

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES

Wednesday, October 18, 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 Hagan (NTSF Rep.), 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).

Absent: Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.)

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton.

I. Announcements and Members Items

Chair Narayan provided an overview of an issue concerning a course: students were being failed in the class due to an incomplete assignment, even though this consequence was not stated in the syllabus. Members agreed that grading based on criteria not given in the course syllabus that is distributed at the beginning of the term should be grounds for a grievance. Some members were concerned whether a final grade should be based on the total body of work for the quarter, or if there could be disqualification under certain circumstances (stated in the syllabus). Members will discuss whether to create a policy in this regard later in the quarter.

Member Chuang gave an update on the Curricular Management Group: A vendor will be selected soon. He consulted with members on two questions:

1. Does CEP want to provide students the ability to see when classes will be offered during future quarters? for planning purposes?
2. Does CEP want to provide a history of past instructors? Some members expressed misgivings about these proposals. After some discussion, Chair Narayan tabled the conversation. The questions will be placed on a future agenda.

Letters from the Consent Agenda:

- CEP to Math Department Chair re Intro Math Courses will be discussed next week.
- CEP to Registrar re Double Counting Disciplinary Communication was approved.
- CEP to VPAA re FTE Transfer Request for Professor Robin Hunicke was approved with one addition.
- Minutes from 9/27 deferred until next week.

II. External Review Overview

Chair Narayan explained the process required for the external review of degree programs. CEP, CPB and GC review programs periodically as per schedule held by the VPAA's Office. For a pre-visit, or Stage 1, questions from the VPAA, the sponsoring Dean's Office and the three Senate committees are sent to the external review committee (ERC) members; CEP's purview is undergraduate education. After reviewing the department's documentation (which includes a self-study prepared by the faculty of the department) along with the supplemental questions, the ERC will produce a report with or without recommendations for the department to consider. After the report is received, the Dean and Department Chair are invited to respond. The VPAA contacts the Senate Office when the report and responses are ready for committee review; this is called Stage 2. Senate committees review the report and look to see if the committees' concerns have been addressed. For each stage of an external review, there will be a lead and second presenter; however, all members are required to read the materials

For Stage 1, the Lead and Second reviewer will work together to prepare supplemental questions and lead the discussion during the meeting. Documents to review: VPAA, Dean and Departmental Chair's questions, self-study, UCUES survey, PLO assessment and last ERC and closure report, and Program Statement. Only matters pertaining to undergraduate education should be considered.

For Stage 2, the Lead and Second will review the report, the department and divisional responses. It is also helpful to review the supplemental questions CEP sent in Stage 1. A list of issues to discuss at the closure meeting should be prepared; these could be issues not addressed in the ERC report, or concerns raised by the ERC and not adequately addressed by the department and division. The Lead CEP representative will attend the closure meeting to advocate for the undergraduates.

III. Undergraduate Writing Curriculum: College Core and Composition Courses

The Chair of the Writing Program Heather Shearer and Chair of Council of Provosts Elizabeth Abrams consulted with the committee on their proposal. After introductions, Chair Narayan opened up the discussion based on the questions sent earlier in the week.

Questions for the Writing Program Chair:

1) Comparing Table 1 in the proposal with the Approved C1 and C2 outcomes, one sees that the C1 and C2 approved outcomes map to Writing 1 and Writing 2 (Composition 1 & 2) respectively in Table 1. Will students with AWPE scores of 8 and 9, who receive C1 instruction at present, no longer do so?

Yes, we predict that, after the College 1 course, these students can complete the C2 outcomes in one course instead of two. A slightly higher retake rate for Writing 2 is assumed in the proposal. Reference Appendix C of the Academic Literacy proposal.

2) What are ELWR approved outcomes, and how do they map to the courses in Table 1? We would like to be sure that ELWR-required students will receive adequate instruction in what they need.

ELWR required students do receive adequate instructions, but there are no official outcomes established for ELWR. The Writing Program is creating a rubric based on AWPE outcomes and a mock up is presented in Table 1. The students should have reached these outcomes at the end of their high school year. The rubric represents criteria needed to be successful and the expectations for college writing.

3) Is it possible to have Honors section for proficient students in writing? Under our present system, we divide the ELWR-satisfied students into two groups, whereas the current proposal has only one.

Yes, Honors courses can be offered. The Council of Provosts would like to propose a full curriculum with an addition of a Writing 3 course. AWPE is not a good measure of students' university level writing proficiencies.

(In response to a member's follow-up question): 1.5% students are expected to take a community college course that is articulated to Writing 2, and will therefore be exempt from the requirement. 3% of the students are expected to take Writing 2 in the summer. Approximately 20% of our students are presently exempt from the C1 requirement, but this is based on AWPE scores; this will not happen under the present proposal. While it may be possible at a later date to include a path between A and B, for AWPE 11 and 12 students to take College 1 and not quite a full Writing 2 course, it would not be advisable to introduce this additional complication at the beginning for such a small group.

4) Will students with different levels of preparation be grouped together in teams in College 1? Will it be relevant for all our students?

Yes for some team tasks; for others, students in a team will have similar levels of preparation.

5) Why has the College 1 class size been reduced to 28 from 30 in the proposal reviewed in the spring?

28 students per section is better, but in the spring when the Writing Program and the colleges submitted separate proposals, budgetary constraints were behind the choice of 30 students per College 1 section. The combined proposal is within the budget envelope according to the VPAA, so this is not necessary.

6) How will students be assessed in College 1? Are the outcomes measurable? Why should one expect the retake rate to increase from 1.9% to 5%?

The students will be assessed with AACU Value Rubrics. In conversation through the Writing Program with IRAPS for assessment. The structural disincentive to fail students in the core course (because they have to repeat the course next fall, and because there is no budget to cover the costs of retakes) will be removed with College 1 sections offered in the winter. A culture for lecturers to give the full range of grades will have to be created.

7) How will instructor effectiveness be assessed?

Assessment of instructors will be using multiple methods – e.g. visiting instructor classes, course evaluation. CoP has a white paper on best practices for instructor evaluation. CITL has a paper on assessing instructors by means other than student evaluations.

Additional member questions and comments

- How do AWPE scores translate to placement in sections? (Answer: 10-12 in C2, 8-9 in C1)

- A high AWPE score does not really indicate readiness for C2.
- Will the lack of a GE designation for College 1 courses lead to opposition among some parts of the faculty? Since mainstream students will need two courses for College 1 + Writing 2, as is the case at present, this should not be a problem. ELWR-required students will need three courses, but everyone understands that the present system is not working for them. One member expressed the opinion that requiring a GE for these courses undermines our role as a liberal arts university.
- “Recursive” should not mean repetitive/boring.
- Engage with composition courses downstream to see what should be adjusted in writing courses; the same issues crop up repeatedly in downstream courses. Unfortunately, there are no resources to work with departments; there are some resources for assessment built into the proposal, but not across campus. Writing 1 and Writing 2 courses will have documented outcomes, which will be shared campus wide so that departments know what skills will be learned in Writing 2, and how the writing courses prepare students for their major DC courses. DC funding every year enables DC courses to be improved.

The proposal suggests that students who originally score “7” on the AWPE (a passing score of “4” and failing score of “3”) will be considered ELWR-Required. However, the systemwide process requires a third read for students who score a “7,” pushing them down to a “6” or up to an “8.” For students who were scored up to an “8,” messaging will be very important: they are deemed ELWR-Satisfied by the systemwide scoring process but ELWR-Required at the local level.

After the consultation ended, the committee discussion continued with recused members (Provosts’ Representative Carson, CCI Chair Aso, NSTF Representative Hagen, Member Ritola) excused.

Overall, members thought that the proposal was very good. The cooperation between the Writing Program and the colleges was appreciated.

One member asked if the proposal is really within the budget envelope, keeping in mind the VPAA’s comments about the funding for the MLC courses. Chair Narayan said that CPB is looking into this, and CEP will receive their analysis and recommendations.

There was concern about grade inflation and whether the assessment plan for College 1 would really be effective. Members noted that most of the students in the college core course get A’s and B’s, so that it is not just a reluctance to *fail* students. However, the committee was unable to come up with a better alternative. It was not clear who would conduct the assessments.

It was clarified that colleges will have to submit course proposals to CCI if the program is approved.

There was discussion about Senate faculty governance of College 1. The proposal asks that the Council of Provosts should be recognized as the faculty of all the colleges. Members felt that RJ&E should be asked to confirm if this is possible. If it is, while CEP can recommend that colleges vest oversight of College 1 in their executive committees, this should not be required. It was noted that the College 1 courses will be reviewed by the Writing Program external review committees.

V. Arts & Design: Game & Playable Media - Revised Charter

CEP reviewed the revised charter and bylaws for the AGPM program and appreciated that almost all our suggestions have been implemented from our previous review last year. If the 5:4 balance of the program faculty that we recommended was felt to not truly reflect the participation of the faculty, then a 4:4 split is reasonable. Members are still concerned with how tied votes will be resolved. Members would like to suggest alternate tie-break mechanisms; *e.g.* the Program Chair could have an additional vote in a tie, or the Program Chair could *not* vote except in a tie, or curricular proposals with tied votes could be sent forward for Senate review, but with a note about the result of the vote, or a tie could result in the status quo being retained. The letter will be placed on the consent agenda at next week's meeting.

VI. Language & Applied Linguistics (LAAL) External Review Deferral Request

The Language and Applied Linguistic Department is requesting deferral of their external review. As it turns out, many senior faculty are on leave during the time for the scheduled self-study review. While this is unfortunate, junior faculty will be supporting the curriculum until the department is at full capacity, and the request seems warranted. CEP is in favor of this request.