The meeting was called to order at 4pm by David Quigley.

I. Dean’s Introduction: Dean Quigley welcomed three returning students and one new member, along with several new faculty. The minutes of the meeting of May were not available and approval was deferred to the October meeting.

11. Review of last year’s primary business: Course to credit implementation
   - The dramatic change has been smooth up to this point
   - Going forward, focus will be on those Departments that have instigated curriculum significant changes (i.e., geology and biology). EPC will be interested in the progress, future changes and additional ideas to creatively utilize the new credit system
   - It was noted that Freshman in the class of 2014 were instructed to enroll in 5 3-credit classes.
   - There was some discussion regarding major requirements for different graduating classes; it was noted that these differences are explained in the catalogue, and generally students have not been concerned about these variations. Students always follow the requirements as defined with their entering graduation date, regardless of the actual year they graduate.
   - Finally, it was noted that the Academic Affairs subcommittee has recommended that students could count one internship for 1 credit toward graduation; additional internships listed on a transcript would be for enrichment only. The Committee is still waiting for verification from Don Hafner in the Provost’s Office.

III. Scholar of the College GPA
   - Motion: The Scholar of the College GPA should be increased from 3.667 to 3.70.
   - Background – The mean university GPA has increased from 3.1 to 3.43 over that past decade. This has not only widened the pool of eligible students, but the number of students with GPAs that vary only by .001 is significant, making judgment calls regarding inclusion of those who come very close both arbitrary and difficult. Raising the GPA to 3.70 will help maintain the academic standard and eliminate the difficulties associated with minute variations in GPA at the .001 increment.
   - Discussion – most of the discussion was off-topic. There were comments that the GPA should not be at the center of the SOC, but rather the focus should be on the project – that it is the project that makes the scholar, and the emphasis should be on developing passion for the execution of ideas, and not generating excellent grades (which have become very ordinary). Also added, the enrollment in 12 credits of Advanced Independent Research (a Dean’s decision) should not be connected to GPA, but to the worthiness of a project to command that much time. However, it was countered that departments are free to development their own criteria for recognizing independent research in their field, and the tradition of the SOC recognizing academic excellence across the curriculum was defended. A student commented that hard work and achievements were not always reflected in a very high GPA, but again it was noted that departmental honors programs would be a more appropriate venue for recognition.
   - Motion to raise the required GPA for designation of Scholar of the College from 3.677 to 3.70 beginning with the Class of 2012 was carried unanimously.

IV. Honors and Awards in A&S
   - Dean Quigley commented that the award ceremony on the Sunday before graduation was becoming an over-stuffed production. While some departments are requesting additional award recognition, and others are looking to be included, there are departments that have no presence in this ceremony. It was questioned whether this was the appropriate place to honor retiring faculty, and if the current structure of the A&S award ceremony should be reviewed by the Honors subcommittee.
The following question was posed: What should the criteria be for an award presentation to made, on stage, at the A&S awards ceremony? A number of ideas and comments followed:
- Limit awards to those that go beyond a single department
- Limit departments to a single award (perhaps unfair when considering student enrollments)
- It would be desirable to have participation from all A&S departments
- Eliminate awards that have their own ceremony (i.e., Cross and Crown)
- Many awards could be listed in a program, without an actual presentation
- One student – one award
- Not sure how to treat departments fairly

It was questioned whether this was a matter of educational policy. No consensus was called for or agreed upon.

IV Upcoming Business for the 2010-2011 academic year

- English Department will be presenting a new curriculum proposal
- Some ideas for future discussion were suggested
  - Changing the drop/add period from Tues-Mon, thus reducing the loss of meaningful instruction due to late adds. This should be looked at by the Academic Affairs committee
  - The academic calendar – as Labor Day fluctuates on the calendar, there can be a variation of 3-4 class days. Does this matter in the long run? Should the start date for classes be flexible – some years before Labor Day, some years after? The educational question revolves around whether 63-64 days of instruction, in certain years, is sufficient. This is potentially an Academic Affairs subcommittee issue
- Issues surrounding university assessment
  - Should there be a minimum standard
  - Large state universities have been under pressure to provide specific rubrics for assessment
  - Departments generally benefit from looking at other similar departments. It is not clear what the College role should be, and what support is needed
  - This was not deemed to be an urgent issue for the EPC at this time.
- There will be one independent major proposal on sustainability

Dean Quigley asked members of the Committee to sign up for one of two subcommittees. Meeting was adjourned at 5:25pm