

AGENDA (Revised)  
Educational Policies Committee  
February 7, 2022  
Zoomland  
3:00 p.m.

- 1) Approval of Minutes – January 23, 2022 (on SHARE)
- 2) Additions to and/or Approval of Agenda
- 3) Business
  - a) Discussion about Math/Data Science proposal
  - b) Chair Report – 2021 EPC Chair’s report sent to the Provost (on SHARE)
  - c) Discussion of Draft ADR Guidelines (previously distributed)
    - i. Biology in Process (per-approval of format)
  - d) Future Meetings
  - e) Good of the Order

Educational Policies Committee  
Minutes  
Monday, February 7, 2022, 3-5 p.m.  
Zoom

Present: J. Cantrill (chair), M. Inman (secretary), J. Thompson, R. Winn, L. Eckert, B. Canfield, G. Logan, C. Johnson, J. Lubig, L. Lawton and L. Warren

**4) Called to order at 3:05**

**5) Approval of Minutes – January 23, 2022**

- a) B. Canfield requested edit to 4.b. – remove the “r” from his last name.
- b) C. Johnson moved to approve. Seconded by R. Winn. All in favor.

**6) Approval of Agenda**

- a. added discussion about the Data Science proposal

**7) Business**

- a) Discussed the Data Science proposal for a tenure track line and how we never saw the final recommendation.
  - I. The program was sent to Senate and it had its first reading last week. Second reading at Senate next week. Brandon asked for a look at the CUP report.
  - II. Consensus was to discuss further the feedback that we got back from the department regarding the proposal.
  - III. Jim to contact Norma and also alert the provost to the fact that EPC needs to weigh in on this before he approves. To be discussed at our next meeting on 2/21.
- b) **Chair Report - FY 2021 Annual Report sent to Provost**
- c) **Discussion of Draft ADR Guidelines (dated September 2021)**
  - I. The ADR looks at the entire department – not necessarily each individual major in the department.
  - II. Weave in the graduate school - P. 7: L. Eckert add something about outside accreditation re graduate programs; P. 5: L. Eckert mentioned adding in graduate data numbers
  - III. B. Canfield – Guidelines state that we’ll provide the template? Per Jim, we need to develop the template still. SWOT analysis should be incorporated. In the case of accreditation do we need to hold those departments to the same standards/procedures (use the same template)? B. Canfield feels we should hold them all to the same thing otherwise we get different results/recommendations etc. from each external accreditation body. Others feel if we already have an external accreditation being done, it’s not necessary to get another one done.
  - IV. Nothing in the first draft of the self-study guidelines talks about the cost of the whole process. It does talk about direct and indirect costs but that’s it.

- V. Per D. Winn, Biology now has a list of possible reviewers that have been approved by the provost. They have someone coming on 2/25 from Humboldt to do their evaluation. Biology has never been through a review of itself.
- VI. L. Warren commented that she said she wouldn't be surprised if the conversation of curriculum and even faculty may need to be added to this document in the future as it relates to diversity and inclusion (DEI issues). J. Cantrill asked if he should add a section on DEI to the document? J. Lubig voted that we not include this at this time because we really haven't defined it as an institution ourselves yet. C. Johnson commented that the data is there on dashboards for students and faculty. Consensus was to not add anything to the document at this time.
- VII. Comments were made that with the current administration being temporary, possibly time would be better served if we wait and see what the next administration deems is important to them when making decisions. While some agreed, others felt we should continue on with these reviews.
- VIII. Will the 7-year ADR cycle really serve a purpose?
- IX. G. Logan proposed having a page limit predicated upon enrollment.
- X. HLC was the body driving us to bring this whole APR process back.
- XI. Tasks: basic format for reviewing (probably won't get to until April); develop template for the reviewers – maybe develop a subcommittee that can work on this (on share drive – Academic Program Review – has documents from back in the day – Jim will try to go back to it and pull out the old template.)

**8) Good of the Order**

- a) Discuss Math/Data Science proposal at the next meeting on 2/21
- b) Future Meetings: 2/21, 3/14, 3/28 and 4/11

**Adjourned 4:58 p.m.**