Senate Committee on Educational Policy  
Monday, February 18, 2013  

MINUTES  

Present: Gay Miller, Chair; Lauren Eiten; Max Ellithorpe; Bettina Francis; Phillip Geil; Sarah Halko; Prasanta Kalita; Randy McCarthy; Jerome McDonough; Eric Meyer; Steven Michael; Paul Prior  

Ex Officio: William Buttlar; Brenda Clevenger; Faye Lesht  

Guests: Roy Campbell, Professor, Computer Science Department; Karen Carney; (by phone) Jon Gant, Director, Center for Digital Inclusion; Ronda McElroy, Assistant Director of Graduate Programs, Computer Science Department; Joyce Tolliver, Associate Head, Associate Professor of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese  

A regular meeting of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was called to order at 1:09 p.m. in Room 232 English Building with Chair Gay Miller presiding.  

I. Introductions  
Guests were introduced.  

II. Approval of Minutes  
Minutes from the January 28, 2013 meeting are incorrect and will be revised and reviewed at the next meeting.  

III. Overview of the process leading to the creation of the Center for Digital Inclusion (CDI) - Jon Gant joined the meeting by conference call  
CDI is the first Center to go through the process of being approved by the Chancellor’s Office. Gant met with Dean John Unsworth to discuss the process, challenges, and criteria. Gant also talked with Kuntz to gain an understanding of the motivation for the process, which was very helpful. Mission? From Gant’s perspective, a Center is comprised of a core group of faculty from one school; if it cuts across multiple schools, then it is an Institute. Funding for a Center does not come from multiple schools. Core Factors are based upon what school or college wanted. CDI is focused primarily on the faculty in GSLIS. The teaching mission of a proposal may be the most difficult part of writing a proposal since it may be the hardest to define; but might be essential to a Center. Gant outlined the steps he took: he wrote a proposal; made revisions; met with the Provost’s office; moved on from Provost’s Office to meet with Burbules’ committee. Getting input from the Provost Office and GUP were important. He then made a presentation to the faculty Senate in September to talk about their initiatives. Questions addressed there included: How does your Center support the teaching mission at UI? Focus of research? Has a good balance between teaching and research. GSLIS has a certificate for students that focuses on teaching. The CDI will help develop curriculum and choose classes. I-Schools (?) have scholarship and action as part of their mission. We meet with prospective clients and students and turn that into research opportunities.
Dependent upon getting proposals funded. Types of projects that we would be going after to garner funding: NSF, Gates, McCarthy, Ford; talks to them to get insight. A large part of their funding is related to projects at the Department of Commerce and the White House. Having the CDI opened the door for grants, like NCIA broadband project.

Miller invited Gant to comment on the Ed Pol proposal DRAFT and the revisions. Miller said his suggestions/presentation was very useful. Gant said GUP wanted to know of the meaningful contributions to the teaching mission. Evaluations at 3-yr and 5-yr mark. GUP wanted an outside evaluation of the Center. The Advisory Board is very important per GUP, for relevancy. Gant thought the current Ed Pol DRAFT form was good and would likely capture what was needed for evaluation of Center proposals. His perspective was the reporting lines for a Center would be to the College, but reporting lines for an Institute would be at the Provost or Chancellor level, or one of their designees.

IV. Review of the DRAFT – Form – Proposal to Educational Policy for Centers and Institutes (Miller)
Whole committee discussion:
Miller went through revised document and noted each change. Miller said GUP said that Centers vs. Institutes is more related to funding. Committee offered more suggestions for revisions to proposal. This proposal DRAFT form is very different from CHAD. Need evaluation criteria and possibly a timeline added. Make distinctions for current grants and future net-zero impact. Begin with a description of the nature of the opportunity. Define Center vs. Institute. Miller will incorporate changes recommended and circulate new form to subcommittee chairs for their feedback; Ed Pol will return to finalize at a future meeting.

V. Chair’s Remarks (Miller)
Miller added an agenda item to the last SEC meeting with Ed Pol’s concerns about the suite of Engineering proposals; R McCarthy and S Michael also attended to provide further granularity to the Ed Pol concerns. Miller is to meet with Provost, Wheeler, and Campbell re: next steps; possibilities may include a Town Hall meeting about our concerns possibly. Might not influence our current work but associated outcomes and guidance will be helpful in the future.
Miller also mentioned an article on the cost of education; passed around a brochure which compared the costs of attending various universities in the US.

VI. Provost’s Office Updates (Kuntz)
None.

VII. Graduate College Updates (Buttlar)
One change: ties into Computer Science revision. Minor revision in the Natural Resources Ph.D. curriculum: go from requiring 32 hrs. of thesis up to 52 hrs. of thesis, and go from 32 hrs. of classes down to 12 hrs. Executive Committee reviewed it; is bringing the program in line with UI peers; is acceptable to Grad College. Several members expressed that Ed Pol should review it. Buttlar will send copy to Miller.
VIII. **Report on Coursera (Buttlar, Kalita, McCarthy)**
Met on Monday; a lot of interest in the website and another RFP may go out in the near future. There has been a decision to not necessarily use all of our money now; also considering in the future not requesting proposal submission more than once a year. Name changed from Coursera to MOOC.

IX. **Old Business**

A. **Subcommittee A** – *Paul Prior, Chair*; Carey Ash, William Buttlar, Brenda Clevenger, Susan Curtis, Bettina Francis, Prasanta Kalita, and Eric Meyer

i. **EP.13.14: Proposal to Permanently Establish the Center on Health, Aging, and Disability in the College of Applied Health Sciences**

ii. **EP.13.18: Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Engineering to revise the Master of Computer Science (M.C.S.) in Computer Science**

Two questions: breadth and depth requirements? Coursework requirements and areas of discipline have been clarified. Per Campbell, students can take their interest course plus depth courses, which spills out into electives they need. Campbell will add clarification. Challenge is defining what an “area” is in order to get depth. Does 2 courses in an area equal depth?

Question about how the additional number of students would be supported (funding, staff)? 100 online students and 50 on-campus, with a target growth of 25 more. Campbell doesn’t want to over-commit the department but thinks that growth is doable with his budget. Campbell will clarify that greater enrollment will be supported by the department. Disparity in this proposal between number of online students and number of on-campus students. Campbell will add clarification. Are courses restricted in any way? No per Campbell, these courses aren’t related to just the M.S. courses. Buttlar expects a bump in applications/acceptances. Miller suggested we receive a revised draft before the committee votes on this. Campbell wants this on the Senate ballot on March 4th; will get revisions to Prior ASAP; the committee will review this again at our next meeting. Some committee members wanted to vote; some want to see the revisions. Prior thinks the numbers question is a big enough issue to require a revision and further review next week. Committee will reconsider the revised proposal at our next meeting.

iii. **EP.13.23: Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to Establish a New Graduate Minor in Global Studies**
iv. **EP.13.24: Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to Establish a Concentration in Spanish Literatures and Cultures within the MA in Spanish in the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese**

Prior re: 13.24: Questions around why there is Portuguese in a Spanish concentration? What is the place of Portuguese in a Spanish degree program, when there is already a Portuguese major? Per Joyce Tolliver, proposal sponsor, Spanish concentration in the MA is wide-ranging and comprehensive. It is unrealistic to leave out Brazil; Brazil is a central part of Latin America today. Prior: why two 500-level courses? Possible to take both per Tolliver, with a confluence factor. Student can begin a concentration in Portuguese. Program is set up with Luso-Brazilian as a small part. Why not call it South American to widen the foundations of the program? Not directed at that, would exclude the “Study of Literature in Spain” course. Is this degree a stepping stone to a doctorate? Per Tolliver, yes, comprehensive exam required after MA. Applications must include a paper in Spanish. Proposal will be revised to reflect that. Prior moved approval; committee voted to approve by voice vote; no opposed; no abstentions.

B. **Subcommittee B – Phil Geil, Chair;** MichaelAndrejasich, Brock Gebhardt, Sarah Halko, Stacey Kostell, Randy McCarthy, Jerome McDonough

C. **Subcommittee C – Steve Michael, Chair;** Lauren Eiten, Kristi Kuntz, Faye Lesht, Leslie Struble, Pratap Vanka

i. **EP.13.17: Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Fine and Applied Arts to terminate the Ed.D. degree in Music Education**

Per Michael, no cost to department. Competitive advantage to the switch. Also, the market has shifted greatly from Ed.D. to Ph.D. Transition plan for existing students, OR they can finish it as an Ed.D. Per Buttlar, campus-wide review of all programs started last year; got detailed feedback to support it. Clarification of change to Ph.D. program will be added. Michael moved to pass this; committee passed by voice vote.

ii. **EP.13.20: Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to revise the BALAS in History, in the Department of History**

Per Steve Michael, this will reduce coursework by 1 class. Clarifying non-Western history into categories. Enough minority courses offered to fill requirement. Michael will get letter from the Library saying that there is no financial impact. Possible for students to get into 300-level courses? Historically a problem in several depts. Concerns about 199 courses too. Revisions will be made and the committee will review it again at the next meeting.
iii. EP.13.22: Proposal from the College of Business to Revise the Bachelor of Science in Accountancy

iv. EP.13.26: Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to a new non-thesis option in the Master of Science in Agricultural and Applied Economics

v. EP.13.30: Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences to transfer the Master of Science in Agricultural Education from the Department of Human and Community Development to the Agricultural Education Program

X. New Business

A. Subcommittee A – Paul Prior, Chair; Carey Ash, William Buttlar, Brenda Clevenger, Susan Curtis, Bettina Francis, Prasanta Kalita, Eric Meyer

B. Subcommittee B – Phil Geil, Chair; Michael Andrejasich, Brock Gebhardt, Sarah Halko, Stacey Kostell, Randy McCarthy, Jerome McDonough

C. Subcommittee C – Steve Michael, Chair; Lauren Eiten, Kristi Kuntz, Faye Lesht, Leslie Struble, Pratap Vanka

XI. Other New Business

A. Report from Certificate Subcommittee (Carney, Halko, Kuntz, Lesht, Meyer, Prior)

B. Illinois Collaborative for Research on Education (Lesht)

XII. Adjournment

Miller adjourned the meeting at 2:54 p.m.

Rachel Glasa
Senate Staff