The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) held 9 meetings this academic year. Committee members and the Chair also attended several meetings associated with undergraduate program reviews. Much of the Committee’s work, such as the careful study of long and complex documents, is completed outside of these meetings and through e-mail if needed in between meetings. The Chair attended meetings of Executive Council and provided updates to the Committee at each meeting from issues discussed at the local level. The Chair, at the request of the administration or Chair of the Division, attended additional meetings and served on ad hoc committees including the Assessment Advisory Committee and the Summer Session Administration and Academic Oversight Committees. At the request of the Chair of the Division, CEP Member Walter Clark served as the Chair of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to review the student proposal for a Gender Studies breadth requirement.

This year, the Division was well represented on the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) by Tom Stahovich, who kept CEP and the Division informed about various items and System-wide developments of interest to the Committee.

A primary responsibility of CEP is undergraduate program reviews. During the academic year, two CEP subcommittees were established to conduct the external undergraduate program reviews of Dance and Economics, and two subcommittees were established to conduct the internal reviews of Electrical Engineering and Materials Science and Engineering utilizing the ABET accreditation report in place of an external review team. The external review for Dance took place on February 4 and 5, 2016 while the external review for Economics was held on March 28 and 29, 2016. The Chair of CEP organized and attended Action Implementation meetings with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE), College Deans and Associate Deans, and the Department Chairs for the reviews conducted in previous academic years for Anthropology, Bioengineering, and Philosophy. As a result of these meetings, action implementation plans with a timeline based on CEP’s Findings and Recommendations were developed for each program except for Bioengineering as CEP was satisfied with their response to the Final Findings and Recommendations report in the Action Implementation meeting and voted to close the review. CEP received a satisfactory compliance report to the action implementation plan from Philosophy and voted to close the review. A compliance report was received from Anthropology and the Committee voted to request an additional follow-up report from the program to address their ongoing approach to issues identified in the action implementation plan.

The Committee discussed the review schedule for next academic year and in an effort to comply with WASC’s recommendation that each undergraduate program be reviewed every 7 to 10 years, the Committee will review 5 undergraduate programs in the 2016-2017 Academic Year. To accommodate the increased workload for members that is necessary to complete the additional reviews the Committee proposed a change to the membership bylaws to increase the number of members from 12 to 15.

The Committee will conduct an external review of Art History, Ethnic Studies, Microbiology, and Religious Studies and an internal review of Bioengineering next academic year. A retreat was held for the programs scheduled for an external review on April 1, 2016 to help the programs prepare for their upcoming reviews.

The Committee updated the Procedures for Undergraduate Program Reviews to include additional requirements for the self study. The Committee adopted a recommendation from the VPUE’s Office to include the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) results for majors as a
supplemental document to the student satisfaction surveys in the student information section of the program review self-study. The requirements for the assessment section of the program review self-study were also updated to require programs to address the 5 WASC core competencies.

The following is a list of open undergraduate program reviews that CEP is working to close:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY Review was Conducted:</th>
<th>Program Reviewed:</th>
<th>Current step:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>CEP to review follow up response to the Action Implementation Plan at October 7, 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>CEP to approve Final Findings and Recommendations Report at October 7, 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>CEP to approve Final Findings and Recommendations Report at October 7, 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>CEP to approve Final Findings and Recommendations Report at October 7, 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>CEP to approve Final Findings and Recommendations Report at October 7, 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important function of CEP is to review and comment on all issues relevant to undergraduate education and occasionally on issues with a more general nature. When warranted, these discussions result in new regulations and policies. Topics discussed and/or acted upon by the committee in consultation with other Senate committees and/or the Administration throughout the year have included:

- The Committee reviewed the proposed changes to Senate Regulation 417 and 621 that were recommended by Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). The proposed changes to SR 417 strikes the word “community” so that all college/university units are treated the same and the proposed changes to SR 621 allow for a fuller suite of standardized examinations for which the University awards unit credit. The Committee voted to support the changes but also commented that the last sentence of SR 417 is ambiguous recommended that the sentence be clarified.

- The Committee reviewed a request form the VPUE’s Office to consider changing the student evaluation of teaching forms. The Committee opined that before a recommendation could be made from the Committee, more information was needed to document the evidence for issues that necessitate the revision of the teaching evaluations and the problems that will be solved by revising them. The proposal was update and the Committee met with the VPUE and Director of Evaluation and Assessment to discuss their reasons for change the evaluations. The Committee opined that the proposed changes did not adequately address the issues with the current system of teaching evaluations and was not supportive of the proposed changes. The Committee recommended that the proposals be withdrawn pending the submission of a more substantive proposal that attempts to address some of the limitation of the current system and its effectiveness. The Committee recommended that a Senate Ad Hoc Committee be convened to conduct a thorough review of the student evaluations to determine what is considered a good evaluation and to review the current evaluation process.

- The Committee continued discussions from last academic year on the proposed Student Classroom and Course Related Behavior policy to address Executive Council’s concerns with the policy. The
Committee made the recommended changes and also updated the policy to revise several ambiguous sentences.

- The Committee proposed a revision to UCR Regulation 6 for campus graduation requirements to formalize the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program after the successful review of the program last academic year. The Committee recommended in the proposed changes that the WAC program be reviewed by CEP every 5 years to ensure that it remains an effective alternative to ENGL 1C.

- The Committee reviewed the Change Management Workgroup’s recommendations for Banner and met with the Registrar and the Dean of Graduate Division who served as Chair of the workgroup to discuss their concerns with the recommendations. The Committee was supportive of the recommendations for 16 unit repeated unit maximum, individual and group activities, all or none pre-requisite checking, and running of the academic standing after the summer term. The Committee was not supportive of the recommendation for the consistent use of the term concentration in an effort to standardize terminology paths within a major as it could be potentially confusing for departments. The Committee recommended that the Workgroup ensure that Department Chairs are notified of the definitions and consequences of using the terms concentration, emphasis, or track. The Committee was not supportive of the recommendation to change the deadlines and timing of the add/drop period, lapse for non-payment, and start of the “W” grading for withdrawals due to the potential negative effect on students. The Committee recommended that the Workgroup ensure that students’ time to graduation and academic progress is not hindered by the proposed changes. Further, the Committee recommended that students be notified at least a week in advance if there is a threat that they will be dropped from a course due to nonpayment so that they are aware of the consequences and if possible can pay the fees that are outstanding.

- The Committee reviewed the proposed Endowed Chemistry Founder’s Chairs in the Department of Chemistry and voted to support the proposal. The Committee did not anticipate any negative impacts on undergraduate education as a result of the proposal.

- The Committee reviewed a proposal for the reorganization of CNAS and had significant concerns with how the continuity of undergraduate instruction will be maintained following the proposed reorganization. Particularly, the Committee was concerned with how the programs will continue to operate and how faculty will be assigned to instruct undergraduate courses. The Committee recommended that the proposal be expanded to explicitly address these issues pertaining to undergraduate education.

- The Committee reviewed the Committee on Courses proposed questionnaire for online course instructors that will be utilized to gather data on remote proctoring practices. The Committee supported the survey, but also recommended that the introduction paragraph be revised so that it clearly states that the Committee on Courses intends to use the survey to request information on examination practices.

- The Committee reviewed and supported a proposal to modify UCR Regulation 7.4.2 to allow a maximum of 19 repeat units instead of the currently allowed 16.

- The Committee reviewed the proposal for teaching credit for faculty-led internship courses at UCR and recommended that the issue of granting teaching credit to faculty who instruct internship courses be decided at the College level. The Committee commented that the College would be the
best source to determine if a faculty member’s workload is appropriate to count for academic credit and that it would be difficult for the decision to be regulated at the campus level without knowing the specifics of the internship course and/or program.

- The Committee reviewed and voted to support the proposed change to the Committee on Preparatory Education’s membership bylaw to remove the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs as an ex officio member of the Committee.

- The Committee reviewed the issue of faculty assigning their own texts to students for the courses they instruct and opined that the issue is not a problem at UCR but rather a perception issue. The Committee recommended that is not advisable to implement a policy to address the issue as in some cases a faculty member’s text is the best in their field or the only text that covers the curriculum for a course.

- The Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the major requirements in CNAS described in Bylaw NR 2.4.5. The Committee commented that the brief justification provided for the change documenting Banner not being able to code the 24 unique units is not sufficient to justify the proposed change. The Committee recommended that the CNAS Executive Committee provide a more thorough justification that documents the impact of the proposed changes on the course requirements for the major programs.

- The Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the academic minors in CNAS described in Bylaw NR 3.4.3. The Committee noted that the justification is not accurate as it has the same justification for the proposed changes to CNAS Bylaw NR 2.4.5 and recommended that a justification be provided for the changes to NR 3.4.3, including a thorough justification for that documents the impact of the proposed changes on the course requirements for major and minor programs.

- The Committee considered the request to review the proposed changes to Graduate Division bylaws to backdate policy and add transfer course work policies and responded that that the proposal was outside of the purview of CEP for review as it did not include impact on the area of undergraduate education.

- The Committee reviewed and supported the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity’s proposed change to APM 245 regarding the duties of Department Chairs to require Department Chairs to ensure their faculty are receiving information regarding the goals of diversity.

- The Committee reviewed and supported the proposed changes to APM 112, 210, 278, 279 and 350.

- The Committee reviewed and supported the draft Campus Five Year Planning Perspectives for 2016-2021 with the exception of the listing of the proposal for the reorganization of CNAS. The proposal was identified as being withdrawn, however the requests to rename the Departments of Biology, Environmental Sciences, and Cell Biology and Neuroscience, which were included in the reorganization proposal, are listed as in progress. The Committee requested that clarification be included on the planning perspectives to document which part of the CNAS reorganization proposal was withdrawn.

CEP also took up a number of matters related to majors, minors and other programs. The Committee reviewed a request from the Registrar to review proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum. The
Committee voted to support that the Registrar be allowed to review proposed changes to undergraduate curriculum after CEP has approved them, but not be part of the decision process for approving changes to undergraduate curriculum.

The following proposal and proposed changes to curriculum were discussed, approved and reported to the Division:

**Approved Curriculum Changes from BCoE:**
- BS in Business Informatics
- BS in Chemical Engineering
- BS in Computer Engineering
- BS in Computer Science
- BS in Electrical Engineering

**Approved Curriculum Changes from CHASS:**
- BA in Business Economics
- BA in Economics
- BA in Economics/Administrative Studies
- BA in History
- BA in Media and Cultural Studies
- BA in Middle East and Islamic Studies
- BA in Psychology
- BA in Theatre, Film and Digital Production
- Minor in Economics
- Minor in Media and Cultural Studies
- Minor in Middle East and Islamic Studies
- Minor in Theatre, Film and Digital Production

**Approved Curriculum Changes from CNAS:**
- BA in Chemistry
- BS in Chemistry: Environmental Chemistry Option
- BS in Chemistry: Chemical Physics Option
- BS in Geology
- BA & BS in Biochemistry
- BA & BS in Biology
- BA & BS in Cell, Molecular, and Developmental Biology
- BA & BS in Environmental Sciences
- BA & BS in Entomology
- BA & BS in Mathematics
- BA & BS in Microbiology
- BA & BS in Neuroscience
- BA & BS in Physics
- BA & BS in Plant Biology
- BA & BS in Statistics
- Minor in Entomology
- Minor in Math

**Approved Curriculum Changes from SoBA:**
- BA in Business Administration

The Committee’s members are to be commended for their close attention to a broad spectrum of matters concerning educational policy and undergraduate education and their genuine concern for student welfare.
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