

Education Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

DATE: December 3, 2021

Faculty/Staff Members: Alyson Dearie, Eric Edlund, Margaret Gichuru, Christina Knopf, Abby Thomas, Jeff Walkuski, Chris Widdall, Lindsey Darvin, Maaike Oldemans

Student Members: none

Ex-Officio Members: Holly Doty,

Guests: Nancy Diller

Members Absent: Carol Van Der Karr

Topic	Comments/Discussion	Action
Approval of minutes	Review of minutes from 11/19/2021	
	Abby requested clarification of Transfer Advisory Committee statements – really about <i>retaking</i> transfer credits.	Eric made the correction.
		Minutes approved with correction.
General discussion	Jeffrey asked about when subcommittees/work groups need to meet.	Eric indicated that these can wait until the new year. Nancy will arrange something for the Microcredentials group.
Old business	Eric reviewed the vetting document regarding sec. 340 & 350	
	Eric noted the concerns about striking the word “impartial.” Its presence doesn’t guarantee its practice, and its absence doesn’t suggest partiality.	Voted to put “impartial” back into the document.
	Eric noted the concerns about including “staff” as witnesses.	Voted to leave document as “faculty or staff”

	<p>Abby and Chris discussed the categories, definitions, and inclusivity of terms surrounding SUNY Cortland employees: how faculty are defined, staff who teach, professional staff who advise, etc.</p> <p>Eric suggested two broad approaches to addressing the concerns: 1) Changing or modifying the language, 2) Developing an external guide to navigate the underlying concerns of etiquette.</p> <p>Chris reminded the committee that it is an advisory body; these debates can be handled by Faculty Senate.</p> <p>Holly noted that inclusion of word “staff” just validated practices already occurring.</p>	<p>Agreed that development of an external guide for etiquette and procedures, beneficial to both students and faculty/staff, should be suggested to Faculty Senate, perhaps as the purview of AGT. -As discussion continued surrounding vetting responses, it was suggested this guide might include what the definition of an advisor or witness is.</p>
	<p>Eric reviewed other concerns in vetting document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What if a student fails to respond? -What if deadlines are missed for good reasons? -Language of “shall” versus “must” or “will” -Nuances surrounding the “obligations” 	<p>Agreed that these had already been adequately considered in EPC discussions surrounding due diligence and reasonable accommodations.</p>
	<p>Eric noted a concern surrounding a student’s “academic record” being reviewed in the Tribunal process.</p> <p>Chris said this requires language clarification: the interest is not in the student’s transcript but in a prior history of AGT.</p> <p>Abby noted that AGT and disciplinary records are separate from academic records. These are not in DegreeWorks.</p> <p>Chris further clarified that the interest should be in AGT matters only, not other disciplinary matters (such as using fake ID)</p>	<p>Chris moved to send this document forward to the Steering Committee, with the clarifying statement about the student’s record, to put it in the hands of Faculty Senate.</p> <p>Jeff seconded.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>

	Eric suggested removing “disciplinary and academic” and replacing it with AGT record – after checking with Ronnie and Tim that the correct terminology is used.	
New business		
Action items (to-do list)		
Adjourned		
	Respectfully submitted by Christina Knopf, 12/3/2021	