

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES

Wednesday, December 6, 2017
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Jeff Bury, Noriko Aso (CCI Chair, *ex-officio*), Burcu Birol (SUA Rep.), 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, Nina Treadwell (via Zoom), Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

Absent: Rob Wilson, Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst).

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton.

I. Announcements & Members Items

Consent Agenda

The following response was approved as well as the minutes for November 1, 8, 15, 2017.

- CEP to VPDUE Removing Enrollment Bar Notation on Undergraduate Transcripts

UCEP meeting debrief:

The ILTI unit advocated for online courses for our mathematics series and a language series from UC Davis. After further thought the online language courses could benefit our students who struggle to find classes in Portuguese and Arabic. Most are taught as small sections using Zoom and are successful. Joining campus-wide expertise and sharing resources creates a systemwide benefit of assets.

SEC Meeting Debrief:

Entangled Solutions consultants visited the committee and asked questions about structural barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration. SEC responded saying the process is limited by Deans who have the authority to hold these up, keeping hard boundaries with regard to resources and teaching workload.

The Chair apprised members on future agenda items sent to CEP by the administration:

- Computer Science Department Impaction Request
- Impaction Policy for Departments
- German Studies Suspension
- A proposal for a degree in Environmental Sciences

II. Proposed Structure of Program Statements in Catalog

The Curriculum Management Group introduced themselves; Don Moonshine, Kiska Blupo and Andrea Gilovitch joined CEP to review the templates developed with the Senate for the new campus catalog structure. Members reviewed the sample program statements for undergraduate degree programs.

Discussion:

Members reviewed two samples. One had a department page with links to all the majors and their requirements, but with the policies and requirements common to all majors on the main departmental page. The other had a brief description of the department on the departmental page, with links leading to

a self-contained description for each major; common material was repeated. Some departments may not have a common item or area, making standardization difficult. Members favored the second template, which helps students see what they need to do for completion of the degree.

The information will be entered into a form that has a defined order of criteria, e.g. program description, etc. All changes made to the program statement will be tracked by the system; courses that are listed will also have a pop up or other alert for required prerequisites to help students plan their degree pathways. CEP will use the draft templates provided by the Curriculum Management Group during program statement review in the winter term, to see if any changes are needed before the templates are finalized.

CEP members asked about AIS keeping track of anti-requisites. An anti-requisite is a course that, once completed, prevents a student from enrolling in another (very similar) course. The Registrar's Office is working on this process within AIS, but no solution has been found yet. Members would also like the program statements to have anchors, which can be helpful with out of date information, and departments would link to the appropriate section for information.

Program Statement Summary:

- Members would like all degrees listed, with links to any 4+1 programs
- Program statement templates will have section headers and flow in a sequence “of events”
- Members should think about the order, content and structure of the templates when reviewing program statements during winter quarter
- Members should consider the proposed section headers during review of their program statement assignments
- The primary ordering of program statements will be Division → Department → Academic Program, but alternative arrangements (e.g. all degrees arranged alphabetically) may also be provided.
- Academic programs can be degree programs, minors, other non-degree programs (e.g. some language programs), and programs like Religious Studies which do not have specific courses associated with them, but are more of a marketing element in the catalog.
- Academic Advisement reports: combined major requirements, major and minor requirements should be clear.

III. Overview of Program Statement Review Process

Chair Narayan walked members through the online course approval system (OCA) and the process for reviewing and commenting in the OCA. Seven program statements will be reviewed each week in the winter term. Each program statement has a lead reviewer and a second. The lead will review the whole statement as well as compare the admissions and major transfer screening criteria with the Admissions Office information on their website. The second reviewer will just review the track changes in the program statements.

Chair Narayan briefly showed members how to review the program statements using the UCSC Cruz blue password. Members will find both course approvals and program statements in the database, CEP members need to only focus on program statements. Other members did find it helpful to review courses that were proposed in the program statement if available for review in the OCA during the initial review

of their assignments. Members will use the search tool, to view items in the senate queue and view all to see all submitted program statements. Members will review the following submitted documents: checklist, cover letter, supporting documentation if provided, draft program statement. Go to the Comments Tab and change the disposition and leave a comment for approval or concerns with the changes. Make your comments public. Moving to this new style of reviewing program statements, the expectation is to allow more time for a thorough analysis, checking for discrepancies, comparing the new template to see if this department's sample will fit into the proposed structure as a planning tool for next year.

IV. CCI Issues

The Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) would like clarity with regard to syllabus content. Many faculty do not break down the required 15 hours of work per week for student expectations. CCI has been requesting this information in an updated syllabus in order to assess the course rigor and academic content. Students are expected to work 15 hours per week for a five credit course.

Discussion:

Members would like to improve the form with regard to tracking course impaction and with the new system coming on line in the next couple of years, adopting new language now is an opportunity to improve the review process.

Suggested additions to the form:

- Add a question on impaction
- Learning objectives should link to at least one program learning outcome
- Changing question language to be neutral with assessment of online course requests.
- Syllabus: student hour break down concerning the class assignments required to meet 15 hours per week. While some members and committee representatives did not see the need for this, it has proved useful for CCI when approving courses. Recently, an instructor had a 5-credit workload for a 3-credit class.
- Some members suggested it was most useful for an instructor to state the percentage of the grade individual assignments receive (e.g., : final, midterm, reading, writing or quizzes).
- CEP Members supported retention of an approval form request to have syllabi indicate an expectation of 15 hours/week or 150 hours/quarter for student work. It was also suggested that instructors might be asked to break down their expectations for a course that had fewer than five credits.

For the present, CCI will retain current approval form language regarding credit hours but will not request revised syllabi so long as the instructor has explicitly noted the general expectation of 15 hours/week.

Summary:

CEP members will review the course approval forms via Google Docs. Suggestions may be added in. Any other feedback should be sent to the CCI Chair Noriko Aso.

V. External Review for Chemistry Stage 1 Supplemental Questions for the Charge

Members discussed the department and have the following draft questions which will be finalized and condensed after the meeting and sent to the division as an addition for the external review committee charge.

1. The UCUES Survey Results show a substantial drop since 2010 in student satisfaction with regards to availability of courses needed for graduation, the quality of instruction and the quality of courses, and opportunities for research experience.
2. What is the ERC's opinion about the feasibility of articulating individual courses in the Chem 1ABC sequence to community college courses, instead of the current practice of articulating them as a block to one year of general chemistry courses?
3. Organic chemistry is identified as being at teaching capacity. Are there alternatives to Saturday labs that may help alleviate congestion? The last ERC described a review of the organic chemistry curriculum, after which there were changes to the curriculum. Now that the changes have been in place for a few years, how have majors and non-majors been affected? How has it affected space requirements, instructors, department staff, and resources?
4. Are the current student times to degree acceptable? If not, what are the bottlenecks to graduation? Is the senior capstone experience meaningful and enriching, and can it be improved?
5. BA vs BS demographics: Women are about 40% of majors in the BS streams (both Chem and BMB), but make up 53% of the BA degrees. Are there reasons for the discrepancy, and can the ERC suggest ways to improve these numbers?

VI. Strategic Academic Planning

IAVPAA Berger has requested that the relevant Senate committees provide feedback: identifying strategies for resource generation and pinpointing internal structural barriers to research and teaching. This information will be utilized in academic strategic planning, and in collaboration with the Entangled Solutions consultants.

Members have expressed concerns with this consulting firm and are concerned there will not be enough time to make sound decisions. Chair Narayan informed members that the administration will be working with the consultants and that it is a working document that relies on input from the campus community as a whole. There is concern that the Senate is not getting sufficient opportunity to provide input and recommendations; this is considered the first in the series of reviews and comments.

- Members will express the need for sufficient lead time to review and comment.
- For a thoughtful and meaningful review, efficient time is needed and could require more than two weeks.
- After the plan has Senate comments, the Senate should review the final draft before implementation. If the Senate committee changes are incorporated then the process should not take long.
- The Senate has purview over curricula and courses.

Members were asked what barriers there are with resources for undergraduate education. Enrollment and classroom space issues are large barriers, but undergraduate education also brings in student fees, lecturers, professional fees, and more start-up funds. Members would like a full accounting of available resources and not discount undergraduate education.

Members would like to see better management of the resources for graduate growth, as the money is not being put back into departments. Faculty must use grant money to support graduate students. Overall, better management of resources for all undergraduates, graduates, and departments is needed. There is an imbalance with teaching labor in the divisions as well as other criteria to consider.

Members will place their concerns in a draft Google Doc over the break so that a response to the Senate Chair can be sent in early winter quarter, as requested.