

Education Policy Committee Minutes, November 13, 2025

Attendance: Kelly Austin, Daniel Babcock, Amanda Baran, Linda Bell, Derek Brown, Clinton Graham, Olivia Grimes, Michael Gusmano, Tom Hammond, Khurram Hussain, Terry-Ann Jones, Lucy Napper, Kylie Mirabile, Joanna Mishtal, Marina Puzkova, Mariana Roldan, Naomi Rothman, Corrie Vakil, Todd Watkins, Edmund Webb

Agenda and Discussion

1. Approval of October 30th minutes

Lucy Napper noted typos; Marina Puzakova will correct.

Khurram Hussain moved approval of the minutes; Tom Hammond, seconded. Approved without dissent.

2. Old Business: 3.1.4.2 —Leave of Absence. Reverted from Senate with questions.

Discussion of Senate concern about the possibility of students taking two years continuous leave, then returning only one semester, then taking another two-year leave. The Senate asked if this loophole was intentional. The general consensus was that, yes, the rule as stated is appropriate.

Linda Bell indicated one rationale is related to 8-year rule for maximum time to degree.

There was general agreement during discussion with comments by Daniel Babcock and Khurram Hussain that that students might take leaves for many reasons (e.g., medical) and that the rules should be flexible, so the overall 8-year maximum rule is a sufficient guardrail.

There was also agreement that the section should include reference to where in R&P the maximum time to degree is defined (3.20.1) and that references to the leave approval and return process and where it is defined (below in same section, 3.1.4.2) could be clearer.

Marina Puzakova added the clarifying language and moved the defining paragraph.

Daniel Babcock made a motion to approve the revised language for 3.1.4.2; Lucy Napper seconded. Approved without dissent.

Marina Puzakova will send the revisions back to the Senate.

3. Old Business: Discussion of R&P 3.6 (Provisional courses) and R&P 3.6.1 (Special topics).

Lucy Napper cleaned up language discussed at the previous EdPol meeting, Oct 30, 2025, dropped reference to what type of faculty (e.g., visitor, adjunct) teaches the provisional courses, added rationale for the proposed extension of the time and frequency a provisional course can be offered before permanent approval, and added a new section to differentiate special topics courses from provisional courses.

Linda Bell reported following up on the question from the Oct 30 meeting about whether courses permanently approved in the CIM system could be selectively omitted from the course catalog. Bell investigated the

feasibility of a separate workflow in CIM: doing so in the software would be complex, needs vendor input, and would incur fees. Bell did not yet know how much or possible timeline for modifications.

Todd Watkins commented that software technology—and avoiding what might be manageable costs to modify it—should not drive policy; technology should follow policy.

Further discussion involved whether to drop the proposed option for courses approved in CIM selectively omitted from the course catalog. Draft alternative language was suggested that proposals would need to go through the respective college's policy committees to be offered more than four times rather than CIM. Kelly Austin raised concern that if a special topics course were not in CIM, approval could bypass EdPol and other affected colleges might miss the opportunity to comment.

By consensus, the proposal was tabled until getting more information about options and costs; Linda Bell agreed to inquire with the vendor, hopefully with reply in time for the next EdPol meeting.

4. New Business: 3.20.1.1. Second Baccalaureate Degree (30-Credit Requirement).

Terry-Ann Jones requested initial discussion on reviewing the policy requiring students completing dual degrees to complete 30 additional credits. Equity issues arise in requiring what could amount to a full year of extra courses, which could be prohibitive and disadvantage some students who do not enter with AP credits or afford summer tuition. Jones suggested the policy should not be arbitrary but rather should justify what the extra credits contribute to.

Michael Gusamano commented about the difference between dual degrees and double majors. Might we expand the concept of double majors within the standard load of credits to enable double degrees?

Kelly Austin asked what data is available on dual degree students. How often 30 credits for the two degrees are needed anyway? What fields are the most common degree pairings and how many students do them? Austin noted concern that modifying rules for double majors to encompass double degrees might entail many substantial changes in R&P. Another challenge is that dropping the 30-additional-credit requirement might drive up demand for course enrollments as student pursue more dual degrees. The extra demand might fall particularly heavily on CAS; CAS cannot handle what might be equivalent to 100s of additional students.

Marina Puzakova asked if any benchmarking with other universities was done.

Terry-Ann Jones indicated she would share more information with the committees.

The consensus was that this is an important conversation to have, and the topic will be added to a future agenda for fuller discussion.

5. New Business: Graduate Certificate R&P language.

Sabrina Jedlika forwarded proposed new R&P language from GRC for feedback. Current relevant R&P language is 20+ years old and does not reflect current practice. GRC had a first read and graduate associate deans have reviewed.

Michael Gusamano wondered about issues in the difference between graduate certificates and potentially overlapping official external certifications. Does the language work?

Tom Hammond expressed that the College of Education often deals with that difference; the latter have legal implications while the former do not. Policing the line of how students represent the certificates is needed. He thought the proposed language works well.

Lucy Napper raised the issue of lack of clarity on whether double counting courses across multiple stacked graduate certificates was permissible. There was general agreement that the policy should specify this aspect.

Tom Hammond will provide feedback to members of GRC to consider whether they need language on double counting.

Meeting adjourned, 4:30 PM