

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES

Wednesday, May 2, 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.), Onuttom Narayan, (Chair), Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Tonya Ritola, Megan Thomas, Kim Van Le (Senate Analyst), Lauren Woo (SUA Rep.), Susanna Wrangell (Senate Analyst), Jessica Xu (SUA Rep.).

---

Absent: Suresh Lodha, Francis Nimmo.

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton, Kalin McGraw Preceptor Representative.

### **I. Announcements & Members Items**

*Consent Agenda: all approved*

- CEP to CAF re Entry Assignment or Exam Response
- Academic Calendar for 2018-2019

Announcements:

Chair Narayan reported on a meeting he had with the Biomolecular Engineering Chair. The department will be submitting a revised program statement. Next year, they expect to propose shortening the sequence of chemistry courses for their major.

The Mathematics Department has agreed to transfer major screening beginning in fall 2020.

### **II. CEP representation on Student Success Steering Committee**

Member Ritola reported on her experience as a CEP representative attending the SSSC meetings the entire academic year. The committee is still determining its charge and role with regard to student success initiatives. The predictive analytics software and the process for use and data collection is under review. Members would prefer to consult with AVPSS Padgett as needed in the future. Registrar Sanger, who is a member of CEP and SSSC, can report to CEP on SSSC items of interest to CEP.

### **III. BSOE Reshaping Proposal (TCDD)**

The transfer, consolidation, disestablishment and discontinuation of programs in a school is precedent setting for the Senate, this is the very first one of its kind. There are four topics for consideration from the School of Engineering Reshaping Proposal: the Proposal, FTE transfers, the establishment and disestablishment of academic units and administrative home changes. CEP will respond from the perspective of undergraduate education.

Because the proposal is long and complicated, Chair Narayan proposed a structure for CEP review, viewing the proposal in terms of its elements:

1. Moving existing departments: Computer Science (CS), Computer Engineering (CE) to create Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) and Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE).
2. The Technology Management Department is to be disestablished, and their graduate program discontinued.
3. CSE is to house the Computer Science, Network and Digital Technology, Technology and Information Management, and Computer Engineering majors. ECE is to house Electrical Engineering and Robotics majors.
4. The Applied Math and Statistics Department is to be disestablished.
5. Statistics is to be established as a new department. Applied Math is to be included in the new ECE Department.

*Discussion:*

1. Having three EE-CE-CS departments is anomalous (e.g. UC Berkeley has one very large department).
2. Members found the proposal did not articulate academic principles or aspects of educational mission(s) that have informed the restructuring of the school, and will request a revision of the proposal that makes those principles clear.
3. Disestablishment of Technology Management Department seems appropriate to CEP, but discontinuance of graduate program in Graduate Council's purview. All FTE transfers are in agreement.
4. Disestablishment of the AMS Department is unavoidable.
5. Members are concerned with the effect on the undergraduate math curriculum of including AM in ECE. This proposal is deeply unpopular with the affected faculty. Many departments rely on AM to provide these courses, and their loss could be a serious blow to the affected departments.
6. Establishment of a Statistics Department requires a full proposal. The mission is not clear, nor is there evidence that the faculty could support the curriculum. It seems unfair as AM is not being given the option to create their own department, even though both AM and Statistics currently have eight faculty.
7. The Registrar's Office may not be able to make the changes for the CMPE course code shared between the CSE and ECE Departments, with some courses in each department. We are informed by the Associate Registrar that it is impossible for courses in a single course code in AIS to report to two different departments.

8. FTE transfer proposals seem appropriate; CEP will defer to the Committees on Academic Personnel and Privilege and Tenure.
9. Members would like to point out that the process does not seem to proceed as outlined in the APU, which suggests two years to review and complete a TCDD. It is not clear that the BSOE faculty were given enough time to respond; allowing for only two weeks for Senate committee review is insufficient for complete deliberation of issues.

Members will work on the consultation process off-line on the google doc.

#### **IV. SAP Stage 1: Campus Landscape Analysis**

CEP members reviewed the first report from the Strategic Academic Plan: Campus Landscape Analysis. Members have the option to review other Senate committee responses before discussion. CEP wanted to spend our time on things of more importance and endorse P&T's letter. Members agreed the document is flawed in many ways, and there is no evidence of any impact of prior SAP feedback. Members endorse and support other senate committee responses.

#### **V. Computer Engineering Major Preparation Criteria**

The Computer Engineering Department had questioned CEP's earlier decision to change its major prep criteria for the computer engineering major, digital network and technology major and the robotics majors to match the corresponding major qualification criteria but – consistent with the practice for other programs – without limiting students to one failing grade in qualification courses. RJ&E has responded about CEP's authority, and IRAPS has provided data on Computer Engineering transfer student performance. The committee discussed whether to change its earlier decision and if a consultation with the department is warranted. CEP will send a response and invitation to the department, and attach the RJ&E response as well as the IRAPS analysis.

#### **VI. Reviewing Major Qualification Policies**

The committee continued its earlier discussion.

Summary so far:

Category I: Required completion of one course: reasonable but review waitlists, long chains of prerequisites, entry quiz and offerings per year. Request a report that determines the common quarter most students complete the requirement and analyzes the barriers.

Category II: Require completion of courses, with no more than one failing grade: there must be justification to defend the requirement. CEP should examine students who are borderline cases and their success rate in the major. For example, if only one failing grade is allowed, how does the graduation rate of students in the major who have failed one major qualification course compare to campus averages? All questions for Category I are also relevant here.

The committee agreed to extend the review method for Category II to Category III (programs that require completion of certain courses, perhaps with no more than one failing grade, with a certain GPA.) It moved on the Category IV: programs which provide a large set of courses, from which a student has to complete a minimum subset, but the GPA is calculated in all major qualification courses. This may be a disincentive to transfer students who obtain the required GPA, to take more major qualification courses and jeopardize their GPA. For students who do *not* meet the required GPA, it encourages them to keep taking courses and hope that they will improve.

A broader discussion about major qualification policies ensued:

- Instituting an arbitrary GPA is a serious problem; such requirements have to be well justified. Approximately 1,500 undergraduate students do not declare a major by the declaration deadline.
- Members would like to bring this discussion to a Senate meeting for awareness
- Should a department with demanding MQC let the student know early on they will not be able to complete the major? Advisors currently struggle with this issue, students are not always willing to change majors.
- CEP members would like to follow up with IRAPS and the VPDUE for data on students who do well in the major with one failed major qualification course
- For the School of Engineering, after disqualification policies were moved to major qualification policies, transfer students successfully completing the program jumped from 60% to 80%
- All majors should have a clear and short appeals process.
- It would be unwise to insist that all MQPs should be the same type, e.g. no GPA requirements are allowed. However, departments with demanding requirements should be asked to point out a way for the student to graduate in a related major.

CEP will continue this discussion at a future meeting.