

AGENDA Revised  
Educational Policies Committee  
March 28, 2022  
Zoomland  
3:00 p.m.

<https://nmu.zoom.us/j/96423549106?pwd=THhTTkNTdkpqOGxvQmsxR0lJTVMxQT09>

1. Approval of Minutes – March 14, 2022 (on SHARE)
2. Additions to and/or Approval of Agenda
3. Business
  - a. Chair Report – Nothing to Report
  - b. Proposed PhD in Rural Leadership (emailed and on SHARE)
  - c. ADR Guidelines
    - i. Comparison of Revised ADR Guidelines & Warren Alternative (both emailed)
    - ii. Review of Top Questions Dropbox Responses
  - d. Future Meetings
  - e. Good of the Order

Educational Policies Committee  
Meeting Minutes REVISED  
March 28, 2022  
Zoomland  
3:00 p.m.

<https://nmu.zoom.us/j/96423549106?pwd=THhTTkNTdkpqOGxvQmsxR0lJTVMxQT09>

Attending: Jim Cantrill (chair), Michelle Inman, Lisa Eckert, Brandon Canfield, Rob Winn, Linda Lawton, Karl Johnson, Joe Lubig, Leslie Warren, Jes Thompson, Wendy Farkas and Linda Lawton

4. Approval of Minutes – March 14, 2022 (on SHARE)
  - a. Approved by J. Lubig. Seconded by L. Eckert. All in favor.
5. Additions to and/or Approval of Agenda
  - a. L. Eckert and R. Winn moved to approve.
6. Business
  - a. Chair Report – Nothing to Report
  - b. Proposed PhD in Rural Leadership (emailed and on SHARE)
    - i. B. Canfield – what are we being asked to consider with this? Per J. Cantrill this has been approved by GPC and it's in Senate Exec tomorrow. There are general reservations about the fit, cost etc.
    - ii. Per L. Eckert this a revision – addition of another track (interdisciplinary track – lives in college of gradate studies). Last year's budget was based on a master's program (look like we are losing money), this budget based on DNP.
    - iii. Teaching load was another issue per B. Canfield – how will it be redistributed? Dissertation compensation in new contract should address that, but if it's not in there where does that come into play? Who advises these folks if everyone already has full loads?
    - iv. C. Johnson mentioned that she didn't think banking time was done anymore – L. Eckert replied that the English dept. still does bank.
    - v. J. Lubig feels this program is not manageable without a new position. It would be funded through global and summer revenue. The program could be launched without a new hire per L. Eckert.
    - vi. Courses could be taught by anyone that's qualified in any department. (the Ph.D. portion of this lives in Grad Ed, but also in SELP).
    - vii. J. Cantrill - Return on investment to the departments – at the end of year five we are in the hole over \$26,707. Can you explain this, Lisa? It includes accreditation fee of \$22,000; dissertation fees etc.

- viii. R. Winn – don't see a new faculty line on this proposal even though Joe mentioned he didn't feel it was manageable without a new position. Per J. Lubig this assumes that someone comes in at the associate or professor level with summer rates factored in.
- ix. B. Canfield - Advising is not even mentioned in this proposal. How much time is each faculty going to spend "advising or mentoring" these students? Now is the time to outline that and how they will be "compensated" for their time in doing so (a stipend or some other way that we reward our faculty for their time).
- x. L. Warren and B. Canfield - The library budget is also not in the proposed budget.
- xi. L. Warren - Zero attrition is unrealistic (National Ave. is 1 in 3). Budget is not realistic showing no attrition. You should note somewhere that some attrition is going to happen (worst case scenario is 12).
- xii. How does this budget for a full-time person (the budget as is is without hiring a new hire)? A new hire would have to work in other programs (LDR) as well.
- xiii. Per L. Eckert, 32 credits are for the Ph.D.
- xiv. If PIF funding comes through it will be for the accreditation fees and some other things. L. Warren asked if they could identify what expenses could potentially be covered by the PIF (3-year sunset).
- xv. Timing: Summer 2023 at the very earliest (if it passes the HLC review)
- xvi. L. Warren - Doesn't say in narrative that a full-time person is NOT needed. We really need to clarify this because it's so important to the budget and to the program. Per L. Eckert, with the additional track that opens this up to faculty from across campus, we really wouldn't need a new faculty. J. Lubig confirmed that there are people from multiple departments that can teach the LDR classes as they helped develop this proposal, as well as the syllabi. The original proposal did include a list of the faculty that are qualified to work on the program.
- xvii. B. Canfield would like to see a sample schedule of the class schedules (per L. Eckert refer to page 3 of 5 in the GPC addendum dated 3/12/22).
- xviii. L. Eckert to go back to M. Frantti to get a revised/updated budget for us with some of these missing details. To be discussed at our next meeting on 4/11/22.

c. ADR Guidelines

- iii. Comparison of Revised ADR Guidelines & Warren Alternative (both emailed)
- iv. Review of Top Questions Dropbox Responses
  - o Propose that we send draft version of the revised ADR Guidelines and Leslie's proposal on to the Provost with a list of advantages and disadvantages to both and let him make that call.
    - L. Warren – feels they are two different approaches and that her draft was a very rough draft. She doesn't see the Provost wanting to wade through all of them.
    - B. Canfield – on the ideas how do you foresee external reviewers? Per L. Warren it doesn't get to that level of detail

yet. For her, how we would go about operationalizing this is all still open for review/feedback.

- J. Lubig – really likes Leslie’s formatting
- J. Thompson – feels Leslie’s proposal gets to the spirit of ADR.
- C. Johnson – said they just went through a department external audit and all of the things on Leslie’s draft are things they were asked.
- B. Canfield – why kick it down the road to an interim Provost? We should decide what we want to do, and propose it.
- J. Lubig moved that proceed with L. Warren’s direction.
- L. Warren happy to support a motion that we move forward with this as an outline, but this is not the actual approved procedure.
- Motion: L. Warren motioned that we proceed to operationalize the APR/ADR framework presented with the understanding that a final draft will be presented to EPC before it is adopted.
- Carol Johnson moved to approve. Lisa Eckert seconded. Passed by majority vote.
- Joe Lubig, Lisa Eckert, Wendy Farkas, Jes Thompson and Leslie Warren to work on the procedure and report back in two weeks.

d. Future Meetings: 4/11/22

e. Adjourned at 5:02 pm