Minutes for EPC Meeting  
November 19, 2015

Present and attending: Dean Kalscheur, Chair  
Amy Boesky, Michael Martin, Clare Dunsford, Eve Spangler, Mary  
Troxell, Bill Petri, Julian Borg, Scott Rizzi, John Baldwin, Thomas  
Dodman, Rory Browne

Greg opened the meeting at 4. He began with introductions and  
announced that the first meeting of next semester will take place  
on Jan 28, 2016. At that point, he would like to discuss 1-credit  
courses—what is the best way to deal with them? Should there be  
any kind of limit to the number taken? After asking if there were  
any other announcements, he asked us to look over and approve  
minutes from the September meeting.  
Eve made a motion and September minutes were approved.

1. Our first item of business was consideration of the proposed  
interdisciplinary minor, Managing for social impact and the public  
good. Clare Dunsford presented a report from subcommittee,  
stating that they were very impressed with the completeness of  
the proposal. She did have some questions and suggestions.  
Why should this be considered an MCAS minor and not “inter-  
school”? After some discussion, Eve noted that it seemed  
important to house the minor in MCAS.  
However: the minor will be open to ALL BC students.
Currently, they propose a pilot with a cap of 25 students. Eve noted that it is hard to determine which students will apply. Clare: “The co-concentration in CSOM has the same name.” Is this a concern? Dean Kalscheur: will there then be 50 students, if the co-concentration and the minor are launching at the same time? This would mean there would have to be more than one section. Eve: CSOM appears ready to support multiple sections. Students need to have 96 of their 120 credits in A and S—students need to be advised of this. 2 2-credit courses will be needed to make up one elective. In their advising materials, the minor director might clarify this. Julian: Do CSOM students have a limit on the # of A and S courses they take? Rory thinks no. Mary has a question/comment. Thinks it’s a wonderful idea but notes that courses listed are v popular. Amy spoke to the fact that this can work out, as long as students are not made promises. Intro course in the new minor is not a pre-req to other courses. The minor, it was noted, is very much in keeping with BC’s mission. Julian: moves interdisciplinarity to the school level and beyond the Core. The Importance of advising was noted. Open to current freshmen and sophomores
Resource questions? No, Andy Boynton has been really generous. Willing to offer multiple sections. Work-study students. Technical issues?
No courses taken abroad during the pilot? Recommended that overseas courses not be counted during the pilot phase.
The minor will be reviewed in January of 2018. Subcommittee recommends approval.
Amy Boesky moves to approve, Julian seconds.
Approval of the pilot of the new minor carries with unanimous approval.

2. Bill Petri raised a second point on the agenda: the A and S honors ceremony on Sunday of grad weekend is large, and many awards are given out. People are tired by the end. We have several depts that would like to introduce awards, making it even longer How can we keep it from growing? Can it get shorter?
Clare: it’s not that long. It feels longer than it is. An hour and fifteen minutes.
Greg: how do we contain it? This is really preemptive containment. Multiple students receive the same award.
Can we make it more efficient? No; we can’t really ask students to walk faster. What if new programs want to give awards? A and S ceremony should focus firstly on awards available to everyone in the college.
There ought to be some limits to how many awards a dept can offer. Right now the range: 0-11.
English would be willing to limit to the top winning student in each category (rather than 1st, 2nd and 3rd place.)

Should individual depts hold award ceremonies? Or allow the current program to get a big bigger?

Should size of major determine number of prizes?

Should minors give awards?

The subcommittee will do more work. Will probably end up making a modest proposal to limit awards.

Greg: committee should get more information.

Individual depts might want to hold ceremonies on commencement weekend.

More to hear next semester.

3. Next we moved on to hear the Appeals committee report, chaired by Kathy Dunn.
There were 2 appeals: the committee came to a summary statement on one. No names were involved.

A student appealed a final grade. Prof had a writing prompt. One criterion was that if the student included citations on the final, the grade would be lowered. This instruction was only given orally, not included in the writing prompt itself. It was felt that it is against best practices not to include an import criterion on the prompt. In this case, it appeared neither on the writing assignment nor on the syllabus. This was determined to be unfair to the student. (This took place in a capstone course.)
The assignment was to write a “reflective” essay without using secondary sources.
Recommendation: ask the instructor to reevaluate the final exam despite the fact that the student has graduated.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.

Amy Boesky