Educational Policy Committee Minutes

December, 11th 2025

Attendance: Kelly Austin, Daniel Babcock, Linda Bell, Paolo Bocchini, Derek Brown, Michael Dills-Allen, Olivia Grimes, Tom Hammond, Khurram Hussain, Joanna Mishtal, Lucy Napper, Henry Odi, Marina Puzkova, Mariana Roldan, Naomi Rothman, Todd Watkins

1. **Approval of November 13th minutes.**
Minutes approved.

2. **Minutes taking: January 29th and April 23rd.**
Marina requested people sign up to take minutes for open spots in Spring. Tom agreed to do so for the January 29th meeting.

3. **Discussion and approval of course proposals.**

Kelly Austin provided an overview of proposed changes reviewed by the C&C subcommittee.

Course updates: Most updates involved changes to prerequisites. There were a couple of course deactivations and new courses proposals from the College of Health and the College of Business. None of the proposed new courses require new hiring. Proposed changes to MECH012 were reviewed to determine if there were substantial changes that might warrant a new course proposal. The changes were deemed not to be substantive.

Non-substantial COB program changes were reviewed. None of which had an impact on other colleges. Two more substantial changes were discussed in detail.

Marketing major revisions. The major is being updated to try and make it more double major friendly. The major consists of 18 credits with 3 required classes and 3 major electives. A list of suitable courses in other business majors has been identified and the proposed change would allow 2 of these courses to substitute for the marketing major electives when a student has two declared majors in the BSBU program. This change would effectively allow two courses to double count across majors. The proposed change has been endorsed by business faculty. No concerns about the proposed change were raised.

Business minor for non-business students. The proposed change addresses the fact that the existing minor is not integrated into departments and their curriculum. COB departments have redesigned the minor curriculum to include courses that are already being taught. Two new required courses are being added to the minor. There will be new hiring within COB to teach these courses. The redesigned minor would give more flexibility to students. Michael Dills-Allen

asked for clarification on the teach-out plan. There are only funds for a one-year teach out. It was noted that this time frame could cause potential issues for students in the current catalog year attempting to complete the minor. Naomi Rothman clarified that there would be courses taught moving forward that substitute for courses no longer being offered. There was a suggestion that the College of Business work with the Registrar to handle degree exceptions in a systematic way to address the need for degree exceptions during the teach-out period. Tom Hammond motioned to approve, this was seconded by Todd Watkins.

4. **Discussion of the Revision of R&P 3.2.1 Changes in Curricula or Courses.**

The motivation for suggested changes was reviewed, followed by a discussion of proposed changes. A number of issues were raised:

1) Kelly Austin noted that the CAS policy committee and the EdPol C&C subcommittee had suggested removing the Registrar from the list of approval steps in the document. It was noted that the registrar is not an approver, and therefore it would be more appropriate to have a separate section noting that approved changes are forwarded to the Registrar for implementation in the catalog.

2) Derek Brown noted that some programs do not grant degrees or certificates (e.g., Explore Lehigh). These types of programs are not addressed by the current proposal. Kelly Austin noted that the Senate may already be drafting separate language for programs that do not grant degrees. There was a suggestion that it would be beneficial to either incorporate language about the approval process for non-degree/certificate programs in the 3.2.1 language or consider the separate R&P section for these programs in tandem with changes in 3.2.1.

3) Lucy Napper noted that throughout the document the approval route step 1 is always a "Department" and that this language is too restrictive and does not reflect that programs also initiate curriculum changes (for example, interdisciplinary programs in CAS). It was suggested that the "Department" language be updated to refer to "Departments / Programs" or referring to these collectively as "academic units" throughout the document.

4) There was a discussion of how the approval process should work for intercollegiate programs. There was recognition that for IC programs that the C&C approvals should go through to the appropriate CPCs and not straight to EdPol. There was discussion of the way that these are currently handled inconsistently, making R&P changes that address this issue important. It was noted that along with R&P clarity it would be useful to

provide clearer instructions on how to handle these workflows in CIM so that they are routed to the correct place.

It was noted that there was some language inconsistency in the document. For example, criteria 6 for changes that are deemed substantial refers to intercollegiate or intercollege programs. But the section that describes the approval route for these programs refers to interdisciplinary programs that affect two or more colleges. There was a discussion of whether multi-college review should happen only for ICs, or if a program is administered by multiple colleges, or more broadly when a program impacts multiple colleges.

There were concerns about how to balance the workload of multiple colleges reviewing curriculum changes with the need for appropriate multi-college review for changes that impact units across colleges. In particular, concerns were raised about not wanting to burden certain colleges / departments (e.g., Math, English) that offer courses drawn on by multiple units.

There was a recommendation that the Senate review the language in the proposed 3.2.1. section to clarify when curriculum proposals should be reviewed by multiple college CPCs and faculty. There was a suggestion to change the wording in the section that describes the approval route under criteria six to make it clearer that, "In the case of a proposed course or curriculum changes that affect two or more colleges, approval is required by the policy committees of all the colleges directly affected."

5) Daniel Babcock raised concerns about the specificity of section 7 and who can determine if an innovation is non-substantive or deemed substantive. There was a recommendation that there should be a limitation on who can trigger the section #7 criteria. There was also discussion of why section 7 specifically mentions online modalities while the rest of the list refers to types of students.

5. Special topic Update

Linda Bell updated the committee that we have not heard from the vendor about implementation options for Special Topics. Michael Dills-Allen clarified that CIM cannot handle a workflow that results in an approved course being excluded from the catalog. The Registrar is currently working with LTS to explore using JIRA as an alternative system to handle Special Topics. JIRA could be used to route approvals to CPCs. There was a brief review of the rationale for the proposed changes to R&P related to special topics. The committee will return to this issue in January once there is more information from LTS on what is possible using JIRA.