**Educational Policy Committee**

**January 23, 2019**

**Minutes**

**Committee Members Attending:** Watkins (chair), Lotto, Zhang, Hoelscher, Gunter, Liu, Webb Piispanen.

**Guests:** Bell, Jensen, McClaind, Szczepanski, Tonkay, Wilson, Zalatan.

The chair called the committee to order.

The committee noted that minutes from the previous meeting were not distributed. The chair indicated he would distribute them for approval at next meeting.

**First agenda item: Changes to R&P 3.1.2 Petitions**

The Committee reviewed a proposal for minor changes to R&P 3.12. These changes tighten the language and change the language to reflect current processes. For example, the SOS petition form does not call for a “full statement by each signer of the pertinent conditions and the reasons for recommended action,” but instead calls for approval (or not), and perhaps a brief comment. Also, “curriculum director” is ambiguous and not a generally used title.

The committee discussed new language, prepared modifications and approved the amended proposal by consensus.

CURRENT

**3.12 Petitions**

The right of petition is open to all students at all times. Petitions must be submitted to the committee on standing of students for curriculum transfers, makeup exams, senior re-exams, special exams, reinstatement or readmission in the university, and for other special action.

The regular petition form must be prepared completely and signed by the curriculum director or academic dean and all other university officers appropriately involved with a full statement by each signer of the pertinent conditions and reasons for the recommended action. Petitions are acted on:

1. by the committee itself.

2. for the committee on the basis of power delegated to academic deans or the executive secretary of the committee.

Any petition denied by a delegated authority may be appealed to the committee.

PROPOSED

**3.12 Petitions**

The right of petition is open to all students at all times. Petitions must be submitted to the committee on standing of students for curriculum transfers, makeup exams, senior re-exams, special exams, reinstatement or readmission in the university, and for other special action.

The regular petition form must be ~~prepared completely and signed by~~ **complete with signature and** **a brief recommendation from** the ~~curriculum director or~~ **instructor (when appropriate), advisor, and** academic dean ~~and all other university officers appropriately involved~~ ~~with a full statement by each signer of the pertinent conditions and reasons for the recommended action~~. Petitions are acted on:

1. by the committee itself.

2. for the committee on the basis of power delegated to academic deans or the executive secretary of the committee.

Any petition denied by a delegated authority may be appealed to the committee.

**Second agenda item: Proposed change to R&P 3.12.3, Petition to waive a prerequisite**

The committee reviewed R&P section 3.12.3 and concluded that the process as described was not being followed—the requirement that a student seeking to waive a prerequisite must receive permission from the instructor, teaching department chair, and the chair of the student’s major department.

In discussion, consensus emerged that instructor permission and permission of the teaching department’s chair were necessary. As it was noted that some accreditors (i.e., ABET, AACSB) require tracking this, the committee determined that permission of the student’s major department *or program* should be maintained.

The committee removed the language specifying the role of the registrar in managing paperwork; this level of detail is not necessary in R&P. The committee agreed to revisit the issue of standards for applying prerequisites, and if needed, processes for managing prerequisite petitions and approvals.

CURRENT

**3.12.3 Petition to waive a prerequisite**

Prerequisites may be waived upon presentation of evidence of substantially equivalent preparation, if satisfactory to the instructor in charge of the course, the teaching department chairperson, and the chairperson of the student's major department.
The records for all waivers are on a standard form provided by the registrar for listing reasons for waiver. The student’s departmental chairperson will not approve the waiver unless adequate reasons are given. Waivers are filed at the time of registration. The registrar notifies the student of the action taken.

PROPOSED

**3.12.3 Petition to waive a prerequisite**

Prerequisites may be waived upon presentation of evidence of substantially equivalent preparation, if satisfactory to the instructor in charge of the course, the teaching department chairperson, and the chairperson of the student’s major department **or program if applicable**.
~~The records for all waivers are on a standard form provided by the registrar for listing reasons for waiver. The student's departmental chairperson will not approve the waiver unless adequate reasons are given. Waivers are filed at the time of registration. The registrar notifies the student of the action taken.~~

**Third agenda item: The report before the full Senate regarding changes to the professor of practice title.**

Due to a conflict, Professor Watkins left the meeting before the start of discussion of the third agenda item, and left chair duties to chair-elect Professor Webb.

Professor Gunter provided a handout on various categories of Lehigh personnel who teach, research and serve (“Substance Before Title”). Professor Gunter noted that the Faculty Senate has received a report on professors of practice that includes proposed changes to R&P. The committee did not review this report. It proceeded with a wide-ranging discussion on the professor of practice title and what constitutes, and should constitute, a professor of practice. Discussion included the differences between professors of practice, lecturers and instructors. Points of discussion included whether one title was seen as superior to others; whether a “track” of advancement is needed within a title; whether professors of practice should be limited to those with practical professional experience; whether creation of positions that are teaching-only will devalue teaching among the tenure-track faculty; whether professors of practice are proliferating and whether they are adequately compensated.

There were no motions or votes taken, but Professor Gunter thanked the committee for its input, which he expected to share with others in his role as a senator. He noted that his handout was not on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or any other group.

The committee adjourned at 4:28.