Present: Gay Miller, Chair; Ray Benekohal, Cynthia Buckley, Randy McCarthy, Eric Meyer, Steve Michael, Rahul Raju, Lane Rayburn, Ann Reisner  
Ex officio: Michel Bellini, John Hart, Dan Mann, Kathy Martensen, Linda Robbennolt

Absent: David Hanley, Theo Moton, Santiago Nunez-Corrales  
Ex officio: Brenda Clevenger

Guests: Amy Edwards, Assistant Provost & Director; Meghan Hazen, Office of the Registrar; Allison McKinney, Director of Graduate Programs & Policy; Linda Moorhouse, Assoc Dir for Undergrad Affairs, School of Music; Nolan Miller, Professor of Finance; Professor Martin Perry, Head, Depart of Economics

A regular meeting of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC) was called to order at 1:10 pm on Monday, September 11, 2017, in room 232 English Building with Chair Gay Miller presiding.

1. Introductions  
Guest introductions were made.

2. Approval of Minutes  
The minutes of the meeting of April 28, 2017, were approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

3. Chair’s Remarks (G. Miller)  
Chair Miller reported that she attended the IBHE-FAC (Faculty Advisory Council) meeting as the campus representative that was hosted by UIUC this month.

4. Office of the Provost Updates and Administrative Approvals EP.18.07 (K. Martensen)  
There were no updates from the Provost’s Office, and Martensen gave a brief overview of EP.18.07, the administrative approvals through September 11, 2017, advising that it was posted on the EPC working web page for the committee’s review. She advised that the one change was in the Graduate Programs to the MS in Cell and Developmental Biology to revise the minimum GPA for the master’s program from 2.75 to 3.0. A discussion followed concerning the GPA with Martensen noting that to ensure consistency in program requirements, the minimum GPA for the master’s should be the same as for the PhD, which is 3.0.

No further discussion was held and EP.18.07 was approved by unanimous consent and will appear on the September 18, 2017, Senate agenda as a Report.

5. Graduate College Updates (J. Hart)  
Hart announced that the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine are in discussions with the Grad College as they are seeking our input concerning graduate degrees with professional requirements to make sure we are graduating PhD students not only trained for academic professions but also informs them of the full range of professional work possible. The Grad College supports their take on this but also does not want to require all degrees to have professional requirements.
A delegation from the University is participating in a study concerning master degrees to make sure they meet certain criteria to ensure balance.

Hart announced that the first university listed on the Coursera homepage is the University of Illinois, noting the benefits of exposure and cost share with Coursera is 60/40 for tuition and 50/50 for MOOCs, which helps fill in the gaps concerning state funding. Chair Miller suggested and there was support for a future briefing from the Provost Office on the financial aspects of Coursera agreements.

6. Process for Discontinuing Courses (K. Martensen)
Martensen spoke on the process for discontinuing courses and noted that when a course is discontinued electronically it is common courtesy to then reach out to other departments, notifying of the change. Martensen advised that when the request comes to her, she questions if they have done outreach to other departments that list the course. A discussion was held concerning when a course that is being discontinued is a prerequisite for another course, are people aware to outreach before actually discontinuing to get input from that department. Martensen answered that it is not normally brought to the attention until it is caught by the reports run in the catalogue, in which Martensen updates programs that have been discontinued. She reported that there are normally 10 to 20 courses discontinued in an academic year. Most discontinued courses do not impact other programs since these courses are often being discontinued because they are rarely offered.

A discussion continued concerning having more data in relation to discontinued courses, including the reasons for being discontinued. The question was posed if the EPC can handle this situation like in Standing Rule 13. It was commented that it would be inefficient to have such an approach for small issues and EPC should be involved only if there is a large impact from discontinuing a course.

7. Old Business

A. Subcommittee A: Randy McCarthy, Chair; David Hanley, Cynthia Buckley, Faculty Vacancy, Faculty Vacancy, Student Vacancy

1. EP.18.05 Establish an Undergraduate Minor in Economics in the Department of Economics from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
   McCarthy provided a brief overview of EP.18.05, noting that the minor in Economics has three options of microeconomics, macroeconomics, or econometrics. The proposal sponsor attended to answer the committee’s main question: is it reasonable to have a minor in economics that has no macro-economics? The sponsor advised that micro-economics is the foundation of and most importance in all the tracts and where the profession has moved. He also stated that the major still includes macro but the minor will only have macro if the student chooses that particular tract. This was done to allow students more options for electives.

   Further consideration of the proposal will be deferred until a revised proposal is submitted to the committee for review.

B. Subcommittee B: Eric Meyer, Chair; Theopolies Moton, Ray Benekohal, Lane Rayburn, Faculty Vacancy, Faculty Vacancy

1. EP.18.02 Proposal to Revise the Curriculum of the Master of Music, Instrumental Conducting- Wind Band Concentration from the College of Fine and Applied Arts.
2. EP.18.03 Proposal to Revise the Curriculum of the Doctor of Musical Arts, Instrumental Conducting-Wind Band Concentration, in the School of Music from the College of Fine and Applied Arts.
   Meyer gave a brief overview of EP.18.02 and EP.1803, noting the minor language changes in the revised proposals posted for the committee’s review. Meyer advised there are no
substantial questions or comments remaining on the proposals and moved for approval of EP.18.02 and EP.18.03. The motion was seconded and no further discussion was held. The motion to approve EP.18.02 and EP.18.03 passed by voice and will appear on the September 18, 207, Senate agenda.

C. **Subcommittee C:** Steve Michael, Chair; Santiago Nunez-Corrales, Rahul Raju, Ann Reisner, David Huang, Linda Robbennolt

1. **EP.18.01 Proposal to Establish the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science and Advertising within the College of Media.**

   Michael provided a brief overview of EP.18.01, advising that he has been in contact with the Department of Business Administration concerning if this presents a conflict by its circumstance and they advised they see no concerns with this creation. Michael gave a brief overview of a Q and A that is also posted for the committee’s review on the EPC working web page. He advised that the suggested changes to the proposal were to update the proposal sponsor and some minor editorial corrections. The committee requested more time to review before taking action on the proposal. Further consideration of EP.18.01 is deferred until the next EPC meeting.

8. **New Business**

   A. **Standing Rule 13**

   Chair Miller described interpretation differences with Standing Rule 13 as it currently exists. She gave an example towards the end of last year that the EPC received an announcement of changes made inside a College. The announcement of changes were not presented as a proposal, but an email notification informing the EPC. She suggested there needs to modification of Standing Rule 13 to clarify it in the way that EPC had intended Standing Rule 13 to work.

   Chair Miller added that Standing Rule 13 came about from discussions from the EPC and USSP associated from concerns with units essentially closing enrollment to a program without involving shared governance. Standing Rule 13 was adjusted to attempt to prevent such an occurrence. She noted that there is still room for interpretation in Standing Rule 13 to allow a unit to effectively make changes without engaging in shared governance and this is the reason behind revisiting Standing Rule 13. Chair Miller introduced Shawn Gilmore, Chair of USSP and he advised that last year’s EPC Chair, Bettina Francis attended the November 29, 2016 USSP meeting to lay out parameters and the variety of changes to units that are not adequately covered by Standing Rule 13 language. He added that Standing Rule 13 does not currently specify clearly enough expectations.

   The committee reviewed Standing Rule 13 and Chair Miller noted that when it was written, a wholistic interpretation was communicated that would come forward to the EPC as proposals. Chair Miller informed EPC that some people do not interpret Standing Rule 13 in that way.

   The Committee reviewed Standing Rule 13’s language and it was suggested to ask USSP to change the below listed language-

   1. To replace the word “statement” with the word “proposal” in the third line of the first paragraph of Standing Rule 13 Section A as shown below:

      *Standing Rule 13 A. (first paragraph)*

      If a unit of academic governance or administration intends to make a significant change to the enrollment or faculty in a current degree, major, minor, concentration, or other educational program, it must first file with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy a statement proposal detailing its intent.
2. To change the language from “proposal’s progress” to proposing unit’s progress” in the last line of the second paragraph in Standing Rule 13 Section A, as shown below:

Standing Rule 13 A. (second paragraph)
After receiving the statement, the committee may require verification that the proposing unit has informed all affected units, faculty and enrolled students. The committee may solicit comments from these and additional parties. Upon review of these materials, the committee shall determine what further action is required, including a public hearing, periodic re-evaluation of the proposing unit’s progress, or further Senate action.

3. To replace the language “shall be” with “will include” in the third paragraph, first sentence of Standing Rule 13, Section A as shown below:

Standing Rule 13 A. (third paragraph)
For the purposes of this Standing Rule, “significant” changes shall be will include those that are intended to last two years or more and that lead to modification of faculty size by at least 25 percent or student enrollment by at least 25 percent (for programs with 100 or more students) or at least 50 percent (for programs with fewer than 100 students).

A discussion was held concerning that a proposal submitted to the EPC, can be one that is simple and informal. It was suggested to create a short template initiating the rationale and the necessary information that can be expanded if the Committee requires. It was also commented that anything that leads to extreme modification to faculty or to student enrollment by 25% should be proposed to the EPC.

It was the consensus of the Committee the goal of revising the language of Standing Rule 13 is to embed process into the statement. It was also suggested that the language “include” needs to be added to the Section B of Standing Rule 13 as well.

Gillmore responded to the committee assuring the USSP is happy to solve language and understand EPC’s intent. He advised that USSP will suggest proposed language to EPC, in which the committee will be able to provide further input and once the proposed language is agreed on, the proposal will be brought to the full Senate for approval.

B. EPC Efficiency – Discussion and consideration for a consent agenda for EPC meetings (Chair Miller)
Chair Miller suggested an item to increase the efficiency of the Committee by considering proposals on a “Consent Agenda” for the Committee. This would be similar to the Senate’s consent agenda that is done for efficiency purposes and proposals that require a full discussion could be moved to the regular agenda. Chair Miller provided the example of what kind of proposals might be placed on the consent agenda: those that had very minimal comments sent to the subcommittee chairs with no substantial concerns. It was suggested that all of the members on the subcommittees would have to respond in some sort of way. There did not seem to be a lot of support for this idea, so further discussion of the topic may occur again but only if EPC workload warrants that.

9. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm

Rachel Park
Senate Office