Educational Policies Committee

Sue Jameson Room
Minutes
October 14, 2004

Members present: Elaine McDonald(Chair), Art Warmouth, Vincent Richman, Perry Marker, Carmen Works, Mary Halavais, Elaine Sundberg, Lynne Morrow, Ben Pugno (AS rep.), Rick Robison (recorder).

Guest: Michelle Jolly, History

1) Chair of EPC - Update on email to Dean Babula regarding AMCS change to 4-unit classes and potential conflict with 3-unit GE classes.

2) Course outline policy, recommendations to the Senate – Carmen Works

Works reported on current status of and changes to this document. She noted grading policy/expectations and the GE committees' additions under item 3. It was felt that a simple URL to the GE policy on the web would be the best format.

Discussion:

- Concern over email address requirement. (BC)
- Enforcement of policy and ramifications (i.e. non-compliance, academic freedom) for faculty.
- 1st reading at Senate only with no EPC review. (AW, BC, EM)
- Student responsibilities (item 7). Provost's concern was noted regarding potential legal liability if this section is not added. (Document was recommended to go to legal department for review.) (MH, EM)
- Length/structure of syllabi. What limitations are there on what we must tell students in advance? What is the necessary information for the students and what is redundant (i.e. item 3 GE)? What of other outlets for this information, i.e. web or catalog? (BC) Pugno noted that some redundancy is useful for students but that students need simple, easy-to-access URLs for information. Morrow also suggested that a syllabus template for faculty may be useful.
- Should these criteria apply to all courses or just GE, majors? (ES)

ACTION: Request to Senate to refer this document back to EPC for a 2nd reading.
Approved (unanimous)

3) Course Withdrawal Policy, 2nd reading, Michelle Jolly

McDonald noted that all was the same except that the line "the chair may refer unusual or very special cases to the University Standards Committee" would be struck from the final document due to redundancy with item 7e.

Jolly clarified that the Standards Committee agreed that Department Chairs are capable of examining a situation to determine the seriousness of situation. Jolly also explained that the major difference between this revised document and the old is the stronger wording in the "DO NOT" list.

Discussion:

- Need to get department chairs on "same page" regarding serious and compelling situations (solutions, such as new faculty trainings, were discussed) (All, ES)
- How do we make sure of a policy of this kind doesn't interfere with an advising/mentoring function of faculty? (BC)
- Potential complications with Federal Grant programs, i.e. increased number of units later. How to address this population? (BC)
- Possibility of students wanting to appeal to other committees.

On identifying student withdrawals, Sundberg noted that PeopleSoft cannot look at a list to see person(s) who withdrew but will only register seat availability change. Also, a "W" is an assigned grade but PeopleSoft does not run grades till end of semester. Upgrade capability is being worked on.

Noted that current Disqualification Policy contains an erroneous statement regarding withdrawals. This policy is being reworded so that it will come into compliance with this policy.

ACTION: Approved (unanimous)

4) Report: Assessment results – Elaine Sundberg

Every Department submitted a report on time. All Departments also met the Chancellor's Office two main objectives of: 1) having developed student learning outcomes and 2) having assessment activities underway.

One concern noted was that not all are at the "program level" of assessment. Thought is being given on how to help departments get to this level, such as trainings, meetings, a model of assessment activities, a website to share departmental activities, etc.

Discussion:

- Ongoing need to emphasize link between program assessment and resource allocation. Critical issue: how to get more resources per student – (AW, BC) Need to put planning and resources into proper format to better relay that this is happening – (ES)
- What role does the faculty play in shaping those reports so that they are from perspective of faculty? What happens to all these docs in regard to educational policy? What of our role in EPC of announcing what should come next? – (BC)

5) APC-EPC Joint Task Force on Alignment with Mission. – Art Warmouth

Reviewed the Draft APC Response to Strategic Plan. Main points: 1) official adoption of Strategic Plan by senate into faculty policy, 2) more alignment of resources with goals, and 3) task force to examine integration of residential life into liberal arts experience.

(APC-EPC Task Force representatives: David Stokes and Liz Close, APC; Lynn Morrow, Elaine MacDonald, and Art Warmouth, EPC)