

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES

Wednesday, May 30, 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, Francis Nimmo, 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: Onuttom Narayan, Chair.

Guest: Associate Registrar Claxton, Kalin McGraw Preceptor Representative, Don Moonshine

I. Smart Catalog with Curriculum Management Team

Chair Pro-Tem Ritola called the meeting to order. Members consulted with the Curriculum Management Project team and reviewed the program statement structure presented in the mockup. The project team created the mockup based on feedback received by campus constituents. The mockup was based on the Mathematics Department. CEP members did not object to the design but desired changes with the ordering of the subheadings. Members found “Introduction and Policies” section misleading and requested changing this to “Information and Policies” instead.

The breakdown of major requirements was much easier to read and understand--each section can fold up and drop down, saving screen space for mobile devices. On the “Courses” page for lower-division and upper-division requirements in Math, members wanted to change the language “or these courses” (has to be pre-defined); instead use, “both of these courses” or “all of these courses.” Members also wanted the two-credit labs added here as well.

Outcome of Discussion: Committee members will review additional questions from the Curriculum Management team off-line and weigh in on the decisions that need to be made now.

Program Statement Organization Approved Now from Mock-up Required

1. Change “Introduction and Policies” to “Information and Policies.”
2. Re-order Subheadings in “Information and Policies”: Move “Advising” and “Recommendations for Prospective Majors” up so that it’s one of the first options students see; finalize the names of sections and the order at a later date.
3. Rename optional subheading “Catchall” to “Other Information,” or allow department to write in a subheading specific to their department.
4. For departments with multiple major or concentrations, either keep “Information and Policies” consistent (as in the Mathematics major) or allow different majors within the same program to list policies separately for each major (as in Psychology).
5. Include consistent policies (i.e., letter grade policy) subheadings across majors, even if the major does not have such a policy. This would be helpful for both advisors and students.

The Project Team is working with SmartCatalog on shared information between departments and how to track both at the same. This could impact the workload for the committee, but the Team has asked SmartCatalog to make it work.

II. Announcements & Members Items

Announcements: The VPDUE updated CEP on the transfer student admissions rate. This year UCSC has reached 50%, but the distribution is uneven across campus. UCSC will be able to reach the 2:1 mandated transfer ratio, but the Social Sciences Division will be impacted. The Council of Deans are meeting to discuss strategies.

Consent Agenda

- Minutes 05/09 and 05/16 were approved

III. Review Proposal for a B.S. Degree in Anthropology

The committee reviewed the proposed program that will require six-lower division courses in the Physical and Biological Sciences and Baskin School of Engineering Divisions. The Anthropology Department has proposed reducing the upper-division requirements by two courses and adding a required upper-division lab. Members reviewed the submitted documentation and the Committee on Planning and Budget's (CPB) recommendation.

While members are favorable toward the degree, some curricular issues are a concern and need to be addressed:

- There seems to be little connection between the lower-division and upper-division courses. While science majors may migrate to this program, members were unclear about why the lower-division science requirements are required for upper-division courses. Members would like to receive clarification from the department about the intellectual congruence between the lower-division and upper-division curricula.
- Members would also like the department to identify the course or courses that would create a clear pathway for students to develop their proficiencies in cultural, biological, or archaeological anthropology. In other words, what defined set of courses or pathways should students take that would differentiate the BA and BS degrees?
- Members are concerned about the five required courses in the major qualification policy with respect to resource impact and prerequisites. Additionally, five courses seems too high, and members are concerned about how these courses create conditions for student success in the major.
- Members also wondered why students must complete five upper-division Core courses across all subfields. Should students' courses focus less on breadth and more on depth related specifically to cultural, biological, or archaeological anthropology so that their courses are more focused on science-oriented anthropology courses?
- The learning outcomes for the BA and BS are almost identical, and there is concern about this, as the BS and BA should ask students to develop distinct proficiencies.

- How flexible is the BA and BS for students who want to move from one major to another? For instance, is there a pathway for students who begin in the BA and want to move in to the BS?
- The major requires an UD lab component, which is optional for the BA but not required. What are the potential resource implications of this requirement?
- The proposal states that the BS is a good option for nursing students, but when a member searched other programs, the upper-division courses required in BS do not match up with the courses required in other programs for students interested in nursing.
- Members did not see a concern for transfer students' pathway in the new major.

IV. Critical Race and Ethnic Studies (CRES) Program Three-Year Review

The VPAA has requested Senate review of the CRES program, per APU policy, after three years. Members reviewed the original proposal and the interim report. While the committee response is optional, members discussed the popularity of the major and its potential for growth if given additional FTE resources.

Discussion:

- Members agreed, after the onerous process of reviewing and discussing the program, that Central administration should provide additional FTE funding to support the program.
- CRES major electives should be advertised across interdisciplinary departments for clarity and visibility. The courses should be organized and visible for students.
- Pedagogically and programmatically, CEP agrees it is a good program that needs to be properly funded.
- Initially, over three years, eight course buyouts were released, but these releases have been used. The Humanities Dean has provided two course releases per year (starting in 2017-2018), but members were not sure if these course releases would be offered in perpetuity or if they are enough to support the program in developing an upper-division curriculum.
- To sustain the program, an assigned 100% FTE should be dedicated to CRES, since the initial search for a senior faculty member was unsuccessful. Members were uncertain why CRES was not allowed to conduct another search.
- Other options for supporting the program were discussed: Advocating and supporting an additional 50% FTE appointment or continue offering 2 course replacements per year until a permanent FTE is appointed.
- There was a lack of clarity on the challenges associated with cross-listed courses and what CRES can do to encourage other departments to offer more cross-listed courses with CRES.
- Members discussed the program's growth and its value: the major has grown to 56 declared/proposed this year; students are interested in learning of issues that matter to them; the program promotes a feeling of belonging to the campus community and allows student populations to participate in community building.
- Interest in the major is growing and should be interdisciplinary, with more departments beside Feminist Studies, contributing to the curriculum.

V. Antirequisites, Similar Courses, and Grade Improvement

Anti-requisites, which have not been enforceable even when they are listed in the catalog can now be enforced. Members reviewed the enclosed documents provided by Registrar Sanger, who has asked CEP to consider in which cases a student who fails one course of an anti-requisite pair should be allowed to take the other for grade improvement. The focus is about preventing enrollment of a course the student has already completed. The Registrar would like clarity on courses that students can retake for grade improvement but may be listed as not repeatable for credit between the two antirequisite courses.

Theses (courses) are the opposites of prerequisites. Someone who has taken Spanish 4 should not take Spanish 1 and receive credit. There are departments, such as Computer Science and Computer Engineering, that have applied antirequisites on at least one course to prevent enrollment and duplicate credit. The question that needs addressing for clarity is, when is a course repeatable for grade improvement? For example, CMPE 3 and CMPS 2 have not been determined to be equivalent and students cannot receive credit for both. Would a student be allowed to retake CMPS 2 for grade improvement if CMPE 3 was not passed?

Members agreed this would be for the Committee on Courses of Instruction to determine. CCI will create a form for departments to request antirequisite course additions as well as add this feature as a type of course approval in the new SmartCatalog system.

CEP will create the guidelines for CCI to determine if the courses are equivalent and by what percentage (e.g. 2/3 or 1/3). Pedagogical rationale would be required, and capacity should be addressed, in addition to any stakeholder issues.

CEP should send a letter to departments updating them on this type of credit prevention in the fall quarter.

VI: CLASS—Undergraduate Survey

CEP undergraduate representative Xu presented this survey at the spring Senate meeting and discussed with CEP members on actions items needing follow up in fall quarter.

Coastal Campus

- Coastal Campus commute impact on students (slide 8) impacted enrollment due to timing and access to transportation.
- The Coastal Campus does not provide dining options for students, lacks ample water fountains, and does not provide study space needed to balance the commute principle.
- Students also note their inability to meet with faculty after class due to bus schedules for getting back to the main campus.
- CEP should address scheduling issues and transportation for the Coastal Campus.

Course Availability and Enrollment

- Students are not able to enroll in the courses that they need (slides 13/14), and their overall abilities to enroll in preferred courses has reduced from last year, which is concerning to the committee.

- CEP would like next year's survey to include a question that asks students about bottleneck courses so that we have more specific information about which courses are most difficult for enrollment.
- Students also reported high frequencies of overcrowded classrooms.
- CEP should continue to address this issue, specifically with respect to bottleneck courses and enrollment management.

Online Courses

- Students reported on their experiences with online courses. Overall, students' satisfaction was highest in SOCY 173x and much lower in Math and Physics. CEP should address this issue in the future.
- For some online courses, students are required to buy access to ProctorU, a platform for completing exams and tests. Students did not report positive experiences with this platform, so CEP should investigate this program in the future.