COMMITTEE ON COURSES OF INSTRUCTION
Annual Report 2016-17

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The newly established Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) had an exceptional year in spite of structural limitations the committee faced. The committee's responsibilities include the review of campus and systemwide policies, all matters relating to courses of instruction (including review of new courses and revisions to courses), consultation with other committees and administrative units, as well as the consideration of graduate student instructors, student petitions and grievances.

Course Priority Enrollment Request for Majors
Last year the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) received requests from the Computer Science and Physics departments about policies and procedures for restricting the access of students to popular courses for majors based on resource limitations. At present, there is no formal process for evaluating the carrying capacity of an undergraduate major or gating the flow of students into the program at the time of admission to either the campus or the major. After discussing this issue with VPAA Lee, a working group was formed to investigate this issue. The working group met and submitted a draft policy on impaction for majors to the Senate for comment and review; the Senate is waiting for a follow-up during fall quarter.

As an interim measure to assist Computer Science and other departments facing significant enrollment pressures, CCI approved restricting the initial enrollment in a small number of key upper-division courses required for students to qualify for their major or to complete their minor or major. Non-majors will be admitted to these courses on a space-available basis.

Restricting course enrollment in this manner is labor-intensive for the Registrar's Office, as it must be done manually. If this approach proves effective, we will investigate whether the process can be simplified or automated in the future.

Computer Science requested a renewal for a two-tier process for enrollment gating in upper-division courses. CCI reviewed the request for their majors during first and second pass enrollment, as well as the Physics Department's request for priority enrollment for one of their courses.

CCI reminded the departments that this process is very labor-intensive due to the manual nature of setting-up and monitoring these restrictions. CCI approved both departments' requests for one year only and encouraged the departments to monitor enrollments during the year to see if any additional courses can be removed from this status in the future.

Undergraduate Course Supplemental Form
A few years ago CEP made changes to the undergraduate course supplemental form to streamline the review process to encourage the answers members required for course approval. This year CCI experienced this same phenomenon, sending out numerous requests for more

information to departments, which delayed the approval process. CCI added additional questions, hoping to reduce uncertainty. The new form was available during fall quarter.

Appendix C and Student Grade Grievances

The Committee reviewed seven grade grievance cases this year, updated Appendix C and created a grievance process map for students to reference on our website. Last year the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) made conforming changes to Appendix C and recommended that CCI review and update the language. Members revised the CEP language in the Appendix to avoid the expectation that a "hearing" would be held. Members disagreed with RJ&E's interpretation that students have an implied right to a hearing. We have updated the language to be consistent with actual practice and adjusted the language to include the process for an "informational investigation."

The following cases were reviewed by the Committee Membership:

- Case A: The student argued that a lower non-passing grade was due to inconsistent grading, lack of clear guidelines and late notification of coursework grading. Student was short two points in a capstone course and could not graduate. Members worked with the faculty member, after a request for information was sent and determined that the student's score did indeed add up to a passing grade and approved the change from a non-passing to a passing grade.
- Case B: This student had taken the course multiple times and cited lack of criteria for lab diligence points on the syllabus; the student was two points short of passing. The Committee reviewed the materials (including syllabus) and did not find sufficient evidence to approve the request; the grade will stand as recorded on the transcript.
- Case C: The student requested to change the grading option from letter grade to pass, no pass or withdraw. Student claims the instructor was unresponsive on student's progress in the class which made it difficult to determine if a change to the grade option was warranted by the deadline. This is the only avenue students have for grade option changes after course completion. After deliberation and instructor consultation, members granted the student's request, changing the letter grade to a grade option of pass.
- Case D: The student was never signed up for two independent studies; he successfully completed one of the courses. The request was to remove the grade and second course from the transcript. The case was determined without committee deliberations based on the evidence provided by both the Department and Registrar's Office and supported the student's request to remove the grade and course from the transcript based on clerical error.
- Case E: The student was accused of academic dishonesty, however, the instructor failed to file the paperwork within the specified quarter, and the Student Academic Misconduct process was compromised. Members supported the request to remove the course and grade from the student's transcript.
- Case F: The student requested removal of grade and course from the transcript. The committee could not establish *prima facie* with regard to grading based on non-academic criteria. The grade will stand as recorded on the transcript.

- ▪ Case G: The student requested removal of grade and course from the transcript. The committee could not establish *prima facie* with regard to grading based on non-academic criteria. The grade will stand as recorded on the transcript.

Other Legislative Changes: Committee Charge and Delegation Policy

CCI wanted to continue the practice begun by CEP of delegating specific routine administrative duties related to undergraduate course approval and student petition policies to several units on campus. The proposed CCI legislation changes to the committee charge were approved at the May 19, 2017 spring Senate Meeting. CCI will monitor and review the policy on an annual basis during fall quarter and post the policy for the current year on the committee website. The following delegations were approved:

University Registrar
- ▪ Course Approvals for renumbering courses within the lower to lower division and upper to upper division course structure, non-essential suspension and reactivation of courses, course enrollment limit increases, cross-listing, adding or deleting of cross-listings and allowing suspension and reactivation of cross-listings with no changes to either course description

College Provosts
- ▪ Withdrawal from a class, including verification of medical/emergency after the campus deadline
- ▪ After a full regular (FWS) quarter has passed, requests for retroactive W must, however, come to CCI

Curriculum Management Group

Project Managers Don Moonshine and Stacey Gustafson gave a presentation on the phases to revamp the current systems (catalog, curriculum leave planning (CCLP), online course approval (OCA) in place and met with Senate committees to seek advice and comments on what changes faculty would like the new online system to have. The Senate Committees on Courses of Instruction, Educational Policy and Graduate Council provided additional feedback for curricular management system changes. There was support for a standardized form for program statements and course approvals, with a balance of information that is concise. There should be multiple fields; some of these should be fixed, others with optional drop down menus and a few free format options. Ideally, the user should be able to choose what is needed and have the option (field) slide up if not needed. Headings and fonts should be adopted. Many members supported an "Open Read" view for anyone wanting to check the progress of their request. Undergraduate and Graduate degrees would be listed independently of a department. Ideally, creating separate sections in the catalog for each constituents programs, with links to departments for referencing other information. Track changes are very important for reviewing as well as editable comments. Some information should auto-fill and dependencies should be automatic (e.g. pop up window).

For course approvals, members stressed the need for instant responses that can be sent directly to the instructor or department when the course requires more information or is approved. Notification does not always reach the right person; there needs to be a standardization of

communication from the system after the workflow is completed and in the Senate queue. When faculty view courses, keep these notifications specific to the department, and make this as transparent as possible. For example, our committee needs to know when a department is cancelling a course that another may have on their program statement. Syllabi must be added as a document or have a field to copy and paste. The standardized form should cover all aspects of course approval process, fields not needed would roll up, allowing for some free formatting for notes. Easy viewing of tasks, GE options, sorting, notifications, mouse-over or clicking a course should pull up the information from the course section of the catalog (description, prerequisites, terms in which course is offered). Reporting tools on types of GEs and course approvals (new, revision, cancellation, etc.). Members benefitted from the expertise and collegial reception the Curriculum Management Group offered.

In Depth Review of Courses

In addition to the issues discussed in earlier sections of the report, CCI reviewed and commented on the following issues and/or policies:

- Crown/Merrill/Oakes/Rachel Carson Colleges request for a College 3 precalculus course and lab offering. As this was a duplicate course offering (Math 3 is offered by the Mathematics Department), the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) needed to weigh in on the course offering. After review, the committees submitted a joint response approving the special section of the two-unit supplemental lab to be offered by the Colleges. The Mathematics Department will offer a special section for students in the Colleges.
- Online Course Approvals and Renewals: (1/23, 2/6) CCI sent out requests to departments requesting online course reports due after the first year of offering an online course (one department sent their report in early). The following online course reports were requested: BIOE 107: Ecology, Earth 3: Geology of National Parks, Econ 133: Security Markets, and Writing 2: Walt Disney. The Mathematics Department submitted their report for online course Math 23A, Vector Calculus, and was reapproved with a report due fall 2020. The Committee received only one other online course report, for Earth 3. Members reviewed and reapproved with a report due Fall 2020. CCI will send out requests in early fall to departments that have not yet submitted their online course reports. The Committee approved the following online courses: Art 80T, Anthro 110I, BIOE 109, BIOE 125, Econ 10A and 10B, 194, HAVC 186I, Lit 61U, Socy 173X.
- The Committee experienced considerable challenges with the Online Curriculum Approval (OCA) system. Understandably, ITS and Registrar Office staff do not want to spend time upgrading our present system when a new one is currently being designed. Departments were submitting word documents into the system, and this was challenging for members to review online; on some mobile devices, the forms opened up blank. A memo was sent out requesting that faculty, department staff, and colleges submit documents in pdf file format for review.

Other Curricular Business

CCI members reviewed 159 new course approvals (including 10 online courses), as well as 365 revisions, and 1 posthumous degree certificate and many general education designations including: CC, ER, IM, MF, PE-E, PE-H, PE-T, PR-C, PR-E, PR-S, SR, TA.
The Chair reviewed the following:

- 420 undergraduate student petitions;
- 155 requests for Graduate Student Instructors;
- 4 requests for Undergraduate Student Instructors; and
- 1 request for an Individual Major.

Additional Issues Reviewed by the Committee:

Learning Data Principles
Senate committees were requested to review the draft principles and practices created by the Ed Tech Leadership Committee (ETLC) surrounding data privacy for students and faculty with regard to data analytics generated by service providers such as Canvas, Sakai, and Piazza for the UC system. CCI reviewed the draft principles and recommended practices and realized the need for UC to develop these procedures around transparency, but had no additional recommendations to add.

Review of Proposed Revisions to SR 630
The Academic Council endorsed the revisions to SR 630.D to include the Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Courses, which are part of a systemwide program, for credit and to meet residency requirements in accordance with the regulation's current definitions. Other programs such as the Education Abroad Program, UC Washington, D.C. Program and the UC Center in Sacramento Program are included in the original version of this Senate Regulation. The Committee on Courses of Instruction reviewed the proposed changes to Senate Regulation 630.D and is in favor of supporting these amendments that allow students to receive credit toward their senior residency requirement.

Systemwide Review on Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual on Teaching Professors
The Academic Affairs/Academic Personnel Vice Provost LSOE Subcommittee identified major areas requiring policy revision for the current LSOE faculty title series, clarifying their roles for teaching, scholarly activity and service. CCI reviewed proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) - 285, 210-3, 133, and 740, and found the overall change of the Lecturer with Security of Employment series to the Teaching Professor series largely unproblematic, although vagueness remains with respect to the proportion of "Professional and Scholarly achievement and activity" expected for appointment and promotion in the Teaching Professor Series. While the description of Professional and Scholarly Achievement and Activity is significantly elaborated, there remains some concern that the vagueness of expectations creates potential for confusion regarding the expectations. From CCI's viewpoint, the revisions to the Teaching Professor series are an improvement.

CCI benefited from the expertise of Associate Registrar Margie Claxton, and we are grateful she is a member of the committee. We also benefitted tremendously from the expert assistance and dedication of Susanna Wrangell.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON COURSES OF INSTRUCTION
Noriko Aso

Myanthi Fernando
Kevin Karplus
Anatole Leikin
Jie Qing
Margie Claxton, *ex-officio*
Gina Dent, Chair

August 29, 2017