

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY Annual Report 2016 -17

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy's (CEP) responsibilities include the review of undergraduate programs, program statements, and consultation with other committees and administrative units on a broad range of issues concerning undergraduate education. In addition to these routine activities, the committee spent considerable time reviewing issues pertaining to the courses that satisfy the College core and lower-division writing requirements; reviewing numerous information requests by the Senate and other departments, and revising outdated policies

I. Proposed changes to the lower-division writing and college core course requirements

Background

The campus writing requirements consist of the Entry- Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), the lower-division Composition 1 and 2 (C1, C2) requirements, and the upper-division Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement. Students must also fulfill the requirements of their college, which typically include a core course taken during the fall of the freshmen year and in some cases a second core course taken during the winter. This arrangement dates from 2005, with the C1 and C2 requirements partially integrated with the college core course.

Over the past three years, CEP has spent a considerable amount of time discussing the lower-division writing and core course requirements in close consultation with other Senate committees, faculty, the college provosts and the administration. Due to the partial merger of the college core course and lower-division writing courses, the majority of freshmen are required to take a composition course in their first quarter, even if they have not satisfied ELWR. After completing--and usually passing--a fall core course that fulfills the C1 requirement, a surprising number of these students are still unable to satisfy ELWR. This raised significant concern for the effectiveness of our lower-division writing curriculum and the linkage of the core courses to the lower-division writing curriculum.¹

In the spring of 2015, CEP concluded that the satisfaction of ELWR should be a prerequisite for enrolling in a composition course, as is currently required at every other UC campus. The modification of SCR 10.5.2 required to implement this change was approved by the Senate last year to go into effect in the fall of 2017. In the spring of 2016, CEP made the following additional recommendations regarding the future of the college core courses and lower-division writing curriculum:

1. Core must be separated from the lower-division writing requirements, including C1, C2 and the courses that help students satisfy ELWR. The writing courses should be

¹ For additional information about these concerns, please refer to CEP's 2014-15 and 2015-16 annual reports and the report CEP presented to the Senate in February of 2016 (http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cep-committee-on-educational-policy/reports-and-presentations/Senate_Meeting_OverviewUCSCwritingrequirementsandMLC.pdf)

administered and taught by the Writing Program, not the Colleges. These courses must focus on making writing outcomes their priority.

2. The courses that satisfy the lower-division writing requirements should be vertically integrated with each other and the upper-division writing courses, including the courses that satisfy the disciplinary communication (DC) requirement.
3. In general, students should have flexibility in the scheduling and theme(s) of their writing courses. To the extent possible, students should be given the opportunity to take a C1/C2 course related to the theme of their college during the winter if they wish to do so. However, we did not support the mandatory linkage of the lower-division writing courses to a specific topic (e.g. the college themes) or quarter (winter of the first year).
4. The college core course requirement should be maintained, but the requirement should be limited to the fall quarter of the freshman year with the size and number of associated credits determined by the educational objectives of the course and available funding. During the past year, CEP worked with Council of Provosts, the Writing Program and the administration to facilitate the implementation of the above recommendations from 2015-16. Proposals for revising the college core courses and lower-division writing curriculum were developed by the Writing Program and Council of Provosts (with input from Humanities Dean Stovall and Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Hughey) and submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) for review as non-degree programs.² We did not receive the proposals until relatively late in the academic year, making it impossible to finalize and launch the revised curriculum in the fall of 2017 as originally planned. We therefore reluctantly agreed to defer the introduction of ELWR satisfaction as a prerequisite for C1 courses until the fall of 2018; this change was approved by the Senate on May 19, 2017.

Although the purview of our committee does not extend to budgetary issues, our feedback on the proposals from the Writing Program and the Council of Provosts was based on the amount of funding available to support the revised core and writing curriculum and feedback from the Committee on Planning and Budget about the cost of the proposed curricula.³ As described below, we considered the proposals from the Writing Program and the Council of Provosts separately because they severed the linkage between the lower-division writing and core courses as recommended by CEP, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) last spring.

Proposed changes to the lower-division writing curriculum

The Writing Program submitted a strong proposal to simplify the complex set of courses and pathways that are currently used to satisfy the ELWR and Composition (C1 and C2) requirements while improving the quality of writing instruction offered to UCSC undergraduates. According to their proposal, students would satisfy the C1 and C2 requirements by taking

²<https://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/documents/Academic%20Programs%20and%20Units%20Policy%20and%20Procedures%20November%202016%20FINAL.pdf>

³ Interim Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Herbie Lee informed the Senate that he was willing to invest an additional \$300,000 per year to support the revised core and writing curriculum.

courses offered by the Writing Program (WRIT 1 and WRIT 2, respectively) as opposed to a college core course. Students would have greater flexibility regarding the scheduling of their C1 and C2 courses, and they will benefit from the enhanced vertical integration of these courses with their other writing courses such as the DC.

The Writing Program presented two alternative plans for ELWR-required students who are not in the Multilingual Curriculum (MLC). Consistent with the recent changes to Senate Regulation 10.5.2, students would be required to satisfy ELWR before attempting WRIT1 under both plans. In the first plan, students would take WRIT 20 until they satisfy ELWR by earning a grade of C or better in this 5-credit, repeatable course. In the second plan, students close to ELWR satisfaction would take a different course, WRIT 20A, until they satisfy ELWR by earning a grade of C or higher in this repeatable 3-credit course. Both plans would replace the current system for ELWR satisfaction with course grades rather than portfolio review. Additionally, both plans would require students to satisfy ELWR by the end of their third quarter, rather than the fourth quarter.

CEP supported the Writing Program's proposal to replace the portfolio review with grades as the mechanism for assessing ELWR satisfaction. A student's grade in a preparatory writing course should accurately reflect their writing ability; they may find it hard to understand if they receive a good grade in one of these courses but are unable to satisfy ELWR via portfolio review. Using course grades to assess ELWR satisfaction will minimize this problem. We also note that the use of grades in specific writing courses to satisfy ELWR is common at our sister campuses.⁴ The proposed transition from portfolio reviews to course grades to assess ELWR satisfaction is therefore consistent with systemwide practices.

CEP also supported the Writing Program's proposal to reduce the deadline for satisfying ELWR from four to three quarters. This deadline should apply only to students who are not English Language Learners (see below). No UC campus gives students other than English Language Learners more than three quarters (or two semesters) to satisfy ELWR. If a student is unable to satisfy ELWR by the end of the first year, they should be advised to take preparatory writing courses at a community college until they are prepared to tackle university level work and return to UCSC. This aspect of the Writing Program's proposal is also consistent with the standards of our sister campuses, including those with relatively high percentages of ELWR-required students. After considering the proposed curricula for ELWR-required students, we asked the Writing Program to go further and construct a plan for a three-credit ELWR course for all students (except ESL students, who are discussed in the next section).

The Writing Program also presented a secondary proposal describing potential changes to the MLC, including the potential elimination of the first of the three courses in the MLC, Writing 25. If approved, this change would go into effect in the fall of 2018. As previously noted by both CPB and our committee, it is troubling that only international students on F1 visas are allowed to participate in the MLC. We decided that all English language learners must be allowed to participate in this program regardless of their visa status. We encouraged the Writing Program and the Department of Languages and Applied Linguistics to submit a proposal to revise the

⁴ We note that portfolio review separate from the course grade may be in violation of Senate Regulation 636.C

MLC to better meet the needs of all English language learners next year, for implementation in the fall of 2018. This proposal should describe the mechanism that will be used to identify the students who will benefit from the MLC and the number of quarters they should be given to satisfy ELWR. CEP will not approve the further extension of the MLC until this issue is addressed.

Other Changes to the Lower-Division Writing Curriculum

During the spring of 2016, representatives from CEP sought input from divisional deans and department chairs about potential changes to the lower-division writing curriculum and its relationship to the college core courses. Although these conversations revealed broad support for splitting the core and writing requirements, faculty in the School of Engineering and the Division of Physical and Biological Sciences divisions were concerned about the potential impact of this change on their majors. For example, ELWR-required students would be required to take a minimum of four five-credit core and writing courses in their first two years, which would make it difficult to follow the standard academic plans for STEM majors and graduate on time. This prompted us to consider whether additional modifications of the lower-division writing requirements would ameliorate these concerns without compromising the quality of writing instruction offered to our students.

Most other UC campuses require only one or two lower-division composition courses carrying a total of approximately 4 to 8 quarter credits, and total of 9 to 15 quarter credits of writing instruction.⁵ Requiring two composition courses carrying a total of 8 quarter credits, together with a 5 credit DC course, would place our composition requirements near the middle of the UC system. This could be accomplished by converting WRIT 1 and WRIT 2 from 5 credit to 4 credit courses or changing the C1 course from a 5 credit course to a 3 credit course. However, there are advantages to the second option. It would ensure that all students, even those who complete the C1 requirement before coming to UCSC, take a 5 credit C2 course and a 5 credit DC course at UCSC. It would also be easier to implement, since 3 credit courses are not uncommon at UCSC (meeting twice a week instead of three times). Therefore, we asked the Writing Program to amend their proposal so that the C1 course carries 3 credits, with the C2 course remaining as a 5-credit course. The approval of this change would require a modification of the Senate regulation covering the Composition requirements.

Second, we asked the Writing Program to construct a plan with a 3-credit ELWR course for all non-ESL ELWR-required students instead of the differentiated 3-5 credit model described above. Although this would make UCSC an outlier compared to other UC campuses, we note that all ELWR-required students (including ESL students) in Crown College currently take Writing 20 in their first term and approximately 80% of these students fulfill their ELWR requirement by portfolio review at the end of six weeks. While we recognized that a 3-credit course meeting twice a week for 10 weeks has a different rhythm than a 5-credit course meeting three times per week for 6 weeks, this would suggest that a 3-credit ELWR course should be sufficient for most of these students, especially since ESL students would be moved to the MLC curriculum. We were also mindful of the fact that, if the ELWR and C1 courses are 3 credit courses and the

⁵ Note that the course credits are defined using the same criteria on all UC campuses: the typical student must devote approximately three hours per week per credit at campuses on the quarter system. At campuses on the quarter system other than UCSC, a “standard” course carries four units of credit and a student takes an average of four courses per quarter.

college core courses are converted to 3 credit courses as discussed below, students would be able to take a college core course, a writing course (either ELWR or C1) and two 5-credit courses as a normal load (16 credits) in their first term.

We also considered another suggestion to mitigate the impact of separating core and writing requirements: to allow students near the cusp of ELWR satisfaction to satisfy both ELWR and C1 by taking a single course. Precedents for this model are rare in the UC system, and our committee believed that it would be quite challenging for a single course to satisfy the distinct educational outcomes associated with preparatory writing and C1 courses. Such a model would also require a reversal of the change to Senate Regulation 10.5.2 that was enacted in 2016. Considering all these factors, our committee did not support this proposal.

Proposed changes to the college core course requirement.

Our committee also considered a proposal from the Council of Provosts to create a first-year curriculum consisting of a one to two quarter course sequence for all incoming students. A 5 credit core course focused on critical reading and academic discourse--College 1: Academic Literacy and Ethos--would be taken during the fall quarter by all incoming freshman. During the winter quarter, students would have the option of taking a C1 or C2 course related to the theme of their college.

Our committee's overall impression of the provosts' proposal was favorable. The proposal documented students' challenges with academic reading and cited research suggesting that a high-impact first-year curriculum would support a significant percentage of our students, including those from historically marginalized communities and/or disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds. Reading as a subject of study offers promise for a college core course and aligns with the colleges' thematic foci in obvious ways.

While there is no doubt that many students could benefit from the proposed revision to the college core courses, some members of our committee were concerned about two points. First, the cited literature about the first-year experience highlighted the benefits of additional instruction in reading for less well prepared students, but not necessarily the typical UCSC student. Second, high-achieving students who enter UCSC might not need the same kind of instruction in reading at the college level. We recognized that students with varied academic preparation levels already take courses alongside one another elsewhere in the university curriculum. But we were concerned about reading as the primary subject matter of the core courses because it is a developmental proficiency; some students need more guidance and time than others to develop successful reading practices. However, these concerns may not apply to academic ethos part of the curriculum which appears to be beneficial to all incoming fresh.

CEP also supported the Council of Provosts desire to limit the size of the College 1 courses to only 30 students; a course focused on cohort building and academic ethos would be less effective in a large-lecture format. We found the justification for why this course must carry five credits to be less compelling. In some colleges, international students who are enrolled in the MLC take a lower-credit version of the college core course, which suggests that a lower-credit course might also be sufficient for domestic students. Moreover, with the removal of writing objectives from the core course, it is logical to expect that fewer credits should be sufficient. Finally, a 3 credit

core course--along with 3 credit ELWR and C1 courses--would simplify scheduling and reduce the overall cost of the core and writing curriculum.

CEP also discussed whether College 1 should satisfy an existing GE requirement to provide additional flexibility to students and minimize their time to degree. Any GE designation carried by a College 1 course would need to match the educational objectives of the course; to do otherwise would risk repeating the problems associated with the fusion of the college core courses with the C1 and C2 requirements. This would not be an insurmountable obstacle for colleges with themes that are clearly aligned with existing GE requirements, if they were 5 credit courses. For example, 5 credit versions of the Crown and Rachel Carson College core courses might satisfy the Perspectives Technology & Society (PE-T) and Perspectives Environmental Awareness (PE-E) General Education (GE) requirements respectively. However, with a 3 credit model for College 1 courses, the options would be limited: only the Practice Service Learning (PR-S), Practice Creative Process (PR-C) and Practice Collaborative Endeavor (PR-E) designations would be possible. We recommended that each college consider whether any of these designations would be appropriate.

The provosts also proposed the option of an integrated two-quarter experience by creating winter C1 and C2 courses linked to the themes of some colleges. Students should have as much flexibility as possible regarding the scheduling and theme(s) of their writing courses. To the extent possible, students should be given the opportunity to take a C1/C2 course related to the theme of their college during the winter if they wish to do so, but we did not support making this a requirement for students in any college.

II. Legislation Revisions to Santa Cruz Regulations (SCR)

It was brought to the attention of the Committee that our delegation policy was not explicitly stated in our charge Santa Cruz Regulation, (SCR 13.17.9) as required by Systemwide Bylaw 20. In addition to making this required change, we recommended the addition of the Chair of the newly formed Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) Chair as an *ex-officio* of CEP to facilitate interactions between the two committees. The changes to CEP's charge were approved during the Spring Senate meeting. Several other conforming changes were made to clarify how various responsibilities related to course approval and program authorization are divided between CEP and CCI.

III. Course Repetition Policy

The committee responded to inquiries about campus policies concerning the repetition of courses, which are covered by SCR 9.1.8. Students repeat a course for credit if a grade of C-, D, D+, D-, or F is received. Provosts can approve the repetition of a course more than once if there are extenuating circumstances such as health or other serious personal issues. Provosts should consult with Department faculty and staff before approving such requests.

CEP was asked to clarify if students must be allowed to repeat a course more than once if the denial of the request would prevent them from completing the requirements of their major. Concerns had been raised that this might violate UC Legislative Ruling 6.11.C (clause 3), which concerns actions that effectively disqualify a student from the University even though they satisfy the minimum standards of SR 900.A. However, SR 900.C allows for more stringent norms if they are based on regulations adopted by a Division and approved by the Assembly;

SCR 9.1.8 satisfies this condition. Although students do not have the right to repeat courses more than once, CEP expects colleges to consider the likelihood that a student will pass a course on their third attempt and complete the requirements of their major. Although the department's recommendation should be taken into consideration, the ultimate decision rests with the College Provosts.

During spring quarter CEP received a related request from a department seeking clarification of the conditions under which a UCSC student who has unsuccessfully taken a UCSC course twice can take it for a third time through Open Campus. A student must obtain the permission of the instructor to take a course through Open Campus. SCR 9.1.8 applies to courses taken through Open Campus; if a student wishes to repeat a course more than once via this mechanism, they must therefore also obtain permission from the provost of their college. CEP asked the Registrar of UCSC Extension to include the necessary permissions (i.e. College Provost approval) on the relevant forms to ensure that students do not use Open Campus to circumvent SCR 9.1.8.

IV. Priority Enrollment Requests check spring quarter

Numerous groups of students - including veterans, Regent's Scholars, a subset of students with DRC accommodations, and members of a variety of other groups have priority when enrolling for courses. In addition, students who earn UC credit based on their scores on AP and IB exams can often enroll in classes earlier than their peers due to their advanced standing. CEP discussed priority enrollment after receiving a request to grant priority enrollment status to students in the School of Engineering Summer Bridge Program. While we understand that priority enrollment would incentivize students' participation in this program, we did not find the rationale provided strong enough to grant this request. CEP does not want to consider programs requesting this status in isolation due to the potential impact on programs lacking sufficient capacity to accommodate all students interested in their courses. The committee will revisit this issue next year.

V. Double Counting Policy: Counting Credits for Double Majors

SCR 10.4.7 specifies how units are counted for students pursuing more than one major. The regulation states that the credits used to satisfy the requirements for each major must include a minimum of 40 upper-division credits not used to satisfy the minimum credits of any other major or minor. The interpretation of this regulation is straightforward for majors with minimal overlapping requirements. The situation is more complex for majors with extensive, overlapping requirements, including many combinations of majors and minors in Physical & Biological Science and the School of Engineering. This has led to considerable confusion concerning campus policies regarding the double counting of upper-division credits for double majors. CEP therefore requested a clarification of SCR 10.4.7 from the Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections (RJ&E)

Committee. Specifically, we asked whether the minimum credits referenced in the regulation refers to 1) the campus minimum of 40 upper-division credits for a major, or 2) the minimum requirements of a specific major. RJ&E informed CEP that "the minimum credits of any other major" refers to the specific program requirements of a given major, not the upper-division credit requirement. Based on this information, CEP will clarify the policies regarding the double counting of credits and consider whether changes to SCR 10.4.7 are warranted next year.

VI. Report on Catalog Year Changes

Three years ago, CEP gave the Provosts the ability to delegate the authorization of catalog year changes for students who were returning to UCSC after more than two years absence to the Academic Preceptors. The Council of Academic Preceptors and the Council of Provosts asked CEP to continue to delegate the authority to make exceptions to catalog rights for GE satisfaction prior to 2010. Our committee agreed to extend this delegation for one more year, beginning fall 2017-18. We do not anticipate renewing this agreement, as all re-entering students should now follow the 2010 General Education requirements.

We also authorized the Registrar's Office to remove 900 previous GE designation from course descriptions beginning in fall 2017. Students who will require a catalog year change for GE requirements will be able to petition through appeal with the Committee on Courses of Instruction effective fall 2018.

VII. Request to Change Procedures Regarding ELWR Holds

At the request of the Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE), we reviewed the procedures used to prevent students who have not satisfied ELWR from taking courses beyond the 4th quarter. To prevent these students from taking classes beyond the 4th quarter, a hold was placed on their record. This caused difficulties for the students who satisfied ELWR by the end of their 4th quarter; their inability to sign up for classes often caused them to fall off-sequence in a major course series, which can significantly impact time to degree. To address this problem, CEP agreed to allow these students to enroll in classes during at the normal time during their 4th quarter. Once the ELWR results are available, students who do not satisfy the requirement will be administratively withdrawn by the Registrar's Office.

Routine Business

The committee participates in external reviews of academic departments and programs, new program proposals, changes to existing programs, and catalog materials.

- New program proposals reviewed and approved this year included Applied Linguistics & Multilingualism B.A., Science Education B.S., and Minor in Sustainability Studies.
- CEP recommended the discontinuance of the B.S. in Physics Education and Biology Education.
- CEP participated in the external reviews of the following departments: Applied Mathematics, Statistics, Biomolecular Engineering, Earth & Planetary Sciences, Education, Feminist Studies, Film & Digital Media, History, Music, Politics and Sociology.
- CEP also reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on the length of review cycle for the following departments and programs: History of Consciousness, Latin American and Latino/a Studies, Literature, Physics, Spanish Studies, Technology Management, Theater Arts and the Writing Program.
- The UNEX certificates in Embedded Systems and VLSI Engineering were renewed for another five years. More information about the following certificates were required before CEP could approve their renewal: Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Education: Supervision and Administration, Instructional Design and

Delivery. The Supply Chain Management certificate is pending approval due to inconsistent course numbering.

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

- VPAA Request for Renaming College 8; Rachel Carson College (October 2016)
- VPAA Request for Review of seven FTE Transfers (October 2016, February 2017)
- Senate Chair request to review the draft Presidential Policy on International Activities for Systemwide Review (October 2016)
- Senate Chair request to review the draft UC Learning Data Privacy Principles & Recommended Practices (October 2016)
- CPE Request to Review Procedures Regarding ELWR Holds (October 2016)
- Vice Provost for Student Success (VPSS) Request for Alternate Advising Plans (November 2016)
- VPDUE Request for Final Exam Schedule Changes (November 2016)
- CEP reviewed and rescinded the policy on Open Campus (November 2016)
- VPAA Request to Review Teaching Assistant Allocations for Graduate Students (January 2017)
- VPAA Request for External Review Deferral for the Computational Media Department (November 2016)
- VPDUE Request to review proposed summer salary adjustments (January 2017)
- Senate Chair request to review the draft proposed revisions to Senate Regulation SR630 for the addition of systemwide course additions (January, 2017)
- VPAA request to review the Curricular Capacity Report (January 2017)
- Review Request for Impaction from Computer Science Department (January 2017)
- Review report on catalog year changes (February 2017)
- Registrar request to review appeals to graduation for students who miss the deadline. (February 2017)
- VPDUE request to review the policy on Withdrawal or “W grade” guidelines (February 2017)
- VPDUE request to review the policy on waiving two units for the 180 unit graduation requirement (February 2017)
- CEP discussed the Senior Comprehensive Exit Requirement (February 2017)
- CEP discussed a policy for online course offerings (February 2017)
- CEP consulted with the Curricular Management Group for program statement priorities for vendor selection (March 2017)
- VPAA request to review the MOUs for the Arts Games and Playable Media major and Computer Game Design (March 2017)
- Review of conforming changes to legislation for CEP’s charge and other Santa Cruz Division Chapters shifting duties from CEP to CCI (April 2017)
- Review Disciplinary Communication Grants (DCG) submissions (April 2017)
- Review Major Transfer Screening requests (May 2017)
- Senate Chair request to review UCSC’s Electrical Safety Policy (May 2017)
- Senate Chair request to review the draft Pedestrian Plan (May 2017)
- Senate Chair request to review Sustainability and Academic Planning (May 2017)

CEP benefited from the expertise of an impressive group of invited guests, including the Associate Registrar Margie Claxton, and Academic Preceptors representative Ethan Hutchinson. Finally, we thank Senate Analysts Susanna Wrangell and Kim Van Le and the Senate Executive Director Matthew Mednick for their outstanding work on behalf of CEP this year. It would have been impossible for our committee to function without their phenomenal support and detailed knowledge of our campus's undergraduate programs, policies and procedures.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Jeffrey Bury

Gina Dent, Chair CCI

David Draper

Suresh Lodha

Onuttom Narayan

Tonya Ritola

Elizabeth Stephens

Lynn Westerkamp

Tchad Singer, *ex officio*

John Tamkun, Chair

Roxy Power, NSTF (F)

Leslie Lopez, NSTF (W, S)

Anthony Ballesteros, Undergraduate Representative (S)

Jessica Xu, Undergraduate Representative (W, S)

Tias Webster, Undergraduate Representative (F)

Manel Camps, Provost Representative

September 27, 2017