

AGENDA  
Educational Policies Committee  
February 21, 2022  
Zoomland  
3:00 p.m.

<https://nmu.zoom.us/j/99864227152?pwd=d1luNGJSRTQrQzJOWDRGMU82NFJEQT09>

1. Approval of Minutes – February 7, 2022 (on SHARE)
2. Additions to and/or Approval of Agenda
3. Business
  - a. Chair Report – Communication with the Provost and Academic Senate Chair
  - b. EPC Recommendation on Data Science Faculty Line Request (documents on SHARE)
  - c. Revised ADR Guidelines (on SHARE)
  - d. Future Meetings
  - e. Good of the Order

Educational Policies Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
February 21, 2022  
Zoomland  
3:00 p.m.

<https://nmu.zoom.us/j/99864227152?pwd=d1luNGJSRTQrQzJOWDRGMU82NFJEQT09>

Present: J. Cantrill (Chair), M. Inman (Secretary), C. Johnson, K. Johnson, L. Eckert, B. Canfield, J. Lubig, J. Thompson, R. Winn, G. Logan, L. Lawton, W. Farkas

4. Approval of Minutes – February 7, 2022
    - a. B. Canfield moved to approve. Seconded by K. Johnson. All in favor.
  5. Business
    - a. Chair Report – Communication with the Provost and Academic Senate Chair
      - Brandon – satisfied with the report we received from CUP regarding the Data Science proposal.
    - b. EPC on Data Science Faculty Line Request (documents on SHARE)
      - Jim unclear if it went forward to Senate after its 2<sup>nd</sup> reading– L. Lawton confirmed it did
      - J. Lubig – questioned how will it be funded? B. Canfield commented that CUP just looks mainly at the curriculum. As EPC, we need to first support the program and the addition of faculty then make our recommendations on whether or not the position requires additional faculty and if so what kind (i.e. tenure track, a 3-year term or 1-year term).
      - C. Johnson – asked L. Lawton: Even if you have a failed search, couldn't you still start the program using the staff that you have. Per L. Lawton we could run the full major and minor for about two years if we had to with existing staff. We just couldn't run the applied statistics part of it.
      - From Joe Lubig to Everyone 03:18 PM
- 3.4.2 The EPC shall advise and make written recommendations to the PVPAA on short- and long-term academic program planning for the University, including financial and staffing considerations attendant to the implementation of new academic programs, including on-line programs, transformation of existing programs or the suspension/cancellation of existing academic
- Motion:** Recommend to the Provost a new base budgeted faculty tenure line in the Department of Math and Computer Science. [Supports new Data Science Major, Data Science Minor, Applied Statistics Minor; Senate approved proposal 2-15-2022]
- Motion II:** Recommend to the Provost the implementation of the new Data Science Major, Data Science Minor, Applied Statistics Minor; Senate approved proposal 2-15-2022

c. Revised ADR Guidelines (on SHARE)

- J. Cantrill asked L. Eckert if changes made to the ADR Guidelines to include the Graduate Studies was what she was looking for/sufficient. She replied that she needs quicker turnaround time than 7 years if there are new programs and stuff on the line. She commented that she would be willing to take this in front of GPC to get their thoughts.
- J. Lubig feels the ADR should be eliminated. He feels the ADR morphs into more than just a department study. He proposed that we use the Deans report after the 10<sup>th</sup> day count; data points that exist other places in other reports etc. HLC requires "The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews and acts upon the findings." Others on the committee agreed, especially those that go through accreditation.
- W. Farkas proposed that we look at the points of the ADR and work as a team to pull the pieces we need from other reports that are done across campus, across departments etc. to complete the ADR ourselves. – That's a huge task EPC would be undertaking
- D. Winn clarified that the ADR is only done every six years. He's having a hard time separating ADR from other departmental reporting. ADR = Introspection.
- C. Johnson thinks introspection is very important, but she doesn't understand what they are supposed to get out of this report. Others like her feel they have much more important things to be doing to manage and improve their departments than to spend time completing this version of ADR.
- J. Cantrill commented that HCL is going to require us to do something like ADR, SRA etc. We don't have the option to say we aren't going to do this as we have to for accreditation. We (EPC) wouldn't be in a position to recommend that these reports be eliminated.
- B. Canfield – D. Cullen should come and tell us again what HLC is really looking for so that we can meet their requirements but then also add to it so that the departments are also getting out of these reports what they need to better themselves.
- G. Logan suggested limiting the number of pages and using hyperlinks. Bring D. Cullen in to see how he could help us limit the document to 10-15 pages using hyperlinks.
- [HLC Commission](#)
- R. Winn – Asked the question to those who currently do accreditation reporting: Do you learn something through assessment reports? J. Lubig said departments in his college are doing reports like this twice (assessment reports and then the ADR reports). For C. Johnson her assessment reports do affect her curriculum; such reports convinced them to add a critical thinking topic to their assurance of learning. She does find them useful. R. Winn commented that out of the 17 departments he oversees, he only has two that are accredited and that have to do these regularly. Therefore, he doesn't have any other departments that are doing these kinds of self-assessments. Therefore, to him these ADR are very beneficial.

- J. Lubig proposed that we find out what's useful to the department and what's useful to the college. He also proposed that his college's accreditation documents be accepted as his ADR. Jim asked J. Lubig what's in the ADR but not in accreditation report? A couple things Joe mentioned were:
  - Evolution of department to the NMU's vision over time
  - History of faculty scholarship and service since the last review
- J. Canfield commented that he feels some things still need to be addressed by us through our ADR. He doesn't feel like an accreditation report is enough. J. Thompson commented that we need better leadership and that these reports are not going to solve our issues. Most felt like a self-study looks like a dean's report – nothing else. Per R. Winn that may be a small part of it, but that is not a self-study of each department. To him, as a dean, those don't show the complete picture.
- K. Johnson – couldn't we require departments to require accreditation programs that are out there that aren't utilized? The problem is that not all programs have accreditation programs (Math doesn't).
- C. Johnson suggested that she could set up a meeting for the accreditors she has coming to meet with the EPC so that we hear what kinds of questions they ask; find out what they care about department wise etc.
- J. Thompson commented that this is just a very antiquated model; she feels we should institutionalize an annual check-up so that we don't lose sight of what the department stays up to date and moving forward. Answer – what is our review goal and how do we get those recommendations to the provost in a timely manner (not every 6 years).
- Jim suggested that for our next meeting the group list 5-6 essential things we need to know from these reports (J. Lubig to put together a Google doc to share).
- J. Thompson suggested bringing D. Cullen back to discuss what data their office can provide so that we aren't overlapping reports. (This was also proposed for our next meeting on 3/14)
- B. Canfield - We were charged to do this by a Provost who is no longer even in the position. Do we have freedoms to make changes at this point; does it have to be the same document for every college?
- L. Lawton – Can we please communicate to those departments that are up for review next year? She doesn't feel they know they are up for review.
- J. Lubig – Is there any opposition in accepting the accreditation reports from those departments that have them?
- **Motion:** L. Eckert moved that we accept the upcoming accreditation reports for the College of Business, Biology and Engineering Tech coming up in place of the ADR reports. K. Johnson seconded.

- B. Canfield made a **friendly amendment** to the motion, which said that the accreditation reports would be accepted in lieu of the self-study. Friendly amendment was voted on and approved. All in favor except for J. Cantrill and R. Winn. (Sidenote: L. Warren was not present at this meeting)

d. Good of the Order

- See if Jason and Dan will come to our next meeting (ask them to generate a report with content we are looking for)
- J. Lubig to create a Google document and gather from the group a list of the 5-6 essential things we need to know from these reports to share at our next meeting.

Future Meetings: 3/14, 3/28 and 4/11

e. Adjournment at 5:08 PM