

EPAG Minutes

Monday, November 30, 2009

3:30-5:00

Campus Center 214

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

1. Minutes: approved with some tweaking of the Sarah Lawrence numbers, and a typo near the end. Also, there were some clarifications to the CDP section.
2. Admissions Director meeting follow-up: What is our next step? We all found it useful session and learned from Lorne's presentation. David will send a thank you note with an invitation to continue the conversation. There's still some cloudiness among us about how information is conveyed by departments to Admissions. Not everyone who has been a chair recalls having been a part of the Academic Updates process. Jayne will call Nancy Mackenzie to see what the process and calendar is for the Academic Updates. Encourage them to invite/schedule chairs/program directors to talk with the tour guide – EPAG would be delighted to facilitate communication in any way!
3. CDP: David distributed an arrowless chart to all of us, illustrating the majors most schools have in common, and others that are less frequently offered. We have a ten school comparison group for data collection. (There was a brief pause in the action in order to appreciate delivery of chocolate.) Pete spoke to using the other group of 17 schools from the Academic Quality Taskforce report because it provides a picture of trends. We recalled that the group of 10 was chosen for similarity in enrollment and endowment size. If faculty FTE numbers are desirable, then Kathy has to reach out to her colleagues and a smaller group ensures more successful participation. Perhaps the 2002 data could be incorporated for the ten, so that there is a trend comparison. Or Dan Balik could use David's template to give us comparison numbers from five and ten years ago. What data do we want? The answer was enrollment by department, faculty FTE, thus a dept student/faculty ratio. Kathy will ask this of her colleagues. David is yearning for a range of variability – what is normal in a field? We could see variations over time; those ratios may evolve and show imbalances and trends therein. Kendrick looked at points A (shape and breadth) B (persisting imbalances) C (faculty diversity) in the shell of the CDP. We have data supporting A and B. What about C? What is diversity in this context? We have data on race – this is part of IPEDS. What about the supply of PhDs in various fields? Terry recalled working with Jane Rhodes, and discussing how the reconfiguration of knowledge (curriculum) allowed for more diversity. To do list: Kathy will get diversity info from Dan and find out what he can collect for the other institutions. What about inviting Jane Rhodes to participate in that writing? Terry will contribute to the writing of C, and will share her paragraph with Jane. Pete is willing to do A or B. Patrick is more interested in A than B. Carleton will work with Pete. David will work with Patrick on A. Are there other comments

on this framework? In the CDP, is there a concept for how we decide on which languages are taught? Terry, Patrick and David may be conferring about this issue. Now back to the document...and back to languages. The CDP may include questions that are still open. Please look at the section that reviews the process for maintaining the CDP. There may be more calls for proposals in the initial years of the CDP, and then later at three-year intervals. Section II is up for comment and discussion – this is the role of the CDP in the allocations process. We don't want to tie the hands of future committees. Flexibility is important. So it will be revised. Please send comments on the framework to David.

4. Music Department Letter: One suggestion was to drop the paragraph about the mission statement. Others had some suggestions for wording. Kathy reviewed the context of the comments on the building process. With these changes, the letter is good to go!
5. Course change memo: approved.
6. Proposals for the CDP are due on Friday, so we need to review them quickly for similarities, and to ask, if necessary, for other feedback. We'll talk about them on Monday. They will be posted on Moodle for our reading pleasure.

Adjourned at 5:02

Respectfully submitted,  
Jayne Niemi, Registrar