COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY ANNUAL REPORT:
Academic Year: 2018-2019

I. OVERVIEW

This year the Council on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed a wide range of interesting and innovative proposals. For the first time, not just UC Irvine, but also in the University of California (UC) system, a proposal for a fully online bachelor's degree was submitted to CEP. CEP was the lead reviewer of this proposal, bringing together input from the UC Academic Senate, the University Council on Educational Policy (UCEP), UCI Academic Senate Cabinet, and several other UC Irvine senate councils and committees. CEP also conducted its first external review of UCI undergraduate writing in ten years. The review covered all of the various undergraduate writing programs at UCI including writing tutoring services, lower and upper division writing, labor issues, budget, and undergraduate writing coordination across campus. CEP activities in the 2018-19, reviewed in this annual report, clearly illustrate the importance and breadth of the work accomplished by the Council.

II. COUNCIL OPERATIONS

The Council is authorized to act for the University of California's Irvine Division of the Academic Senate in approving new or amended UC Irvine undergraduate course and degree requirements for all UCI minors, majors, and specializations, concentrations, and emphases within majors recommended to the Division by the UC Irvine Faculties. The authority of the Faculties 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."

UCI Academic Senate Bylaw 85 (B) Council on Undergraduate Policy details the many duties of the Council:

1. Consider all matters related to academic policy, make recommendations regarding curricula and programs and other educational matters, including general campus requirements and grading systems, issue recommendations on the establishment, substantive modifications or withdrawal of academic programs, review and report on the character of the educational programs on the Irvine campus, make recommendations about undergraduate policy matters and evaluate their effect on campus diversity. Supervise the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement and the UC Analytical Writing Placement Examinations, and formulate the policies for, and supervise the requirement in American History and Institutions. Act for the Division in approving new or amended degree requirements recommended to the Division by the several Faculties; failure by the Council to approve new or amended degree requirements within sixty (60) calendar days following the original submission of such recommendations by a Faculty, the Faculty in question may refer the matter directly to the Divisional Senate Assembly for action.

2. Act as a screening committee for the general education options (see IR 520). Solicit courses from the academic units, review them, and approve or disapprove them. Advise units of any overlap between proposed and existing courses and of areas not covered by the proposals. The Council may request that units submit special kinds of courses to meet the requirement. Review all general education option courses at regular intervals and take appropriate action.

3. Act on final recommendations from the Campus Writing Coordinator for recertification of courses satisfying the upper-division writing requirements; the Campus Writing Coordinator shall conduct a recertification review of these courses at regular intervals and recommend to CEP whether a course

continues to meet writing course guidelines or whether CEP should inform the unit that the course no longer fulfills the upper-division requirement.

4. Provide guidance on all matters related to student learning assessment, including policy development around assessment of student learning at the classroom, course, program, general education, and institutional levels. Monitor the university's progress in implementing its assessment plan, including those resulting from regional reaccreditation review, and, where appropriate, promote the use of assessment results in planning activities.

5. Provide advice on all educational policy matters pertaining to the core campus undergraduate programs and advice on matters relating to international education and continuing, part time, and summer session education. In matters pertaining to the establishment, substantive modification or withdrawal of programs that may impact core campus academic programs, the Council shall issue recommendations with the Graduate Council, as applicable.

6. Maintain liaison with the University Committees on Educational Policy, Preparatory Education, and International Education.

CEP Membership (UCI Senate Bylaw 85.A)

The Council on Educational Policy (Undergraduate) shall consist of two members from each Faculty offering an undergraduate degree, and the Chair of the SCOC (Undergraduate Subcommittee on Courses and Continuing, Part-Time, and Summer Session Education). Ex officio members shall be the Registrar, the Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Campus Writing Coordinator, and the Chairs of the Subcommittee on International Education and the Academic Program Review Board.

CEP membership 2019-2020

Hugh Roberts, Chair, Humanities
Tony Smith, Vice Chair, Social Sciences
Richard Pattis, CEP member and Chair of Subcommittee Policy and Assessment, ICS
Elizabeth Allen, Humanities
James Brody, Engineering
Philip Bromiley, Business
Theresa Dalton, Social Ecology, Fall Quarter
Amanda Holton, Physical Sciences
Seth Houston, Arts
Hing Yu, Humanities
Ketu Katrak, Arts
Young-Suk Kim, Education
Chen Li, ICS
Catherine Loudon, Biological Sciences
Stephen Mang, Physical Sciences
Debra Mauzy-Melitz, Biological Sciences
Michael McNally, Engineering
Mary McThomas, Social Sciences
Ruth Mulnard, Health Sciences (Nursing)
Daniel Mumm, Engineering
Samuel Schriner, Health Sciences (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
John Turner, Business
Karna Wong, Social Ecology, Spring Quarter

Joanne Zinger, Social Ecology
Daniel Gross, Ex Officio, Writing Coordinator
Elizabeth Bennett, Ex Officio, University Registrar
Victoria Bernal, Ex Officio, Subcommittee on International Education
David Casper, Ex Officio, Subcommittee on Courses
Michael Dennin, Ex Officio, Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning (DUE)
Junha Baek, Representative, ASUCI Winter Quarter 2019
Zayn Sikander Suhale, Representative, ASUCI Fall Quarter, 2018
Tiffany Alana Stills, Representative, ASUCI Spring Quarter 2019
Amy Shine, Representative, AGS
Ying Zhang, LAUC-I
Bradley Queen, Consultant, UCI Composition Program
Aliya Hassan, Consultant, University Editor
Helen Morgan, Consultant, Director, Social Sciences Undergraduate Student Affairs
Paul Lampano, Consultant, Associate Registrar
Michelle AuCoin, Analyst

CEP met seven times during the AY2018-2019. In addition to meetings of the full Council, the newly formed Policy and Assessment Subcommittee (Policy), composed of eight CEP members and chaired by CEP member Rich Pattis (ICS), met three times by the recommendation of CEP to review or discuss matters related to undergraduate academic policy. During AY18-19, Policy provided recommendations to CEP on the following undergraduate academic matters:

1) Policy reviewed the response from the School of Biological Sciences to CEP's concern about TA shortages and TA training. Policy was satisfied with the response and recommended to CEP that no follow up with the School would be necessary. CEP agreed with the recommendation.
2) Policy designed a new survey for instructors to complete to assess student learning in General Education Courses. CEP approved the survey, which is expected to be launched in fall of 2019 (more details below).

CEP Members of CEP were asked to serve on at least one other CEP subcommittee[1] or university-wide committee:

- *Policy and Assessment Subcommittee*: Richard Pattis, Chair (ICS), Elizabeth Allen (Humanities), Chen Li (ICS), Samuel Schriner (Health Sciences), Debra Mauzy-Melitz (Biological Sciences); Philip Bromiley (Business), Amanda Holton (Physical Sciences), Seth Houston (Arts), Daniel Mumm (Engineering)
- *Academic Program Review Board (APRB):* James Brody (Engineering) and Mary McThomas (Social Sciences)
- *University-wide Committee on Preparatory Education* (UCOPE): Dave Casper, Chair of SCOC
- *Subcommittee on International Education* (SCIE): Joanne Zinger (Social Ecology)
- *Subcommittee on the 2019 External Review of Undergraduate Writing*: Steve Mang (Physical Sciences) and Young-Suk Kim (Education)

II. NEW DEGREE PROGRAM AND NEW DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:
During 2018-2019, CEP approved two program proposals, one from the Department of History for a new minor in Armenian Studies, the other from the Program in Public Health to approve a new minor in Global Health.

CEP approved a proposal to make the Program in International Studies the Department of Global and

---

[1] The CEP subcommittees are the Subcommittee on Courses (SCOC), the Academic Program Review Board, the Subcommittee on International Education, and the Policy and Assessment Subcommittee.

International Studies.

CEP approved a proposal to establish a new Department of Clinical Pharmacy Practice.

III. CEP APPROVAL OF PROPOSALS TO CHANGE THE NAME OF PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENTS AND/OR DEGREES
- CEP approved a proposal to change the name of the Campuswide Honors to the Campuswide Honors Collegium.
- CEP approved a proposal to change the name of the Minor in Psychology and Social Behavior to the Minor in Psychological Science.

IV. CEP APPROVAL OF PROPOSALS TO MODIFY CHANGE OF MAJOR REQUIREMENTS:
CEP approved the proposal to change the requirements for UCI students to enter into the Education Science BA: The requirement for students to complete at least three required core courses for the Education Science major was added to the existing the existing change of major requirements.

V. PROPOSALS TO MODIFY UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS
Upon the recommendation of the CEP's Subcommittee on Courses, CEP approved 27 proposals to modify degree program requirements during AY18-19 (list of actions below may not include all that were approved in that proposal). Please see the UCI General Catalogue for all degree updates. Approvals this year were down significantly compared to previous years: SCOC and CEP approved 43 proposals to modify degree program requirements during AY17-18, 48 proposals in AY2016-2017, 49 proposals in AY15-16, 42 in AY14-15, and 44 in AY12-13.

CLAIRE TREVOR SCHOOL OF THE ARTS
- BA in Dance (added a new list of electives: DRMA 60B, 60C, 30A, 50C, and Dance 127 to the Choreography specialization)
- BA in Music (added MUS 48 to "music and culture" list; re-added MUS 157 to "theory, comp and technology" course options; added MUS 43 to "Theory, comp and technology course options for BA and BM)

SCHOOL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
- No submissions in AY18-19

PAUL MERAGE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
- BA in Business Administration (delete the Emphasis in Healthcare Management)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
- BA in Education Science (many substantive changes, see UCI General Catalogue AY19-20)

HENRY SAMUELI SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
- BS in Aerospace Engineering (revisions to language to clarify degree requirements)
- BS in Chemical Engineering (many changes including replacement of CHEM 132B-C with CBE 105 Engineering Physical Chemistry and removal of BEMS 119 and EECS 10)
- BS in Mechanical Engineering (updated unit requirements from 189 to 188, revisions to language to clarify degree requirements)

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
- Minor in Archeology (Overhaul of Minor due to change of administrative home from Classics to Art History)

- BA in Art History (added new course Art His 42E to list of LD Art History course options)
- BA in Korean Literature and Culture (Changed language requirement from Korean 3A Advanced Korean to Korean 3A, 3B or 3C)
- BA in Gender and Sexuality (deleted one existing course (100C: Feminist Cultural Studies) and made two existing elective courses part of the degree requirements (157B: Queer Knowledges and 165B: Health and Medicine). Renumbered these two courses (100D and 110D, respectively);
changed the title of 120A to Histories of Sexuality).
- Minor in Medical Humanities (made Medical Humanities 195 Capstone Seminar optional instead of required)
- Minor in Native American Studies (interdisciplinary minor overseen by School of Social Sciences and School of Humanities; added seventh course requirement to minor)
- BA in Spanish (added Spanish 3 US Latino Communities to degree requirements for majors who score in specific range of placement exam)

DONALD BREN SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND COMPUTER SCIENCES
- No submissions in AY18-19

SUE & BILL GROSS SCHOOL OF NURSING
- No submissions in AY18-19

PROGRAM IN PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
- No submissions in AY18-19

PROGRAM IN PUBLIC HEALTH
- BA in Public Health Policy (many changes including deletion of 11 Bio Sci course options which were replaced with Public Health courses related to Biology)
- BS in Public Health Policy (many changes, mainly removal of course options under requirement sections of the degree)

SCHOOL OF PYSICAL SCIENCES
- BS in Chemistry (added CHEM 263 Materials Chemistry; removed CHEM 245C Topics in Atmospheric Chemistry)

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
- Minor in Medical Anthropology (added Anth 134N to list of electives)
- Minor in Anthropology (changes to UD requirements)
- BA in Anthropology (three course changes, two of which are new courses added to degree requirements in order to enhance the methods of training and career readiness)
- BA in Business Economics (Removal of Math 4 as LD course option)
- BA in Economics (Removal of Math 4 as LD course option; added new course ECON 126 to list of UD course options)
- BA in Quantitative Economics (Removal of Math 4 as LD course option)
- BA in Global International Studies (formerly BA in International Studies); (major overhaul to major due to new faculty and departmentalization of IS Programs)
- Minor in Political Science (added one course each to LD Pol Sci course options and UD Pol Sci course options)
- Minor in Native American Studies (interdisciplinary minor overseen by School of Social Sciences and School of Humanities; added seventh course requirement to minor)

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL ECOLOGY
- BA in Social Ecology (too many changes to list)
- BA in Urban Studies (some course removals and additions)

DIVISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
- Minor in Civic and Community Engagement (removal of a number elective courses that had been deleted; replaces these courses with similar new courses including the UNST 85A-C)

VI. CEP REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW BOARD (APRB) EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORTS

As part of CEP's annual routine business, the Council conducts reviews of annual APRB School reports/School response and School updates to APRB reviews.

CEP review of the 2018 APRB external review report of the School of Biological Sciences and the School's response to the report

CEP was generally pleased with the review report and the School's response. That said, there remained a number of areas of concern in the report about which CEP asked for some clarification:

1) Reviewers raised a number of pressing concerns about the number of TAs assigned to courses offered by the School, about the quality of their training and the education they deliver, and about the relationship of their teaching duties to their research obligations. The reviewers signaled their concerns about this complex set of problems quite unequivocally. CEP noted that all UCI Schools are faced with the same criticisms about the low number of TAs and TA training. Still, CEP strongly recommended that the School of Biological Sciences carefully examine how its TAs are used, assigned, trained, evaluated, and distributed throughout its undergraduate curriculum to improve experiences for instructors, graduate students, and undergraduates. The TA challenges appear to be complex and intertwined in specific nuanced ways that are difficult to discern from a short site visit. Yet it is absolutely critical for the School of Biological Sciences to work efficiently to examine their current TA system from multiple perspectives with the goal of responding rapidly.

2) CEP asked the School for more detail about what steps are under way to develop its mission statement and, more importantly, what structural steps the School is taking to ensure that the vision will in fact shape future curricular (and other) developments in the School.

   o Reviewers raised concerns about the School's retention rate of undergraduates. The School's response references the EASE program, which provides support to students who might be expected to struggle to adapt to the rigors of the School's majors. It also mentions that the School has taken some steps to allow students to continue to progress through the major where, in the past, they might have been "weeded out." The School notes that many fewer students are now on probation than in previous years. What was unclear, though, is how these two approaches (providing more support to challenged students and easing the requirements for continuing in the program) have interacted. CEP asked whether EASE itself was responsible for raising student achievement or whether the reduction in students on probation was largely a result of changing the criteria for probation.
   o In the review of the Department of Neurobiology and Behavior's response, CEP found reviewers baffled by the failure of faculty to explain the "purpose and mission" of the major in Human Biology and, particularly, the rationale for the major being situated in the NBB department. CEP asked for more information about this.

The School's response to the above concerns expressed by CEP.

6

In spring 2019, the School provided a response to CEP's concerns. The Subcommittee on Policy and CEP agreed the School adequately addressed CEP's concerns.

CEP review of Social Ecology's response to CEP response to Social Ecology's Seven year follow up report to its 2010 APRB review
CEP discussed Social Ecology's response to CEP's review of Social Ecology's seven-year follow up report. In response to CEP's question about how SE will respond to students' request that the SE major be higher-profile with a more clearly defined scope and purpose, SE responded that the School is interested in developing concentrations for core students in the SE major. The concentrations will be in Innovation and Entrepreneurship and Non-Profit Development and Management. CEP pointed out that before these concentrations or other related certificate programs are developed into proposals, SE should receive support from the School of Business which houses similar programs for its majors. CEP was satisfied with SE's explanation for offering SE190 and SE111 as electives instead of as requirements.

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

In AY17-18, CEP and the then-Assessment Committee (which has since folded into the new Policy and Assessment Subcommittee) decided to combine the annual CEP and AC GE reviews into one GE review to be conducted by AC alone. This was done in order to avoid confusion and redundancy that occurred each year as a result of the dual CEP and AC reviews. It was decided by AC that instead of evaluating one or two GE categories each spring that all courses and course sections of all eight GE designations taught during fall, winter, and summer quarters would be evaluated. This action was moved to the Assessment team in the Division of Undergraduate Education beginning in Spring Quarter 2018.

During fall quarter last year, a number of concerns about the GE survey were raised by GE instructors and the Assessment Office in DUE. First, the response rate to the survey was averaging about 30 to 40%, and for those GE instructors who did respond to the survey, about half successfully followed the GE assessment instructions. The survey asked instructors to provide at least some quantitative evidence on the extent to which students mastered the GE's course specific learning outcomes. Second, GE instructors noted that some of the open-ended questions about the GE course should have been auto filled on the survey for the GE instructor, such as the quarter the GE course was taught, the definition and specific course learning outcomes of the GE designation, and the final student enrollment number for the course. Answering seemingly simple questions such as these, instructors noted, was time consuming. Most faculty don't have immediate access to the definitions, names, learning outcomes of the GE (s), nor was it easy for them to locate the final enrollment number of the course. The third major concern about the survey came from unit 18 lecturers teaching GE courses. CEP learned that unit 18 lecturers teach about 45% of GE courses each quarter even though UCI senate regulations note that ladder rank should teach GE courses "most of the time." Lecturers who were required to complete the GE survey notified the UC AFT about a possible breach of contract. The union was concerned about the approximately ten additional hours of assessment work lecturers would be required to do without additional pay and outside of the time limit terms of the course contract. Lecturers were especially concerned about their ability to satisfactorily complete the GE survey. Incomplete or poor response to the GE survey could have a significant impact on their ability to secure future course contacts. The issue did finally get resolved for Spring Quarter 2018 in a meeting with Academic Personnel, CEP, and the union. It was decided that unit 18 GE instructors would not be required to complete the GE survey for spring 2018 GE courses.

In order to remedy each of these concerns about the GE survey while also continuing to appease WASC, the Subcommittee on Policy and Assessment designed a new user-friendly GE survey (Appendix A). Each academic year, the new GE survey will target only one or two GE designations, as opposed to all eight of them. The focus of the new survey will not require instructors to do assessment of GE using a quantitative analysis or a specific

design. Rather, instructors will be asked to reflect on challenges students face in their efforts to master the GE's CLOs and potential solutions to these challenges.

IX. CAMPUS ISSUES (abbreviated versions of discussions and reports below, for more information see CEP minutes)

A. Presentation of a proposal to establish a BA degree for CA prisoners. *Valerie Jenness*

Professor Jenness summarized the background and rationale for establishing a BA degree which would be taught in prisons for prisoners in the near future. The proposal was presented as an information/discussion item for CEP members, rather than a formal review for an actual BA degree. In an informal vote, CEP members voted in favor of the proposal.

B. Review of a proposal to departmentalize Global and International Studies

CEP reviewed and endorsed the proposal which will allowed the Program in International Studies to become the Department of Global and International Studies. CEP noted that it is always a good idea for an academic unit to be academically and administratively cohesive with dedicated faculty ownership of the academic research and curricular missions. What's more, given the number of majors that have been graduated each year for the past twenty years and the fact that the Program in International Studies (IS) now houses 600 majors, departmentalization is clearly overdue.

C. CEP discussion of ESports at UC Irvine, *Mark Deppe, Director of UCI ESports and Constance Steinkuehler, Professor of Informatics*

CEP invited Mark Deppe, the Director of UCI's eSports program and Constance Steinkuehler, Professor of Informatics to learn about the eSports program in order for CEP to prepare its response to the following questions which were discussed at the January 2019 Senate Cabinet meeting.

1. *Should the eSports program be more closely linked with an academic unit?*
2. *Does CEP have any concerns about the sources of funding for the eSports program?*
3. *Does CEP have any concerns about how funds generated by the eSports program are used on the campus?*

Based on this information and answers provided by Mr. Deppe and Professor Steinkuehler, CEP came up with the following responses to the Senate Chair's questions:

1: Should the eSports program be more closely linked with an academic unit?

CEP noted that eSports has instituted a new faculty advisory panel (which will include representation from CTLSE), which was seen as a positive step forward but an incomplete answer to the question of how best to enhance Senate oversight of eSports. Mark Deppe made it clear that the eSports program welcomes Senate guidance and input, which is gratifying, but the CEP conversation did not clarify what would be the best institutional form for that relationship.

2: Does CEP have any concerns about the sources of funding for the eSports program?

Yes, it does. The degree to which the eSports program cedes control of students' experience and the university's image and reputation to powerful for-profit industries who have their own priorities is potentially very troubling. On the other hand, if UCI is to participate in the eSports world at all there seems to be no obvious alternative. It is undoubtedly true that many UCI schools and departments have genuine research and scholarly commitments that naturally build bridges to these gaming companies.

3: Does CEP have any concerns about how funds generated by the eSports program are used on the campus?

CEP did not receive a detailed breakdown of the eSports budget. The high-level overview we received did not raise systemic concerns. Some urgent concerns were expressed about the recent eSports conference on campus which featured events with women dressed in costumes that CEP members considered demeaning. Professor Steinkuehler acknowledged that this had been a misstep in organizing the event and that they had canceled further "fan art" and fan participation events as the conference proceeded.

Overall, CEP's discussion did not add much to discussions that have already taken place at CTLSE. The explosion of interest and student participation in eSports obviously presents UCI with some exciting opportunities, but also with some very real reputational and other risks. Esports might well become the college football of the next generation, in terms of fandom and wider public interest, and in terms of the financial rewards that will be dangled in front of student athletes and it is not clear that UCI is in a position to manage the various kinds of pressures and distortions that this could place on our academic mission and our public image. It is obvious that the Senate should keep a close eye on the growth of the eSports program, and maintain a productive dialogue with those who are running it. What the ideal institutional position of the program should be, however, remains unclear.

D. Presentation on UCI Learning Assistant (LA) Program, Vice Provost Dennin
VP Dennin provided CEP with an overview of the UCI LA program and plans for its development. CEP members asked questions and made comments about the LA program as they came up throughout the presentation.

LA Program Overview

Learning Assistants are part of a national trend (used primarily in large introductory STEM courses) and UCI is taking the lead in adopting Learning Assistants across all disciplines. LAs fill a vital role in an instructional team as they are the closest to the undergraduate peer-wise and because the LAs recently completed the University Studies course which is required of them to become part of the instruction team for the course.

LAs are not currently paid for their work. Rather, it's the opposite: LAs are required to pay for a UCI course (through tuition) that teaches them how to be LAs. LAs do not replace teaching assistants or instructors. They can only be added to an instructional team for educational reasons and goals. The ratio of the number of learning assistants per course is dependent on the goals of the course and the nature of the learning activities in the course. The UCI LA program started in 2015-16 as a pilot program in three courses. In 2017-18 the LA program expanded to develop Certified Learning Assistants as the result of LA funding. The LA program is specific to undergraduates and the LA is an integral member of the instructional team of the course. In contrast, undergraduate peer tutors are supplemental to a course and not integral to the instructional team. LAs can work with students in a group setting as part of a discussion section in a lecture course but also during group time during the lecture hours of the course. Similarly, LAs work in group settings in lab courses.

Numbers

Totals for 2017-18 (Fall, Winter, Spring Qs)	Totals for Fall Q 2018
104 LAs	95 LAs
11,728 students	5,780 students
204 Discussion Sections	82 Discussion Sections
78 Lab Sections	32 Lab Sections
42 Lecture Sections	17 Lecture Sections
36 Courses	17 Courses
9 Schools/Depts.	9 Schools/Depts.

LA Selection Process
VPTL: The LA selection process is determined by the department or school although the Office of the Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning is available to help with the selection process until departments or Schools have developed their own selection criteria. LAs are selected in the same way LARC tutors are selected (see OVPTL website). Students must apply to become LAs and they must meet the LA requirements set by the department or the instructor.

CEP response: CEP was broadly supportive of the LA initiative, but urge OVPTL and Schools that implement the program to maintain vigilance to ensure that compensation for student labor is fair and that students clearly understand what they are being offered when they work as LAs. The requirements for students to become LAs should be written and publicized to so that students have a clear understanding of a possible path to become an LA. CEP wonders how the selection process will be overseen by DUE, the Senate or possibly the Schools to ensure fairness and transparency.

LA Duties
VPTL: LAs attend weekly meetings with the instructional team to ensure full integration into the instructional team. LAs are meant to help with active learning-based teaching—typically some form of group work/discussion. LAs CANNOT grade, lecture, or lead discussion in the absence of faculty/TAs.

LA Training and Compensation
VPTL: In addition to attending weekly instructional team meetings, LAs must enroll in two unit pedagogical course offered through DUE during the same quarter they are serving as LAs for a course. The two units of credit for the pedagogical course serve as compensation for the LA during their first quarter of working as an LA in a course. For students interested in serving as LAs in future quarter(s), the current plan under DUE is to give LAs two compensation choices. They can either enroll in the internship LA course (also offered through DUE) to be compensated with one to three units of credit (units of credit determined by department), or they can choose to be compensated financially. Financial compensation would be in accordance with AP and union contract under the "peer category" pay rate and labor terms which state that the maximum time commitment of a peer tutor or LAs is ten hours a week. Financial payment to LAs would only be available to those LAs from schools who have made the decision to provide their LAs with this option. Schools or departments who can provide LAs with financial compensation would pay their LAs using resources allocated to the School from the Provost, as opposed to from OVPTL.

Supervision of LAs
VPTL: Instructors working with LAs for the first time attend an information session with DTEI staff. The instructor of the course is the main supervisor of the LA. The LA coordinator observes LA in one class.

Benefits of LAs
VPTL: The OVPTL noted that research has demonstrated that the use of Learning Assistants improves student learning especially for first generation, low-income, and under-represented students. LAs demonstrate increased academic performance as the result of the LA experience. The benefit to faculty is that that they can scale active learning to large lectures. Also, teaching assistants can learn new teaching skills as LAs can take over some of the group work normally performed by TAs.

E. Update on COMPASS, *Michael Dennin and Raymond Vadnais*
COMPASS allows advisors to harness data about students with the goal of using this data to improve student success. Instructors have access to COMPASS, though significantly less than advisors at this point. Faculty may find COMPASS data about their students enrolled in in their course helpful for understanding and improving student learning outcomes. COMPASS will eventually have the ability to provide reports to instructors showing the relationship between grade distribution and other data that could reveal patterns helpful for improving student academic performance by instructors, departments, the administration etc.

Currently, COMPASS provides instructors with student data and grade distribution in a course, but not the relationship between the two. All identifying student factors are redacted on COMPASS. Based on the CEP discussion, it appears that faculty instructors can also see grade distributions in other instructors' courses and some CEP members noted that grading at UCI is inconsistent across campus, even among instructors of the same course. According to the presenters, beginning in spring 2018, CEP was told they will have access to COMPASS reports which show the relationship between student demographics and grade distribution within the course. This information is already available to counselors.

F. CEP discussion of the removal of concentrations and specializations from student transcripts
Some faculty members from Physical Sciences, Engineering and other departments/Schools are concerned about the plan for the Student Information System to remove information about student completion of concentrations and specializations within the major on the student transcript.

CEP learned that the removal of specializations and concentrations would affect 50% of Engineering students and a similar percentage of Physical Sciences students. It was noted that the completion of concentrations and specializations in many STEM majors is a big draw for students interested in applying to some UCI STEM majors. A few members pointed out that if this information were to be removed from the transcript, many current majors would be forced to split into two or three new majors just so completion of concentrations and specializations could continue to be communicated clearly and consistently to stakeholders, particularly industry in the Southern California region.

The University Registrar offered two main responses to the proposal to retain specializations and concentrations on the transcript. First, UCs do not all follow this practice. Second, there are other ways of communicating this information to employers of prospective UCI students. In response to both retorts, faculty members noted that because the practice of including student completion of specializations and concentrations on the transcript has been in place for a number of years, it has already become the expected means for informing employers, particularly in southern California, about UCI students who have completed specializations and concentrations.

G. CEP review of Charge to Reviewers of the Senate's 2019 External Review of Undergraduate Writing
CEP's Subcommittee on the 2019 External Review of Undergraduate Writing was responsible for designing and planning and assisting in the External Review of Undergraduate Writing, which included a site visit on April 22 and 23, 2019. One of the most important tasks of the Subcommittee was to come up with a list of questions to help guide the reviewers in the review (Appendix B).

H. CEP finalization of review of ITSA proposals
The four reviewers of the seven ITSA proposals were selected because none of them was from a school that was represented in the ITSA slate of proposals under review. CEP received eight ITSA proposals. The reviewers ranked each of the proposals. The four rankings were averaged, and the top six of the eight proposals were funded.

I. CEP review of GC's proposed revisions to the English Proficiency Requirements for graduate admissions and TAships at UCI.
The Graduate Division requested an update to the English proficiency requirements for graduate admissions and TAships. The current policy (established in March 2002 and last reviewed in October 2008) requires all non-US citizens (international students as well as permanent residents) who are from non-native English speaking countries to pass an oral English proficiency test to establish eligibility for admissions and teaching assistant appointments. The Graduate Council, in consultation with the Graduate Division, has developed a list of recommended revisions to the policy.

While CEP was broadly supportive of the Graduate Council proposed revisions, it did have some concerns and would welcome some further consideration and comment from Graduate Council. It is not necessarily CEP's wish that implementation of the revisions be delayed, but we would hope that continued revision and refinement of the policy be a priority should it go into effect before these issues can be resolved. The most troubling issue for CEP arose from the proposal to devolve responsibility for the implementation of the policy down to the programs. CEP also noted that undergraduate students at large (as, for example, through their ASUCI representatives) do not seem to have been consulted about this policy proposal. CEP would be pleased to see some effort made to consult with undergraduate students to ensure that their concerns are being addressed. Some members of CEP also suggested that Graduate Council consider an exception similar to that for Quebecois universities for Puerto Rican ones. These are United States institutions, but graduates are frequently Spanish speaking with limited English.

J. CEP approval of proposal from English Department to extend the two-year Writing 39B pass out pilot program to a third year.
In June 2017, CEP approved a proposal from the Department of English to implement a one-year pilot program which allowed UCI undergraduates 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 and go straight into Writing 39C. In June 2018 the pilot was extended to a second year due to budget concerns.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR FALL 2019

- CEP Review of 2018 APRB reports/responses for Public Health and Education
- CEP Review of 2018 External Review Report/response from UCI undergraduate writing
- Implementation of the new GE Assessment survey

APPENDIX A

Instructions to Instructors Teaching GE Courses

Prelude:
This GE survey form is designed to give instructors a chance to reflect on their courses, with an eye towards improving how they teach their classes and assess students in the future. The questions are designed to be a bit loose and open-ended, so you can answer them in any way meaningful to you and your course. The ultimate goal here is reflection and improvement of your teaching, which we hope translates into better outcomes for your students.

Your responses will be archived by the Office of the Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning (OVPTL). We hope that your department, or the school in charge of your course, will make your answers available to future instructors directly. We understand that completing this form can take good amount of thinking and your time. We expect your time-on-task now to be under an hour, because we expect you have been thinking about these issues throughout the quarter. Thank you for your efforts in codifying your thoughts, a process that we hope will be as useful to you as it is to us.

Options:
Option 1) Write about an instrument that does a good job of assessing how well students meet one or more of the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) specified for your General Education course. Describe the instrument and what CLOs it assesses. Explain why it does a good job, and report any relevant statistics and an interpretation of student performance on the instrument

OR
Option 2) Write about where/how your students are struggling to meet one or more of the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) specified for your General Education course. Describe how success is currently assessed, why students struggle with the CLOs, or why assessment is difficult or just inadequate, and indicate how any of these might be improved. You can critique any changes from prior course offerings or propose changes for subsequent offerings.

AND OPTIONALLY
Write criticism or praise for the current CLOs, as they relate to your course. Are there any that don't apply? If one or more don't, can you suggest improvements to them or alternative CLOs to replace them?

How the Web Page should Work
We would like the following technology to be available for entering and submitting this form on the web.
We will talk to whomever might help in the creation of this software.
Information Instructor will enter:
  Your name/UCI email
  The course number

The form is automatically populated with:
  The General Education Category of this Course
  The General Education CLOs for the category/course
  A link to upload your syllabus and/or any other relevant documents
  The number of students in the course
  A link to some sample forms (vetted by CEP) with answers for Gen Ed courses

Final Information Instructor will enter:
  Text, in boxes, to answer the questions
    Or
  Pdf files, via links to upload files, to answer the questions

Samples
I have included below a sample of Option 1 and the Optional Question for the course I teach. I hope to have members of this committee write (or solicit an instructor from their department/school to write) similar samples, for inclusion in the material populating the form above (also emailed in bulk to Associate Deans overseeing faculty who should be submitting such forms). The samples don't even have to be for a real class; they just must illustrate what kinds of answers we are looking for.

Sample for ICS-33 (a course I teach every quarter):
GE Vb
GE CLOs:

1) Understand the concept and purpose of formal languages such as propositional and first-order logic, simple programming languages, mathematical models or linguistic formalisms.

2) Possess an elementary grasp of the power and limits of formal methods.

3) Be able to do one or both of the following: apply formal tools of logic or mathematics to the analysis and evaluation of everyday and/or scientific arguments, texts, and communicative situations; apply basic algorithms for the generation of logical deductions, linguistic structures, or computational processes.

This course requires students to take two In-Lab exams. The duration for each is 110 minutes, during their regularly schedule lab hours, in weeks 4 and 9. Students are given the specifications for various functions (In-Lab #1) and a class data structure with various methods (In-Lab #2). They are expected to first read and understand these specifications, then synthesize an algorithm and translate it into running code in the Python language, and finally debug their code by comparing their outputs to the required ones, for various standard inputs/outputs supplied with the specifications. During the exam, students have access only to online materials describing Python and its libraries (not notes nor sample programs). Finally, students are given the prior quarter's exams, to practice on: both for the problems themselves and to familiarize themselves with the format of the exam, because this is often the first time that are taking an exam using this format.

These exams address CLO-3, going from English specifications, to algorithms, to code, to debugged code shows symbolic and computational reasoning at every. This kind of reasoning is especially useful during the debugging phase, when the computer presents students with information about errors in their code. Student need to understand such feedback, and then use backwards-reasoning to posit and test corrections to their code.

These exams are designed to test whether students can demonstrate a mastery of the course material. Although 70% is a passing grade, I really consider 80% to closer approximate mastery. Unless the program produces exactly the correct results, the student receives no credit for that part of the problem. The following statistical information is from the fall 2018 offering. These scores are representative of a typical quarter

In-Lab Exam #1	In-Lab Exam #2
A: 40%	A: 64%
B: 8%	B: 10%
C: 4%	C: 9%
D: 8%	D: 6%

F: 40%	F: 11%

The U-shaped distribution is typical, especially pronounced for Exam #1: the students who have not mastered the material do poorly on many/all problems. Improved performance on the second exam (which is comprehensive, including material from the first as well as new material) is also typical: more students have mastered the material and more are comfortable taking an exam using this format.

AND OPTIONALLY
CLO-1: This one is a bit trite for ICS-33 (which is the last in a sequence of three). Even when they arrive in ICS-33, students understand the concept and purpose of programming languages, and have written some sophisticated programs.

CLO-2: Students certainly grasp the power of programming languages when they arrive in this course, the focus of which is studying even more powerful programming language features. At present, students spend about a week studying *complexity analysis* for algorithms, which in the case of exponential algorithms shows practical limits on the size of problems that even very fast machines can solve. A bit beyond the scope of this class is showing that there are actually interesting and easy-to-state problems (e.g., The Halting Problem) that are unsolvable by any computer. Students certainly know enough to understand such a problem and its proof of insolvability, so I might experiment and schedule a lecture introducing this topic for the last week of the upcoming quarter. Such coverage would nail this CLO.

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE   ACADEMIC SENATE

**Non-Degree Academic Program Review
Undergraduate Writing
Monday April 22, 2019 – Tuesday April 23, 2019**

CHARGE TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

I.   REVIEW STRUCTURE

The External Review Committee will use this charge to guide its review. We encourage you to ask questions based on your read of the Self-Study Report and documents, and your interactions with our faculty, staff, and students.

We are interested in your overall assessment of the academic programs and courses involved in undergraduate writing, including the Composition program, Humanities Core, Academic English, and the Center for Excellence in Writing and Communication as well as faculty research, teaching accomplishments, and potential of the all of these programs. **Please make an explicit comparison of the UCI program with comparable programs at other major universities noted for their research and teaching excellence in writing.** Your assessments of the quality of the undergraduate writing courses and programs will be reviewed by the Irvine Academic Senate's Council on Educational Policy (CEP) as the Senate Council with ultimate authority over reviews of non-degree academic programs at UC Irvine.

We encourage you to be as specific as possible in your assessments and recommendations. While you may recommend increased resources for the unit under review, more specific recommendations related to organizational structure, faculty hiring, coursework, student mentoring, etc., will be more helpful to the unit and our campus. **Please identify the 2-3 most important priorities and provide justification for these priorities in order to most effectively influence the planning process.** Our primary concerns are the quality of the academic programs, research, and teaching, the quality of the faculty and students, and the undergraduate writing programs potential for distinction.

It is critical that you communicate with the ERC Chair, Linda Adler-Kassner, before, during, and after the campus visit to communicate your findings and any issues that arise that may impact the review. All reviewers are expected to read the Self-Study Report and documents provided in the reviewer's notebook by the Irvine Academic Senate's CEP Subcommittee on the 2019 Undergraduate Writing Review. If you would like additional information based on your readings of these documents, please let the Academic Senate Office know as soon as possible by contacting CEP analyst, Michelle AuCoin (maucoin@uci.edu) or (949) 824-6728.

II.   AREAS OF INQUIRY

CAMPUSWIDE ISSUES (Administration, Curriculum & Instruction, Advising & Mentoring, and Diversity). Please comment on the following campuswide issues.

ADMINISTRATION
— Are there enough seats to fill student demand for writing courses in Academic English, lower division writing, and upper division writing classes? If not, how might the situation be improved?
— How would you characterize the overall administration of undergraduate writing at UCI?
— Do undergraduate writing courses and programs receive sufficient resources from central administration and school deans? If not, please explain why and how the situation might be improved.
— How does the distribution of resources to undergraduate writing programs and courses at UCI compare to peer and aspiring institutions?
— How effective is the writing administration in fostering important relationships and collaborations with other schools, departments, or academic programs outside of the undergraduate writing programs?
— How effective is the communication about student preparedness for lower and upper division writing courses and classroom space between the writing programs, the Registrar's Office, and school counselors?
— Comment on any fundraising priorities and strategies of the undergraduate writing programs.
— Comment on the strategic plan for undergraduate writing and the likelihood of achieving the goals outlined given current and planned resource allocation and the administrative structure of undergraduate writing programs.

DIVERSITY
— Comment on the number of underrepresented minorities in the undergraduate writing programs, including the hiring and retention of administrators, faculty, staff and undergraduate students in enrollment and attrition in undergraduate writing courses.
— Comment on the academic success of underrepresented students as compared to all undergraduate students in Academic English, lower division, and upper division writing courses.
— What is the perceived climate among underrepresented students of any undergraduate writing programs, writing instructors and undergraduate students?

TEACHING
— How would you describe the overall quality of instruction of undergraduate writing courses provided by faculty (tenure and tenure track instructors), unit 18 lecturers, and teaching assistants?
— Is the percentage of courses taught by regular-rank faculty (vs. unit 18 lecturers, visitors, etc.) appropriate for this discipline and similar to what other good departments do at peer and aspiring institutions?
— How would you characterize the undergraduate student/faculty ratio and undergraduate student/unit 18 lecturer ratio in both lower and upper division writing courses?
— What training do TAs receive before serving in lower and upper division writing courses? Is that training adequate?
— Is there specific training for TAs of online lower and upper division writing courses?
— Does the student to TA ratio for lower and upper division writing courses seem appropriate?
— How appropriate are the pedagogical approaches used in the classroom?

— What suggestions do you have for enhancing the quality of instruction?
— How are student course evaluations taken into account in changing course offerings or who teaches the course?
— How is teaching assessed and rewarded? Is there support within the various schools and departments for the teaching of upper division writing classes, or are these seen as less important than "content classes"?

CURRICULUM

— For upper division writing courses, is instructional and TA workload shared equitably across the Schools and departments?
— Comment on the quality, quantity, cohesiveness and relevance of lower division and upper division courses for all UC Irvine majors.
— Students are supposed to complete lower division writing requirements and in many cases other content related prerequisites before enrolling in upper division writing courses. Are these prerequisites being enforced consistently? If not, how are unprepared students in upper division writing courses affected? Are they unable to succeed in these upper division writing courses, and if so, what can be done to improve the situation?
— Are international students who primarily speak languages other than English able to succeed in lower and upper division writing courses? Are these students prepared for lower and upper division writing courses upon enrollment to them? In cases where these international students are already enrolled in lower or upper division writing courses but have demonstrated lack of preparedness for them, are these students able to immediately enroll in the Academic English courses they need in order to become prepared for the lower or upper division writing courses they need in time to graduate?
— How would you assess the overall design, breadth, and rigor of the undergraduate writing curriculum (preparatory writing courses, the Lower Division writing courses and Upper Division writing courses?
— How well does the overall undergraduate writing curriculum reflect current thinking about university writing instruction?
— Are there differences between the academic quality of online vs. traditional lower division and upper division courses? If so, how might the situation be improved?
— Are there qualitative differences between sections of the same lower division courses or taught by different instructors? If so, how might the situation be improved?
— Are there qualitative differences between upper division writing courses across campus? If so, how might the situation be improved?
— How do the undergraduate writing programs for both lower and upper division courses determine whether a course will be taught online, and are the online courses meeting their pedagogical goals?
— What suggestions do you have for improving the academic quality of online and traditional lower division and upper division writing courses?
— How well do the lower division (if applicable) and upper division writing courses serve transfer students?

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

— What are students expected to know or be able to do as a result of completing the lower and upper division writing requirements?
— Are the learning outcomes for undergraduate Lower Division and Upper Division adequate?
— How satisfied are students with the academic quality of lower and upper division writing courses?

PROMOTING UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH
— To what extent do upper division writing courses (or lower division writing courses) engage undergraduate students in the research process?
— To what extent does the writing curriculum prepare students to engage in independent research?

We welcome your comments on the review process itself. How useful were the materials provided prior to and information gained during your campus visit? Were these sufficient to make an adequate assessment of the Writing Program at all levels? If not, what would have been helpful to have?

III.   SUBMISSION AND REVIEW OF FINAL REPORT

The ERC Chair will submit the completed, final report to the Academic Senate via email to CEP analyst Michelle AuCoin (maucoin@uci.edu) no later than **Friday, June 14, 2019**.

The final report will then be submitted to the Campus Writing Coordinator, the Director of Composition, the Provost, and the appropriate Senate Councils for review and comment.

We thank you very much for your efforts to help us build on the strengths of our programs.