

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

MINUTES

Wednesday, October 17, 2018

10:40 a.m.-1:10 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307

Present: Noriko Aso (CCI Chair, ex-officio), Needhi Bhalla, Elisabeth Cameron, Manel Camps (Provost Rep.), Bruce Cooperstein, Noah Finnegan, Joy Hagen (NSTF Representative), Rebecca Hurdis (Senate Analyst), Dongwook Lee, Matthew Mednick (ASO Director), Onuttom Narayan, (Chair), Tchad Sanger (University Registrar, ex-officio), Megan Thomas, Lauren Woo (SUA Rep).

Guests: Preceptor's Representative Emily Burt, Deputy Registrar Margie Claxton, Associate Registrar Kalin McGraw.

Absent: Micah Perks

I. Announcements

The following consent agenda items were approved:

- Minutes for 10/10/18
- Letter to VPDUE re transfer students changing majors
- Legislation to be put forward to the Senate regarding add deadline
- Draft policy regarding changing major requirements

Chair Narayan discussed with the committee that the "Grade Option Changes and Letter Grade Requirement" policy will most likely come back to the committee as some divisions are initially objecting to not being able to require letter grades for graduate courses.

Chair informed the committee of a change in meeting location next week in case the impending strike restricts main campus access.

II. Courses with Two General Education Designations

In 2015, as a pilot study CEP authorized a limited number of courses to carry 2 GE (General Education) designations (one being the default, the second available to students as an alternative, by petition). There was no follow up to this pilot. There has been a request for CEP to consider two courses to carry 2 GE designations. Member Cameron recused themselves from the discussion.

Chair Narayan and the Registrar spoke about the former GE system, where courses were able to have multiple GE designations but it was believed that students were taking advantage of this and ultimately not having a broader GE experience. The 2010 GE revised system intended students to have areas of knowledge rather than by disciplines. However, many of the GE descriptions are subtle in distinction that is not always apparent to students. This results in CCI reviewing many student petitions requesting a GE change. CCI Chair Aso expressed that while CCI members follow the GE guidelines, interpretations can vary over time and which courses get below the line multiple GEs and which don't is fairly arbitrary since it is driven by petition. Chair Aso asked that if the current system is maintained it would be helpful if CEP could create a standard process of review.

Currently, many departments are developing courses that satisfy the GE requirements so that students are able to take their GE requirements in the department of their proposed/declared major. The discussion turned to contemplating strategies for providing more opportunities for students to expand their breadth of knowledge and educational experience. UCSC is unique in that the majority of the courses are 5 credits (opposed to other UC's where the standard is 4 credits) and thus, it limits the availability to take other courses. Additionally some majors have demanding major requirements, which leave very little time for students to take other courses. Members suggested that creating smaller credit (2/3/4) courses could support enrichment and breadth as well as help earn credits toward graduation. One of the fundamental questions that the committee contemplated was: is there a desire by students to take a variety of classes or has that receded in the pursuit of multiple majors/minors?

Additionally, the question of transfer students arose, when it was asked how GE's are awarded from community colleges. Articulated courses carry the same GE credit as the UCSC course to which they are articulated. CEP may have delegated authority to approve GE credits for other courses to the Office of Admissions many years back, but such delegations are supposed to be reviewed annually under Divisional Bylaw 13.17.10. The Chair will follow up and report back to the committee.

More generally, many committee members were concerned about the decisions being made by and for transfer students, in particular because Assist has not been updated for 3 years. The undergraduate rep said that when there are transfer students come from another UC campus, their courses do not show up in assist and do not necessarily articulate to UCSC.

The committee discussed the facets of allowing courses to carry multiple GE's. The Registrar was asked if this would create a problem in the Schedule of Class and in AIS. While it would require creating additional GE categories, and thus impose a burden, it would not be impossible.

Committee members tentatively determined that a more formal pilot by CEP should be developed to gather data about how students would utilize the option and if this increased enrollment in departments. Some suggestions put forth by members:

- It would ideally seek a few course proposals from each of the 5 divisions.
- It would need to run for at least 4 years to follow through graduation.
- What is the effect on to time to graduation?

Action:

Members will make a decision regarding this pilot. They will formulate what success consists of and what is the clear goal and hypothesis of doing this pilot.

III. Major Qualification Review Methods: Consultation with IRAPS Director Julian Fernald

Qualification policies have been approved for many undergraduate majors over the last several years: students are required to complete a set of courses with a specified minimum GPA before they can declare the major. These policies were approved for a fixed period of time, after which they were supposed to be reviewed. Major Qualification Criteria in majors are subject to periodic review by CEP to see how well they are working. CEP felt that it was desirable to develop a uniform protocol to review existing major qualification policies from time to time and to evaluate requests for new major qualification policies. In 2017-18, CEP approved a policy about what would be examined in such a review, but it was conditioned on

a definition of student success. CEP asked the Chair to work with IRAPS and return to the committee with some possibilities.

Committee members discussed the data that IRAPS provided to determine the best way to measure student success. Members spent a considerable amount of time looking at the IRAPS information in thinking about what the data revealed in terms of what is hidden, with specific focus on the category of students that did not meet Economics 2.8 GPA qualification. It was asked if the 2.8 GPA requirement served to restrict students into the major. There was a general discussion on the function of the GPA requirement and whether it further marginalized disenfranchised students.

Action:

The goal of the committee is to develop a method for analysis for all majors. In thinking through this, the committee requested IRAPS to expand the data inquiry.

- Comparing 4-year graduation rates for the 2013 frosh cohort of Economics students as a function of GPA in the Economics MQ courses, with the 4-year graduation rates for the same cohort of Social Sciences students as a function of their overall GPA at the end of their second year.
- Look at all of the proposed majors that completed all of the major requirements but could not/did not declare, to determine what their 4 or 5 year graduation rates were as a function of their GPA in the MQ courses, i.e. would they have been better off if they had been allowed to continue in Economics.
- Look at factors of 1st generation to college, race and ethnicity