

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTESWednesday, April 18, 2018  
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 Hagen (NTSF Rep.), Suresh Lodha, Onuttom Narayan, (Chair), Francis Nimmo, Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Tonya Ritola, Megan Thomas, Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

---

Absent: None.

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton, Kalin McGraw Preceptor Representative, Don Moonshine, Kischka Bluspiro, Andrea Gilovich.

**I. Announcements & Members Items**

*Consent Agenda Items were approved.*

- Program statement letters to Biomolecular Engineering, Music, Spanish Studies, Applied Linguistics and Multilingualism.
- Program statement letters to Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, Computational Media, Economics, Sociology, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.
- CEP response to the Economics Accounting Concentration, OPERS PE Courses, Waiver for the 180 Credit Requirement, and SR 542.
- Letter to departments concerning 2:1 Transfers from VPDUE Hughey will have CEP's endorsement.
- Minutes for 4/4/18 were approved.

Announcements:

UNEX policy draft was approved and will be sent to CCI and GC for review.

The VPDUE is proposing a local exchange program; UCEAP/UCIE approve a partner university; all the courses count for credit as a UC course.

**II. SmartCatalog Program Statements**

Curriculum Management Project Manager Don Moonshine and his staff have prepared four mockups for the Committee to consider:

- The first mockup is the most verbose; i.e., has the most repeated information.
- The second mockup pulls out much of the common information into a separate page, which dramatically reduces the size of the page for each major.

- The third mockup merges all the concentrations into a single page for the undergraduate major. This organization is the most economical of the mockups.
- The fourth mockup uses tabs at the top level of a program, which offers a different visual and navigational model.

There were also two mockups in HTML versions for review.

Summary:

Option 1: Overall landing page for departments with all the degrees, bread crumbs useful for path. Interdisciplinary programs such as Environmental Sciences could be listed by multiple departments, regardless of the department where the program is housed. Student representatives like the tabs so that navigation is easier. Mobile interfaces may not use this option much. The section, Undergraduate Review, lists all undergraduate majors, but the Graduate section will be determined by Graduate Council. If a left bar option is removed, tabs would be placed at the top, or instead of a sidebar, the navigation would be by breadcrumbs at the top. The Smart Catalog staff do not recommend using tabs due to the delay with large file downloads.

Option 2: Academic programs have information on the department at the top level. If one clicks on the undergraduate program, the next level shows each major (links) hosted by that department and related majors students maybe interested in. Each major link would list the requirements for the degree, including courses, AP credit, enrollment requirements, MQP policies, etc. Updating would have to be by departmental staff and is critical for all majors and non-majors. The section should be on the primary page for the department or program.

Planners:

SmartCatalog is discouraging the use of a planner with a grid. The planner example provided is in a linear format. CEP members unanimously supported grid planners. The Registrar's Office will report back on the outcome of adding the planners with grids at a future meeting.

### **III. Continue Review of Major Qualification Policies- moved to a future meeting**

### **IV. Review Responses from Departments to CEP regarding Program Statements**

**Literature:**

- More clarity about what each concentration requires. General Literature is itself a concentration, but requirements for the other concentrations can build off it.

**Cognitive Studies:**

- Approved

**Italian Studies:**

- Deferred until 4/25

### **V. Policy regarding review of online courses**

The CEP subcommittee presented their draft policy to members after researching system wide policies and other universities across the country. During the overview, it was noted that UCSC has a more permissive policy than some of the other UC campuses. CCI does have a mechanism for reviewing online courses and the policy will provide campus guidance to departments. All agreed for online courses an experienced well trained Graduate Student TA is required. Members all agreed no more than 50% of course offerings should be online for any major or program.

### **Discussion**

- Let students know up front that it's an online class. Faculty want undergraduates to be aware they're signing up for an online version of the class. Identifying and tracking by section number is an option.
- Difference between online and distance learning should be clarified in the policy. Fully online courses defined as those in which the students have less than one hour of in-person interaction with the instructor.
- Add footnote to compare with UCLA policy.
- Limiting online courses for students should be justified, but this is only being recommended for courses required for a major, and requests can be made for waivers.
- Discuss the underlying principles. Provide protection for undergraduate teaching and provide clarity. Emphasis should be put on the shared value of offering an online class; delivery mechanism of online courses can be more like a textbook; missing the feedback from mortar and brick course interactions.
- Chair Aso and CCI will review assessment questions.
- Proctoring remains an important question.
- Student evaluation:
  - What aspect of the online course was most/least effective, Lecture format, etc.?
  - Were you forced or chose to take the course?