The Educational Policy Committee met roughly every other week, and we spent time on a variety of matters over the year. The following lists topics we discussed over the year.

**Credit hour issue** — The NEASC review found Tufts to be out of alignment with their Policy on Credits and Degrees. EPC discussed the issue and decided that work needed was extensive enough to warrant forming a special committee. We drafted the charge for the Academic Credit Compliance Committee (AC3), which formed and began its work in November. AC3 has been working intensively since then to develop a proposal for bringing Tufts credit system into better alignment with Carnegie units. Carmen Lowe is the chair.

**Student overload** — We discussed and decided to table the topic of student overload, expecting that the work by the AC3 would help address the problem. In particular, giving more academic credit to courses that involve significantly more work (e.g. lab sciences, languages) will help students anticipate workloads.

**World Civilization** — We have spent several meetings discussing the World Civilizations requirement, out of concern that it has wandered from its original intent. It has been a challenging topic for us, for a number of reasons, starting with the difficulty of defining its purpose in precise enough language to support course design and selection. After a fair amount of discussion, including an attempt at a proposal we decided wasn’t ready, we recommended a roundtable discussion on the topic, which Dean Nancy Bauer arranged. Since then, a subgroup of EPC has been working to draft an alternative proposal, but their schedules and the ongoing difficulty of the question have made progress slow. We plan to take up this topic again in the fall.

**Tufts online courses** — We revised the proposal we had prepared the year before, fixing problems identified by the Executive Committee and by the AS & E curriculum committees. We presented the proposal to the ASE faculty, and it passed. The new policy (1) raises the limit for online courses from two to five, to count for undergraduate degrees, and (2) establishes a two-tier process for approving Tufts courses to be taught online.

**Transfer online courses** — We also submitted an interim proposal to allow up to two online courses from other universities for transfer credit, but that proposal voted down by the ASE faculty meeting. There were a number of concerns, many the same as arose in the discussion for the Tufts policy. One of the major concerns was a misunderstanding: Two members of the faculty claimed that departments can only decide what will count for their major, in the transfer of credit, not what counts for general credit. They were mistaken, but nobody corrected them. We have requested time in an ASE meeting to clarify the policy. In the fall, we will consider whether to ask for a reconsideration of the proposal.
Student access to online course evaluations — We reviewed the current policy — on
the books but not currently active — that allows students access to the numerical
portions of online course evaluations. We endorsed this policy, but we felt it should
come before the faculty again to be acknowledged, along with a set of other
adjustments and the question we would like to raise of whether we should work on
designing a policy that would give students access to comments in course evaluations.
We have submitted this proposal for a faculty meeting in the fall.

Code of conduct — At the request of the Committee on Student Life, we reviewed and
discussed the Code of Conduct along with the CSL “guiding principles” in its application.
The Code and Principles had language that seemed inappropriate — for example, taken
literally and precisely, they would mean a penalty of suspension for a student who takes
her cell phone from her bag to silence its ring during an exam. We discussed the Code
and principles, and we made some recommendations to CSL for revisions.

Final exam policies — We discussed the question of whether to revise policies to
protect students from having to take three finals in one day. We decided not to change
the policy, but we recommended adding language to the faculty handbook to say that
syllabi need to specify when the exam will take place, and the course needs to adhere
to it.

Declaration of minor — We discussed the process and timing for declaring a minor, but
we decided to table the topic until iSIS is farther along.

Foundation and distribution requirements — We revisited this topic, still thinking it needs
attention, noting that it is one of the A&S Dean’s Working Goals: “Create a process for
reviewing foundation and distribution requirements in the undergraduate curriculum.” At
the same time, we have our experience from the year before, which suggests that we
need the faculty to support it as an endeavor before we undertake it. We prepared and
submitted a proposal to the A&S Strategic Planning Committee, suggesting that SP (or
SP and EPC together) bring a proposal to the faculty to form a task force that would
synthesize objectives for our undergraduate curriculum and design foundation and
distribution requirements that would meet those objectives. SP plans to work on that
proposal.

Extraordinarium degrees — The Provost asked us to consider awarding
“extraordinary degrees” en masse to former Tufts students who graduated early in
order to go to medical or dental school, during WW II. Sol Gittlement had made several
one-off decisions to award extraordinary degrees to individuals in this category, and
David Harris felt it was unfair to do this only for those who think to ask. We reviewed
some candidate transcripts for these degrees, most of which included two years or less
of coursework. We decided we could not support the proposal as is; we suggested
directions for further discussion and invited David or Kevin Dunn, now Associate
Provost, to visit in the fall to discuss.