COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY ANNUAL REPORT:
Academic Year: 2011-2012

I. COUNCIL OPERATIONS

The authority of the faculty over undergraduate instruction is given by the Standing Orders of the Regents of the University of California, 105.2 (b) Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate which states: “The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, or over non-degree courses in the University Extension. No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned.”

The Council on Educational Policy (CEP) met eight times during the 2011-12 academic year. Additional business was handled electronically.

Members of the Council were also busy with other Senate activities. Chair Michael Dennin attended meetings of the following committees: the WASC Committee, the Academic Planning Group, the Enrollment Council, the Universitywide Committee on Educational Policy, the Senate Cabinet, the Divisional Senate Assembly, and the Chancellor / Provost / Cabinet Luncheons throughout the year.

In addition to meetings of the full Council, the Programs and Policy Subcommittee (PPS), composed of six CEP members and chaired by CEP member Tony Smith (Social Sciences), met eight times to consider matters related to undergraduate academic policy, issues concerning General Education and degree requirements, proposals for new majors and minors, changes to majors and minors, and proposals for criteria for change of majors by undergraduates. Actions endorsed by the PPS were sent forward to the full CEP for final approval on a Consent Calendar. Items requiring further discussion and major proposals appeared on the regular CEP agenda. Additional business resulting from the regularly scheduled meetings but needing further input from members was conducted electronically.

Members of CEP were asked to serve on at least one CEP subcommittee:

- **Programs and Policy Subcommittee**: Tony Smith, Chair (Social Sciences) Myrona Delaney (Arts), Bernard Choi (Engineering), Maria Pantelia (Humanities), John Dombrink (Social Ecology), Fillmore Freeman (Physical Sciences), and Alexander Ihler (ICS).

- **Academic Program Review Board (APRB)**: Nader Bagherzadeh (Engineering)

- **Universitywide Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE)**: Jonathan...
Alexander (Writing Program)

- Assessment Committee (AC): Jessica Utts who served as Chair of AC

II. PROGRAM APPROVALS:

CEP endorsed the proposal to establish a joint M.A. degree program in the Departments of Logic and Philosophy of Science, Philosophy, Economics and Political Science.

CEP approved 18 modifications to Change of Major Criteria for the following majors:

- Nursing
- Economics
- Earth Systems Science
- Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Public Health
- Business and Information Management
- Computer Science
- Computer Science and Engineering
- Informatics
- Informatics and Computer Science (discontinuation)
- Computer Game Science
- Biomedical Computing (discontinuation)
- Software Engineering
- Literary Journalism
- Biological Sciences
- Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
- Microbiology and Immunology
- Chemistry

CEP approved the combination of existing majors in the Classics Department into one new major:

- B.A in Classics.

CEP approved two new minors:

- Minor in Mathematics for Biology
- Minor in Health Informatics

CEP approved three new honors programs:

- Honors in Public Health
- Honors in Music and Music Culture
- Honors Studio Art
CEP approved one new specialization:

- Specialization in Mathematical Biology

CEP approved a number of XI courses (XI courses are Extension courses that are exact versions of existing UCI courses).

Non-controversial items, such as new minors, changes to programs were forwarded to the full CEP for final approval on the Consent Calendar.

**CEP Review of the 2011 APRB Report on the School of Social Ecology.**

CEP was asked to assess the external review committee report on the undergraduate and graduate programs in the School of Social Ecology along with the response to this review from the Dean of Social Ecology. CEP was pleased with the external reviewers’ report and particularly with the Dean’s detailed clarification of concerns raised by the report.

**2007-2008 Academic Program Review of the School of Biological Sciences (SoBS) and Medicine, Follow up report from the School.**

CEP was satisfied with the follow up report and confirmed that all concerns presented by the APRB external reviewers had been addressed or clarified by SoBS and Medicine. CEP provided additional clarification on two issues identified in the original APRB external review. First, CEP recommended that SoBS increase publicity of its searchable website to increase student traffic and understanding about the School. Second, the APRB reviewers noted that many students who initially declare a major in Biological Sciences subsequently transfer to other majors. CEP provided clarification on the transfer out rate issues in the SoBS. The UCI practice of encouraging students to declare majors upon admission and the transfer out rate in Biological Sciences are intimately connected. CEP also encouraged the school to continue to integrate non-majors into its educational mission.

**2011-2012 Draft Charges for the APRB Review of Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences**

CEP was asked to review charges to external reviewers for the AY 2011-2012 School-wide and departmental reviews of the Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences. CEP endorsed both sets of charges as written.

**Proposal to Change the name of the Department of Studio Art to the Department of Art**

CEP was asked to review and comment on the proposal from the Department of Studio Art to change its name to the Department of Art. CEP supported this name change, and agreed that the name change more accurately reflects the contemporary view, research and teaching of the department. CEP noted that although curriculum changes are not associated with this name change, the Department of Art may want to submit a proposal for similar name changes to its degrees for the purpose of maintaining consistency and avoiding confusion.
Review of General Education Categories VII and VII

The general duties of CEP include the regular review of the General Education (GE) courses. In response to this duty, and the previous changes to GE, all course designated as GE prior to Fall 2010 require review to ensure they are in compliance with the new course level student learning outcomes and general policies governing GE courses. This year CEP reviewed courses in General Education categories VII (Multicultural Studies) and VIII (International and Global issues).

CEP requested that units remove the GE VII or VIII designation for all upper division courses as part of CEP’s overall goal to make certain that GE is a component of lower division courses only. If the unit felt that the GE designation was appropriate for a particular upper division course, an exception request detailing the justification was reviewed by CEP. Courses requesting to maintain a GE VII or VIII designation on an upper division course were responsible for showing that 1) the GE course is fundamental in nature and the experience provided is relatively broad, and 2) that the GE course is intended for non-majors and should be general enough to be accessible to non-majors.”

CEP reviewed 80 GE exception requests from units (Education, Chicano Latino Studies, Anthropology, Social Ecology, East Asian Lang and Lit, Political Science). Each request was reviewed to determine if the course met General Education criteria. Thirty courses were approved by CEP and allowed to maintain the GE designation. Fifty were denied approval and asked to remove the GE VII or VIII designation by Fall, 2013. All courses with prerequisites other than writing were not approved. Courses whose associate deans were not in support of maintaining the GE designation were not approved. Courses whose exception requests did not make arguments in support of keeping GE were not approved.

III. CAMPUS ISSUES

Changes to CEP Bylaw 85

The UCI Assembly approved CEP’s proposed changes to CEP and its subcommittees’ bylaws (Bylaw 85). Changes are effective September, 2012. These bylaw changes were the result of a three year process involving the creation of a new subcommittee of CEP (the Assessment Subcommittee), a review of the recently revised General Education procedures (GE), and a general review of the procedures for CEP and its three major subcommittees: Policy, SCOC, and Assessment. The review highlighted a number of areas in which selection of the Chairs of the subcommittees had inconsistencies and in which the review process for Program modifications could be streamlined.

The UCI Assembly also approved a conforming change to IR 34 (g) to address problems of inconsistency which arose as the result of the proposed changes to Bylaw 85.

Rationale for the changes to Bylaw 85:

1) The three main subcommittees of CEP are Policy, SCOC, and Assessment. Chairs of these committees needed to be voting members of CEP to maintain the necessary level of interaction and connection between the subcommittees and the
full CEP. This is especially important as the range of curricular options increase. Before these bylaw changes, only the Chairs of Policy and Assessment were selected by CEP. The change to the by-laws created similar mechanisms for selecting the chair of SCOC.

2) The previous division of labor between Policy and SCOC was inconsistent with regard to evaluation of changes to curriculum based on implementing existing policy versus issues of changes in policy or potential impacts on policy. This resulted in a number of inefficiencies and confusions with procedures. The most relevant inconsistency involves routine changes to programs that currently require actions by two subcommittees of CEP: SCOC and Policy. CEP agreed that all course related matters, including routine changes to programs, should be evaluated by SCOC. This process not only streamlines the approvals, but it provides for more consistent review as the course and program changes can be reviewed as a coherent package. Only new programs and major revisions of programs, which can have policy implications and involve policies beyond course related issues, are now reviewed by Policy.

**Senate Regulation 610**

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed and discussed the proposed amendments to Regulation 610 (Residency). CEP supported the language amendments put forward by UCEP to clarify the definition of “residency” in Senate Regulation 610 but proposed a minor language change (in bold).

610
Residence in any regular term is validated by a program of courses or other exercises approved by the Faculty of student’s college or school, irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery. For undergraduates this shall be at least six units of resident courses of instruction. Graduate students validate residence with programs of instruction or research approved by appropriate graduate council. This regulation does not address impact the California Residency Requirement or questions of non-resident supplemental tuition.

**CEP’s Response to CSE’s Proposal to Provide Online Access to Teaching Evaluation Results**

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed and discussed the proposal. CEP recognizes the importance of providing students with more meaningful information about faculty instructors for the purpose of course selection; however some members of the council believed that the proposal as written will not result in the desired outcome for the following reasons.

1) Teaching evaluations appropriately measure teaching quality and student learning outcomes. Therefore, before teaching evaluation results are made public, a review of the scientific validity of the results should be conducted to ensure that teaching evaluation results are providing information to students
that will help them select instructors who are best suited to their individual learning styles.

2) For many departments, teaching evaluation results are used by faculty to improve the quality of the course, learning outcomes, and classroom experience for students. If evaluation results are posted online, the purpose of the teaching evaluation will become more student oriented.

3) The majority of teaching of undergraduate students is performed by instructors who are not academic senate faculty. If the purpose of publicizing teaching results is to help students make informed decisions about instructors, then teaching evaluation results of all instructors, including graduate students, not just senate faculty, should be available.

4) ASUCI stated there is a demand from students to publicize teaching evaluation results. CEP requested that CSE determine to what extent this demand exists.

5) CSE might also ask ASUCI how students would use this information to make course selection and improve their educational experience.

CEP’s endorsement of the School of Education

CEP was asked to review the proposal for the establishment of the UC Irvine School of Education. CEP members unanimously endorsed the proposal.

Priority Registration for Foster Youth Students

CEP voted in favor of priority registration for foster youth.

Wireless in Lecture Halls

In 2010-2011, CEP reviewed the issue of use of wireless by students in the lecture halls and potential methods of controlling access by students to the wireless network in lecture halls. At that time, CEP approved a policy stating that faculty members have control over the use of technology in their classroom. This means that faculty can decide if students are allowed to use laptops and other devices. This issue was raised again this year with a specific focus on the installation of kill switches or other optional methods of controlling wireless access. The Policy subcommittee of CEP reviewed this issue and determined that the policy approved last year would allow for the installation of kill switches in the lecture halls that give instructors the opportunity to turn off internet service in the lecture hall. Given this fact, Policy primarily determined that the decision to install optional kill switches is a budget/administrative issue and not a CEP Policy issue and did not see the need to review the issue at this time.

Therefore, CEP did not take any additional action on this issue beyond confirming that the statement issued last year covers the proposed actions. However, CEP recognized that the kill switches may give rise to issues relevant to the Council on Student Experience and CEP recommended forwarding such issues to that Council.

IV. SYSTEMWIDE PROPOSALS
BOARS: Proposal for Major-Based Transfer Admission to the University of California

CEP reviewed the revised proposal, was satisfied with the revisions, and supported the proposal’s recommendations. CEP recognizes that the state of California has an ongoing interest and obligation to improve the efficiency of transfer pathway programs from California community colleges to UC campuses.

CEP registered two concerns about the proposal:

1) The three proposed pathway programs at community colleges will further disenfranchise a vulnerable set of students who have not taken the administrative steps to become locked into one of the major preparation pathways.

2) Existing major pathway programs are currently functioning well for many UC majors. The revised proposal should have outlined how the proposed pathways for some majors would be an improvement over existing major pathway programs.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR FALL 2012
a. Review of GE II (Science and Technology) Courses that were grandfathered in during the 2007 Revision of GE.

b. The Department of Education is mandating accreditation agencies to push campuses to define units and credit hours in order that all colleges and universities link course credit hours to student workload and instructor contact. As such, all UC courses must be more narrowly defined in terms of workload and instructor contact. WASC is looking to UC Senate Regulation, SR 760: 760 to guide its review of unit definition on UC campuses. The regulation states, “The value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours' work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent.” WASC wants to UC campuses to clarify what work students are doing to earn three credit hours for one unit. UCI has a four unit system and may need to change definitions to comply with WASC requirements. CEP may be asked by a university wide council to review or clarify how units are counted for UCI courses.
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