well students performed in introductory mathematics courses compared to online classes. The presentation did not reveal any statistically significant differences between the outcomes for students in face-to-face or online classes in subsequent courses, even though there were noticeable differences in outcomes from one instance to another; this was because the number of students in the two groups that could be compared was small. One significant factor in the performance in the subsequent course was the grade in the prior course. There does not seem to be a selection bias for students in taking the online classes. Each UC campus offers different areas of the online lower division introductory courses

A CEP Representative shared that he was on the review team for the Mathematics Department three years ago. The team learned online courses accommodate different learning styles, and one of their concerns was that students would pass the class and not do well in their upper division courses. It's a technological advantage, engaging with the textbook, delivering examinations. Research shows that it's not cheaper, but allows for a different learning opportunity. The course content and instruction tools determine the lowering or raising of the standard by "flipping" the course and gained efficiency in the college courses.

Another representative shared that, based on a student survey from last year, many students do not prefer online courses, 46% didn't like, 40% indifferent, and 11% liked.

A CEP member raised her concerns about pedagogical issues like critical thinking and discussion for exclusively online classes.

Chair Narayan stated that based on the outcome data, the courses are comparable. He proposed that CEP should send a request to the Mathematics Department to pull back on online course offerings or break up the course offerings from solely online to in-class face to face so that students have the opportunity to take face-to-face courses, not have the entire curriculum online.

Members raised concerns with approval of online courses, but these follow a similar process already in place for review of new or revised courses. The syllabi list the homework assignments, hours per week, etc. The Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) welcomes input from CEP.

### **III. Double Counting of Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirements**

This is an example of two majors with the same DC requirement. If two majors have overlapping or identical DC requirements, i.e. a single course serves as part or all of the DC requirement for both majors (e.g. CMPE Computer Engineering and BENG Bioengineering), what should a student doing a double major be required to do?

Members discussed scenarios where a course has been approved by the CCI or CEP as the Disciplinary Communication (DC) course for two different majors, and a student is double-majoring in these. As long as a student fulfills the requirements of both majors and complies with SCR 10.4.7 (forty distinct credits per major), members found no reason why one course cannot serve as both DCs. While it is true that the DC requirement is also a Senate requirement, SCR 10.2.3.1.b only requires a student to have “instruction and substantial practice in modes of communication appropriate to their major.” Members determined it is quite possible for two related majors to have very similar modes of communication (as evidenced by our committee approving the same DC course for both during the general education requirements review in 2009), in which case a single course can teach how to communicate in both disciplines. CEP will send a letter to Registrar Sanger and copy advising. Students in such a situation should be permitted to use the same course towards both DC requirements as a matter of policy; individual petitions are not required.

### **IV. Senior comprehensive Requirement**

Last year, CEP agreed to propose legislation giving major programs the option of offering or dropping the senior comprehensive requirement, instead of requiring it for all programs. Members discussed if CEP should bring legislation to the Senate in the fall. Chair Narayan gave a brief history based on systemwide senate regulations SR 780; a Division can request a variance to their own grading system. UCSC had the narrative evaluation and senior comprehensive requirements; these were approved together by the systemwide assembly. Now that UCSC has letter grades in courses, it is not clear if the senior comprehensive is still required by the assembly, or if it is a requirement that can be changed locally.

Members expressed concerns that many senior exit requirements are tied to the DC general education requirement, requiring a significant change to the department. Another member expressed concern clarifying the definition: senior exit requirement, comprehensive requirement, thesis, capstone, and seminars.

Members want more discussion on this subject, as this is a big change there could be unintended consequences. Other recommendations were to request feedback from departments on what their requirement is and how it satisfies the undergraduate students experience for completion in their major. CEP will revisit this issue at a meeting in mid November.

### **V. Undergraduate Writing Curriculum: College Core and Composition Courses**

Members reviewed the proposal from Writing Program and Council of Provosts and various supplementary documents as well as background materials from the section of the 2016-17 CEP Annual Report. This is the first of a continuing discussion on the newly proposed undergraduate writing curriculum with resolution by the end of fall quarter. Chair Narayan provided an overview of the current status of the undergraduate writing curriculum courses. Last year CEP split the undergraduate writing curriculum proposal, removing writing from College Core and reducing the units to three and reducing some of the writing courses to three units too, to meet the proposed budget envelope.

Chair Narayan updated members on a meeting called by VPAA Lee during the summer for the Senate Chair and incoming chairs for CPB, CEP, and CPE with the Chairs of the Writing Program and the Council of Provosts to discuss a new proposal for College Core and composition courses that they were developing. Following this meeting, the committee Chairs sent their concerns to the Writing Program and CoP Chairs in the form of questions that they recommended should be addressed in the proposal. Chair Narayan sent a separate letter to the VPAA and the Writing Program and CoP chairs, with a timeline for the new proposal so that it could be reviewed by the Senate in time for 2018, and a request for an analysis by the administration about whether the proposal was within the budget envelope. Such an analysis was not provided with the present proposal.

#### Discussion concerns:

There will be changes with regard to AWPE score satisfaction and course enrollments. Students who enter UCSC will enroll under the following requirements:

- All students will take College 1
- Most students (~66%) will take a composition course (Writing 2) after completing College 1
- ELWR required students, and those with AWPE score of 7, will take an additional writing course (Writing 1) before the composition course (Writing 2).
- ESL students and international students with English as a second language will be enrolled in a Multilingual Curriculum (MLC) course concurrently with College 1. Then, they will take Writing 1 or Writing 1E before taking the composition course (Writing 2). Some ESL students who have relatively high AWPE scores place directly into Writing 1/1E before Writing 2

The Writing Program is collaborating with the Languages and Applied Linguistics Department (LAAL) on creating languages courses. The question of timeline and summer session offerings still remain.

In this proposal, the Colleges will offer 10 different thematic course proposals with the same learning outcomes, doing away the structural differences between the colleges. All colleges will conform to this new course structure.

There is concern with regard to the teaching opportunities Graduate Student Instructors (GSI) will have with increased section offerings if the courses are to be seated at 30 or less. It was clarified that GSIs will not be replacing current lecturers; in fact, there may be additional recruitments to meet the demand.