

Committee on Educational Policy Annual Report 2017 -18

To: 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 transfer students, the Strategic Academic Plan, the Computer Science impactation status request, the reshaping proposal for the Baskin School of Engineering, and planning the program statement templates for the new online curriculum system set to be live fall quarter. The committee sent out more than 190 letters during the year.

I. Transfer Students and Major Preparation

In 2017-18, the University of California suffered a mandate from the state government to strive to reach a 2:1 frosh:transfer ratio in entering students at every campus separately (except UC Merced). That is, the number of transfer students entering a campus would have to be at least half the number of entering frosh each year. Before this year, UC Santa Cruz and Riverside (and Merced) were the only campuses that did not meet the 2:1 target. As a result, there was tremendous pressure this year for these two campuses to increase the intake of transfer students. Since UCSC has been admitting all transfer students who meet our minimum conditions for admission, this was a question of increasing the number of applicants and the number of admission offers that are accepted by making UCSC seem more attractive to transfer students, and removing any unnecessary conditions for admission to a program.

Conditions for admission of students are determined by the Academic Senate. At UCSC, major-specific preparation requirements for transfer students are determined by CEP, while all other conditions for admission are determined by the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA). Accordingly, CEP undertook a review of major preparation requirements for all majors to see where they could be simplified or reduced without compromising the academic program. A few programs changed their preparation requirements as a result of this review.

CEP also tried to ensure that information for transfer students in the General Catalog and on the Admissions website was as transparent as possible. In the 2018-19 catalog, almost all programs have a two-year major planner for transfer students, with a statement about what courses have to be completed before coming to UCSC if a student wishes to follow the planner. By the 2019-20 catalog, this will be true for all programs. CEP also worked with CAFA and Admissions to ensure that the wording of the Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs) for transfer students was made clearer. In the coming year, CEP will continue to work with departments and programs to streamline and clarify major preparation requirements, and to help the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) articulate courses more widely across the California community college system.

In the fall term, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) at the systemwide level published an advisory policy for all campuses, asking that courses required for major preparation should not be changed with less than two years' notice, to ensure that prospective transfer students have time to plan their coursework at community college. CEP supports this goal, and will adhere to the policy where there is insufficient reason to provide less notice to prospective students. CEP and CAFA wrote jointly to BOARS, opposing having this policy as a rule rather than a guideline.

CEP reviewed and responded to the 2:1 Transfer Strategic Plan created by Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Hughey in the fall term, which proposed how the Senate and the administration could work together to achieve the transfer target.

Mainly because of the hard work of the Admissions Office under the supervision of the VPDUE, the number of transfer students entering UCSC in Fall 2018 far exceeded expectations, going beyond the 2:1 target. Partly because of developments at the community college level, it would be premature to assume that this remarkable outcome is assured for future years, and efforts to remove unnecessary obstacles must continue in all programs. However, if this outcome is sustained, CEP believes that the new entry pathways for transfer students that UCSC created this year — winter transfer admissions, sophomore and senior transfer admissions — should be minimized or closed; UCSC already has poor time to degree statistics, and creating numerous entry pathways for programs makes it harder for departments to guide students toward completing the degree in normative time.

The increase in transfer students entering in fall 2018 is not uniformly distributed among departments. Instead, a small number of departments have experienced sharp increases in enrollment. CEP urged Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Tromp to provide sufficient resources to these departments so that the enrollment increase *benefits* them, rather than expecting them to work with the minimum resources with which they can somehow manage. Over the next few years, ladder rank faculty positions will be needed in some of the departments that have been most highly affected. If programs have more students than can be taught with the resources available to them, they should apply for impactation, failing which CEP will have to take steps to ensure that the program quality is not degraded.

II. Timely Graduation of Students

Throughout the year, CEP was concerned about various aspects of students' timely progress in their academic program, or lack thereof. Approximately a third of incoming frosh at UCSC do not declare their major by the campus declaration deadline. The percentage of frosh graduating in four years dropped from 56% for the 2009 cohort to 49% for the 2012 cohort. CEP reviewed and approved proposed legislation and policies that would take various steps to simplify and reduce the number of student petitions that college and departmental advisors have to handle, so that they can focus on providing guidance to targeted students. This will be submitted to the Senate in the fall. CEP also approved proposed changes to the policy regarding Withdrawal (W) grades; departmental feedback will be obtained before the policy is confirmed.

Because of the lack of time, CEP was unable to discuss proposals to simplify the major declaration process so that the percentage of students who are able to meet the campus

declaration deadline is increased. These changes, and possible policy changes (similar to several other UC campuses) regarding students prolonging their academic programs, should be discussed in the fall.

In response to a proposal from the VPDUE, CEP approved UCSC Physical Education (PE) courses carrying half or one credit if the administration felt it would be able to support such credit-bearing courses. CEP also learned that UCSC accepts up to six transfer credits of PE courses from community colleges. The committee felt that this was excessive and revised the limit to three credits, irrespective of whether the courses are from UCSC or other colleges. With these changes, the committee supported requesting the Senate to repeal the regulation allowing students to graduate with 178 credits instead of 180, which is peculiar to this campus in the UC system.

III. Data Analytics for Student Success

In the spring term, the Senate received a proposal from the Student Success Division and the Institutional Research and Policy Studies (IRAPS) unit to provide various standard reports that might help departments assess how their curriculum works in practice (bottleneck courses, flow of students through the major, migration into and out of the major, etc.), and diagnostics to assess if a student is in danger of not succeeding in their academic path. The committee supported the custom reports created by IRAPS, but had serious criticisms of the reports that the commercial software from the Student Success Division would provide. The committee appreciated the objective behind the proposal and hopes that the shortcomings pointed out by CEP can be remedied.

The proposal also contemplated creating a Data and Information Governance Policy, and possibly curtailing the availability of ad-hoc reports that faculty and staff request at present when standard reports start being provided by IRAPS and Student Success. CEP's recommendation was that a simple data policy, largely codifying present practice, should be sufficient. The committee strongly opposed the possibility that ad-hoc reports might be curtailed; even with standard reports, the demands of curricular planning keep changing, and ad-hoc reports are essential to deal with this.

IV. Program Statement Review and New Curriculum Management System

The General Catalog will transition to a new system provided by an external vendor, SmartCatalog, in 2018-19. This is being supervised by the Curriculum Management Group (CMG) in the registrar's office. CEP consulted with the group when the vendor was being chosen. It also held several meetings with the CMG to decide the structure of program statements in the new catalog. CEP and Graduate Council worked with the CMG to create the new curriculum management system. In the 2018-19 catalog, each degree and non-degree program will have a separate statement. In addition, each academic unit (department, college, division) will have a brief statement and links to all the programs it sponsors, as well as links to any other programs that may be of interest to its students. For an undergraduate degree program, the program statement will have an Information and Policies tab, as well as a tab leading to the course requirements and the planners for the program (with multiple tabs if the major has several concentrations).

In order to prepare for the transition to SmartCatalog, to provide clear guidance to prospective transfer students, and to catch errors in the catalog that have accumulated over the years, CEP conducted a comprehensive review of all program statements this year instead of only looking at the changes from the previous year. During CEP's annual review of program statements in the winter term, each member was required to review two statements per meeting: one as the lead reviewer (comprehensive review) and one as the second reviewer (changes from the previous year). CEP appreciates the work of departments in responding to numerous questions and requests for changes in a short time, enabling the catalog to be released before incoming students enroll in classes for the fall term; this has not been possible in recent years. After the transition to SmartCatalog, the Office of the Registrar, along with CEP and GC, should see if the catalog release date can be advanced still further, ideally before continuing students enroll for the fall term.

V. Academic Literacy Curriculum

Over the last several years, the Writing Program and the colleges had been working on a restructuring of the College Core course and writing/composition requirements, based on new guidelines created by CEP. The results of this effort were reported to the Senate from time to time and in CEP's annual reports. In 2016-17, CEP and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed proposals from the Writing Program and Council of Provosts, and made substantial modifications to ensure that they would conform to the budgetary constraints.

During the summer, the Senate was apprised that a combined proposal for an Academic Literacy Curriculum (ALC) was being developed by the Writing Program and the Council of Provosts, to replace the modified proposal that was endorsed by the Senate committees in the spring term. The Senate received the proposal early in the fall, whereupon it was reviewed by CEP and CPB. In the proposal, all students would take a College 1 (core) course in which students would not be tracked by their proficiency in writing. After College 1, all students would take one composition course (Writing 2) taught by the Writing Program, with an additional prior course (Writing 1) required for students who had not satisfied the Entry-Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) of the University of California system. The Multilingual Curriculum (MLC), which has hitherto been available only to international students, would be opened to domestic English multilingual students; with this change, the systemwide ELWR satisfaction deadline (one year after matriculation) would be applied to students, except those in the MLC for whom the deadline of four quarters after matriculation would be retained. CEP endorsed the proposal with the following observations:

- i) Detailed assessment plans for students in College 1 would have to be developed by the colleges, with the involvement of the Writing Program and Institutional Research and Policy Studies (IRAPS), when course proposals would be submitted to CCI. The effectiveness of the writing instruction provided by the ALC should not be worse than it is at present for any group of students.
- ii) College 1 courses would have to be designed to engage a broad spectrum of students, since students would not be tracked. CEP and CAFA are reviewing the College Scholars (Honors) program, whose students at present are placed in separate sections of the College Core course. Depending on the outcome of the review, some additional features

in the ALC might have to be introduced in the future for students in the College Scholars program.

- iii) The Writing Program should develop a Writing 2H (honors) course as an option to Writing 2 for students entering UCSC with the greatest writing proficiency who might wish to take a more challenging course.
- iv) Each section of College 1 should have 30 students instead of the proposed 28. Even with this change, classrooms with 30-50 seats would be in high demand, and it might not be possible to schedule all College 1 sections in the colleges.
- v) As per advice from the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections, authority over the College 1 course (and other aspects of college curricula) cannot be delegated by the college faculty solely to the College Provost. At a minimum, it must be delegated to the College Provost and the Chair of the Faculty. CEP recommended that the college faculties delegate their authority to a broader group, the College Executive Committee.
- vi) CEP and CPB made suggestions to the administration of possibilities that might lead to additional savings in administrative costs.
- vii) CEP supported the VPAA's recommendation that the Academic Literacy Curriculum be included in the external reviews of the Writing Program.

In order to be implemented in fall 2018, CEP, CPB, the Writing Program, the Council of Provosts and the administration had to review the proposal and each other's comments extremely quickly. CEP is grateful to all of them for this effort. The necessary legislative changes were approved by the Senate in its fall 2017 meeting (SR 10.2.3.1.a and 10.5.2).

VI. Kresge Project

At the beginning of the fall term, CEP learned of a planned reconfiguration of the classroom space in Kresge College as part of a larger project to replace several buildings in the college. CEP wrote to the administration presenting arguments why the campus would be better served if the proposed largest classroom — with 600 seats — were to be scaled back to slightly more than 500 seats, while the intermediate sized classroom with 150 seats was enlarged. The campus administration had chosen the sizes of the classrooms without formal consultation with any Senate committees and without CEP's knowledge. Later in the fall, the Senate was informed that no changes would be made to the project without Senate consultation. Despite this assurance, the committee learned in the winter term that two small classrooms had been cut from the project while preserving the 600 seat classroom, without the promised Senate consultation. CEP, along with CPB and the Senate Executive Committee, protested this action and disputed the reasons behind it. With the introduction of the Academic Literacy Curriculum and the increasing emphasis on effective use of discussion sections, the pressure on small classrooms is increasing enormously, and reducing their number without replacement rooms being identified is imprudent.

VII. Introductory Calculus Courses

CEP continued the discussion that was initiated in 2016-17 about the quality of the introductory calculus courses and the role of their online versions. Calculus courses are foundational to student success for many majors in the School of Engineering and in the Physical and Biological Sciences Division. A letter requesting feedback had been sent by CEP to the Mathematics Department in spring 2017. The response from the department, an IRAPS study comparing the effectiveness of online and face-to-face calculus courses, and a study of calculus courses at other UC campuses conducted by a CEP subcommittee were reviewed by CEP.

CEP recommended to the Math Department that discussion sections in these courses should be small and used for active learning. The Math Department agreed to implement this recommendation. Later in the year, CEP discussed with the Math Department and the Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) Dean how to ensure that the department would have adequate resources to accomplish this.

At CEP's request, the Math Department also agreed to look into the feasibility of a Calculus Room, where help is available to all students in calculus courses for a block of time each day; UC Davis uses this very successfully.

CEP also recommended that the class sizes in Math 19A, 19B and 23A be limited to 150-200 students; this is the general practice at other UC campuses. In response, the PBSci Dean pointed out that there was no data to support the conclusion that this norm was actually beneficial for students. CEP has requested the Math Department to have two offerings of one of these courses in a single term, taught by the same instructor, with appropriate class sizes (e.g. 200 and 450) to test this.

The IRAPS report on the online calculus courses found them to be as effective academically as the face-to-face offerings of the same courses. The data that was studied was limited by the way in which these courses have been offered by the Math Department; there were no examples of an online and face-to-face version of a course being offered in the same term, which would have allowed a direct comparison of the academic performance of the two groups in the next term. The IRAPS report urged the Mathematics Department to develop rubric-based comparisons of the two versions instead of relying entirely on the statistical analysis. After discussion, CEP concluded that reviewing a specific online course is the purview of the Committee on Courses of Instruction. CEP focused on constructing a general policy regarding the use and review of online courses.

VIII. Online Course Policy

CEP has been concerned that our campus does not have a policy for online courses, nor do we provide guidance to campus departments. During the fall quarter, a sub-committee was formed to make recommendations for a UCSC online course policy. The sub-committee reviewed policies from other campuses in the UC system and across the country, and presented recommendations to the full committee. CEP members all agreed that students should have a choice between face-to-face and online offerings of a course, and not more than 50% of the seats in a course should be online in any academic year (with certain exceptions). The schedule and questions for review of new online courses were modified: 1) assessment reports would be limited to the first and third years; and 2) the revised questions sought to eliminate duplicate information and to target more

precisely issues distinct to fully online courses. The policy was then reviewed by the Committee on Courses of Instruction, which made minor changes to the assessment questions. Proctoring remains a concern for both committees. The policy will be presented to the Senate in the fall for feedback.

CEP members agreed that online courses should be clearly visible as such to students. The committee discussed the possibility of having a special suffix to the course number for an online course; although this is the practice at a few UC campuses, the committee was informed by the registrar that this would be too complicated to implement at UCSC. The committee then decided that the schedule of classes for each quarter would show “Online” in the Location field for online courses, and section numbers in a certain range (e.g. 90 and above) would be used. The course description in the catalog should also state if the course is sometimes or always offered online.

IX. Impaction Policy and Computer Science Enrollment Management

The Senate and administration worked together in 2016-17 to develop an “impaction policy” by which departments whose curricular resources were insufficient to teach the number of students interested in their academic programs could limit the number of students. Hitherto, all students who satisfied the qualification requirements for a program would be admitted into the program. Following comments from Senate committees, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) circulated an updated version of the policy this year. CEP supported the policy with minor comments. Beyond the impaction process, CEP retains the ability to make modifications — or suspend admissions to — an undergraduate program that is not functioning properly.

Toward the end of the fall term, the Senate received an enrollment management (impaction) proposal from the Computer Science (CS) Department for its undergraduate programs. The enrollments for CS majors have grown extremely rapidly over the last few years. For 2018-19, the Admissions Office estimated the number of proposed majors would grow by another 25%. Senate committees were concerned that a public university is about access, and the CS major is perceived by many students as a path to a brighter future. After extensive discussion by CEP, CPB and CAFA, the Senate supported the impaction request for one year. CEP was unable to verify the capacity analysis supplied by the Computer Science Department in time for 2018 admissions, but in view of the urgency of the situation, tentatively endorsed the target of 400 CS declarations per year (excluding transfer students) for one year. CEP recommended that the number of transfer students per year should be capped at half the target number of non-transfer declared majors per year. CEP also requested curricular changes, and asked that the department conduct a curricular review as recommended by their last External Review Committee. Following Senate review, the number of students admitted as proposed Computer Science majors for fall 2018 was limited, and lateral entry into the program (from students proposed or declared in other majors) was stopped. If this is to be continued for 2019, the department will have to submit a request for renewal.

Near the end of the spring term, CEP learned that there was a serious shortfall in the number of seats planned for 2018-19 in various essential CS courses, partly because the number of frosh and transfer students accepting admission offers in CS was unexpectedly large. The committee was also told that incoming students listing CS as an alternate major in their application might be allowed to propose the major, but the committee did not have to take steps to respond to this

because it was informed by the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) that this would not happen. CEP wrote to the CS Department Chair, BSOE Dean Wolf, and CP/EVC Tromp with its analysis of the deficiencies in the 2018-19 CS course offerings and a request that the problem be remedied by the administration during the summer. CEP asked that a revised Curriculum Plan be provided to the committee by the beginning of the fall for the committee to assess if further steps would be needed.

X. Baskin School of Engineering Reshaping Proposal

Late in spring quarter the Senate received a proposal to reorganize the School of Engineering. The proposal included (i) the disestablishment of the Computer Science, Computer Engineering and Electrical Engineering departments and their reconstitution as two departments instead of three; (ii) the disestablishment of the Department of Technology Management and the redistribution of its faculty; (iii) the disestablishment of the Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics; and (iv) the creation of a Department of Statistics and the transfer of faculty in Applied Mathematics to the newly created Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. CEP reviewed the proposal based on the immediate and long-term impact on the undergraduate curriculum, and offered qualified support for the first item and support for the second and third items, while disagreeing with the fourth item. The final decision by the CP/EVC approved the creation of the departments proposed by the BSOE Dean as well as a Department of Applied Mathematics, with the Department of Statistics and the Department of Applied Mathematics to be reviewed internally after three years. Decisions about programs and courses were deferred to 2018-19.

XI. Strategic Academic Plan

At the end of the fall term, the Senate received its first request from the administration for input about the Strategic Academic Plan that was being developed. This was the first of several such requests during the rest of the year, generally with short deadlines. Especially during the winter term when program statement review had to proceed at a pace that ensures timely publication of the General Catalog, short deadline requests from the administration strained the committee. Senate feedback was first requested to identify strategies for resource generation and to identify internal barriers to teaching and research. (Although the request from the administration asked for barriers to *interdisciplinary* activity, the scope of this item metamorphosed and broadened.) Feedback was then requested on the Future State Brief, which was supposed to identify design principles for future campus growth; unfortunately, CEP found the “principles” to be platitudes. Finally, feedback was requested on the Themed Academic Working Groups (TAWGs) in the spring term; unfortunately, the large number of other items pending with the committee and the brevity of each of the TAWG proposals made it impossible for CEP to conduct a review in as much depth as it would have liked. More details, including most of CEP’s letters on the matter, can be found on the Strategic Academic Planning Website¹ and on CEP’s website². The draft SAP was released in the middle of July, to be reviewed by Senate committees during the summer before being finalized by the CP/EVC. CEP’s response is on the Senate website.

¹ <https://cpevc.ucsc.edu/academic-plan/index.html>

² <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cep-committee-on-educational-policy/CEP%20to%20AVPAA%20re%20Strategic%20Academic%20Plan%20Process.pdf>

XII. Review of Major Qualification Policies (MQP)

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. For some majors, students cannot obtain more than one failing grade in the qualification courses, or cannot complete the requirements after the UCSC major declaration deadline. All major qualification policies were approved by CEP based on student data presented to the committee. However, each department's request would analyze the data differently. 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. The data analysis should be conducted by IRAPS. When reviewing existing major qualification policies, the following should be taken into account:

1. For majors that require a set of courses to be completed — perhaps by the campus deadline to declare a major — the review will consider whether the number and choice of courses was the appropriate subset of the course requirements for the major. Barriers to completion will also be considered (long chains of prerequisites, the length of waitlists, the number of offerings per year, fail/withdraw rates, and entry quizzes) and the term in which students typically complete the qualification requirement.
2. For majors that require completion of courses with no more than one failing grade, CEP will examine students with one failing grade and how the success rate in the major for these students compares to campus averages, to see if two failing grades would indeed be undesirable. All questions for Category 1 are also relevant here.
3. For majors that require a minimum GPA in courses, with or without a limit on failing grades, an analysis looking at threshold cases, similar to Category 2, should be conducted.
4. For major programs that require a specific grade individually in multiple courses, CEP will request data about whether obtaining the minimum grade in any one of the courses is indeed sufficient to result in borderline student success rates. Otherwise, recognizing the variation in grading from one instructor to another, wherever possible these should be replaced with a GPA in a set of major qualification courses.
5. For majors that require completion of a minimum number of courses from a much larger set, and count the GPA in all completed courses, the review will be similar to Category 3. In addition, CEP will seek data about whether students who complete the minimum number of courses and fail to meet the required GPA continue to take major qualification courses without ultimately being able to declare the major, thus merely delaying their rejection. If this is the case, the policy should be changed so that eligibility to declare the major is determined as soon as the student has completed the minimum number of courses.

The review of proposed new major qualification policies will be similar, except that there will be sufficient data on student success for students who do not meet the proposed qualification policy, and therefore the extrapolations in Category 2 - 5 are not needed. CEP will work with IRAPS to

decide the best way to measure student success (e.g. four/five year graduation, graduation in the declared major or in any major, etc.). CEP will also check with IRAPS if separate analyses can be conducted for transfer students, which would allow major qualification and major preparation requirements to be decoupled; at present, CEP policy does not allow major preparation requirements to exceed major qualification requirements.

XIII. Graduate Student Instructors

Director Greene from the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL) consulted with the committee on the programs the center is offering. Among those, CITL has created a training program for graduate student teaching assistants. The Center has rewritten the Graduate TA Handbook and is encouraging departments to promote compliance and professional development for graduate students. Currently, there is a 10-week Graduate Pedagogy Fellows program that is available to students who are interested; students meet for two hours every other week during the quarter and develop training for their home departments. There is also a pilot program for summer session Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) with peer mentoring. CEP members support the center and will advocate that it be provided adequate resources in the fall.

CEP also reviewed a proposal from the central administration to promote the use of GSIs. The committee acknowledges that some graduate students can teach certain courses very well, and that teaching experience is valuable for the future career plans of many graduate students. However, the committee could not endorse the proposal without clearer guarantees that the GSI would be sufficiently qualified, trained, and mentored.

XIV. College Scholars Program (CSP)

In the fall term, CEP formed a joint subcommittee with CAFA to review the campus honors program, which has been renamed the College Scholars Program (CSP). Some colleges admit students to this program when they enter UCSC in the fall term. An additional group of students is admitted to the program in the spring term of their frosh year. UCSC compares favorably to national averages with regard to retention and graduation of its academically weaker students, but fails to do so at the other end of the spectrum.

CEP discussed the report of the subcommittee in the spring term, consulting with the Director of CSP. Both the Program Director and CEP supported the subcommittee recommendations. To this end, CEP has written to CP/EVC Tromp requesting that CSP students be provided a space of their own at certain designated times during the week to foster interaction and allow the students to organize their own activities. CEP will work with CAFA to expand enrollments in this program, which will enable additional colleges that wish to participate in the fall-start part of CSP to do so. CEP expects to send a request for resources for this program to the administration next year, after a review of similar programs across the country. At present, some volunteer work by faculty members, especially college provosts, is needed to keep the program running, which is a precarious situation.

XV. International Exchange Program Proposal

VPDUE Hughey requested Senate review and comments on his proposal as Interim Vice Provost of Global Engagement (IVPGE) to bring students to UCSC as part of an international exchange visitor program. UCSC is estimating 10-20 students will be in the program for any year. CEP

was supportive of the program, approving priority enrollment as long as the enrollment does not exceed 30 in any year. If the number goes beyond the limit, CEP will revisit this status.

CEP did not approve waiving course prerequisites for these students. CEP expressed concern to the IVGPE that, in some courses, the department approves all prerequisites being waived for visiting students, and asked how this was consistent with Senate Regulation SR 542, which gives *instructors* the right to keep out unqualified students from their courses. IVGPE Hughey proposed that, when such waivers were sought for any term, the course sponsoring units would be informed that they would need approval of the instructor. CEP found this arrangement satisfactory and consistent with SR 542. CEP has subsequently sought clarification about the reported practice in which prerequisites are waived for *all* students in a Summer Session course, including UCSC students.

XVI. Senior Comprehensive Requirement

The Senior Comprehensive requirement was part of the grading process approved when UCSC was established with the Pass/No Pass narrative evaluation system. This requirement has morphed into a requirement that is not necessarily comprehensive in the sense of tying together the student's study of discipline during their undergraduate career. Some departments create a senior capstone experience for their majors, which CEP felt plays a valuable role. The committee discussed if the Senior Comprehensive should be retained as a requirement or made optional for each program, perhaps with CEP permission. After discussion and informal consultation with various departments, the committee sent a letter to all department chairs requesting their perspective. Six departments with undergraduate majors responded, all of which supported the requirement and indicated that successful completion benefited students and contributed to student satisfaction in their program.

XVII. Course Grading Schemes

CEP considered whether the grading scheme used in a course must be provided to students at the beginning of the term in the course syllabus. The committee concluded that fairness to students requires that this be done. The committee also decided that an entry quiz, where the performance of a student on a quiz to be taken at the beginning of the course (i.e., based on prior knowledge) can determine whether they fail the course, is a kind of prerequisite, and must be approved by CCI and noted in the catalog description of the course. In the course of the discussion, committee members realized that different departments may have very different grading schemes that they commonly use; information was requested from a few departments to allow the committee to better understand practices across the campus.

XVIII. Double Counting Policy

In 2016-17, CEP requested clarification from the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJ&E) about how courses satisfying the requirements for two majors should be counted for students pursuing double majors, in the light of Santa Cruz Regulation SCR 10.4.7. RJ&E's interpretation was stricter than the current practice. After discussion in 2017-18, CEP felt that it would not be desirable to change the current practice and brought draft legislation to the Senate to amend SCR 10.4.7. The proposed legislation was approved.

XIX. Other Policies

CEP reviewed the policy regarding Withdrawal (W) grades in courses. At present, students can withdraw from any course until the end of the sixth week of a term, and thereafter under documented emergency circumstances, with permission. This results in a lot of petitions being processed by college advisors, and a surge in the workload for Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) in the last few weeks of each term. After discussion, the committee felt that the six week deadline should be extended to nine weeks, with a limit placed on the number of such non-emergency W grades. The proposed policy will be discussed with departments for feedback.

CEP also reviewed divisional regulations pertaining to undergraduate students, with the general objective of simplifying and reducing the number of student petitions. Proposed legislative changes, and policies, will be presented to the Senate in its fall meeting.

XX. Routine Business

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

- *New programs:* New program proposals reviewed and approved this year included the Environmental Science B.S. and the Intensive History Major. An Anthropology B.S. proposal was reviewed, and comments were returned to the department. A proposal for an Accounting concentration in the majors sponsored by the Economics Department was also returned to the department with suggestions about how it could be modified and resubmitted.
- *Maintenance of programs:* Proposals to change the names of the concentrations in the History major and to transfer the Biomolecular Engineering concentration from the Bioengineering program to the Bioinformatics program (to be renamed Biomolecular Engineering and Bioinformatics) were approved. CEP reviewed and endorsed the charter and bylaws for the interdisciplinary Art Design: Games and Playable Media program. CEP also reviewed the charter and bylaws for the Computer Science: Computer Game Design program, but objected to the fact that all Senate faculty in the Computational Media Department would not have equal voting rights in the program, despite contributing fully to teaching the program. A revised charter and bylaws are expected for this program.
- *Discontinuance and suspension of programs:* CEP approved the discontinuance of concentrations in the Feminist Studies program, the discontinuance of a concentration in Science Education in the Earth and Planetary Sciences program, the discontinuance of the Assistive Technology (Cognitive & Perceptual) concentration in the Bioengineering program, and the suspension of the German Studies major due to the lack of resources.
- *Internal review of new programs:* The reports from the three-year review of new programs were discussed by CEP for Critical Race and Ethnic Studies (CRES) and the Sustainability Minor. The committee informed the VPAA that the CRES program was under-resourced and suggested how this could be remedied. The committee supported the proposal that suitable college courses should be provided with Teaching Assistant (TA)

support, provided that this was not achieved by changing the formula by which TAs are provided to academic divisions. (The actual number of TAs varies from year to year and could go down if the enrollment in courses in a division were to decrease as a result of college courses.)

- *External reviews:* At the request of the Languages & Applied Linguistics Department and the Dean of Humanities, CEP recommended deferral of the external review of the department by one year. CEP participated in the external reviews of the following departments: Applied Mathematics & Statistics, Art, Chemistry, History, Linguistics, Music, and Earth & Planetary Sciences.
- *Mid-cycle reviews:* CEP reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on the length of review cycle for the following departments and programs: Electrical Engineering, Mathematics, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, and Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology.
- *University Extension:* After reviewing systemwide and local regulations and Regents' Standing Orders, CEP, CCI, and GC created a new process for approving UNEX courses and certificate requests. The UNEX certificate in Supply Chain Management was approved under this process.

In addition to the issues discussed in earlier sections of the report, CEP dealt with the following matters:

- Systemwide review of draft changes to Academic Personnel Manual Section 285 for Lecturers with Security of Employment.
- Review of systemwide Senate Regulation 424.A.3, changing the Area d requirement for incoming frosh at the University of California from two units of Laboratory Science to three units of Science.
- Request to remove notation about academic disqualification or an enrollment bar for academic reasons after the sanction has ended; enrollment bars for disciplinary reasons are removed under similar circumstances. The request was approved.
- Review of Disciplinary Communication (DC) Grant proposals from the following departments: Art, Ecology and Environmental Biology; Environmental Studies; Psychology; the CITL, IRAPS, and the Writing Program (joint proposal); and Crown College. CEP made recommendations to the VPDUE who makes the final funding decision.
- Updated learning outcomes for the Composition requirement. CEP approved the revision.
- Request for clarification about whether a course that had been approved as satisfying the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirements for two majors would fulfill this

requirement for both majors for a student pursuing both. CEP decided that the same course could be used for both DC requirements.

- Review of student categories that are given priority enrollment. CEP decided to retain the status quo.
- Proposal from Office of Research to provide seed funding to Centers of Excellence that have the potential to generate substantial extramural funding. CEP felt that a more detailed and better justified proposal was needed.
- Proposal from Graduate Division that teaching assistantships should be provided for large classes in master's programs. CEP opposed this being done by reducing TA allocations for undergraduate courses. The committee also felt that large master's classes would primarily be in self-supporting programs (at UCSC, programs charging professional degree supplemental tuition) for which the supplemental tuition should be sufficient to cover such expenses without cutting back on resources provided for undergraduate courses.

Throughout the year, CEP was provided with valuable input from Associate Registrar Margie Claxton and the Academic Preceptor representative Kalin McGraw. We also thank analysts Susanna Wrangell and Kim Van Le for the enormous amount of work they did in supporting the work of the committee and serving as a repository of knowledge about CEP activity in previous years.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Jeffrey Bury

Ben Carson (W&S)

Patrick Chuang

Suresh Lodha

Francis Nimmo

Tonya Ritola

Megan Thomas

Nina Treadwell (F)

Rob Wilson (F)

Noriko Aso, *ex officio*

Tchad Sanger, *ex officio*

Onuttom Narayan, Chair

Joy Hagen, NSTF

Jessica Xu, Undergraduate Representative

Burcu Birol, Undergraduate Representative (W&S)

Lauren Woo, Undergraduate Representative (S)

Ben Carson, Provost Representative (F)

August 31, 2018