Education Committee Minutes
December 20, 2018

Attendance: Gene Declercq, Carol Dolan, Anne Fidler, Chris Gill, Sophie Godley, Megan Healey, Michael LaValley, Jessica Leibler, Lois McCloskey, Meera Ruparelia (staff), Cassie Ryan, Lisa Sullivan, Michael Ulrich, Amanda Velez

1. Degree Modification – Public Health Nutrition program
   a. Added a 5th competency
   b. Indicated the semesters that courses are offered since majority aren’t on the medical campus
   c. Nikki had concerns with the way that classes were bucketed
      i. We’re reliant on another school offering that course and if they decide to cancel it, students are left dry
   d. Committee Feedback
      i. Could be difficult for part-time students
      ii. Buckets should be removed
      iii. Competencies 3 and 4 need to be reworked as they’re the same thing
      iv. Would like to see more SPH course offerings
      v. Does not approve for now, needs more work

2. Practicum Policies
   a. Trying to standardize process more (strict deadlines for students, internal policies)
   b. Policy number 2: concern is what if supervisor doesn’t respond in 14 days?
      i. Paragraph 2B: change wording to something like “should communicate any issues or else… “
      ii. Include in original communication to supervisors that students will have to stop their work if this is not completed in a timely manner
      iii. Find out what committee meant by plus or minus 14 days

3. TA Guidelines
   a. Dean Galea recommended to have two columns: enrollment and range
      i. Number of TAs who get assigned is based on intensity of grading, etc.
      ii. Committee agrees this is fine and this will now go to GC

4. Teaching Award Discussion
   a. Committee agrees that awards should be meaningful and positive and that different sources of information should be used
   b. 5-10 awards will be given annually alongside student awards
      i. What is realistic to get as far as information?
         1. Senate felt that course evaluations were limited in their scope as far as what they could say about teaching within those realms, not as “big picture”
         2. Committee thinks we should use the following: student nomination, peer nomination, self-nomination, and alumni-nomination
            a. Using certificate directors, program directors, associate chairs if applicable
3. Using TAs to get more information since they have a bigger understanding of what’s going on in the classroom
   c. Looking for nominations for “excellence in teaching, dedication to student learning, caring, career preparation, skill building, mentoring, advising, innovation, taking risks”
   d. Committee will draft a document that will be distributed widely, ask people to nominate faculty thinking about items in Bullet C
      i. Separate committee will review – will include some Ed Com members, some faculty senate, previous winners
      ii. Requiring nominators to send a scored paper to see how they grade students, give feedback, etc.
   e. Shooting for February 2019 as a timeline (all of 2018 included and Fall 2017)
   f. Trish: this has been made to be an issue in the Faculty Senate, subcommittee came up with best options for Senate to review and send to EC

5. Causal Inference
   a. Background: overlap between Steve Pizer’s course and Biostats, two groups met and decided that one 4-credit course wouldn’t serve anyone
   b. Meeting last week: attempt to figure out a solution because committee doesn’t want to approve courses that will have low enrollment
      i. Proposal was that Steve would like to teach his 4-credit course during Spring 2020, Biostats would like to teach their 4-credit course in 2021
      ii. Courses will be offered on an alternating basis
      iii. A Biostats student could possibly take the HSR version and vice versa
      iv. If fewer than 5 students enroll, the course will be cancelled
   c. Committee agrees that these courses are hot topics right now so putting them on the books and evaluating as we move forward is the best approach
   d. Concerns: pushback won’t come until 2020, HSR students may not have the math background to take the course, in general we try not to run classes that have less than 5 students enrolled
   e. Amanda will send the proposals by email and committee will return feedback so that the respective groups can continue their processes

6. Phase 2 Proposals
   a. Participation grades changed as suggested
      i. Peer review down to 10%
      ii. Added another assignment for 20%
   b. Holding lecture and lab in two separate classrooms
   c. Committee approves both proposals