**Educational Policy Committee**

**February 6, 2019**

**Minutes**

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

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

The chair called the committee to order.

Minutes from 11/28/18 and 1/23/19 were approved by consent, with a name typo corrected.

**Topic 1: Conversation defining HU, SS, NS, etc.**

Jennifer Jensen brought up a previous review by a group in CAS looking at the definitions and process for assiging HU, SS, NS designations to to courses, and a recommendation that a subcommittee was to be created. But that has not moved forward. The majority of these courses are housed in CAS, and therefore there was general consensus from the EdPol committee that EdPol should request that CAS create a document to define these categories and process for their courses as a first step. This may become more important when the College of Health curriculum begins to be developed, as many of their courses might well be appropriate for these designations. A related question that CAS should also address is whether global and diversity designations also be more clearly defined. EdPol asked Jennifer Jensen to pursue this request with CAS.

Action Item: Jennifer Jensen will meet with Susan Szczepanski to review next steps and to task CAS with developing the definitions and designation process.

**Topic 2: Charging additional tuition for overloads above 19 credits**

The SOS committee had raised the question of whether Lehigh should charge students who overload beyond some number of credit hours. The chair presented RAS data on numbers of students in the two most recent semesters who had taken more than 18 or 19 or 20 credit hours. Fewer than 2%, fewer than 90 students each term, took more than 19. Discussion revolved around what is the objective for charging additional tuition? Excessive overloading may take seats away from other students. There was a question as to how many students might be dropping or “blocking”. Most members were against additional fees because of affordability or charging a student who wishes to finish early. No further action or change recommended.

**Topic 3: Should all courses be 3 vs 4 credits**

During the Topic 2 discussion, one issue raised had to do with whether some of the overloading had to do with 4 credit vs. 3 credit courses, and whether more clarity on how to define and determine the credit hour content of particular courses. Discussion ensued. R&P defines it currently by hours of work expected. There was consensus that there should be guidelines to define a course, but also that the definitions are hard to apply uniformly given the diversity of pedagogies and course structures. It is difficult to define student effort as a general description. Should a future agenda review this section of R&P (3.1.3)? Is there a need to review a subset of this rule? No further action or change recommended.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30.