

Educational Policies Committee (EPC) Minutes

Meeting Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2015

Status of Minutes: Approved 9/9/15

Attendees:

MEMBERS PRESENT: L. Becker (Chair), L. Borchard, B. Lasky, Y. Mimura, J. Oh, B. Osorno, D. Schwartz, W. Smith, C. Spector, D. Wakefield

MEMBERS ABSENT: N. Kucera

STAFF: E. Adams, J. Hunter

GUESTS PRESENT: J. Binkley, G. Lennon, M. Filbeck, M. Sariscsany, S. Malhotra, M. Hoggan, K. Sedghisigarchi, C. Jones, D. Gray, P. Faiman, R. Ryan, M. Cahn, C. Hayashi

I. Announcements

- A. L. Becker (Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting and announced the year's meeting schedule.
- B. New and returning members, associate deans, and guests introduced themselves.
- C. L. Becker announced the curriculum review schedule for Fall 2015. Associate deans should let him know if any colleges have a conflict with the schedule.
- D. E. Adams reminded the committee about EO 1100. The executive order issued earlier in the year requires a "C" or better standard in the four basic subject courses for Fall 2016 implementation.

II. Business

- A. The minutes from 5/6/15 were **MSP approved**.
- B. L. Becker explained that EPC has a representative at both MOU and exit meetings for all program reviews. The main role is to identify if there are any particular policy or curricular issues occurring in that department and to also help answer questions if they arise. E. Adams added that EPC members should not volunteer to represent EPC for a program review in their own college (even if it is a different department). D. Schwartz volunteered to serve as the EPC

representative at the Communication Studies exit meeting scheduled for September 29.

- C. L. Becker reminded the committee about EPC's Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). He announced that there is no proposal to revise the SOPs and that members should read the procedures if they have not done so already.

L. Becker also discussed criteria to consider for early implementation requests and to limit granting early implementation to situations where there is a pressing need or mandate. There should be a good justification explaining why early implementation needs to be granted. Downsides to consider include completing the changes on time, as well as how students learn about the changes. E. Adams said there are also issues related to catalog rights (students have catalog rights to the old plan).

L. Becker also shared that proposal requirements have not changed. E. Adams and J. Hunter provided an update on the progress with an online form and workflow. Several drafts have gone back and forth from the vendor and once a contract is established the system will be setup and piloted.

Regarding assessment, L. Becker reminded the committee that departments can use either the matrix or a narrative describing how the proposal fits with the assessment program, including discussion of what is driving the proposal and closing the feedback loop.

Additionally, financial implications of proposals should be answered fully. Availability of funding can be part of the decision of whether to approve a new program proposal.

- D.-E. L. Becker shared feedback regarding two EPC policies that arose during the summer: The Standardized Breaks in Classes Policy and the Scheduling of Instruction Policy. He asked if the committee wanted to consider revising/updating the policies.

L. Becker provided suggested revisions to the Standardized Breaks in Classes Policy from Academic Resources and Planning to make the guidelines in line with standard class hours.

Regarding the Scheduling of Instruction Policy, D. Wakefield explained that as a department chair he receives many questions and not everyone understands the policy. It is dated and mention of online instruction is absent from the policy.

It was decided to create a subcommittee that will treat the two policies separately and consult a representative from other groups, such as associate deans, Educational Resources Committee (ERC), Graduate Studies, National Center on Deafness (interpreters), student representative, Personnel Planning and Review Committee (PP&R). L. Borchard, C. Spector, and D. Wakefield volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

III. Other Business

A. D. Schwartz asked about General Education (GE) review. L. Becker said EPC is waiting for a report from the General Education Council (GEC) about the experience in general. EPC has already been reviewing new GE curriculum. The big question to tackle is the future of GE Recertification. W. Smith shared his experience on GEC with the committee regarding workload.

B. L. Becker said that Special Topics versus Experimental Topics courses are being used in different ways in different departments and issues related to this use need to be resolved. He will recommend a way to consider and discuss these issues.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 p.m.