

11-17-2015

Minutes, November 17, 2015

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/epc>

Recommended Citation

"Minutes, November 17, 2015" (2015). *Educational Policies Committee*.
<http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/epc/21>

This Governance is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at Augustana Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Policies Committee by an authorized administrator of Augustana Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@augustana.edu.

Educational Policies Committee
11/17/15
4:30 p.m., Old Main 127
Meeting Minutes

Present: Faculty: Tim Bloser, Dave Dehnel, Ann Ericson, Ellen Hay,
Taddy Kalas, Vicki Phipps, Forrest Stonedahl, Shara Stough
Students: Allan Daly, Samantha DeForest-Davis, Jacqueline Jastrzebski, LaDonna
Miller, Christopher Saladin
Ex Officio Members: Liesl Fowler, Wendy Hilton-Morrow, Brian Katz

Guests: Mike Egan, Pareena Lawrence

Absent: Reuben Heine

Start Time: 4:35

End Time: 5:35

- I. Approval of Minutes from 10/27/15 (**approved**)
- II. Continuing Business
 - A. New Business Course: BUSN 308 Entrepreneurship for Non-Business Majors
Supporting material: Recommendation to Add Course form, syllabus, Intrepreneurship
Certificate approved last year
(An updated syllabus has been provided.)

(saved for next meeting)
- III. New Business
 - A. Senior Inquiry: Report and Proposals from the LEAP Team
Supporting material: LEAP Team report on SI Syllabi

Discussion & Questions:
 - *There are some well-designed SI models out there we can emulate.*
 - *Do we re-review the SI syllabi? Right now no external group looks at the SIs. The extent to which learning objectives appear on the syllabi varies.*
 - *Not all the syllabi had students coming up with and developing a question on their own. There are all different levels of SIs from doing individual work to doing a group project.*
 - *How do we gather information that bridges the gap between SI syllabi and what students are actually doing?*
 - *What are the common expectations and what are the common goals? There is a distinction between the objectives of the SI and what project students will do.*

- *How robust do we want these projects to be because it can be hard to do more than one? We need to allow students to integrate the two or petition to do only one (Wooster does the latter).*
- *Is SI a Capstone for the core curriculum or the major? Depth vs Breadth requirement-signature work is about depth. Interdisciplinary and depth are at odds with each other. Recommendation 1 has that tension and if you are writing about all those things it wouldn't have that depth.*
- *Could the reflection piece be used to pull in the common expectations and goals? Could there be a common prompt for reflections across the college? The results shared with a common committee?*
- *Neither signature work nor reflection on it must always be in writing. Signature framework suggests different kinds of reflections. Video reflection as an option? There should be some time between the project/presentation and the reflection piece. Should the reflection piece be graded? Conversation with prompts? Pass/Fail for reflection piece? Follow up after graduation to find out what their experience was in SI? Greg Weight encouraged us to think of the signature work as a verb and not as a noun. It is a step to the next thing, after college.*
- *Signature work is accomplished many times at Augie, but it is doubtful that all students produce signature work. The LEAP team chose to focus on SI because SI was the vehicle to make sure everyone got the signature work piece done.*
- *Archiving? What is the purpose? Digital commons would be better than the S drive. Librarians only want the best stored on the Digital commons. What if the student doesn't want their work archived? It's a requirement. Students need to know before they do their work that it is destined for public view in archives.*
- *Do we establish the SI/signature work as a requirement? Should we carry out a review process parallel to the review of original SI proposals?*
- *Does recommendation 2 imply that courses with pre-determined topics don't fit the bill?*
- *Can we have departments that know their SIs need improvement identify themselves and then work with them first?*
- *Next steps and how does EPC fit? If these recommendations seem worthwhile, then EPC would be helpful in implementing it.*
- *What kind of process to implement the recommendations? Groundwork would need to be laid with faculty and opportunities for feedback given.*
- *Faculty development for SI has always been left up to the departments and with all the new faculty, some of the meaning of SI has been lost.*
- *Providing support to faculty in terms of how you do some of the things in the model.*
- *A lot of lingering questions.*
- *What should we do next?*
- *A brief report should be given for full faculty and then a faculty conversations session.*

*Respectfully submitted,
Julie Olinger*