

## Educational Policy Committee

Minutes – 10/21/09

Attendance: Leslie Miller-Bernal, Cindy Speaker, CJ Koepp, Ted Lossowski, Susan Tabrizi, Amy Godert

Meeting called to order at 9:30

Minutes of the previous meeting were corrected and approved with corrections.

The work of the distribution requirement subcommittee was discussed. It is difficult for the subcommittee to make progress given the flux in our institutional and academic program goals since they are closely linked. The subcommittee has completed some work regarding the skill sets that students who complete the distribution requirements should have. That work will serve as a starting point for EPC to continue the work of the subcommittee.

The progress of the Information Literacy and Oral Communication subcommittee was discussed. There was concern over whether the report was in a form appropriate to present to the faculty at this point. Since strategic planning must occur in the fall, in order to obtain input from faculty, staff and students, the strategic planning committee will be holding open meetings that could conflict with EPC open meetings. The EPC open meetings could be pushed into the spring in order to allow more time for SPC meetings and also to allow the subcommittees enough time to generate thorough reports to present to the faculty. The Information Literacy and Oral Communication subcommittee report will be brought to EPC next week (10/28) for discussion. The question of whether other subcommittee members could be present during the discussion of the report was raised. The committee decided that the first presentation of the report should be done by just the subcommittee chair, and the need to have other members at a different meeting could be discussed later.

The Board of Trustees needs to see progress on general education in the February report, so we need focus on getting our general education draft complete.

The chair of the subcommittee on experiential learning introduced their report, and the following points were brought up:

- Currently we have no consistency across campus, even within the same type of experience there is huge variability. We need to ensure consistency, which could potentially mean a centralized system with administrative support would be needed. EMT is working with Career Services to look at this.

- The question of what should count was brought up – with specific examples of PLEN, TAs and RAs. Under the current proposal, as long as the student can show that the objectives are met, find a faculty sponsor, and do the reflection/sharing component, they can get credit for the experience.

- How many times an experience can count and repetition of the same thing over and over were also mentioned.

- Can we require an internship in a major area as a sort of capstone or unique Wells experience?

-Should majors be required to have experience in their field? Could the experience be in the minor field (specifically education) instead of the major?

\*In next draft, EPC would like the subcommittee to

--highlight the differences from the current requirements and address why they are important.

--address potential approval mechanisms for experiential learning – would it go through a committee (ASA), administrative staff, faculty?

--discuss the constraints on the nature of the experiences (ie what counts, how many times can the same experience be done, off-campus?).

--look at the required number of experiences in terms of number of semesters in residence at Wells (EPC supports expanding the #, but is concerned about fac load).

--address issues of regularizing the process (administrative mechanism to ensure regularity)

The meeting ended at 10:35.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Godert