

AGENDA (revised)
Educational Policies Committee
March 14, 2022
Zoomland
3:00 p.m.

<https://nmu.zoom.us/j/95935845736?pwd=cTh3SjJJQmc2UnlkLOlwN1VJVjRHUT09>

1. Approval of Minutes – February 21, 2022 (on SHARE)
2. Additions to and/or Approval of Agenda
3. Business
 - a. Chair Report – Communication with the Provost and Data Science Recommendation
 - b. Revised ADR Guidelines (on SHARE)
 - Questions for Dan Cullen and Jason Nicholas
 - Review of Top Questions Dropbox Responses
 - c. Review of Proposed Sports Psychology Graduate Program
 - d. Discussion of Provost's response to Data Science recommendation
 - e. Future Meetings
 - f. Good of the Order

Educational Policies Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 14, 2022
Zoomland
3:00 p.m.

<https://nmu.zoom.us/j/95935845736?pwd=cTh3SjJJQmc2UnlkLOlwN1VJVjRHUT09>

Attending: Jim Cantrill (chair), Gabe Logan, Lisa Eckert, Brandon Canfield, Rob Winn, Linda Lawton, Karl Johnson, Joe Lubig, Leslie Warren (notetaker until 3:30), Michelle Inman, Jes Thompson

Guests (arrived at 3:30): Dan Cullen, Jason Nicholas

4. Approval of Minutes – February 21, 2022 (on SHARE)
 - a. Changes requested by Brandon were made prior to today's meeting
 - b. Move to approve – Lisa; Seconded by Brandon
 - c. Approved
5. Additions to and/or Approval of Agenda
 - a. Brandon: add to discussion Provost's response to recommendation; Jim adding as item 3(d) in business over Leslie's objection
 - b. Lisa questioning item 3(c) – has not passed GPC yet; doesn't know why it's here; Jim it's an FYI item, not a review
 - c. Agenda approved with addition of discussion of Provost's response to DataSci recommendation
6. Business
 - a. Chair Report – Communication with the Provost and Data Science Recommendation
 - i. Jim: talked to Dale about data science report + a couple conversations about ADR
 - ii. B. Canfield said as a committee he feels we need to reaffirm our recommendation to the provost. The provost gave no real reason for rejecting this. G. Logan commented that after further review it appears there are two conflicting pieces to the contract that he and L. Warren are going to review further and report back to EPC on before we readdress the provost.
 - b. Revised ADR Guidelines (on SHARE)
 - Review of Top Questions Dropbox Responses
 - Review of Google Drive document "ADR Essential Question Development" -
 - Template: Part A, departmental
 - Importance of asking for reflection, not just data
 - SWOT analysis, supplemented by requested data

- Questions and comments for/from Dan Cullen and Jason Nicholas:

I. Dan sent around the HLC criteria for accreditation (the standards themselves) and which are applicable to all sizes and types of campuses.

II. D. Cullen They simply imply that “the institution maintains a practice of regular program review (doesn’t tell us exactly how that is done) and acts upon the findings” (again doesn’t tell how to act upon those findings).

III. Per D. Cullen he feels the first section of our ADR under “Purpose” is contradictory and vague – why are we doing it? What will it be used for etc.? Why is this important? Why do the departments need to do this? J. Nicholas asked if the product of this report was feedback from EPC (yes via recommendations to the Provost regarding resource allocation) or from the department on their self-study? J. Cantrill replied and said it was both.

IV. Per J. Cantrill the ADR is meant to provide context to external reviewers; To answer what has happened to our previous aspirations and goals from 6 years ago; If there was something that was going to come to a department, did they get it and how was it received/delivered. Primary audience is yourself, but it will also be the provost, outside reviewers, perhaps the dean etc. J. Nicholas commented that from what he can see from the outside there are two processes going on here: self-reflection (self-study) and resource allocation.

V. J. Nicholas said he recommends a common spreadsheet that shows all recommendations or changes from whatever the process was (accreditation review, HLC ADR etc.) that shows an ongoing progress report. He’s not sure a self-study will lead to the change you are actually looking for.

VI. B. Canfield – asked what’s the difference between Student Credit Hours (SCH) and Department (DCH)? Per J. Nicholas, SCH are hours generated by students through their major. DCH are hours generated by courses taught by the department (service or by major); Faculty (FCH) are hours generated by a faculty member regardless of what department.

VII. J. Nicholas discussed using existing dashboards or helping us to develop a Qualtrics document to help obtain the requested data from each department.

VIII. J. Cantrill to work on rewording the first paragraph and also work on tentative language to modify the guidelines. He asked that the rest of the membership should at least make comments on the document that Joe loaded up (ADR Essential Question Development).

c. Review of Proposed Sports Psychology Graduate Program

I. Per L. Eckert they are not going to move on this until the fall because the proposal is not complete.

d. Future Meetings: 3/28 and 4/11

e. Good of the Order

Adjourned 5:00 pm