

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES

Wednesday, October 4, 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), 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: Francis Nimmo.

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton, IRAPS Director Fernald, Curriculum Management Group Manager Don Moonshine.

I. Announcements

This was the first committee meeting with our representatives. Chair Narayan called for introductions before starting the meeting.

UCEP Meeting Debrief:

- UC-wide representatives discussed concerns with the 2:1 ratio with regard to transfer students.

The following consent agenda items were approved:

- CEP to VPDUE Hughey on Meeting Consultations
- CEP to VPSS Response to CEP Representation
- CEP to Departments re: Transfer Student Curricular Review
- Sub-committee assignments for program statements
- CEP Delegation policy was approved with a memo on the AP/IBH Chart clarification to be sent to the Admissions Director.

The following were not approved:

- CEP to Associate VPAA and VC BAS re: Kresge Project, pulled for language change consideration. Members will have until Friday to review and approve.
- External Review Assignments will be reconfigured for our October 18 meeting.

Chair Narayan briefly touched on approval of correspondence. If members cannot approve, a request to remove it from the consent agenda must be stated before approval. The item will be reviewed during the meeting, time permitting, or will be moved to our next agenda. When members are assigned drafts, these should be sent to the analyst by Friday for committee review and approval by Monday.

Chair Narayan requested a volunteer to work on the College Scholars (former Honors Program) in a sub-committee with a CAFA member. CEP Member Chuang will work on this sub-committee and will update the committee regularly.

II. Major Qualification Policies (MQP)

Chair Narayan gave a brief background account of past CEP approval of various MQP policies. CEP will now need to review the criteria for the data request from IRAPS that departments can submit for renewal or changes to current policies.

CEP invited the IRAPS Director, Julian Fernald, to present data on major qualification criteria with scenarios for one major with their current MQP and a proposed MQ Policy. From the data, it was seen that a significant fraction of the students (approximately 15%) who meet the current MQP and graduate in 4 years would be disqualified under the proposed MQP. At the same time, it was seen that only 30% of the students who meet the current MQ criteria but not the proposed criteria complete a degree in the same major in the same academic division, compared to 70% of the students who meet the proposed criteria. A balance between not excluding students who can complete a major and redirecting students who will not complete the major early in their career is needed.

Chair Narayan mentioned that this kind of analysis is possible when a department proposes to make its MQ criteria more strict; one can study how well students who would be excluded by the proposed policy would succeed in the major. But to see if an existing MQ policy should be loosened, one has to ask whether students who are being excluded would have succeeded in the major. This is difficult to do, except by extrapolation. For example, if a major has a GPA cutoff of 2.8, and most students with the minimum GPA graduate in the major, it would be reasonable to lower the cutoff slightly. One member pointed out that the same question could be asked about the number of courses that have to be completed, not just the GPA required.

The issue of what data departments should be asked to provide when their major qualification criteria are reviewed and what IRAPS can provide needs further consideration. A member will be assigned to work with IRAPS and bring the matter back to CEP.

III. Review Draft Letter to VPDUE re Transfer Students Admission Request

Members reviewed the draft letter, and it will be approved for transmittal next week.

IV. Curriculum Management Project

Member Chuang is the CEP liaison with the Curriculum Management Project and will provide updates on a regular basis for committee review and comment on any concerns with regard to the overhaul of the campus general catalog for 2019.

Project Manager Don Moonshine provided proposed standard titles for sections of the catalog to be used from 2018 onwards, bringing consistency for easy searching and standardization. From 2019, the program statements will have a defined order template with flexibility built in for departments to add in

other parts that don't fit under the proposed standard titles. The sequencing and how the layout will look will be determined later in the process. Standardization for review helps with sorting, searching and clarity when reviewing the catalog online.

V. Class Sizes in Introductory Math Courses

Members reviewed the report on data for class sizes in introductory math courses at UCSC and at other UC campuses. The report was based on surveying practices at other UC campuses and interviewing the department chair or undergraduate director at several campuses.

Recommendations from the Report:

Recommendation 1: Discussion section of 30 students with one hour per week meeting. Periodic quizzes in the discussion section. The UC Davis innovation of a Calculus Room should be looked into.

Recommendation 2: Keep face-to-face lecture size to 100-150 students. Analyze the resource availability and financial viability in collaboration with CPB.

Recommendation 3: Examine whether the uneven class size in these courses is appropriate. Consider making preparatory courses in large lectures or online, supplemented by active learning tutoring resources for the students to come up to speed.

Recommendation 4: When they can be offered, keep lecture size to 30 students for advanced and honors level lower-division mathematics courses.

Some members expressed concern that the argument for small class sizes is not complete, due to lack of data showing poorer teaching or learning outcomes for large class sizes. Chair Narayan said that the discussion would be continued at the next meeting, when the online introductory math courses would be discussed.

VI. Policy Regarding Students who are Found Unqualified to Declare a Major

Members held a discussion on how departmental and college advisors should proceed with students who have a proposed major but have failed to meet the qualification criteria; have been notified about this fact and the deadline to appeal; and have either not appealed by the deadline or have had their appeal denied. While the campus has established procedures for students who fail to declare their major by the campus declaration deadline, students can become ineligible to declare their proposed major much earlier. In such cases, it is desirable for the student and the university to plan for a different major as soon as possible.

CEP's understanding is that, in such a situation, after the appeal is denied or overdue, students are asked by the departmental and/or college advisors to meet with them and draw up an academic plan for a different major. If students follow this plan, they are designated as proposed in their new major. If students are sent this notice and fail to set up an appointment to create a new academic plan in a reasonable time, CEP believes that it is appropriate for advisors to change their status to undeclared.

When CEP sends their response to this request, we will clarify that this is not a new requirement for college or departmental advisors, but an option. CEP will invite the advising community to determine what “a reasonable time” would be to give a student enough time to take necessary action with the desirability of setting them on a new path to declare a new (different) major in time.

VII. Student Survey re: College Core Courses Cancelled.

Committee on Educational Policy, 2017 - 18