Minutes, January 31, 2017
Educational Policies Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
01/31/17  
4:30 p.m., Old Main 127

Present: Faculty: Ann Ericson, Taddy Kalas, Brian Leech, Jason Mahn, Todd Miller, Jane Rose (for Dave Dehnel), David Snowball, Forrest Stonedahl, Shara Stough, James Van Howe  
Students: Allan Daly, Samantha DeForest-Davis, Jacob Devos-Roy, Michelle Henry, Christopher Saladin  
Ex Officio Members: Susan Granet, Wendy Hilton-Morrow, Mike Egan

Guests:
Start Time: 4:32  
End Time: 5:

I. Approval of Minutes from 1/24/17 Approved as corrected.

II. Continuing Business:
A. The substitute motions

Here are three wording options that have evolved from our email conversation. Some of the suggestions involved rather more assertive language about our disapproval of larger footprints and the gimlet eye with which we’d read such proposals. I was unsure of whether would trigger too much pushback, so I haven’t added the text though we surely can decided to do so if we want.

1. Current motion:

Majors should require no more credits than necessary to fulfill their mission; majors requiring more than 32 departmental credits or 36 total credits, or minors exceeding 20 credits, including required supporting courses, will be asked to justify the exceptional load.

2. The minimal tweak

Majors should require no more credits than necessary to fulfill their mission; majors requiring more than 32 departmental credits or 40 total credits, or minors exceeding 20 credits, including required supporting courses, will be asked to justify the exceptional load.

3. Substitute 1.0:

Majors should require no more credits than necessary to fulfill their mission. (a) No major should expand its net size, sometimes called its footprint. “Net size” is the percentage of credits required by the major divided by the number of credits required to graduate. Conversions may be “rounded up” only to the next even number of credits. So, if the percentage conversion translates to 32.7 credits, you would round up to 34 not to 36.  
(b) Majors requiring more than 32 departmental credits or 40 total credits, or minors exceeding 20 credits, including required supporting courses, will be asked to justify the higher credit requirement for their program.
4. **Substitute 2.0:**

Majors should require no more credits than necessary to fulfill their mission.
(a) No major requiring 32 or more departmental credits, nor any minor requiring 20 or more credits, should expand its net size. “Net size” is the percentage of credits required by the major divided by the number of credits required to graduate. Conversions may be “rounded up” only to the next even number of credits. So, if the percentage conversion translates to 32.7 credits, you would round up to 34 not to 36.
(b) Majors requiring more than 32 departmental credits or 40 total credits, or minors exceeding 20 credits, including required supporting courses, will be asked to justify the higher credit requirement for their program.

Discussion concluded to not to use any of these 4 choices and to go back to the drawing board.

III. **New Business:**

A. **Wording change from Spanish.**

To more accurately reflect current usage, Spanish wants to change “Spanish-American” to “Latin America” in several course titles and descriptions. In general this comes to us as an announcement rather than an action item, but if folks have reservations, this would be the time to share them with Spanish.

EPC does not have to approve this, they were just letting us know.

B. **Required FYI 100 for all first-year students.**

Gen Ed is proposing to require all first-years to complete FYI 100. Currently first-year advisors have their advising groups in a 101 section; some students are also channeled into 100. People believe that that change accounts for part of our increased retention. Gen Ed thinks it should become universal. That would entail compensating each FY advisor for one additional credit and allowing each FY student to complete one additional credit without overloading. In general, it seems to be in Gen Ed’s bailiwick, but they wanted to open to input from EPC before proceeding. The proposal is in our “current agenda” directory.

This discussion revolved around some concerns:
1. Faculty load
2. Room availability
3. Timing of classes interfering with meetings
4. Making it mandatory for all students is not a good idea
5.

Respectfully submitted,
Julie Oliger