

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, January 6, 2016
11 am-1:30 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Doris Ash, Faye Crosby, Matt Guthaus, Erica Halk (NTSF Rep.), Seamus Howard (SUA Rep.), Dee Hibbert-Jones, Sean Keilen,(Provost Rep.), Matthew Mednick (staff), Tonya Ritola, Vanessa Sadsad (SUA Rep.), Tchad Sanger (Registrar, *ex-officio*), John Tamkun, (Chair), Susanna Wrangell (staff).

Absent:

Guests: VPDUE Hughey

I. Announcements

Chair Tamkun gave a brief update on grade submission issues in process with regard to the new Academic Integrity (AI) policy. One member suggested sending these types of situations to the VPDUE for review. There are bound to be unforeseen issues when a new policy is put into effect. Chair Tamkun also suggested the creation of templates with boilerplate language for faculty to reference when contacting students as per established procedures. After joining our meeting, the VPDUE was apprised of the AI policy issues and is working on additions to the process. Ideally the process should be in the Advocate Database system. The Advocate system work flow would include templates and send updates when due dates are approaching, contact students and faculty members on the process. Currently, the process is a manual one with faculty members initiating and following through by the required deadline.

Registrar Sanger updated members on the new grading policy with regard to academic disqualification, and there was a drop in the number of undergraduate students on academic probation.

There was a brief discussion on eCommons and the default grading option choices. The grading options should be revised to include the C-, D-, and D+ for future courses.

Chair Tamkun called on committee members to decide on guests invitations for winter quarter.

Members agreed to extend standing invitations for winter quarter to:

VPDUE Hughey (who attended the meeting after member approval.)

Associate Registrar Claxton, Articulation Officer Barbara Love and a College Preceptor.

Guests will have agendas and appropriate enclosures sent weekly.

Approved Consent agenda items

Draft Minutes December 2 & 9, 2015 were approved with corrections.

Members will approve the draft correspondence next week after all members review.

Approval of Draft Response to FILM 80V General Education Designation request

Approval of Draft Response to VPDGS Miller on Chancellor's Teaching Fellowship Awards

II. Biology Minor Administrative Oversight Change

The Molecular, Cell and Developmental (MCD) and Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) Biology Departments are requesting to move sponsorship of the Biology Minor to the MCD Biology department. CEP members found this request unproblematic but will request this change be reflected in the MOU.

CEP's decision to recommend the administrative home change request be approved was unanimous. Chair Tamkun recused himself before any discussion or decision was made by the committee.

III. Program Statement Review Process

After discussion and review of the process members agreed to the following outcomes:

- Divisional representatives should not approve materials for their home department, but should read over the program statement to make sure it accurately reflects the department's goals
- Members will read over cover letters, checklists and program statements; look for track changes; and note any changes or problems in the OCA comments area so the Analyst can follow up with the department. Any issue that is not trivial will be placed on an agenda and discussed by the committee as a whole.
- The Committee agreed to send out a letter to departments who have not submitted their program statements by the deadline. CEP will not approve these this year, but members agreed to review these statements, offer feedback, and ask departments to re-submit for next year. An email will be created.
- Deans and Department Chairs should not hold up the process, but instead offer comments. The Catalog is the legal binding document for students and the University community.

IV. Mid-Cycle Review for Environmental Studies and Science Communication

CEP discussed the external review schedule for the Environmental Studies Department and the Science Communication Program and found the requests to be unproblematic, and were pleased the revisions to ENVS 100 were based on learning outcomes. Thus, CEP agrees with the VPAA that an eight year review cycle for the Environmental Studies Department and an eight-year review cycle for the Science Communication Program would be appropriate.

V. Update Online course Report Questions

After a robust discussion on the template, it became apparent that CEP needs to create a new reporting form or maybe not have one at all. Our current practice is that, after the course is approved, CEP only reviews or requests information when the course offering is revised. But some members felt strongly that this information would be helpful for online education in general. The current form will not be distributed and will be removed from any website hosting the document.

Members will work on the following criteria if another form is developed in the near future:

- How does the course online differ from the in person version and how do you know what the difference is?
- What assessment tools did you use?
- What was the grade distribution and did the students learn or complete the course?
- What was the enrollment at the time of sign up and how many finished?
- Extract information about the course itself, did the students find the course structure valuable?
- A comparison survey with in person and online comparison of the course

Members agreed this issue may lie in the purview of the Committee on Teaching. CEP Member Ash will consult with the COT Chair and report back to CEP.

VI. Disciplinary Communication Grants (DCG) CALL for Proposals

Members reviewed and approved the DCG call, which will be sent out next week through the Senate listserv.

Committee on Educational Policy, 2015 – 16