

EPAG Minutes – Draft

Tuesday, April 13, 2010

3:00 – 4:30

Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer, Terri Fishel, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Kathy Murray, Ann Minnick, Michael Orr, Patrick Schmdt, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak
Students Max Cady and Gerard Hoogvliet joined us at 3:45 p.m. after the allocations discussion.

1. Approval of the minutes – approved.
2. Last meeting will be May 4th.
3. Allocations memo – We had a discussion on the length of responses. It was decided to list the responses in alphabetical order by department with the results. As this is an opportunity to move away from previous format, it was suggested that language could include “department previously had [name of person] in this position.” It was agreed that the shorter pieces on approved requests should be expanded to include a rationale for the positive result; and that the same language should be used in each case when an EPAG member recused him/herself from the discussion. An affirmative action statement should be added for the Geography response. David will send an email by Friday evening.
4. Proposal for a Chinese Major – a summary of the overlap issue was provided, and our decision two years ago about Math’s proposal based on the amount of overlap for students in the major. The discussion focused on tracks versus major versus a focus. Some departments such as History, English, and Philosophy all have a major without sub-tracks. The main issue appears to be parity between Japanese and Chinese. Questions and issues for Asian Studies include:
 - Provide EPAG with the data regarding frequency of courses
 - Reconcile discrepancy between our assessment of overlap and the department report
 - Identify if there is any way that they can make these two programs distinct enough
 - 294 is a topics course – how would they make this a permanent course?
 - Potential for transition in history faculty – how can they guarantee ongoing nature of course offerings?
5. College Course Evaluation Policy – we had a brief discussion of whether EPAG could mandate evaluations or if it had to go to the faculty for a vote. Concerns were raised as to where evaluations should go? It was determined that if part of the faculty addendum included a section on assessment, the evaluations could go to chairs, who could report on them in their letters supporting their faculties’ addenda. It should be an expectation that every faculty member do this. Addendum could be rephrased to talk about assessment and offer every faculty member a means to reflect. Faculty member writes the narrative that goes to the Provost and this would put everything in control of the faculty member. This proposal would apply to non-tenured track faculty as well as tenure-track and tenured faculty.

We adjourned at 4:36.

Respectfully submitted by Terri Fishel, Library Director