

COMMITTEE: Educational Policies and Planning

MEETING DATE: Friday, November 12, 2021 (online)

PERSON PRESIDING: John Collins

ATTENDANCE

Regular members: John Collins, Bryna Coonin, Timothy Jenks, Michael Dingfelder, Suzanne Lea, Jean-Luc Scemama, Michelle Wallen

Ex-officio Members (with vote): Cyndi Bellacero, Mark Bowler, Ruth Little, Ron Preston, Jonathan Reid, Jason Yao, Cameron Brown (Rep. of Student Body)

Also in attendance: Rachel Baker, Puri Martinez

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Call to order: 1:01 pm

Agenda Item #1: Approval of minutes from October 8, 2021

Action Taken: APPROVED

Agenda Item #2 Discussion of Low-Productivity Program Reporting

DISCUSSION: We propose to insert some type of follow-up into this process. When a program is flagged for low productivity, it is two years before there is follow up. Bellacero's proposal was that there be follow-up after a year, involving EPPC. IPAR can do this with/without EPPC but EPPC would like to be involved, so we need to discuss. Are there other steps? We may need to revise EPPC charge, if so. Puri Martinez reminded that EPPC involvement was in the fiscal sustainability report – this is evidence that there is a place for Faculty Senate involvement here. Martinez supports EPPC involvement rather than creating a new Faculty Senate Committee to do this. Involvement of faculty is essential. Reid voiced concern about how we define productivity – what is a university? Are these popularity contests among students and the public? Where does the faculty stand? What is an undergraduate education? Low productivity definition for UNC System is set and given to us (Bellacero). However, when a program responds, they can choose among responses – so can say mission critical and should be exempt. But if you promised to grow enrollment and you didn't do it these should be examined. Discussion ensued. UNC System office looks at graduates. Some programs have add-ons and a lot of students but not a lot of graduates. Bowler – what of Reid's wholistic mission – is the program valuable if no one takes it? Reid suggests we start by defining what an education is. Collins: We don't have to settle today what the criteria should be.

Is there a consensus that we want to be involved? There are different levels at which we can be involved. It was proposed that EPPC engages in an 'a priori process' – we watch and warn the program that they will likely be flagged so they are prepared for this. Bowler suggested examples of how this might work.

ACTION TAKEN:

MOTION: To affirm our willingness to get involved, proceed with the question of EPPC adopting responsibility for the low-productivity review with the material that Bellacero prepared as the basis for moving forward. We charge Collins and Martinez with getting back to us on how we would actually accomplish this. **APPROVED**

Agenda Item #3 Academic Program Review Unit Response: Department of (Biomedical) Engineering

Representatives: Barbara Muller-Borer (mullerborerb@ecu.edu) and Sunghan Kim are both present (kims@ecu.edu). EPPC rep is Michael Dingfelder.

Discussion: Muller-Borer provided overview of their response. Program begun in 2014. Most relevant feedback was adding a non-thesis option to the program. Making some adjustments to the curriculum. Did unit acknowledge and address each item? Dingfelder says response was good, addressed all the points. Some of the action plans are a little ambitious timing-wise. Bowler asked whether Muller-Borer was aware of any faculty members intentionally deceiving external reviewers. Muller-Borer said she was not. Bowler – we have a non-thesis option which is very helpful for enrollment and retention. Lea questioned the non-thesis option. Will the non-thesis option have another outlet to allow students to get the research/writing needed when working with the research process in a Master's of Science degree? Graduate faculty in biomed requires the department take care of this – they are aware of this and are starting conversations about it.

Action Taken: APPROVED

Agenda Item #4 Academic Program Review Unit Response: Department of Psychology

Representative: Alan Christensen (christensenal19@ecu.edu). EPPC rep is Jean-Luc Scemama.

DISCUSSION: Christensen – need more faculty. Starting a search for two faculty members, but need more. Undergrad student advising came up in review. We have not had a clear strategy for managing the large numbers. Have an advisory committee working on this. Promoting undergrad involvement of undergrads involved in research – increasing that number will be important. Scemama indicated that the program response was satisfactory. Jenks mentioned that students had complaints about advising – was Psyc aware of this? Yes. Some faculty were also discontented with how advising was working. Bowler asked about discussing expectations for full professor with some faculty -- why only some? Christiansen indicated that they were happy to have conversations with any/all associate professors – but the department needs to have more full professors. Bowler asked whether Christensen was aware of any faculty members intentionally deceiving external reviewers. Christiansen said he was not.

Action Taken: APPROVED

Agenda Item #5 Undergraduate Certificate Revision: Computer Science: Computer Game Development Certificate

<https://ecu.curriculog.com/proposal:7263/form>

Representatives Qin Ding (dingq@ecu.edu) and Bobby Hoggard (hoggardr@ecu.edu).

DISCUSSION:

Ding gave details concerning courses – in service of clarifying the prerequisites for game development certificate and the order in which courses should be taken. Bellacero's input in Curriculog was also noted: That this change rides the line of what needs to be preapproved by SACSCOC before instituting. It is right at the 25% threshold. However, after considering that the certificate is intended for Computer Science majors and that the additional course is part of their curriculum for the degree, all that the addition is doing is ensuring that it is taken.

Action Taken: APPROVED

Agenda Item #6: Revision of ECU Credit/Contact Hour Guidelines: Zero Credit Hour Courses

Representative: Eli Hvastkovs (hvastkovse@ecu.edu)

DISCUSSION: College of Business wanted to set up a class that gave a grade but gave zero credit hours. His committee (Admissions and Retention Policies) received the request from UCC to discuss. The committee sent a proposal to UCC who thought it would suffice. Jenks' question – are these being created for purposes of using the online proctoring system. COB wanted the students to take a class online and for it to be proctored but proctoring requires that the course needs credits.

Any course that is associated with a final grade assignment must have the required number of credit hours associated with it as stated in the ECU Credit/Contact hour guidelines. Any zero credit hour (CH) course must be linked with a co-requisite course. **The assigned grade** for the credit-bearing course must represent work performed and completed in the associated corequisite zero CH course.

COB was going to use proctoring for a lot of students – they would require a lot of students to take the course but are not generating any money to cover it. Clarification: if a student gets an F in this course but has enough hours – is ill-will created? A line can be put into the catalog that it is not associated with a grade. Biology has a lot of this with labs associated with lectures. Nursing has the clinical tied to the lecture. The COB cannot do what they wanted to do.

ACTION TAKEN: Amendment Approved, with two abstentions

ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES:

APR Updates:

External Review Visit for School of Hospitality Leadership is Nov. 15-17 online.
History meets on Nov 19 meet to discuss external review.
Sociology – nothing new – recommendation approved.
Africans and African studies – has not yet started.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Friday, January 14, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Bryna Coonin

Bryna Coonin,
Secretary