

Educational Policy Committee Agenda

February 26, 2026

Only via Zoom

In (virtual) attendance: Marina Puzakova, Kelly Austin, Linda Bell, Derick Brown, Michael Gusmano, Tom Hammond, Joanna Mishtal, Naomi Rothman, Erica Hoelscher, Daniel Babcock, Khurram Hussain, Todd Watkins, Edmund Webb, Amanda Baran

1. Approval of Feb. 12 minutes (attached)

Attendance was checked for last meeting. No other issues were raised, the minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Discussion and approval of course proposals.

One course and three program changes are being proposed.

- BUS 273 course proposal has been approved.
- Supply Chain Management program is adding additional electives. This has been approved.
- Financial Technology program is being deactivated due to low student interest. A suitable plan to wind it down is in place. This has been approved.
- Education Minor is being deactivated and replaced with a different minor. A suitable plan to wind it down is in place. This has been approved.

EdPol voted unanimously on all the proposals.

3. Update: R&P 3.7.2 (Common Hour Exams). Guest speaker: Dave Angstadt.

The committee reviews the survey about the common hour exams in an Excel document. Twenty four responses have been collected through the survey. Narrative responses have been displayed and read by the committee.

Guest David Angstadt:

- Has been scheduling common exams since the fall semester of 2020
- Typical process would be to send the Google document at the start of the semester asking faculty to sign up - this made it difficult to catch conflict between courses. This approach has been eliminated. The new approach addresses the issue of avoiding conflicts because students cannot register for classes that would conflict with their exam schedule. Currently an email is sent to the faculty to sign up for the exam and faculty have three weeks to complete this task, following which the schedule of exams is finalized.
- The issues that have arisen are:
 - faculty request exam slots without knowing what the enrollment for their courses will be. If the enrollment is less than 100 students, their course is wiped off the schedule and the faculty member has to scramble to make other arrangements for their exam. This has caused complaints from the faculty.
 - Another issue is that in some cases it is unknown who is teaching the course until later so it is also unknown whether an exam time will be needed.
 - Another issue that comes up is the 100 student cap. The R&P doesn't say that courses with fewer than 100 students are not allowed to have an exam scheduled, but only that courses with 100 or more students will be prioritized.
- Ed Pol committee discussion developed whether the R&P should be clarified or it

- should be clarified how the R&P language is being interpreted in practice.
- David believes the priority should be the following:
 - multi section courses with 100 students or more should have top priority,
 - multi section courses with fewer than 100 students should have the second priority
 - non multi section courses should have 3rd priority.
 - David shows an example of an Excel sheet with the exam schedule from Spring 2026 which the committee reviews.
 - A question emerges from the committee about the unintended consequences of starting the exams at 4:00 PM due to the fact that students have other activities such as athletics, music and theater rehearsals, and other activities that are considered academic credit.
 - David believes the solution is that exams should be prioritized in case such conflict arises and that such issues should be prevented because students cannot register for conflicting courses.
 - A question is raised from the committee: is there a need to clarify the R&P regarding the cap for the courses. This could be an equity issue as some faculty may be required to create multiple versions of their exams, students may also share information about the exam.
 - David raises the issue of room availability. The answer to this question may be unclear but in any case if multiple rooms are needed this could force the hiring of proctors to proctor exams in the other rooms. This could incur costs.
 - David: Why is the issue of common hour exams raised to begin with for discussion at Ed Pol? The answer is there have been concerns expressed about the cap of 100 students. The history of this cap is that it was originally instituted by Bruce who wanted a strict cap, and this was communicated to Carol who has since been working with this directive.
 - Marina questioned whether the R&P is the problem, which doesn't seem to be given the fact that the language there does not strictly prohibit courses from being below 100 enrollment, therefore this may be an issue of interpretation of the R&P text.
 - Linda suggests that it is best to have a threshold.
 - David asks whether the R&P can be revisited.
 - Kelly makes the point that grace should be given if a course is slightly below the 100 cap but historically has been over this cap.
 - Others on the committee bring up the fact that the R&P is not consistent with the practice in place and for this reason the practice should be revised.
 - Another point brought up is that the R&P's word "priorities" is creating varied interpretations so it is really a problem with the language in R&P.
 - Marina raises the question of whether the Ed Pol Committee has a role to play here in addressing the situation.
 - Marina closes the meeting by saying this issue will be revisited again.

The remaining points in the agenda were not discussed due to time constraints.