

Educational Policy Committee Minutes

January 25, 2017

Present: Renata Jackson, Sarah Greer, Janine Hawley, Kjersten Lester-Moratzka, Erin Morin, Krystyna Puć, Christia Thomason, David Winkelman, Abigail Yager, David English, Karen Beres

Guests: Trish Casey, Jeff Gredlein, Bob King, Elizabeth Klaimon, Rosemary Millar, Joe Mills, Dean Wilcox

Minutes: Jackson asked for a motion to consider the minutes of the January 11, 2017 meeting. Winkelman made the motion, Puć seconded the motion. Brief discussion followed and the minutes were approved as written.

Business: Jackson turned to Morin for a brief update on the new Bulletin. Morin stated that her team had spent the last week and a half poring over the three Bulletins. Because they were able to make pro forma edits it will no longer be necessary for committee members to go over course description in their respective Bulletin sections. Morin suggested that the committee take up a number of style questions, at a later point, for standardization. The work her team did will be turned over to IT on Friday (January 27).

Jackson welcomed our guests from the Division of Liberal Arts (DLA). Puć made a motion that the committee endorse the revision of the common core to 30 credit hours with the addition of a 1 credit hour capstone course. This change to the core would also revise the teaching of English composition within the framework of the common core. Hawley seconded the motion. Discussion: Jackson opened the discussion asking our guests to address the change of Composition I & II into to the First-Year Experience (FYE) and the “Writing About” (WA) component. Jackson stated that she hoped all committee members had been able to read the informative document sent by Wilcox; as well as the e-mail string, spurred on by Michael Rothkopf, that was forwarded this morning.

Wilcox stated that he appreciated committee members meeting with him prior to today’s meeting; the conversations have been fantastic, and the questions raised were thoughtful and engaging. He stated that he hoped that this would be a process that the Campus goes through more than once every 30 or 40 years, and that we keep the conversation going. Wilcox introduced the faculty: King, Millar, and Casey are working on the FYE; Gredlein and Klaimon are working on the Capstone piece (CP); and Mills is working on the WA.

Jackson agreed that the process has indeed been productive and she especially appreciated the e-mail thread shared over the last 24 hours. She stated that we all have a dog in this fight: we all care about the students, their writing skills, and the improvement of those skills—the more communication the better!

King stated that he is one of three people in the team that is working on this class. Utilizing a shared leadership model, they are endeavoring to try and find out as much as they can [about the FYE] by actually doing something, rather than just talking about it. King stated he thinks that writing is a distracting term— a dangerous term in academics, about as charged as accountability: you release these terms and lots of stuff happens. He stated that he was not saying that in a bad way, he thinks it is good to have that conversation, but the class (the FYE) is not a writing class, although it has a lot of writing in it. He asked Jackson if she'd like to hear him say where the writing is.

Jackson stated that that would be helpful, as one of the questions raised by the document “Addressing questions on the proposed Gen Ed revision” (dated January 6, 2017) is certainly about writing. Given that we have students without strong writing skills, two semesters of robust writing exercises help one learn to write better (just as one learns to be a better dancer by dancing). Jackson referred to pages 2 and 3 of the document describing the conceptual, experiential, and production work and the learning outcomes of the course. Her note in the margins was, and her question is: where is the writing component here?

King replied that question is pretty much covered, with both of the big strategic aims right now, one is written communication specifically and the other is critical thinking: so it is designed as a freshman seminar class. With that in mind, with that little caveat, the class is billed as an experimental, project-based class designed for students to engage in a comprehensive and unique exploration of art: through experiencing, thinking, talking, making and reflecting. So where the writing fits in is sort of smack-dab in the middle actually, it is one of the core methodologies. King stated that the core of what we are asking students to do is to keep a very comprehensive learning journal throughout the entire class. So, he said, we started that with introducing the “learning journal” as a genre; we didn't want to make the mistake of making the students wonder what in the heck that was. We cast these words about: we say “Where's the reflection”, so we found an article from the University of Worcester¹ on learning journals that actually says what a learning journal is, here is why it exists, here is the kind of writing you do, and here's the kind of thinking you do if you are writing a learning journal. So point number one is that the methodological spine of this course is the writing of a learning journal that in the end will be turned into an animated book, so we're going to have them go through the process of morphing a learning journal: editing it, using some aesthetics as well as just academic stuff and assembling a book and creating these objects. It will also have an online expression, in terms of taking the pages and turning them into a PDF document and publishing it on the internet. So this is at the center— they are writing all the time: they are writing things down in class, they are writing things down as they are responding to readings. We are asking them specifically to give us how they are reacting to this material, so it is not impersonal, we are not asking them to tell us back what the article says. We are wanting them to tell us what came to their mind when they were reading the article, or watching the performance, or whatnot. It's a fairly pervasive idea.

¹ http://www.worcester.ac.uk/studyskills/documents/Learning_Journals_2016.pdf (accessed 6 February 2017).

Jackson asked if the writing is assessed in the way it is assessed in a composition class. King replied that it remained to be seen, as the journals were collected for the first time this week. The members of the team will bring different perspectives to evaluation. Millar will be looking at the journals through the lens of someone who teaches composition regularly, Casey will be looking at them in a very different way. He stated that in talking to Casey one of the things that caught her attention on this discussion of writing is that we are also looking for ways to welcome people into the world of a life of the mind and writing. That is also part of our methodology. King then said that he would say this course is balanced: if it has a center it is somewhere between the goal of having students be good critical thinkers, and also recognizing that they are Art majors (every single one of them), and also recognizing that yes, he doesn't think there is anybody that argues that we don't want them to leave our school better writers than when they came in: that is not the argument. Jackson stated that indeed nobody thinks that anyone is making that particular argument.

King stated that he felt it was important to clarify that we're all in support of writing. In his case, he is also in support of multi-modal composing, that was the first Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), and he still thinks that is relevant. There are schools much like ours where the closest they get to an English class (especially a writing class) is one that treats writing as including writing in video, audio, text, and image. And asking students this question in the title: writing in the digital age. Asking students to wonder what is happening to writing. King went on, asking what is writing, for example, when he is producing a lot of his writing these days with voice recognition software that turns his voice into a text? Is that writing or is that composing in language? And aren't we the ones, in Higher Education, that should be driving that definition? He stated that in his opinion that is a question we need to be asking. King stated that that is where the balance between critical thinking and writing is, and what this class is centered around. King stated that we get to kind of use critical thinking to ask questions about writing.

Winkelman stated that what King was bringing to the surface, in part, is the idea that writing as a means of communication ultimately serves many purposes and is used in the service of many purposes. There is academic writing for a dissertation or thesis, there is creative writing for personal expression purposes, there is expository writing, and so on. There are parallels in Music: we have tonal theory, we have chromatic theory, we have atonal theory. We don't try to teach all of that, all at once, in the first year. We understand that there needs to be a certain progression throughout. In conversation with Wilcox, it was shared that part of what DLA has been looking at is, in Winkelman's term, a strategic mapping of writing activities throughout the Liberal Arts curriculum. Winkelman stated that it might help the committee to have a better sense of how the mosaic gets assembled and the total skill set that students would depart with.

Wilcox stated that DLA, as part of the ongoing Institutional Effectiveness Committee process, is going through the student learning outcomes (SLO). At this point we have a bunch of pieces for the program, we cannot even begin the conversation of what happens because there is no there there: there is no center. Part of this proposal is to create that center so that we can then have that conversation, with the expectation that

we do the curricular mapping that everybody in this room is going to be working on next year, and thinking to embed those learning outcomes throughout all DLA classes. At that point we can specifically articulate what those benchmarks are. Wilcox stated that it would be putting the cart before the horse to state the SLO now, they are just not quite there yet. King then spoke about the specificity of the learning journal as a genre and aims of the course.

Jackson invited Millar and Casey to address her question about the writing component of the FYE. Millar responded that they collected the journals on Monday and will be commenting on them for revisions and to spotlight issues to help them focus on written communication and critical thinking. Millar stressed that the reflections are more than mere reactions: the reflections push the idea of synthesis and engagement with course materials and the review of the journals will help to gauge whether the students are engaging with the materials at a deeper level.

Casey treated the committee to a bit of interpretive dance to represent her one foot in the Gray Building and the other in the Academic House with her body spanning the gulch. Casey stated that while she did not have a specific answer to Jackson's question about the writing component, she can speak of her first-hand witness of the poverty level of some of the writing skills [of students in Dance]. She thinks that we can all agree that we want our students to excel in their art, and write well, and listen well, and be deep thinkers, and speak well—however that may serve them. So in terms of student success we share that, and from what she sees we are basically inheriting children from a deteriorated system (she stated that that is not a critical point aimed at K-12) it is just what the teachers have been able to do in their system. Casey stated that there is no quick fix, this is going to take time. Casey stated that from what little she knows, she can respect the fact from our DLA colleagues that they have tried many approaches to try and help students, so if what they have done is not succeeding that would give cause to keep returning to the table to see what will bring success. In their thinking they have students, and the majority of their writing is texting emoji. We have the headset with respect to tradition and form, that maybe we should try the strategy of meeting them where they are. Why do they come to this school? They love their art—and what else do they like to do? If we can get a hook in somewhere, then they will be more likely to write, even if it is poor. If there is an engagement, then they have given us something to hook onto, and Casey thinks within it may come a natural motivation to become better. Casey has been interested in the lively thread of conversations over the last 24 hours. She stressed the “pilot” nature of the course and that while they don't have data yet, it has been interesting to see the initial comments from the students: they are highly responsive to thinking more deeply.

Winkelman stated that he was concerned that King may have misheard the spirit in which he was asking his question. He stated that he had great reservations about a traditional two semester “We're going to sit and write, children” kind of course. Winkelman stated that what King brought up about what *is* writing—at the end of the day it is about conveying some concept, idea, some thought one person to another and those can happen many different ways. Winkelman stated that while he had not done any research, he would be willing to bet that people who speak in a fragmented way also

write in a fragmented sort of way; people who speak in a thoughtful, coherent way don't necessarily write that same way, but if they simply transcribed what they are saying on to paper, they would be farther along. What we are talking about is crafting thoughts and coherently expressing them in whatever for that may be. Winkelman stated his second thought is that you cannot coherently convey something if you don't first have something to convey. To have as the entirety of the first-year experience of a college student be "children, now let's write" really doesn't tap in to what we want them to be growing in to—it parses it out in an academic, intellectual sort of way, rather than a creative, dynamic way. Winkelman's third thought: writing for him is skill development. His life has been spent helping students learn the skill of aural skills: of looking at music and imagining, of listening to it and knowing how to notate it. Skills do not develop in 15 weeks, they don't develop in 30 weeks. You make significant down payments along the way, but the real payoff of that skill development happens as those skills continue to be engaged and developed in higher level work down the road. That is why he was interested in DLA's thoughts on the subject, he understands and respects that DLA is not there yet. He stated that what he is interested in seeing for our students would be something that would truly tap in, in a skill development way, in a thoughtful scaffolded way, to the totality of their four years here.

Mills interjected that this might be a good time to talk about the "Writing About" (WA) classes as they address Winkelman's second and third points. These classes are specifically designed to be subject-driven, they are not just classes about writing: now go write something! Rather this is a class about this particular subject, now we will craft compositions around it. And because we write when we have something we want to say about a particular subject, as opposed to exercises. They can only work well when we have enough subjects to offer, so our students have a choice, so they can take something they are in fact interested in. Mills stated that the variety of choices also means, and this is equally important, it is taught by faculty who are excited to teach their subject. Mills stated that when he first started teaching here first year writing classes (and this is no knock against our current composition format at all) were all taught by full-time faculty. These faculty members were quite often teaching the first and second year sequences, so they had an understanding of the whole, and they were also guiding students through the whole. As our faculty was cut, and we got more and more students at the same time, composition became much more of an adjunct proposition (bringing in somebody for a couple of sections (and they do it very well)). One of the things the WA classes do, is they can introduce them to the very faculty that they can have, perhaps, for the next couple of years. So, this in fact, also gives more of a coherency across the student's coursework.

Jackson stated that historically the WA courses have been advanced placement (AP) level courses. Not all of our students are at that level, is it possible to offer WA to those students as well? Mills responded that the way it developed we had students who could pass out of composition (with appropriate AP, IB, and transfer credit) yet they still needed a writing class. We offered WA to those students and it worked well, and he does not see why the courses could not be expanded. Jackson stated that one of her concerns was that based on the language of the initial proposal of the FYE and the WA she did not see the inclusion of those courses for students at the non-AP level. Mills responded this

is something he can see working through, as we have students with such a range of skills it, the idea that one course could serve everybody just doesn't work. He could see there being different courses. Jackson stated that possibility would make her feel better about the proposal. Speaking as a representative of the School of Filmmaking the clarification of the availability of the WA course addresses her concern about the AP language. Puć explained that the only reason why the WA classes are attached to the phrase "advanced placement" is because for those students who come in AP English (language or literature) it gets them out of Composition I and we offer this as an alternative to Composition II. The beauty of the courses is that they can be expanded and multiplied and you can work on a variety of levels. Jackson stated that this explanation is much clearer to her.

King interjected to speak to a point that Wilcox has made with the DLA faculty many times: this is kind of an integrated system. So to some extent we are trying to make our class [FYE pilot] really friendly to anybody at any level of their writing, so it is that way. And this is where it becomes extremely crucial, maybe, in the future of the pilot that there be a comp trained person in the mix of people working on those classes, because this is a great opportunity for Millar to identify who is not ready for a WA by going through the FYE. He stated the student is not getting beat up in the FYE, but a chance to see really where students are on that vast spectrum of writing. King then stated that as to the question of what happens to a student who is identified as genuinely needing remediation, to him that is where we need to go to the research. It is by no means clear to him that asking such students to take another class, verses a contract to have extended one-on-one tutoring—the best, hands down, method of education ever invented on writing— in order to get to that bar. King stated that he is not saying that he has the answer to this, but he thinks there are answers in the research; that whether or not we want to have another remedial writing class, or whether it really may be a good move to take that to the Writing Center he just wants to put a flag on that question.

Thomason suggested that we talk about remediation, given that the reality is that the number of our students who need writing remediation is not inconsequential, and the odds are that this situation not going to get much better. She stated that one of the only questions that the Library raised about the initial General Education proposal was about relying on the Writing Center to do this remediation. The Administration has got to realistically fund, and staff, the Writing Center for that to succeed. Thomason raised the other systemic problem that Mills alluded to: the idea that the student body increased, but the staffing didn't increase in DLA to teach these students and that they are being overwhelmed by the number of students that need these writing courses. Thomason stated that she felt it was important that we do not allow systemic budgetary considerations to be a factor that shaped our curriculum— that is not what should be wagging the dog. Thomason stated that she well understands that we live in the real world and we have to pay for things, but we also, as an institution, have a responsibility to use our resources in a thoughtful and equitable way to ensure that our students get the skills they need. They need these writing skills because they are going into an environment where they are going to have to write a coherent grant proposal, it's all about preparing them for the real world. Writing is an art, and as an Art school we should not devalue that art. The attitude these writing courses are something they have

to get through, that they won't use it later on, is penny wise and pound foolish. Thomason stated that we need to have a commitment to systemic support of this, that our budget decisions show what we value, and we have a chance to address this now.

Wilcox then segued to the capstone piece (CP). Wilcox said that while he knows it is a complex piece there has to be something at the end: the only way to sustain that conversation about student writing, and their skills, and improving is to target them to move toward something. To just say "take it, you're done" doesn't solve that problem. He recognized that the CP is complex, but built into it is a sustained conversation. And that sustained conversation may actually engage us across the entire curriculum, not just in their General Education. Puć stated that is it not just a sustained conversation, but it is a sustained reflection on what the student has done at UNCSEA over the course of 4 years. So, the student is asked to look back over how all of these pieces fit.

Jackson asked that Gredlein and Klaimon speak to the committee about the CP. Gredlein connected to Winkelman's scaffolding component, stating that as a first-year student one has little to reflect on, you are just beginning the scaffolding transition. There is that fourth year piece and one has been reflecting the whole time to bring this together: that's a beautiful way to ensure arts, academic, college, and career. He stated that that is why he feels the CP is so important and has a connection to the discussion of writing and the Writing Center.

King interjected it would be a mistake not to let it be part of the record that the experience kind of happens simultaneously with the writing in the FYE class. A big part of it is experiencing art works, the ones that are performed on campus, so there is that recognition that they don't have experience yet. But we might have them get that experience on Tuesday and write about it.

Klaimon stated that this is where the FYE ties directly into the final experience, the CP. She feels there is truly value in the FYE and in her roles as a composition teacher and the Director of the Writing Center she has her own thoughts about writing. She stated that if we are going to promote writing and help students that need remediation in writing we really need the backing of the Administration. Klaimon reminded the committee that the Writing Center is a half-time operation: 22.5 hours a week, 3 tutors, (plus herself) and they handled 145 student appointments last term. There is only so much they can handle at current staffing levels.

Klaimon stated that the CP committee was called together in October, they are all volunteers (the members are Klaimon, Gredlein, Puć, L. Lawrence, and Levin) and they all feel strongly about the idea of having something that finishes off their experience at the School of the Arts and connects it to their DLA curriculum. They are still coming up with a model for the actual CP. The pieces that they do have in place are that the students would be presenting an artifact. That artifact could be, and most likely *would* be, something that they are doing in their art. And yet that artifact would also in some way connect back to their DLA experience. The idea would be to have them present this artifact: it could be a group artifact, a group poem, a group project, it could be a senior thesis, it could be anything that they have done. Each student would have to do a

written reflection, so there would be a written component. Klaimon's vision is that within the capstone experience the written reflection would be skilled through, with the student sitting there in class (hopefully 1 hour a week over 13 weeks). Klaimon stated that the written reflection would be a process that the students are lead through, not just an assignment they do on their own. In that written reflection within the CP they would be looking for evidence of: critical thinking, beyond just the creation of the project; connection—which needs to go back to the DLA experience in some way; and then the context of that artifact within their UNCSA experience, and looking globally as they move out into the world. Klaimon stated that one could think of this as a project that might launch them: they would be both reflecting back (and where they are now), and then moving forward to wherever they are going. She stated it would be a senior project, which is not an unusual thing to find within Liberal Arts curriculums. Further, as far as the DLA faculty go, they were thinking how nice it would be, cohort-wise, for the students in the FYE to later reconvene in their junior/senior years as a capstone cohort. That way they can reconnect with each other and see what they are doing, and literally if we are talking about curriculum and skill-set mapping we can map that through the FYE to the CP. Klaimon stated that while she doesn't know what the written reflection will look like (she doesn't have the prompt) but perhaps some skill-set that they began in that FYE—be it observing, reflecting deeply, journaling—could be moved through in a more advanced way for the written piece. Klaimon recapped for the committee: each student would submit a written reflection (that they would have a certain prompt, or parameter for) and an artifact (a performance, an art piece). Klaimon gave an example from her own experience of a dance student who based a later choreographic work on an Independent Study course she did on a particular piece of literature. Puć shared the example of a group project done in the Self Society & Cosmos course.

Casey commented that when she hears this trajectory from a FYE to CP she feels that the goals, ambition, and passion of DLA is the same as the Art component: we take a student a certain experience level and we finish with the student at another level. This plan aligns our efforts and reason for being here very closely. Additionally, in this kind of thinking with writing—Casey stated that she has a very hard time separating writing from listening, from reading, from speaking: you have to have it all working to convey. What she is liking about what she is hearing and seeing in this thinking and re-visioning is that we have the need to rework something because it is not working. But can we, in this School, not create *another* thing that they have to do? So why would you not look into their experience in their artwork while here, and take that something and use that as the basis for their writing. In reaction to Casey's point Thomason stated that if we, as an institution, could tear down the wall that exists between DLA courses and Arts courses (and the idea that DLA courses are just something Art students must simply get through) we would have truly accomplished something.

Winkelman stated that in each Art school, to his knowledge, there is already some sort of art focused capstone event (in Music that would typically be the graduation recital). That said, he has found himself strongly supportive of the idea of some sort of end product—he is a little bit uncomfortable with the term capstone—that aims to help students synthesize the totality of their work here. For that reason, he has found himself wondering if that final event most properly belongs as a DLA course. Winkelman asked

(with a nod to the Provost) if there were some way that the Institution could have a project that would not be in competition with, or replace, the individual Art School capstone. But be a different kind of summation of the totality of the work accomplished here. If it could live not under a DLA course number, or a MUS, or DEP number— that, for Winkelman, would move toward breaking down some of these walls and silos. This led to further discussion of the ideas of scaffolding and skill development.

English stated that when he examines his role he looks at the procedural process. He feels that this has been one of the most robust reviews of a curriculum that he has seen in his time at UNCSCA. English said we were created as a very specifically focused college (or university) but the fact that we do award high school, college, and graduate degrees is a key part of who we are. At the undergraduate level the general education is really the foundation of who we are putting out as students. He looks at the amount of work and discussion, the research that has been undertaken and he commends Wilcox and his colleagues on the amount of time and effort that has been put into the process. English stated he looks at the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requirements as our liaison, and that this proposal goes a long way toward helping us be in true compliance with both the letter, and the spirit, of what SACS expects of a general education program. English acknowledged that we, as an institution, have struggled mightily with the question of the balance of general education in a conservatory environment. He thinks that this goes a long way to having a robust academic core within a unique institution.

English stated that while he enjoyed reading the e-mail responses to the proposal, he felt the situation in which they came out exposed certain underlying tensions that perhaps don't always go spoken on the campus. But he stated that seeing the faculty share their thoughts on the good parts and the areas of improvement, helped him to see that this is a proposal that has been developed by the faculty and the leadership of the Division with great thought and intent. On a substantive basis English feels that this is a curriculum that will really resonate with our students and he is excited about this. English stated that from an administrative standpoint he asked Wilcox, going forward, to look at the conversation that general education is not DLA and DLA is not general education: we cannot lump them together as a 1:1 relationship. English said that DLA is an administrative structure for a set of faculty in academic expertise, whereas general education is a set of shared courses that we believe are core to the major. So, he went on, the idea of more connections and interspersions between the faculty in the Arts schools and the general education program is wonderful. English stated that Wilcox is supportive, and he thinks the faculty are as well, of having an ongoing and broader conversation about general education. The idea is that we are not setting this in stone for the next 30 years—let's set a five-year horizon and revise this. He feels that this should be a standard for all of our programs on campus: in many cases we've gone 10, 15, 20 years without getting the faculty together to say, "Is this the way we'd design it now. It may be what we inherited, but is this the best way for the current set of faculty with the current set of students?"

Jackson asked for other questions from EPC representatives about the proposal. Hawley asked if the CP could happen in the junior year as opposed to the senior year. Klaimon

responded that there is flexibility, as they know different Arts areas have various needs. She also stated that the model of seat time has not been fleshed out, they are aiming for an hour a week, but the instructor teaching the course would be in charge of managing the time. Hawley also asked how much collaboration there would be between DLA faculty and Arts faculty on the CP. Klaimon replied that it is open. Wilcox stated that the question is open, and DLA welcomes as much collaboration as one can stand. The more that we can have this dialog, it will be easier to have these conversations down the road. Collaboration is welcomed. Klaimon outlined a possible scenario for interdisciplinary collaboration in the context of the CP.

Lester-Moratzka asked if the writing seen so far in the journaling in the FYE course will get the students ready to handle the WA courses. Millar replied that they have just received the first journals; but from what she has seen the students are, for the most part, doing the type of engagement and critical thinking she was hoping to see. Millar gave an example of student engagement and critique of a guest presentation to illustrate her point. Lester-Moratzka explained that she asks her question to inquire about what would happen if there are students who fall into a gap between the FYE and the WA courses.

Yager recounted that her conversation with Wilcox illuminated her understanding of how our students can have a more rigorous experience within what looks like just a reduction of credit. Yager stated it was her understanding that FYE would be intentionally open, refining how they are even experiencing their art, and their engagement, so they have something to respond to; and then her understanding was the second semester everybody was going to be in these WA courses. Concerning the WA classes there was a question of—and this is an open question—is it better to level those courses so we are able to meet students at their writing level or is it better to have an integrated classroom model where students at different levels are able to learn from each other. But that the classes would ultimately be for everyone, not just AP students. And that in the first semester students who need the Writing Center can be identified. Yager echoed that the Writing Center needs more resources at their disposal, as there are many students who are desperately in need of Writing Center help who don't even go. Yager stated that as long as the second semester is targeting the entire population, and that then segues through classes that are not specifically designated as WA classes, their experience will be guiding them throughout. Mills replied that it was the intention in the scaffolding for all these courses that they have something that will cover everyone without being monolithic; that, in fact, allows for choice for both students and faculty. Mills stated that he taught composition for 10 years and never once in that time did a faculty member ask to teach composition. With the WA classes they ask about teaching every year. It is important to have enthused faculty as well and to offer those opportunities within an overall scaffold that covers everyone. Mills stated that they are trying to go for: something that is large, but also flexible.

Jackson thanked the guests from DLA for clarifying, and giving us feedback, and information. Jackson stated that she was going to table the vote on the motion until the February 8, 2017 meeting as she feels this conversation is crucial and that it behooves us to go back to our constituents and share the e-mails of the last 24 hours and the

information learned today. Jackson stated that she was prepared to vote against the proposal had it come up for a vote at this meeting because even though she finds many strengths (the 30 hour core, addressing the needs for SACS, the idea of writing across the curriculum, the need for reflecting back, and the positive potential of the capstone) she was very unclear about the FYE and the WA. The information learned today addressed many of the concerns that she, and her Filmmaking faculty colleagues, shared. Jackson stated that she wants to go back to them and share this information.

Pu  asked if a vote could be taken on just the 30+ 1 hour core curriculum. Jackson stated that she was reluctant to do that at this moment, given that the 30+1 hour core curriculum was the one piece of the motion that we did not discuss today, and she would like to hear from the committee on that question. Morin stated that she had some questions about the +1 for the next meeting. Jackson did not feel comfortable rushing to a vote before the conversation is finished. She stated that she was making the best suggestion as Chair of EPC: she means to do well by this campus, and by this proposal, and she wants us to be able to continue conversation and not rush to a vote.

English offered his advice, stating that it is important to define very clearly what needs to be seen at the next meeting out of respect for the faculty; to a certain extent on campus there is a bit of “whack-a-mole” in that every time something comes up somebody raises a different issue. While English stated that he didn’t think that was happening at this table, he doesn’t think it is fair to put the DLA faculty through a set of hoops that other programs and revisions aren’t subject to. Jackson asked the Provost if that is what he feels she is doing. He replied he did not, but that she needs to define clearly what are the set of questions that need to be discussed, and then ultimately for the committee to say we need to call a vote on its merits. Jackson stated that she feels we have made tremendous headway, but she thinks that there are still questions that Morin has and she would like us to have discussion about those issues. Jackson stated that she hopes that the Provost does not feel she is being obstructionist.

Meeting adjourned at 1:59 PM.

Respectfully submitted 7 February 2017
Christia Thomason
Educational Policy Committee Secretary