

EPAG Minutes  
Monday, November 2, 2009  
3:30-5:00  
Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer, Terri Fishel, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Kathy Murray, Michael Orr, Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Robert Strickling, Tom Varberg

1. Minutes of October 26th: approved, after David clarified one of the bullets under the CDP and passed his notes to Terri.
2. Lorne Robinson has agreed to join us on November 23<sup>rd</sup>.
3. Terry has resigned her position on the GERC. A replacement appointment will need to be made.
4. Course change memo – all changes were approved.
5. Next semester's meeting time – Jayne will check on times when we are all available and report back. Since this will be done prior to registration, the students may not know their schedules yet, and we're not sure who the student representatives will be for next semester.
6. Patrick asked that we discuss the balance of study away document next week. Kendrick will post the documents relating to this discussion.
7. CDP: The call has gone out. We still have a range of ideas about the document and the process. Pete reviewed his report and asked that some version of this might be included in the CDP. He also passed out additional data. If it's not something that EPAG concludes should be part of the CDP, perhaps there should be a minority report. Carleton pointed out that the numbers for fine arts have a significant discrepancy because of the way lesson and ensemble load is calculated. He also mentioned that a more lengthy historical view might show that the humanities and/or fine arts were not highlighted as part of the institutional mission. We were referred to section 7 of the handbook, and the second order criteria – is this information about enrollment and work load already there? It was noted how overcrowding affects the student experience, and can diminish the academic excellence a department can provide. There is a perception that faculty will tolerate the high numbers and the resulting workload increases to benefit the students, but that practice is not sustainable. A rookie 1<sup>st</sup> year EPAG member reading the CDP is using it for guidance, so it should be useful to such a person. Pete's data shows that there is divisional imbalance and it's getting worse for the social sciences, it seems. There is a lack of clarity about where the arguments, whether compelling stories or data, should reside – is it in the CDP or in the allocations requests. It's generally accepted that there are differences among the divisions and pedagogy. It seems that an imbalance already exists, and it could get worse. Patrick reported that he's been working on a "preamble" sort of thing, and found a problem with conflicting handbook language. Others confirmed that there is a difference between what is on paper, and what we actually do. If the CDP has both a bird's eye view and ten year trend information, it will be too much. Can we move the very important trend info to the allocations process?

- Another person said he thought it should stay in the CDP. We attempted to clarify who the audience is for the report Pete wrote – is it really the allocations committee or the whole college? We all agree that transparency is good. One of the goals of Pete’s report (the most important) is to inform the people sitting on allocations committee. David reminded us that one version of our plan was to first get a wish list, with no accounting. Then allocations take things into account (like students hanging from the rafters), so wishes are or are not granted. There was solid support for the idea of a rationale for why something makes the CDP or not. We wish/need to defend publicly the stand we take. At least one member thought that a draft of a preamble would include some of Pete’s report, and that we should move from discussion to drafting a document. David is worried that the scope of the CDP has crept beyond his intentions. Patrick, as volunteer writer of the preamble, said his goals are to inform the consideration of allocations deliberation, and promote the transparency of the process. This is what we think a CDP should look like: preamble, wish list and rationale. Needs, opportunities, added on. What about a cauldron for ideas that’s available for the full internal audience? The data needs to be presented in a useful way. Would having something in a public repository discourage someone from updating a proposal?
8. Conflict of interest issues: past chairs of the joint committee abstained from doing proposals, although the full committee did not. Some feel that no one on EPAG should participate. Others would argue against that as a violation of academic freedom. We debated whether it is more honest and transparent to allow members to submit proposals and then recuse themselves from the deliberation on those proposals. That is now the plan.
  9. Preparation for upcoming faculty meeting: David plans to report on the allocations process beginning to actually follow the handbook language. It would be good to have a Moodle forum ready to roll for after the faculty meeting. Setting a generous but definite word limit is advisable.
  10. Task Force for Facilities: Brian Longley’s request for such a group to work on classroom environment, equipment, furnishing, and out of class learning areas was discussed. It was suggested that it should be advisory group (not a task force) to the Provost and Treasurer instead of EPAG. That idea was declared brilliant, and it was requested that two faculty members be appointed.
  11. Terry’s replacement on GERC: we need someone from humanities or fine arts, hopefully with some assessment experience. Several individuals were identified as possible candidates. Kathy and Pete will work together.

Adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jayne Niemi, Registrar