

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

September 1, 2009

4:30 – 5:30 PM

Hellstedt Room

MINUTES

Members Present: Faria Ahmed, Jeff Abernathy, Lindsey Bell, Kristin Douglas, Ann Ericson, Liesl Fowler, Bob Haak, Bill Hammer, Katie Hanson, Rick Jaeschke, Taddy Kalas, Adam Kaul, Mary Koski, Sven Steen, Mark Vincent, Nick Wedderspoon, Ritva Williams

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 PM.

AGENDA ITEM I – APPROVAL OF MAY 12, 2009 MINUTES

Ann Ericson's name should be added to those members present. The amended meeting minutes were approved.

AGENDA ITEM II – NEW BUSINESS

A. New Course/LP Requests

1. BIOL 240: Concepts in Public Health & Epidemiology [PN]

A motion was made:

“To approve BIOL 240: Concepts in Public Health & Epidemiology [PN] as presented.”

Motion-Hammer, Second-Jaeschke APPROVED

2. RELG 394: Key Issues in Comparative Religion

A motion was made:

“To approve RELG 394: Key Issues in Comparative Religion as presented.”

Motion-Hammer, Second-Kaul APPROVED

B. Learning Community Approval

A motion was made:

“To approve as a Learning Community: Understanding Global Health: Resources and Roadblocks to Equity in Public Health [BIOL 240/POLS 340] as presented.”

Motion-Hammer, Second-Kaul APPROVED

- C. African American Studies. Jeff noted that African American Studies as a program was removed from the 2009-2010 catalog given the creation of the Africana Studies program. Faculty involved in the development of the new program intended that the African American Studies minor be dropped but that was not officially included in the motion. Because there was general agreement as to the intent of the program faculty and the Senate, Academic Affairs removed the minor from the 2009-10 catalog. Jeff asked whether there was any concern and none was expressed.

- D. Agenda item D will be discussed at the next meeting.

E. New Program Proposal Form

Up until this time there has been no formal form for submitting new major/program proposals; mostly because there have been very few new majors proposed. The potential exists now, however, of proposals coming in for as many as 10 new majors, and an approval form can serve as a tool to assist this committee in carefully vetting these majors. There is also discussion about whether the approval process for new majors should be exclusively given by the Educational Policies Committee and Faculty Senate. Should there be an additional committee included in the approval process? Jeff and the faculty senate chair will have further discussion on this matter.

Suggestions/comments made about the form:

- Use a numbering system instead of bullets on the form.
- Clarify whether new programs would be housed with another program on campus, or stand along in their own department.
- For the question “How many students do you believe will choose the proposed major? What specific goals do you have for the number of graduates over the first six years?”is that for the major alone, or majors and minors?
This is for both majors and minors.
- For the question “What specific element of the curriculum or co-curriculum would make the proposed major distinctive?” Distinctive from what?
As compared to similar majors at other colleges as well as other majors on our campus.
- How was the span of six years come up with as it relates to “what are the specific goals you have for the number of graduates over the first six years?”
(6-year graduation rates are considered by the administration, and also that this length of time is helpful determining hiring needs)
- What is the rationale for asking “What balance will there be between students attracted to the major as a primary area of interest and those for whom it is secondary to their primary major?” Why do we need to know this? Is this a question for pre-professional programs?
(This information is helpful to Admissions so that they know how to market the program. Also, it helps the committee to maintain a balance of evaluating popular majors and those not-so-popular, but that are meaningful to the College in other ways.)
- Not sure what good answers are for the questions on the form. Committee will need to work this out.
(It could be that this is a form that would benefit the administration more than it would this committee. Perhaps two different forms are needed in the evaluation process).
- Would administration weigh in on viable majors before EPC considers them? Would EPC be the first to evaluate these proposals?
(Funding would be a deciding factor at times...administration would have to weigh in if more resources were needed. If the college already has resources to support a new major, EPC would likely be the first venue for evaluation once the department has given their approval. EPC members are encouraged to bring ideas for new programs to the committee as well.

Under “Needs”what documentation is acceptable as “evidence”?
(Hopefully whoever’s proposing the program has research, statistics and studies to support their request. One of the reasons Jeff asks them to meet with him first is so that he can make sure they talk with others who can be helpful in the process, i.e. Tim Schermer, who can provide statistical/comparative data).

- Under “Needs”remove the word “sufficient” in “Is there sufficient demand...” (will replace with “What’s the evidence in student interest...” instead.
- Rename the form “New Program Proposal Guidelines”
- Generate a Checklist that requires all departments/divisions/faculty that have any involvement in the new program to sign off on, so that everyone involved is aware of the new program proposal. Make this part of the evaluation process. The departments should explain their support in the new major, taking into account teaching loads, etc.

Jeff will revise the guidelines with suggested changes and bring the form back to the committee at the next meeting.

F. Nomination of EPC Member to Curriculum Task Force

Rick Jaeschke and Ritva Williams were nominated to serve as representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski