

EPCC Minutes, February 10, 2009

In attendance: John Bolen, Rick Spellerberg, Ron Albrecht, Mike Hadden, Murphy Waggoner, Josh Brammer, Hannah Landgraf, Ann Woldt, Julie Summers, Rachel Bandy, Tracy Dinesen, Steve Griffith, John Pauley (acting as Chair)

I. Minutes

- a. Change on II. A.
- b. Approved

II. Advanced Topics Courses (190, 290, 390)

- a. Changes are in purple, deletions in yellow.
- b. Change, no longer departmental in order to allow for interdisciplinary courses.
- c. Change from Advanced to Special topics to create consistency.
 - i. Change title to Special as well and in second paragraph substituted the word advanced to special.
- d. Removal of prerequisites and also removal of approval of the Academic Dean.
- e. Question on 390 junior-senior status and 290 idea of focus on upper-class students. Is that necessary since it is a special topic.
 - i. Proposed that on the 390, add "or instructor approval" in addition to the junior-senior standing to allow for special cases.
- f. Underlined sentence re: new courses. The language seems not definitive enough.
 - i. Idea: move it to the end as a note. Also, change the "2 or 3 semesters" to "2 semesters"
- g. Move to send to faculty with changes (Waggoner), second (Hadden), approved.

III. Minimum number of credit hours for a minor.

- a. There are 15 credit hours that need to be completed for students to receive a major from Simpson College. Currently there is no policy for minors and the minimum number of credit hours.
- b. Proposed: "All students must take a minimum of 9 credit hours at Simpson College in their minor field in order to be granted a minor from Simpson College."
- c. Move to send to faculty (Waggoner), Second (Bandy); approved.

IV. National Survey on Student Engagement

- a. Second time Simpson has participated. We will participate every 2 years from now on.
- b. Important as EPCC looks at LPWG proposal to note how many of the negative indicators in the survey are being addressed in the LPWG proposal.
 - i. Example, mental activities page 5, we are below the mean on memorization for the 1st year and above the mean for the seniors. In other words the seniors are reporting that they are asked to memorize facts more than their peers, which is something that we don't want. We are also below the mean on courses that require analyzing elements, synthesis, making judgments.
 - ii. Number of books higher in the 1st year and close to the mean in the Senior year but the number of books read on their own is substantially lower.
 - iii. Number of reports written of 20 pages or more is also substantially lower than the reporting schools.
- c. What is interesting is that this information was received after the LPWG proposal was formed. It was based during our personal experience as educators and the results of the survey validate those impressions.
- d. We have evidence that there is something we can improve. We are coming close to the mean BUT, is that where we want to be? What can we do to meet our goals?
- e. There are some very positive things that we are scoring high on. They tend to be those that deal with one-on-one relationships with faculty. Example Academic/Intellectual Experiences, S; worked with faculty outside of course work was very high.
- f. HARI???? (From Sal) study and LPWG proposal: Question where the faculty were asked if students were expected to have information literacy but we don't seem to be asking students to do those things that reinforce those aspects. This can also help LPWG proposal.
- g. We also should look at the effect size, (moderate, weak, robust) so that we know what should be done to address these issues. This will guide us in where we should place our priorities.

V. Meeting adjourned. Next meeting is February 24th.