AGENDA
Council on Educational Policy
Thursday, October 6, 2022
11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Academic Senate Conference Room (AH 338)

Action | Item
--- | ---
**Information** | I. CEP Welcome and Information
A. Introductions
B. Remarks by Manoj Kaplinghat, CEP Chair
C. Remarks by Georg Striedter, Academic Senate Chair
D. Information on CEP Subcommittees
   a. Subcommittee on Policy and Assessment (volunteers welcome!)
   b. Subcommittee on Courses & Continuing, Part-Time, and Summer Session Education
   c. Academic Program Review Board (joint subcommittee with Graduate Council)
E. [UCI Academic Senate Conflict of Interest and Recusal Policy](#)
F. CEP Authority: [UC Regents Bylaw 40](#) and [UC Bylaw 85](#)
G. [CEP Website](#)

**Discussion/Action** | II. Proposed New Senate Regulation 479
Issue: Systemwide Senate Chair Susan Cochran has distributed for review a proposed new Senate Regulation 479 creating the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC).

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) designed Cal-GETC in response to State Assembly Bill 928 (AB 928), which calls for the establishment of a single lower-division general education pathway that meets the academic requirements for transfer admission from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to both UC and the California State University (CSU).

Cal-GETC is based on the longstanding Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) (see [Senate Regulation 478](#)). It aligns UC and CSU transfer requirements without increasing the 34-unit ceiling for the course pattern, as mandated by AB 928, and will take effect for students entering a community college as of fall 2025. Senate Regulation 478 will eventually sunset once it is replaced by the proposed Senate Regulation 479.

The proposed regulation and background information are available via the Senate’s Data Management System. Divisional Senates are asked to approve the proposed language for Senate Regulation 479. The CSU and CCC Academic Senates are also reviewing the Cal-GETC proposal. It is important to note that under AP 928, if the UC, CSU, and CCC Academic Senates are unable to reach agreement on a singular lower-division general education transfer pathway by May 31, 2023, authority...
for doing so would shift from the faculty to the respective administrations.

**Presented By:** Chair Kaplinghat  
**Action:** Members will be asked to volunteer to serve as lead reviewers and provide comments.

### Discussion/Action III. Proposed Amendment to Systemwide Senate Regulation 630

**Issue:** Systemwide Senate Chair Susan Cochran has distributed for review a proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 630 proposed by the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and endorsed by the Academic Council last year.

The amendment clarifies the residency requirement for a bachelor’s degree by adding section 630.E requiring undergraduates, both freshman and transfer cohorts, to complete six units of in-person courses in a quarter/semester for one year, with an in-person course defined as having at least 50% face-to-face instruction. The amendment also permits divisional Senates to require a higher threshold for in-person course credits per term or for the number of terms in which a threshold applies. Finally, the amendment closes a loophole through which campuses could potentially or inadvertently create fully online degree programs through individually approved online courses.

**Presented By:** Chair Kaplinghat  
**Action:** Members will be asked to volunteer to serve as lead reviewers and provide comments.

### Discussion/Action IV. Entry Level Writing Requirement Task Force Report and Recommendations

**Issue:** Systemwide Senate Chair Susan Cochran has distributed for review the report and recommendations of the Academic Council Entry Level Writing Requirement Task Force. The task force was charged to collect and analyze campus Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) data, to consider questions related to ELWR placement, and to develop recommendations for updating Senate Regulation 636 (SR 636), the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement.

The task force’s [Phase I Report](#) includes initial findings and observations based on data collected about the use of the ELWR across campuses. Its Phase 2 Report includes specific recommendations for ELWR and a proposal to update SR 636. CEP and CEMA are asked to focus on the Phase 2 Report placement principles (pages 10-13), recommendations (pages 13-16), and proposed revision to SR 636 (pages 16-18).

The Phase 2 Report is available via the Senate’s Data Management System. Please refer to the [Phase I Report](#) for additional background information and data as needed.

**Presented By:** Chair Kaplinghat and Daniel Gross (Campus Writing & Communication Coordinator)  
**Action:** Members will be asked to volunteer to serve as lead reviewers and provide comments.
Discussion V. Hybrid and Online Courses

Issue: At the request of the Academic Senate Chair, CEP discussed and deliberated existing definitions of course modalities throughout the 2021-22 academic year. The Council will receive an overview of the topic as well as suggestions for any renewed discussions.

Presented By: Chair Kaplinghat

Discussion/Action VI. Unpublished Elective Courses

Issue: The Registrar’s Office brought a concerning issue to the Senate’s attention. Twenty-nine undergraduate programs currently determine – without Senate oversight – which courses may be considered program electives without publishing all electives in the General Catalogue. As a result:

• The Registrar’s Office must collect information on “unpublished” electives after each academic year to reflect them manually in degree audits.
• Academic units have effectively been allowed to change electives, and thus program requirements, without the Senate’s review and approval (quarterly in the case of some programs).
• Students enrolled in the applicable programs cannot fully or clearly understand their responsibilities and rights as to which electives they are required to complete and entitled to receive credit for.

The Senate should address the unintended consequences of this practice, namely, (i) delegating the Senate’s authority over curricula, (ii) jeopardizing students’ catalogue rights, and (iii) causing unnecessary manual administrative processes.

Since the academic units have received – or believe they have received – approval by CEP to modify electives and publish changes on their program websites, they will need to identify and formally propose all courses that have not yet been approved by the Senate to count toward program requirements. Upon Senate approvals, electives will need to be published in the General Catalogue so that students can know their programmatic responsibilities and rights.

Presented By: Chair Kaplinghat

VII. Announcements

VIII. Consent Calendar – no items at this time.

IX. New Business

X. Adjournment