

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 22, 2006
12:15-1:45, KERR HALL RM 307**

Present: Heather Bullock, Pedro Castillo (Provosts Rep), Tim Fitzmaurice (Non-senate teaching faculty rep), Richard Hughey (Chair), Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex-officio), Tracy Larrabee, Anatole Leikin, Roxanne Monnet (ASO staff), Jaye Padgett, John Tamkun.

Guests: Margie Claxton (Academic Editor), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Michael McCawley (Associate Director, Admissions).

Absent: Floyd Amuchie (SUA representative).

I. Announcements.

The next Senate Meeting is scheduled for March 8 at 2:30 p.m. at the Kresge Town Hall.

Subcommittees were asked to meet with the academic editor as soon as possible regarding course approvals and program statements.

Divisional 10 year plans – 5 year responses. How the various Senate committees will be involved is still being sorted out.

The Committee heard a brief overview of the American Studies external review closure meeting.

II. Minutes. The February 8 minutes were approved as amended.

IIIa. 10 year academic plans

The Committee discussed the currently envisioned process for CEP's review of the divisional 5 year responses.

Certain concerns consistently arose regarding all proposals. After considering each division separately, the Committee will prepare an overall list of questions. It was noted that undergraduate education and research was not present in each plan and they were heavily focused on resources and faculty growth. Discussion of planning for summer session was absent from many plans. The Committee hopes for an outcomes-based undergraduate planning process, more focused on degrees than enrollments. They would like to know more about use of resources toward curriculum management, and distribution of undergraduate workload among the programs. CEP likes the idea of applying external review self-study templates to divisional plans. They would like to see more connections drawn between existing centers on campus and undergraduates.

As relates to the response procession, the possibilities for feedback include: (1) giving advise and feedback to CPB prior to their meeting with deans, (2) joint meetings of other senate committees with deans, (3) a written response to the VPAA and deans with questions and concerns, and (4) longer-term, big-pictures comments on the process overall to the VPAA.

It was unclear to the Committee how these reviews and plans are being used.

IIIb. 10 year academic plans - Engineering

Professor Padgett served as Chair Pro Tem for the Engineering discussion. At Chair Pro Tem Padgett's request, Professor Hughey answered several questions about the plan, and then left the meeting room.

The Committee considered ideas given in the proposal for future undergraduate programs and anecdotal information on interests expressed by prospective students. There is a perception of a high level of interest in bioengineering and game design, as well as nanotechnology and autonomous systems. It was noted that biomolecular engineering and assistive technologies are current strengths in the School and that, combined, they could lead to bioengineering strengths.

A draft response document will circulated via email.

IV. Program Statement Reviews

Art Department – Concerns were expressed regarding the the high disqualification GPA (3.0), hw seniors would be affected, where disqualified students would complete degrees, relationship with the pre-major, and lack of an appeals process. Chair Hughey will relay the Committee's concerns to the department, and the response will be discussed at a future meeting.

Earth Sciences – Approved.

Film and Digital Media – Approved.

Legal Studies – Approved.

V. GE subcommittee proposal

This topic is carried forward to the next meeting. VPDUE Ladusaw was invited by the committee to provide written feedback for discussion at the next meeting.

Attest:

Richard Hughey, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy