Senate Committee on Educational Policy  
Monday, April 15, 2013

MINUTES

Present: Gay Miller, Chair; Michael Andrejasich, Susan Curtis, Lauren Eiten, Max Ellithorpe, Brock Gebhardt, Phillip Geil, Bettina Francis, Randy McCarthy, Jerome McDonough, Eric Meyer, Steven Michael, Paul Prior

Ex Officio: Mary Lowry for William Buttlar, Stacey Kostell, Kristi Kuntz, Adam Fein for Faye Lesht

Guests: Amy Edwards, Assistant Provost and Director, Division of Management Information; Brian Farber, Associate Dean and Director, Office of Student Conflict Resolution; Piper Hodson, Student Services Coordinator, Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences; Mary Kalantzis, Dean, College of Education; Jennifer Quirk, Associate Director of Research and External Affairs, Institute for Genomic Biology; Bill Simmons, Professor and Assistant Dean, Academic Programs, ACES; Christopher Span, Associate Professor, College of Education; Charles Tucker, Alexander Rankin Professor and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Innovation

A regular meeting of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC) was called to order at 1:10 pm on Monday, April 15, 2013 in room 232 English Building with Chair Gay Miller presiding.

1. Introductions
   Guests were introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes
   Minutes from April 8, 2013 were approved as amended.

3. Chair’s Remarks (G. Miller)
   Chair Miller shared a Times Magazine news article titled “The Thin-Envelope Crisis”. The article discussed the broad changes taking place at U.S. universities that are moving them away from an emphasis on merit and achievement and toward offering a privileged experience for an already privileged group. Lower-income students are admitted to some of the country’s best colleges and universities, but the competition has become so intense and the percentage admitted so small that the whole process seems arbitrary. Then, if special preferences for various categories—legacies, underrepresented minorities and athletes—are taken into consideration, it appears less merit-based than it looks on the surface.

   Chair Miller noted the large amount of work listed on the agenda and encouraged members to be succinct in discussions.

4. Provost’s Office Updates (K. Kuntz)
   No updates.

5. Graduate College Updates (M. Lowry)
   No updates.

6. Report on MOOCs (massive open online course) (W. Buttlar, P. Kalita, R. McCarthy)
   No report.

7. Graduate College and Senate Educational Policy Program Review (A. Golato)
   Miller shared her discussion from a meeting called by the Dean of the Graduate College, Debasish Dutta, which included perspectives on the values of the current process of review. Miller did not feel
it was appropriate to speak for the whole committee and asked for the presentation be presented to the full Committee.

Golato gave a presentation outlining the current process. A proposal for the Graduate Program is first reviewed by the department. Then it may go through a College Committee. Next it is submitted to the Graduate College, and then on to the EPC. The Graduate College is interested in streamlining the process. Proposals are reviewed by the Graduate College Executive Committee. This Graduate College Executive Committee is a campus-wide committee that consists of 8 elected faculty members, 6 appointed faculty members, and 2 graduate students. Is EPC duplicating efforts? Multiple reviews lengthen the review process and sometimes create confusion with sponsors if the EPC and Graduate College give opposite recommendations. The Graduate College proposed consideration for a joint committee for reviews, agreeing on some sort of division of labor, or a Graduate College review which is only administrative and not the full Graduate College Executive Committee review. This would ensure that programs have adhered to Graduate College Policy before sending the proposal to EPC for review. All programs, revenue generating or not, should receive the same review.

EPC members feel that the EPC reviews add value. EPC suggested in general more reviews are better than fewer reviews with each review making contributions. Communication between committees is important. It is not a good plan to limit EPC’s review. There are major differences between the Graduate College Committee review and the EPC review. It was suggested that the Graduate College Committee send a summary of their discussion to EPC that outlines proposal revisions and actions along with a revised proposal. Articulation of the Graduate College Committee process and actions would be helpful for EPC. Chair Miller noted that a briefing to EPC by the Graduate College had been encouraged at some point each year, or each semester as needed. The briefing would include time for questions and answers. Miller also noted that the Graduate College has an ex-officio member serving and contributing to EPC.

8. Old Business

A. Proposal to Educational Policy for Centers & Institutes (full committee)
   Chair Miller suggested using the current text for any proposals over the summer and to make changes as needed to address distinctions between temporary and permanent requests. A motion was made to respond to specific needs expressed by proposal sponsors rather than try to envision what the sponsor or EPC would need for better evaluation. The motion was seconded and passed. There was no opposition and no abstentions. EPC members, the Office of the Provost, and others can share the current document with any groups involved with proposals.

B. EP.13.42: Proposed Revisions to the Academic Integrity Portions of the Student Code (full committee)
   Chair Miller noted the approved motion from the previous meeting to open a dialogue related to definitions, and asked if further discussion was needed on the proposed revisions to the Student Code. The committee agreed that no further discussion was warranted and a motion was made to approve the proposal to revise the Student Code. The motion was seconded, and the proposal was approved. There was no opposition and no abstentions.

C. Subcommittee A – Paul Prior, Chair; Carey Ash, William Buttlar, Brenda Clevenger, Susan Curtis, Bettina Francis, Prasanta Kalita, Eric Meyer
   i. EP.13.14: Proposal to Permanently Establish the Center on Health, Aging, and Disability in the College of Applied Health Sciences (AHS)
      The EP.13.14 proposal will be resubmitted next academic year.
ii. **EP.13.23: Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) to Establish a New Graduate Minor in Global Studies**

Prior announced that the sponsor revised the proposal to address course structure concerns as requested by the committee. The Committee debated the intellectual vs. ideological perception of this field. Miller read an email from the Director of the Center for Global Studies, Edward Kolodziej. The email defended the program and the growing field. Subcommittee Chair Prior moved approval of EP.13.23. The motion was seconded, and by a show of hands the proposal passed with one objection and three abstentions.

iii. **EP.13.34: Proposal from the College of Applied Health Sciences (AHS) to Change the Name of the Bachelor of Science Degree in Health to the Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Health**

Based on EPC’s recommendation, the sponsors agreed to change the title to “Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Health Sciences”. Letters of support were also added. Subcommittee Chair Prior moved approval of EP.13.34. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote with no opposition and no abstentions.

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

E. **Subcommittee C - Steve Michael, Chair; Max Ellithorpe, Lauren Eiten, Kristi Kuntz, Faye Lesht, Leslie Struble, Pratap Vanka**

i. **EP.13.35: Proposal to Establish the Institute for Universal Biology (IUB)**

This proposal establishes a fully funded NASA Center on emergence of life in the universe with combination of biology and physics. This institute will link research and outreach goals. More granularities on the budget would be requested if the sponsor eventually seeks permanent status. Kuntz noted that stability is most important for long-term funding viability. Budget oversight will occur at the Office of the Provost level. No faculty lines will exist inside the institute. NASA has awarded a 5-year federal grant with an option to renew. Michael moved approval of proposal EP.13.35. By voice vote, the proposal passed with no opposition and no abstentions. Miller added that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) will place center and institute proposals on the “proposal” section of the Senate agenda rather than the consent agenda as EPC proposals are generally listed. Therefore, proposal EP.13.35 will appear on the “proposal” section of the April 29 Senate agenda. The sponsor will attend the Senate meeting to answer any additional questions from the full Senate.

F. **Certificates Discussion** (Kuntz)

Kuntz conveyed the subcommittee’s recommendation to continue discussion on certificates.

9. **New Business**

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

i. **EP.13.41: Proposal from the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences (ACES) to Revise Requirements for Ph.D. in Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences (NRES)**

The Committee suggested the following changes. Reduce course hours from 32 to a minimum of 12 hours and increase the maximum number of hours for thesis work from 32 to 52 hours. Clarification is needed on the program structure. Students develop their plan of study with an advisor and committee. The plan must be approved by the committee. The proposal specifies 12 hours of graded courses, and not only independent study. On the
condition that the changes listed above are made, Prior moved approval of EP.13.41. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote. There was no opposition and no abstentions. EP.13.41 will appear on the consent agenda portion of the April 29, 2013 Senate agenda.

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

Revisions are in progress. The Committee noted concentration overlaps. The College of Education responded that they have worked with the College of ACES (Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences) before on similar issues with positive outcomes. There appears to be a total of 9 hours of overlap in a 120 hour program. The desired effective date for enrollment is Fall 2015. The College of Education was given a timeline to allow for campus and state approval. This proposal is being now to account for anticipated delays in the full approval process according to Kuntz. Non-licensure needs clarification in the proposal. The Committee expressed concern that this non-licensure concentration does not differ from the one in ACES. The College of Education responded that the program will prepare students to go abroad and also wants to enroll international students and freshmen. Geil moved approval. The motion was seconded and approved by a show of hands with 5 in favor, 3 opposed, and 3 abstentions. Th proposal passed and will appear on the consent agenda portion of the April 29, 2013 Senate agenda. The final version of the proposal must be received by April 17 from the sponsor.

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

D. Written Briefing from Political Science Department Head William Bernhard
Chair Miller noted this document was distributed at the previous EPC meeting.

E. Revision to Standing Rule 13 - Enrollment Management (L. Eiten & M. Ellithorpe)
Discussion Summary by Ellithorpe: Original changes were denied; new version says letter of intent must be filed.

The definition on the word “intent”, the lack of a defined time frame, and overages were issues noted by EPC members. Standing Rule 13 might be legally necessary. Kostell noted that the College of Engineering and Computer Science are growing while humanities are in decline. The Office of Admissions cannot force students to enroll in declining programs to prevent their closure. Enrollment reports are provided periodically by Kostell for EPC to stay abreast of changes. Chair Miller noted that she informed the Political Science Department Head to expect contact from EPC regarding proposal development by the middle of next academic year if a proposal has not been received by that time. Large departments could change an individual program and still fall within this rule. Enrollment is an administrative process and no faculty members are involved. Intercollege transfers are determined by college administrators. Graduate programs are complex. The process needs more in-depth consideration to determine a need for change. Transparency, while important, would need further clarification as to what is actually revealed and when. Standing rules are legalistic; discussion reflecting the “spirit” that relates does not apply. Communication via email is standard. However, it is important to realize that all communication takes time. Several EPC members noted the importance of supply and
demand and how to balance these while also considering costs. EPC does not have a staff or system of reporting and reviewing; this occurs in academic units not in EPC. A motion was made to carry this agenda item to next academic year for further discussion. The motion was seconded and approved by voice. There were no members opposed or abstentions.

F. **AA.2013.18 ISS Resolution the Requirement of Due Process for the Closure of Academic Programs** (L. Eiten & M. Ellithorpe)
   No discussion.

G. **AA.2013.20 ISS Resolution on Civic Leadership Program** (L. Eiten & M. Ellithorpe)
   Ellithorpe expressed his desire for a transparent formalized process for students on the closure of the Civic Leadership Program (CLP).

10. **Other New Business**

11. **Adjournment**
   The meeting adjourned at 2:51 pm.

Rachel Glasa
Senate Staff