COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY ANNUAL REPORT:
Academic Year: 2016-2017

I. COUNCIL OPERATIONS
The Council on Educational Policy is responsible for considering all matters related to academic policy, including makes recommendations regarding curricula and programs and other educational matters, including general campus requirements and grading systems, issues recommendations on the establishment, substantive modifications or withdrawal of academic programs, and reviews and reports on the character of the educational programs on the Irvine campus. The Council is authorized to act for the Division in approving new or amended degree requirements, including new or amended minors, specializations, concentrations or emphasis, recommended to the Division by the several Faculties. 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 nine times during the 2016-17 academic year. CEP business and consent calendars for June and July, 2017 were handled electronically. In addition to meetings of the full Council, the Programs and Policy Subcommittee (Policy), composed of eight CEP members and chaired by CEP member Arvind Rajaraman (Physical Sciences), met three times to consider matters related to undergraduate academic policy, such as issues concerned with General Education reviews, degree requirements, proposals for new majors and minors, and proposals for change of majors requirements for undergraduate majors. Actions endorsed by the Policy were sent forward to the full CEP for final approval on the CEP Consent Calendar. Items requiring further discussion and proposals for new majors 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: Arvind Rajaraman, Chair (Physical Sciences), Michael McNally (Engineering), Hugh Roberts (Humanities), Chen Li (ICS), Andrew Noymer (Health Sciences), Katherine Faust (Social Sciences), and Debra Mauzy-Melitz (Biological Sciences); Philip Bromiley (Business), Ramash Arasasingham (Physical Sciences)
- Academic Program Review Board (APRB): Pavan Kadandale (Biological Sciences) and Richard Pattis (ICS)
- University-wide Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE): Brad Queen (Writing Program) and Daniel Gross (Composition)
- Writing Advisory Group (Sean Greenberg, Humanities)
- Assessment Committee (AC): Justin Shaffer, Fall and Spring (Biological Sciences) and Russ Detweiler, Winter (Engineering) served as Chairs of AC.
- The Subcommittee on Courses (SCOC): James Brody (Engineering) served as Chair of SCOC

II. NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS:
During Academic Year 2016-2017, CEP reviewed and approved fewer new degrees compared to the past four years. Normally, CEP reviews and approves at least two new majors and a handful of minors. CEP approved one proposal for one new major:
CEP approved one proposal for a new BA/MA program:

- The BA/MA in European Thought and Culture

CEP approved one Honor’s Program:

- An Honors Program in the B.A. in Drama.

III. PROPOSALS TO MODIFY CHANGE OF MAJOR REQUIREMENTS:

CEP reviewed and approved nine proposals to change requirements for UCI undergraduates to change into the major (Change of Major (COM) proposals)

With consideration of feedback from initial reviews of COM proposals by the Associate Deans and the Enrollment Council, CEP is responsible for conducting the final review of the proposals. Nearly all COM proposals are requests to lower or raise GPA requirements and/or reduce or add course prerequisites in an effort to expand or decrease enrollment in the major. CEP members are charged with determining how the proposed modifications to Change of Major requirements might impact both the academic quality and the likelihood of student success in the major. CEP reviews data provided by the proposers related to predictors of student success, such as graduation rates, information on probation and disqualification. CEP also considers issues related to instruction, classroom space, advising and other resources that may be affected by the proposed COM modifications. CEP spent a good deal of council time discussing and reviewing Change of Major proposals this year compared to the past three years.

CEP approved two proposals for COM criteria for new degrees:

- B.A. in Language Science: (overall GPA 2.0 and GPA of 2.0 previous quarter before entering the major and two course prerequisites).
- European Thought and Culture: (admission into both BA and MA: 1) A completed graduate application. 2) A statement of purpose (1-2 pages) 3) An official transcript, including GPA (at least 3.0). 4) Three letters of recommendation from faculty members in a related field of study. 5) GRE scores.

CEP approved seven proposals to modify COM requirements for existing majors:

- B.A. in Chinese Studies (course criteria made more flexible to enter major)
- B.A. in French (course criteria made more flexible to enter major)
- B.A. in Japanese Language and Literature (course criteria made more flexible to enter major)
- B.A. in German Studies (course criteria made more flexible to enter major)
- B.A. in Korean Literature and Culture (course criteria made more flexible to enter major)
- B.A. in Spanish (course criteria made more flexible to enter major)
- B.S. in Human Biology (GPA and course prerequisite criteria loosened)

CEP approved 48 proposals to modify degree program requirements during AY16-17, similar to the number of degree modification proposals reviewed and approved by CEP over the past four years: CEP approved 49 proposals to modify program requirements during AY15-16, 42 modifications to majors and minors during AY14-15, and 44 during AY12-13).
SCHOOL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
- B.S. in Human Biology
- B.S. in Biological Sciences, concentration in Biological Sciences Education

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
- Minor in Education

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
- B.S. in Biomedical Engineering
- B.S. in Biomedical Engineering, Premed
- B.S. in Chemical Engineering
- B.S. in Computer Science and Engineering
- B.S. in Engineering
- B.S. in Material Sciences Engineering
- B.S. in Electrical Engineering
- B.S. in Chemical Engineering and Materials Science/Specialization in Energy and the Environment
- B.S. in Software Engineering

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
- B.A. in Chinese Studies
- B.A. in Chinese Cultures, Emphasis in Chinese Language and Literature
- B.A. in Comparative Literature
- B.A. in English
- B.A. in English, Emphasis in Creative Writing
- B.A. in English, Specialization for Future Teachers
- Minor in English
- B.A. in European Studies
- Minor in European Studies
- B.A. in Film and Media Studies
- B.A. in Global Middle Eastern Studies, seventh emphasis added to major
- Minor in Italian
- B.A. in East Asian Cultures
- B.A. in Japanese Language and Literature
- Minor in Latin American Studies
- B.A. in Literary Journalism
- Minor in Literary Journalism
- B.A. in German
- Minor in German Studies

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND COMPUTER SCIENCES
- Minor in Bioinformatics
- B.S. in Computer Science
- B.S. in Computer Game Science
- B.S. in Data Science
- Minor in Digital Information Systems
- Minor in Health Informatics
• B.S. in Informatics
• Minor in Informatics
• Minor in Information and Computer Science
• Minor in Statistics
• AP Statistics Exam score to test out of Statistics 8

SCHOOL OF NURSING
• B.S. in Nursing Science

PROGRAM IN PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
• B.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences

PROGRAM IN PUBLIC HEALTH
• B.S. in Public Health Science

SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL SCIENCES
• B.S. in Chemistry, several major modifications to the major
• B.S. in Math

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
• School requirements for Social Sciences majors
• B.A. in Quantitative Economics

The Subcommittee on Courses (SCOC) conducts the first round of review of degree modification proposals. If approved, SCOC forwards the proposals to the full CEP for final approval on the Consent Calendar. Consistent with the past few years, most of the degree modification proposals listed above were non-controversial changes driven primarily by the departments’ desire to update and/or improve the academic quality for students in the major. However, this year, SCOC/CEP reviewed a number of degree modification proposals seeking to lower the academic quality of the major, with requests to reduce the number of required units, replace upper division course requirements with lower division requirements, replace standard core courses with topics vary courses, or to eliminate difficult course requirements, such as calculus and statistics. The motivation for these proposed changes was either to increase enrollments in the major by reducing the academic quality of the degree in some cases. In other cases, departments and programs wanted to maintain graduate levels and to do so would mean eliminating difficult course requirements. SCOC sent back these proposals back to the academic units with requests for clarification and/or additional modifications to the degree, with the aim of ensuring the proposed degree requirements maintain a similar degree of academic rigor as the exiting degree requirements. About half of these proposals were approved by SCOC and CEP after the second or third round of revisions and review.

V. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS
Each year, CEP reviews and responds to the following reviews or aspects of the review process:

• The Academic Program Review Board’s (APRB) external review of a UCI School and the School’s response to that review. APRB is a subcommittee of CEP and CEP along with Graduate Council provide responses to APRB reviews. CEP reviewed the School of Engineering External Review Report and the response from the school and provided its own response to APRB.

• The Three to Five-Year follow up report written by the school to the APRB external review that was conducted three to five years prior. CEP reviewed follow up reports from the School of Humanities and the School of Social Sciences
• The APRB review charge for the upcoming School review. CEP did not review a charge this year.

• Any non-degree seeking academic reviews performed by CEP the previous year. CEP conducts non degree academic reviews each year or every other year. CEP oversaw the external review of UCI Summer Session this year.

**CEP Review of the 2016 APRB External Review of the Henry Samuei School of Engineering and School Response.**

CEP reviewed the 2016 APRB external review report of the Henry Samuei School of Engineering and the School’s response to the report. In keeping with CEP’s charge to oversee undergraduate curriculum and courses, CEP limited its review of the report to the undergraduate program in Business Administration. CEP forwarded the following comments to the School and the Provost via APRB in July, 2017.

• The external review questions the sufficiency of teaching resources, especially given proposed increases in undergraduate enrollment. The lack of resources included insufficient TA support and a paucity of teaching faculty. The school’s response acknowledges the shortfalls and potential for serious insufficiency in the future, and points to plans for new faculty hiring. However, these changes depend on increased funding from the UCI administration. Furthermore, while the School anticipates additional hiring, the response does not indicate that it will target the hiring to the departments with most insufficient teaching resources. The School could add faculty in total without alleviating the lack of faculty relative to teaching needs in specific departments. While the School does not fully control the availability of funding for instruction, it also does not specify how it would use additional funds. We note the review committee’s reminder that training future engineers is important but expensive; sufficient resources are essential for a good program.

• The external review notes a lack of career and placement counseling at undergraduate (and master’s) levels. Given our location in the midst of an engineering-intensive region, modest improvements in career services could pay large dividends in placement and student morale.

• With regard to academic advising of undergraduate students, CEP recommends all new students be advised as a significant number of students are not enrolling in the courses they should be enrolled in.

• The external review notes that some undergraduates say they lack ways of expressing their concerns and having their voices heard by the school. Again, the school’s response agrees with the concern. Student voice can substantially influence student perceptions of the “climate” in the School, and consequently student experiences and morale. A positive climate both benefits current students and influences the attractiveness of the department to potential students.

• CEP applauds HSSOE achievements and efforts made in this area, particularly with regard to the number of female faculty hired in recent years. Because the student population in HSSOE is more diverse than the HSSOE faculty population, CEP believes one way the HSSOE could improve diversity outcomes is to find new opportunities for meaningful instructor/student interaction. Increasing the number of sections of courses to make them smaller and hiring more TAs or instructors for these sections, CEP believes, would almost guarantee increased quality and number of personal interactions between students and instructors that lead to mutual
understandings and awareness of diverse groups of people.

- CEP was surprised that only 20% of transfer students complete the degree in two years (apparently having to take summer classes to do so), and the objective is to raise this to just over half. While this may be necessary, we would emphasize that prospective transfer students should know the distribution of completion times.

VI. GENERAL EDUCATION
CEP is responsible for General Education (GE) policy and the routine review of GE courses (See Academic Senate Bylaw 85 and Regulation 520 in the UC Irvine Academic Senate Manual.

Each year CEP conducts a review of one or two GE categories. This year CEP completed the review of GE IV (Arts and Humanities) and GE VI (Languages other than English) and initiated the review process for GE VII (Multicultural) courses.

The CEP GE review process involves the review of the syllabus and evaluation material of each GE course and section in the category being reviewed to determine whether the course specific learning outcomes in the GE category are being taught and evaluated by the instructor.

In May 2016, after a yearlong review of the current GE VII CLOs, CEP with the consultation of GE VII faculty instructors voted to approve modifications to the current GE VII CLOs. For this reason, the CEP review of GE VII may require some academic units to make significant changes to existing GE VII courses in order to satisfy the newly revised GE VII Course Specific Learning Outcomes (CLOs).

A. Review of courses with General Education designations (GE) IV (Arts and Humanities) and VI (Languages Other than English).

GE IV (Arts and Humanities) and GE VI (Languages Other than English) reports. CEP completed its review of GE IV (Arts and Humanities) and GE VI (Languages Other than English).

- A total of 146 GE IV courses were reviewed o 124 of the 146 GE IV courses were approved by CEP.
- 12 of the 146 GE IV courses were not approved by CEP. These courses have already had their GE designations removed.
- 10 of the 146 GE IV courses were sunset by the departments.
- A total of 15 GE VI courses were reviewed by CEP.
- 14 of the 15 GE VI courses were approved by CEP.
- 1 of the 15 GE VI courses were not approved by CEP.

B. CEP Initiation of General Education VII (Multicultural) Review

In May 2016, approved modifications to the GE VII CLOs. Academic unit chairs and associate deans were altered to these modifications and as part of the upcoming CEP review of GE VI were asked to have instructors of GE VII courses/sections to make appropriate modifications to the course content to conform to the new GE VII CLOs, should they wish to keep the GE VII designation on the course. Some GE VII courses will already meet the new CLOs; others will not. Academic units are required to submit GE VII syllabi and evaluation material to CEP on September 30 of this year (2017).

VI. CAMPUS ISSUES
A. **Review of proposal from Student Affairs to allow Esports scholarship students to have priority registration**

CEP members were divided on this issue, but a majority of members voted in favor of *not* allowing Esport scholarship students to have priority registration due to a lack of evidence provided in the proposal to indicate priority registration would benefit these esport scholarship students.

B. **Review of proposed revisions to UCI Senate Regulation 450.B**

SCOC and CEP rejected a proposal from UCI Cabinet to add Professors of Clinical X (see 450B below, underlined language is proposed language from UCI Cabinet) to the list of authorized titles authorized to give course grades. Both CEP and SCOC rejected the proposal because the request provided no information on why this modification was necessary, and Clinical X professors were not hired to teach undergraduate courses at UCI.

Proposed IR 450.B- (new language underlined):

Authorized Titles:

Professors, professors in-residence, *professors of clinical* (e.g. medicine) and adjunct professors of any rank, instructors, instructors in residence, and adjunct instructors, and lecturers may give courses of any grade. Persons holding other instructional titles may teach lower division courses only, unless individually authorized to teach courses of higher grade by the appropriate [Subcommittee](#) Committee on Courses or the Graduate Council. If a course is given in sections by several instructors, each instructor shall hold the required instructional title.

C. **Review of BUSHFA plan to increase the percentage of graduating seniors awarded Latin Honors from 12% to 16%**.

CEP members endorsed BUSHFA’s proposal. agreed that loosening the criteria for Latin Honors would help a larger number of academically high performing UCI’s graduates in their postgraduate pursuits. Like BUSHFA, CEP believes current UCI’s percentage threshold is low for Latin Honors should be corrected to align with the other UC campuses. An alignment would allow for an additional four percent of UCI’s graduating seniors to better compete with their Latin Honors counterparts from other UC campuses for higher paying jobs, prestigious volunteer opportunities, such as the Peace Corp and Doctors without Borders, and graduate school admittance and scholarships. CEP would asked BUSHFA to monitor the distribution of Latin Honors across majors within each school to ensure that no single major or majors within the school graduates a disproportionate number of students with or without Latin Honors.

D. **Review of proposal eliminate the hybrid distinction in the current UCI definition of online courses.**

Over the past six years, the number of online courses offered to UCI students the number of UCI students enrolled in online courses has grown significantly. Many other UC campuses already have a review structure in place for online courses, particularly during Summer Session. CEP is being tasked by the UC Irvine Senate Office to conduct a review of the academic quality of UCI undergraduate online courses 2018 to determine the extent to which online courses and traditional courses may vary in academic quality. In preparation for the review, the Academic Senate, will categorize online courses into two groups, fully online courses and partially online courses. The Academic Senate asked CEP and SCOC to reassess the current definitions of online and hybrid courses and evaluate how information about hybrid and fully online courses is tracked by SCOC and the Registrar and advertised to students in the Schedule of Classes.
Both CEP and SCOC voted in favor of keeping the current definitions of traditional, hybrid and online courses (see Appendix R (link below):

1) **Traditional Course** - centered on scheduled meeting times in a common physical location between instructors and students, with minimal required use of online tools.
2) **Hybrid Course** – uses scheduled meeting times in a common physical location between instructors and students and a significant fraction of required online tools.
3) **Online Course** – no required scheduled meeting times in a common physical location between instructors and students (though meetings at a common time using online tools may be required).


CEP and SCOC also endorsed the proposal to make the distinctions between course delivery systems more visible in the CIM. This means an extra question would be added in CIM in the online course proposal questionnaire. The question will the proposers to check a box to indicate whether the course is hybrid or online. CEP and SCOC also approved a plan to request that the Registrar place information about whether a course is online or hybrid front and center on the Schedule of Classes, with information on the exact dates the lectures/sections/discussion/labs etc will be held online and the exact days/times the class will held, traditionally, on campus. CEP asked that this information be specified in both the course schedule section in the SOC in addition to or instead of the "Notes" section.

E. **Assessment Committee memo to SCOC asking departments to appoint a faculty member to be responsible for a new GE course.**

CEP and SCOC voted to support an Assessment Committee proposal which would require requiring GE designation proposals to name a faculty contact responsible for each new GE course or existing course with a new GE designation. These faculty members would be responsible for ensuring the course learning outcomes appear on the GE course’s syllabi when they and other instructors teach the course; that the instructor teaches and evaluates student learning of CLOs, and in some cases, provides evidence students have met the GE’s CLOs. The purpose of assigning each GE course a faculty member to oversee the course is to help departments acculturate to UCI senate GE assessment guidelines and requirements.

In June, 2017, CEP reviewed and approved another proposal from the Assessment Committee to allow CEP to strip the GE designation on courses whose instructors have not submitted GE assessment reports to AC or on courses whose instructors submitted GE reports to AC without significant evidence to indicate they have followed AC’s instructions to assess the CLOs in the GE category.

F. **Proposal to allow students who have received a score of 4 or 5 on either the English Language and Composition exam or the English Language and Literature exam to test out of Writing 39B.**

CEP approved a proposal from the Department of English to implement a one-year pilot program during Academic Year AY2017-2018. The pilot will allow UCI undergraduate students with AP English scores of 4 or 5 on either the English Language and Composition exam or the English Language and Literature exam to test out of Writing 39B.
G. Interdisciplinary Teaching Support Award (ITSA)

- **FUNDING:** In 2015, the Provost’s Office agreed to fund CEP’s pilot Interdisciplinary Teaching Support Award (ITSA) program for three years, at $50,000 per year. The award is intended to support interdisciplinary courses that would not normally be offered by departments.

- **PURPOSE OF ITSA** is to encourage intellectual and pedagogical diversity and to support the desire of faculty to offer innovative, topical or experimental classes.

- **OUTCOME OF ITSA CALL:** Calls for ITSA proposals went out early Spring Quarter and were received and reviewed by CEP at its June meeting. $90,000 was available for ITSA funding, with a maximum award of $10,000 per course. Two of the two ITSA proposals were approved funded by CEP. Money not used this past year ($30,000) and the year before ($40,000) will be carried over into AY2017-18. CEP will have $120,000 to fund ITSA awards in June of 2018.

- **CHALLENGES.** Based on feedback received by CEP members and email queries from faculty members interested in applying for ITSA, CEP learned the ITSA award requirements cannot be met by many departments and interested faculty due to budgetary limitations in individual departments and due to organizational barriers built into the administrative structure of UCI Schools and departments. Some units, mainly STEM, require more than $10,000 to pay a lecturer to teach the course normally taught by the ITSA awardee. Another unresolved challenge is most interested faculty would like to collaborate with another faculty member in another discipline to create an ITSA course. Because CEP can only pay out $10,000 per course, faculty member collaboration across units is discouraged, as CEP cannot provide $10,000 to both departments for two course buyouts.

**AGENDA ITEMS FOR FALL 2017**

a. Respond to External Review of Summer Session and Summer Session’s response
b. GE VII Review
c. Review proposal to allow GE Va courses with GE II, III, IV, or VI designations to carry four units.
d. Begin discussions on Online course review
e. Review Writing 39B pilot program which allows students to test out of course based on AP score.