

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017  
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Noriko Aso (CCI Chair, ex-officio), Jeff Bury, 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).

Absent: Ben Carson (Provost Rep.), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton.

### **I. Announcements**

Chair Narayan conducted introductions and reviewed orientation documentation. He defined CEP's plenary authority and process, and stated that despite CEP's plenary authority, the committee should consider referring big issues to the Senate.

### **II. Chairs Orientation to CEP Business**

Chair Narayan provided an overview of member responsibilities and procedures for conducting CEP business. CEP will follow a softer recusal policy and would like to consult with conflicted members prior to the discussion, but members will not be present during the final deliberation of the item.

The meeting content and discussions are confidential. Caution should be exercised when seeking outside opinions about an issue being considered by the committee, keeping in mind the possibility of it being misinterpreted. Comments in passing during a committee discussion that are not being considered by the committee should not be divulged. Members should not attribute outside the meeting any comments to specific committee members or invited guests.

Chair Narayan addressed access for members, guests and representatives. All will have access to agendas, materials and draft letters (for representatives and guests, this is to review for any technical facts or issues), but the content of the response will only contain that of the voting members.

Members briefly reviewed the Consultation Procedures and held a discussion on how CEP will use a consent agenda for approval of items that don't require discussion. Any member who disagrees with approval should request pulling the item off the consent agenda for discussion. The item may be discussed or moved to another agenda, time permitting, or maybe sent out via email group for approval.

Representatives do not have access to the OCA system. Program statements for discussion at a weekly meeting will be put in the agenda folder.

### **III. Guest Guidelines**

CEP has a precedent for extending standing guest invitations based on their area of expertise.

A member suggested inviting the Director of Admissions and VPDUE Hughey. Chair noted there is some fluidity over at the Admissions Office, and CEP can consult with the VPDUE Hughey depending on the topics.

**Action**

Members reviewed the guest list and will extend the following invitations: Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education and Global Engagement will be invited to consult with CEP depending on topics. The CEP Chair will meet monthly with VPDUE Hughey and update the committee on any pressing issues.

Associate Registrar Claxton will be a standing guest for the academic year.

Preceptor Representative will be invited during winter quarter as a standing guest.

Articulation Officer will be invited by topic as as needed during program statement review.

**IV. Policy for students who become ineligible to declare their proposed majors**

Moved to a future meeting due to lack of time.

**V. Systemwide Review to Revisions for SR 424.A.3**

Moved to a future meeting due to lack of time.

**VI. Kresge Project**

The Chair introduced members to the concern surrounding the Kresge project meeting (held during the summer) and the addition of the proposed 600 seat classroom, with an anticipated completion date of 2022. Members were apprised of pedagogical concerns teaching a class of this size. Members agreed the campus needs more smaller classes for discussion sections. CEP reviewed data that was presented and the campus need is for intermediate size rooms between 150-200 seats. CEP is categorically opposed to any reduction of the number of classrooms; small classroom should be protected; and medium size rooms should be in the range of 200 seats. Various members shared strong concern about the trade off for small and medium size classroom space compared to the proposed larger size classes.

**Action**

CEP will draft a letter to IAVPAA Berger and VCBAS Latham requesting broader consultation with regard to classroom space. CEP agreed Senate consultation should include the Committees on Educational Policy, Teaching and Graduate Council with the Committee on Planning and Budget. CEP defers expertise in pedagogy at the departmental level with the greatest expertise in their disciplines and should request comment. One member requested reviewing the plan or analysis behind this classroom configuration being considered for the re-design of Kresge College. It was agreed that the letter would invite the IAVPAA and VCBAS to provide CEP to provide such a plan or analysis if it exists.

**VII. Transfer Major Screening**

The CEP Chair informed members that the State Legislature will withhold \$50 million from the UC systemwide budget if each campus does not enroll at least one California transfer student for every two California resident frosh each year. This is called the 2:1 transfer enrollment goal. Systemwide, UC has reached this goal; a few campuses including UCSC have not been able to reach this ratio, while others

have exceeded this ratio. A cap on transfer admissions at each campus, imposed systemwide, may be required to enable the campuses that have not reached 2:1 to do so.

During the summer, VPDUE Hughey sent out a letter to some departments with screening majors (those which have major preparation criteria for transfer student admission) requesting that they change their major preparation criteria, which CEP has purview over. A member noted there are large differences between the Divisions with respect to progress towards 2:1, and does not understand an administrative review of the specific departments that the VPDUE wrote to. There was a discussion of winter admits for transfer students and declaration of the major at the time of entering UCSC. With some majors, there are courses required by a department, but these may not articulate and the student must take the course after enrolling in fall quarter. If the student does not pass, then they may have to wait until the next fall when the course is being offered. This can delay declaration of the major as well as progress through the major.

#### **Action**

CEP reviewed the request to the Sociology Department and agrees with the changes for their major preparation criteria that the department consented to. The Chair proposed writing a letter to all departments regarding winter admits for transfer students.

CEP will ask for the following tasks from Departments when preparing program statements:

- Provide course criteria students must have completed before coming to UCSC in fall quarter to guarantee graduation in 2 years;
- Check the UC transfer pathway for the department's majors;
- Examine curriculum to see what courses transfers would need to have completed by the end of fall quarter to be admitted in the winter; and
- For both fall and winter admissions, consider criteria for transfers who satisfy major preparation requirements to be declared in the major instead of as proposed majors.

#### **VIII. Invitation from VPSS Jaye Padgett**

Vice Provost for Student Success Jaye Padgett has invited CEP to send a representative to the Student Success Steering Committee. Members agreed that a representative should be sent to keep the committee membership apprised of issues of interest to CEP, such as the software for student retention and advising. The CEP representative for the fall is Member Ritola and Member Treadwell for winter and spring.

#### **IX. Request from a professor regarding final examination**

One instructor has requested CEP permission to have a final paper due during finals week but before the scheduled final exam. CEP has been reluctant to approve these changes due to impact on students who have Monday finals; students could possibly have up to 3 exams on this day.

#### **Action**

CEP members appreciated the instructor conscientiously submitting her request and the issues she raised for TAs grading undergraduate work while having their own coursework due. Members realize that,

with increasing enrollments, this issue puts pressure on TAs. However, the request could not be approved because many courses are affected by the same issues raised here.

**X. CEP/Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) Interface**

CEP Chair Narayan introduced CCI Chair Aso, who is a member of CEP and will bring any policy issues with courses to CEP for review and guidance. Chair noted that CEP sets policy, CCI implements policy. Examples included each committee's role in general education courses, disciplinary communication, and policy for major requirements. The CCI Chair noted her role in raising questions from CCI about CEP intent when the application of policy is unclear. One issue for which CCI would like a clarification from CEP was how specific the requirements in course approval forms for course syllabi are, e.g. the weekly breakdown of course work hours.

A member raised his concern about the course approval forms, where he felt that there are gaps in the information a department should provide. He would like CEP to review these at a future meeting.

**Action**

Member Lodha will work with CCI Chair and Analyst to provide concrete suggestions for course approval forms. For the questions in the course approval form for which a clarification from CEP is needed, CCI will provide examples of the range of answers faculty submit. CEP will review sometime in early November.

**XI. CEP Senior Comprehensive/Exit Requirement SC Chapter 8**

Moved to a future meeting due to lack of time.