**COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY ANNUAL REPORT:**

**Academic Year: 2014-2015**

**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 2014-15 academic year. CEP business and consent calendars for June and July, 2015 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 five times to consider matters related to undergraduate academic policy, issues concerning 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 (Arts), Daniel Mumm (Engineering), Kristen Hatch (Humanities), Peter Ditto (Social Ecology), Marco Levorato (ICS), Andrew Noymer (Health Sciences), Katherine Faust (Social Sciences), and Bradford Hawkins (Biological Sciences).
* *Academic Program Review Board (APRB):* Bernard Choi (Engineering)
* *University-wide Committee on Preparatory Education* (UCOPE):
Brad Queen (Writing Program)
* *Assessment Committee (AC):* Martin Huang (Humanities) served as Chair of AC
* *The Subcommittee on Courses (SCOC):* Tim Bruckner (Public Health) served as Chair of SCOC

**II. PROGRAM APPROVALS:**

During Academic Year 2014-2015,

Five plus one Bachelor/Master approval:

CEP approved the Bachelor in Art History/Master in Art History, a 5 plus 1 degree) in conjunction with Graduate Council (GC). The proposal at time of this writing is being reviewed by the university wide Graduate Education Committee (CCGA)

CEP approved two new majors:

CEP spend a good deal of time discussing and reviewing revised proposals for new majors and minors. CEP members expressed a number of general concerns related to most of the new proposals: (1) lack of consultation with all departmental faculty members and School deans; (2) no or little explanation of the academic goals of the program and how the courses selected for the program are a reflection of these academic goals; (2) using one unit 18 lecturer to teach the majority of the program’s courses; (3) improper vetting of courses required in the major.

* Bachelor of Arts in Global Middle East Studies. At the time of this writing the degree has not been approved by UCI Cabinet or Divisional Assembly.(approved after three revisions)
* Bachelor of Science in Data Science. (approved after one revision)

CEP approved three new minors:

* Minor in Speech and Hearing (approved after one revision)
* Minor in Persian Studies
* Minor in Digital Filmmaking (approved after three revisions)

CEP reviewed 7 proposals to modify Change of Major Criteria for the following majors (five of the seven proposals were approved):

* B.S. in Informatics
* B.S. in Ecology and Evolution (not approved)
* B.S. in Biology/Education (not approved)
* B.A. in Criminology, Law, and Society.
* B.S. in Neuroscience
* B.A. in Business Administration
* B.A. in Social Ecology

CEP approved 42 proposals to modify program requirements. CEP approved 38 modifications to majors and minors in academic programs during AY14-15, and 44 during AY13-14)

SCHOOL OF ARTS

* B.A. in Music
* B.A. in Drama

SCHOOL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

* B.S. in Neurobiology

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

* B.A. in Business Administration

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

* B.S. in Computer Engineering
* B.S. in Materials Science Engineering
* B.S. in Electrical Engineering

PROGRAMS IN HEALTH SCIENCES

* B.A. in Public Health Policy
* B.A. in Public Health Sciences
* Minor in Public Health

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES

* B.A. in History
* B.A. in Gender and Sexuality Studies
* Minor in Queer Theory
* Minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies
* B.A. in German
* B.A. in Spanish
* Minor in Spanish
* Minor in European Studies
* B.A. in Literary Journalism
* B.A. in Art History (two separate proposals)
* Minor in Art History
* B.A. in Japanese Language and Literature
* B.A. in Comparative Literature
* B.A. in English Literature
* Minor in Archeology
* Minor in Jewish Studies
* Minor in Humanities and Law
* School of Humanities requirements for all Humanities majors

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND COMPUTER SCIENCES

* B.S. in Computer Engineering (two separate proposals)
* B.S. in Informatics
* B.S. in Computer Game Science
* B.S. in Software Engineering

SCHOOL OF PYSICAL SCIENCES

* B.S. in Chemistry
* B.S. in Math

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL ECOLOGY

* B.A. in Criminology, Law, and Society

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

* B.A. in Psychology
* B.A. in Quantitative Economics
* B.A. in Business Economics with Specialization in International Issues and Economics
* B.A. in Sociology
* Minor in Sociology

Non-controversial changes to programs approved by the Subcommittee on Courses or the Subcommittee on Policy were forwarded to the full CEP for final approval on the Consent Calendar.

**III. 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.
* 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.
* The APRB review charge for the upcoming School review.
* Any non-degree seeking academic reviews performed by CEP the previous year. CEP conducts non degree academic reviews each year or every other year.

***2013-2014 Claire Trevor School of Arts Review (CTSA): CEP response to the 2013-2014 APRB CTSA External Review Report and Response to the Review from the School and its Departments***

CEP noted that the state of the Music Department is a cause for significant concern. The longstanding tension articulated by the chair, between the expectations and context of a department on a UC campus and the reality of the music world and professional musicians, constitutes a difficult challenge. CEP believes that the department and the Dean should be encouraged to resolve these issues as soon as possible. Professor Dobrian’s remark that “the question of choosing between degree ‘a’ and degree ‘b’ is a divisive red herring” seems useful.

One overarching issue that emerged in the reviews of the CTSA departments (and was confirmed in responses) was the alarming deficits in staffing, facilities and maintenance. Staffing shortages and dwindling support budgets immediately affect the quality of undergraduate student experience by limiting opportunities and presenting safety issues. If CTSA is to rise to preeminence, these matters must be addressed as quickly as possible.

 ***CEP response to the School of Social Sciences’ Five-Year Follow up Report to the 2001-2010 APRB external review.***

Since it began conducting joint graduate/undergraduate reviews in 1999, the Senate has been implementing a formal follow-up and closure process. The purpose is for the School to reflect upon the recommendations contained in the external reviewers’ report and determine whether steps have been taken to address the issues raised. This process takes place approximately three years after the review document was submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost’s office.

CEP members urged the School of Social Sciences and the Provost to allocate approximately 50 faculty lines to Social Sciences academic programs to alleviate the significant imbalance of student to faculty ratios. High ratios are problematic with regard to the quality of instruction students receive. CEP would like the Provost and Dean of Social Sciences to prioritize the granting of faculty lines to units, according to the number of undergraduate enrollments in that unit’s major. Although recent faculty and PSOE hires to the departments of Economics, Political Science, and Cognitive Sciences have lowered the student to faculty ratio somewhat, the faculty student ratios in these units are still significantly higher than those of other majors campus-wide... As the School of Social Sciences continues to recover from severe budget cuts between 2008 and 2011, and as the school continues to receive more and more freshman, transfer and change of major undergraduates, it is imperative that faculty lines not only return to pre-2007 student/faculty ratios, but that they keep pace with steady increases in Social Sciences enrollments.

CEP members asked that the School of Social Sciences leadership to ensure that teaching assistants from the Department of Sociology are utilized for Sociology courses only, rather than for courses in majors outside of Sociology. Undergraduate students benefit most by having T.A.s who have direct expertise in the subject matter of the course, rather than T.A.s from other departments who have less academic knowledge in the course as compared to counterparts in that course’s home department.

***CEP Response to the 2014-2015 Draft Charges for the APRB Review of the School of Business***

CEP was asked to review charges to external reviewers for the AY2014-2015 School-wide and departmental reviews of the School of Business. CEP endorsed the charges as written but also requested to ARB that external reviewers are aware of the fact that when the B.A. in Business Administration was approved by CEP, the approval included a caveat stating that 60% of the courses in the major must be taught by ladder rank faculty members. According to the School of Business, the B.A. in Business Administration has only one ladder rank faculty teaching one or two courses in the major.

***CEP Response to the 2013-2014 External Non-Degree Granting Program Review of the Campuswide Honors Program.***

Campuswide Honors Program Review Report and Response

The Campuswide Honors Program (CHP) reviewers were tasked with reviewing the academic and administrative structures within CHP. Reviewer comments about the program were extremely positive, and CEP is in agreement with the reviewers' findings. CEP made the following suggestions, much of which is reflected in the external reviewers’ recommendations, the Faculty Director of CHP, the 2013-2014 the Academic Senate Board for Campus-wide Honors, and the CHP Board, and the 2013-2014 chair of the Academic Senate.

1. CEP recommended the director of CHP no longer report to the Dean of DUE. There have been issues in the past involving the hiring and firing of Faculty Directors of CHP by the Dean of DUE, so it is recommended that the reporting relationship be altered so that such problems can be avoided in the future. In particular, the reporting structure should avoid creating any conflict of interest between the budget goals of DUE and the academic goals of CHP.
2. Similar to (1) above, CEP recommended the associate director of CHP no longer report to the Dean of DUE. The Associate Director of CHP and the Director of CHP should report to the same entity to avoid potential conflicts of interest between the Associate Director and Director of CHP.
3. CEP should consider new ways to attract faculty members to teach Honors Courses. Currently, departments are penalized when faculty teach courses outside of the department because they lose enrollment counts and the funds attached to them. Departments are hence unwilling to give up faculty members to teach courses outside of the department. When faculty members do teach courses outside of their departments, the reasons for doing so vary and are not necessarily sustainable. CEP strongly recommends that Senate leadership and Administration should explore avenues to obtain a significant increase in funding for CHP to enable them to support faculty and Teaching Assistants for Honors courses.

***CEP Response to the 2013-2014 External Non-Degree Granting Program Review of the Seven Programs in the Division of Undergraduate Education***

**CEP Response and Recommendations for the U/U Program**:

**Advising**: Based on the reviewers’ comments and other information provided to CEP, CEP members agreed that CEP should assume a larger role in the advising arm of U/U. CEP will examine all advising to U/U students, but will focus on the advising of U/U members wishing to major in STEM programs. Because many (not all) STEM majors are putting more and more restrictions on Change of Major requirements in order to maintain the delicate balance between resources and enrollments, it has become more difficult for students to move into these majors. U/U students must have realistic expectations about major choice, but also should be meticulously advised so that they can build a course schedule which will allow them to meet the specific prerequisites for the major within a short time frame. U/U advisors should continue to communicate to students updated and specific freshman admissions restrictions which would pre-empt a student’s ability to be admitted into a major regardless of which courses he or she might take during the first or second year to prepare for entrance into the major.

**UNI STU Courses associated with the U/U Program**: In the past, there have been issues with some of the UNI STU courses. A review conducted by the Subcommittee on Courses (SCOC) from spring 2013 to summer 2014 indicated that the course content of some of these courses was in conflict with SCOC policy and definition of what constitutes an academic course that requires critique of theories and critical thinking analysis versus a trade school type course whose focus is on information transmittal. The SCOC review resulted in some courses being eliminated, while other courses were changed from academic credit to workload credit, and yet other courses were revised to conform to SCOC policy. Secondly, on a few occasions, staff members from DUE have been granted instructor titles for some UNI STU courses without appropriate consultation with SCOC (UCI Senate Regulation 450).

CEP members believe the best method for ensuring that instructor and course quality are maintained would be to have all courses housed in an academic department. CEP requests that DUE move the UNI STU courses to an academic department. All academic departments and schools at UCI have structurally routinized faculty, chair and dean oversight of courses and programs. CEP feels that it is inappropriate to burden administrative units with these responsibilities, given that there is significantly less faculty involvement and review of courses and programs in such units (D.U.E. and Graduate Division)

**CEP Response to the Freshman Integrated Program (FIP)***:* The First-Year Integrated Program (FIP) is a year-long sequence of courses that approach a similar topic from the perspective of three different disciplines. DUE has put FIP on hiatus, beginning this year. One issue reported with FIP was that it was difficult for three faculty members to receive course releases from their respective departments and then design a three-course sequence that approached a topic from the perspective of three disciplines. While a few examples of the FIP sequence were successful, most of the FIP sequences could not be sustained year to year. CEP members also reported a number of problems associated with the undergraduate writing program in FIP.

**CEP Response and Recommendation for Minor in Civic and Community Engagement:**

CEP members support the continuation of the program but request that the administration of the program be moved to a School where the program will be subject to the same academic program modification reviews and the same degree approval structures required for all other programs at UCI. CEP requests that UNI STU 181 “Internship in Civic Engagement” be removed from the list of electives in the Minor as the courses awards only workload credit.

**CEP Response and Recommendation for UTeach:**

CEP members fully support the continuation of the program.

**CEP Response and Recommendation for the Summer Bridge Program**:

CEP members are satisfied with the trajectory of the Summer Bridge Programs course review and strongly value the program itself. CEP recommends the continuation of the program.

**CEP Recommendation for the Freshman and Transfer Seminar Series**

CEP members support the continuation of the Freshman and Transfer Seminar Series.

**IV. CAMPUS ISSUES**

 ***CEP final review of the proposal to establish an Academic Integrity policy and campus-wide Office of Academic Honesty.***

The Council on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed and approved the revised draft of the Academic Integrity Policy presented to CEP by the Council on Student Experience (CSE). CEP members were satisfied with the revised proposal and noted that CSE had addressed concerns registered by CEP in May of 2013.

CEP’s initial review of the Academic Integrity Policy proposal expressed members’ concern about what appeared to be a decline in the instructor’s role in resolving the academic dishonesty incident either before or during the review by the Academic Integrity Administrative Office (AIAO). Such concerns were addressed in CEP’s second discussion of the proposal. Under the revised proposal, the instructor still has the opportunity to resolve a cheating incident informally with the student and therefore forego reporting the incident to the AIAO. In addition, if the instructor does decide to report the incident to the AIAO, he or she will have the ability to communicate with the office about the alleged incident at any point during the review process. The instructor also remains the sole authority responsible for assigning the course grade to the student. What the revised proposal still leaves unresolved, however, is the potential mismatch between the AIAO review findings and the instructor’s grade assignment to the student.

CEP’s review of the first draft of the proposal also noted that the AIAO’s plans for staff, expertise, and budget remain too opaque for CEP to officially support the proposal. After the second discussion of the proposal, CEP members are now satisfied that the AIAO will be small, consisting of only one or two staff members with expertise in academic dishonesty reporting and review, and that the office will reside in Student Affairs. CEP understands that the current proposal of the policy will be forwarded to Cabinet and possibly Divisional Assembly only if an arrangement for the AIAO can be made under these terms.

***Preparation for External Review of AY2015-2016 Extension and Summer Session: Cancelled but see below for initial preparation ideas by CEP to be considered for potential 2016-2017 External review of Extension and Summer Session.***

Senate will postpone its review of Extension and Summer Session to the 2016-17 academic year. This is due in part to recent Senate discussions about online education and to the recent changes in the administrative reporting structure of Summer Session.

Even though the Academic Senate postponed the CEP 2015-2016 review of Summer Session and Extension subsequent to CEP plans to review these units. The following paragraphs outline CEP’s review plans made before the announcement of postponement. Because CEP will probably assemble a task for on reviewing the quality of online vs. hybrid vs. traditional courses this coming year (which is in part the reason why the Extension/Summer Session review was postponed), some of the items listed below may be addressed in the online review.

* The Extension/Summer Session review will probably involve four external reviewers. The review will focus on measuring the quality of credit bearing courses that are offered through Summer Session or Extension. Thus far, CEP plans to focus the review on the following courses and programs. It should be noted that CEP is in the organization stage and details about the review have not been confirmed.
* Summer Session offers a large number of online courses. CEP plans to look at the number of online courses that are offered through Summer Session and evaluate how summer session online courses compare to their in person counterpart in offered in summer session and during the academic year and online counterpart offered during the academic year. CEP plans to evaluate the quality of summer session courses taught by graduate students, as significantly more summer sessions courses are taught by graduate students that would normally be taught by senate members.
* CEP will also evaluate the quality of XI courses and instructors. XI courses are UCI credit bearing courses offered through Extension. These courses have identical counterpart courses offered through departments; however the instructors of XI courses are different from those who teach them in departments, and XI courses are targeted to both UCI and non-UCI students.
* CEP will address whether Summer Session is offering courses that UCI students need to meet baccalaureate requirements. Under the current system, departments submit proposals to teach summer session course, and Summer Session select the courses. CEP would like the faculty to be involved in the Summer Session course selection process. It is important that CEP be provided with a list of summer session courses selected by departments that are not approved by Summer Session and to determine whether students were negatively impacted by the unapproved courses.
* CEP will assess the post baccalaureate program in Psychology and Social Behavior that is offered through Extension.

***CEP endorsement of proposal to move undergraduate proposals to the Registrar’s CIM system.***

(CEP) endorsed a proposal from the University Registrar to move the development and approval procedures of undergraduate degree proposals from a paper system to an online system so long as the Registrar includes the ability for one to convert proposals on CIM into PDF documents. The online program for new degrees and changes to degrees will reside in the Course Inventory Management System, which is already being administered successfully in the Office Registrar. The course and program systems within CIM conform to academic senate policy and procedures and the Academic Senate, as the office of record for programs and courses, retains full authority over policy, procedures and access related to the establishment, approval, and maintenance of courses and programs.

***CEP/Policy rejection of a proposal to monitor instructor log-ins of online courses.***

At the request of the Dean of Extension, the Subcommittee on Policy considered formulating a CEP policy that would monitor the frequency and duration of instructor log-ins to online courses they are currently teaching.

Policy members recommend that CEP abstain from formulating a policy that would monitor instructor log-ins or require a certain number of instructor -student interactions, since that was likely to be counterproductive. Some Policy members also suggested that any guidelines related to instructor-student interaction should take into account research on the best methods for achieving overall teaching effectiveness in a course, and not simply monitor the number of instructor -student interactions. It was agreed that any guidelines for online courses should parallel existing guidelines for traditional course, with suitable modifications to take into account the new mode of delivery. Current guidelines on the responsibilities of instructors are part of the Senate manual, and Policy members felt that that would be the appropriate location for guidelines regarding online courses as well.

***CEP Review and approval of proposal for Interdisciplinary Teaching Buyout Award***

The ITBA program will provide an award and a mechanism of administration to provide departments with ‘buy-out’ funds to replace a faculty member who has been selected, by committee selection, to teach an interdisciplinary undergraduates course to the campus as a whole. Such interdisciplinary courses cannot be accommodated within existing UCI administrative and academic structures. The award refunds departments for the cost of releasing faculty.

***CEP Review of General Education II (Science and Technology) and GE III (Social Sciences).***

CEP review pairs approved 103 General Education II and III courses. Five GE II or III courses were brought to committee for further review. CEP discussed five courses flagged for further review. CEP members agreed that the documents provided to CEP do not indicate that GE II or III outcomes were being taught in the course. Instructors for these three courses will receive follow up emails explaining why CEP members did not approve a continuing designation of GE II or III. Instructors will be provided with an opportunity to update or revise the courses in order to conform to GE II and III policy on course specific learning outcomes.

***CEP Revision of Appendix H (policies for General Education courses)***

CEP members agreed that some of GE II courses reviewed showed little or no evidence of inclusion of course specific outcomes in the course. In these cases the course either needs to be stripped of GE II or be revised substantially to ensure the course specific learning outcomes are addressed. At the same time, based on evidence from the CEP and AC reviews, it seems that the GE II definition, description and course learning outcomes are either too difficult for many current GE II courses to address, or some of the content and language in the course specific learning outcomes needs to be revised so there is better match between the definition of GE II, which appears to include science and technology courses, the category course learning outcomes, and the actual course specific learning outcomes. CEP members voted in favor of reviewing the GE II definitions and outcomes at the October 1, 2015 meeting.

CEP approved final revisions to Appendix H (Policies, Procedures and Background of General Education) at its April 2, 2015 meeting. From January through April of this year, both CEP and its subcommittee, Policy, discussed and revised Appendix H to clarify and eliminate redundancies and inconsistencies. The revision of the policy followed an iterative process. CEP and Policy members vetted concerns and revised language in the policy until consensus was established on the final revision. The final policy contains clear statements of expectation, outcome or conduct that comply with relevant policies, regulation and institutional requirements.

**AGENDA ITEMS FOR FALL 2015**

a. APRB external review of the School of Business and the School’s response

b. Organize AY2015-2016 Review of Online Courses or Organize Review of Summer Session

c. Complete GE II and III review

d. Conduct GE IV (Humanities) and possible GE VI (foreign languages) reviews

e. Review Asian American four plus one proposal

f. Review Language Science B.A. proposal

**2014-2015 Council on Educational Policy Membership**

*Voting Members*: Simon Penny (Arts), Chair; Arts: Simon Leung; Humanities: Sean Greenburg and Kristen Hatch; Biological Sciences: Andrea Nicholas and Brad Hawkins; Business: Chris Schwarz and Alexander Nekrasov; Engineering: Daniel Mumm and Bernard Choi; ICS: Jessica Utts and Marco Levorato; Physical Sciences: Alessandro Pantano and Arvind Rajaraman; Social Ecology: Richard McCleary and Peter Ditto; Social Sciences: Katherine Faust; Health Sciences: Andrew Noymer and Zuzana Bic

*Ex Officio*: Elizabeth Bennett, University Registrar; Michael Dennin, Dean, DUE; Brad Queen, Campus Writing Coordinator

*Consultants*: Helen Kwon Morgan, Academic Counselors; Brian Williams, LAUC I, Aliya Hassan, Editor

*Council Analyst*, Michelle AuCoin, Academic Senate

*Annual Report CEP 2014-2015 prepared by*

*Michelle AuCoin, CEP Analyst*