

Minutes

3/3/15

Educational Policies Committee (EPC)

In attendance: Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Nathan Rank (NR), Alvin Nguyen (AN), Tim Wandling (TW), Melinda Milligan (MM), Laura Watt (LW), Kristen Daley (KD), Kathryn Chang (KC), Felicia Kalker (FK), Luisa Grossi (LG), Rich Whitkus (RW)

Called to Order at 11:04 am

Approval of Agenda (approved with removal of a time certain for EPC working groups)

Approval of Minutes of 2/18 (approved)

Reports

1. Chair of EPC — L. Watt
 - Kinesiology discontinuance proposal going to Senate today, FYI. Not the changes to Master's program; it is being reconsidered.
 - A subgroup of ACT is working on prioritization of capital projects. LW was not able to attend latest meeting but will report back when she has more information.
 - There is some discussion about governance committees continuing to meet in Stevenson building. ExCom has decided not to; some EPC members also feel uncertain about it. LW will investigate other meeting rooms but only if they will be available on a consistent basis.
 - LW is willing to run for chair of EPC again but notes that she must first be re-elected from School and also will be going on sabbatical in fall. MM is willing to sub during fall if LW is re-elected as EPC chair.
2. Interim AVP, Academic Programs — R. Whitkus
 - No report
3. Vice-Chair of EPC — N. Rank
 - SEIE working group will meet Tues to find their bearings, go over plans and what to talk about with Deborah, find out what the curriculum committee is doing
4. Liaison to Graduate Studies Subcommittee — Vacant
5. Liaison to GE Subcommittee — T. Wandling
 - No report
6. Liaison to/from APC — IN HIATUS
7. Voting member of Program Review Subcommittee — Vacant
8. Liaison to/from Senate Budget Subcommittee — L. Watt
 - No report
9. Liaison from Senate Diversity Subcommittee — C. Elster (Occ. Report)

CE arrives @11:30 to discuss diversity guidelines he created for inclusion in Program Review process. EPC members recommend bringing to Program Review committee which will soon be re-located to APARC rather than EPC. FK recalls this document was reviewed favorably by last year's Program Review committee and the suggestion at that time was to include it as a helpful resource on the Program Review website. LW notes that the Program Review policy will soon be undergoing revision as an outcome of the faculty retreat in January. NR suggests that some programs may wish to look at demographics in addition to student learning/pedagogies. All discuss issues of classroom climate, sensitivity and how program review can advance strategies for improving these issues.

10. Liaison to University Standards — Vacant

Consent Item ASTR 150 for permanent GE area B1

MM asks one question about letter from M Pillai (curriculum committee chair): what does it mean that it says it satisfies B1 or B3. RW notes B3 is not a requirement at all. It's unnecessary but on this campus unofficially used to get your B units up if you want. I.e. if your course doesn't fit in B1, 2, or 4 then it can go in B3. It is used as lab in other schools. NR says we have a set of learning outcomes associated with it. We've integrated it in our curriculum to some extent. LW notes there are no mandated categories in B at all, but we have created them.

This course for GE is not considered controversial. Approved.

Discussion Item EPC working groups – updates:

LW has not yet called together curriculum guide group but soon will.

LW will be sending her department's TA policy to the TA policy group.

TW has submitted a draft questionnaire that the TA policy group created. LW will share with EPC.

Discussion item GE recommendation on grades for year long courses.

Rich brought this issue to GE last fall. EO 1100 states GE areas A and B4 have to be passed with a grade of C or better for student to get GE credit. It starts this fall for all new students. Registrar's office needs to know how to code it.

GE has come up with a strong recommendation and CB notes there's a lot of agreement in the recommendation.

NR, FK and RW point out that the memo is complicated. We need more time to talk about it and create a clear path for going forward. The memo doesn't cover all scenarios. RW notes it had as its starting point the scenario in which a student is failing. Perhaps it goes too far for students not in that situation.

We also need to outline what is going on in a communication to students. Syllabi, catalog etc.

NR points out there are student situations where they are getting better in spring and though they didn't get a C in fall, they are working harder now. Perhaps because they didn't get that C in the fall.

RW notes that the CO has given us permission to use the spring semester grade for yearlong courses so that resolves the issue of the fall grade. This does not resolve the

Minutes

3/3/15

Educational Policies Committee (EPC)

issue of the student who does well in fall but poorly in spring. Discussion question: Can the grade be averaged?

Other discussion questions that came up: Have instructors of all the relevant GE courses seen this memo or thought about this issue...? Can we go about getting input from these instructors? Unclear which groups were consulted.

RW: A third complication is the credit/no credit courses. If credit means C or better you're clear. C- would not be an option for a credit. But that is our policy currently. Does this conflict with the EO?

IP grades raise logistical issues as well (e.g. what if student leaves)

FK notes that we need to outline all the different scenarios that this EO applies to.

TW and CB will spearhead the effort to write a policy or, at least, an implementation plan. It will be based on these other documents and the questions raised today.

It is also noted that the catalog copy for regulations and the GE section need to be changed. RW says this is University Standards.

Meeting is adjourned at 12:30.

Minutes submitted by F Kalker.