

## EPAG Minutes

Wednesday, December 3rd, 4:00 to 5:30

Campus Center 214

Aaron Brown, Kendrick Brown, Stephanie Ewbank, Pete Ferderer (Chair), Terri Fishel, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Tom Varberg

1. The minutes from the meeting of November 19<sup>th</sup> were approved. Jayne will not be attending any more December EPAG meetings, so Terri graciously agreed to take minutes for the rest of the month.
2. Course changes were approved as listed in the draft memo, with some verbal additions and after questions. Jayne will notify chairs and department coordinators of the approvals, and then circulate the updated memo (including the INTD course noted in item 6) to the faculty.
3. Russian Studies proposal to change their major: approved. Pete will notify the department.
4. Chinese minor proposal: We had many questions about this proposal, including the following: Are there enough additional courses? Are they offered frequently enough? Are they missing any possible areas, such as Music? Are three additional courses the appropriate number? There is a course numbering difference between page 1 and 2. We wonder about the clarity of the three-course requirement. Is there any concern about the level? Pete will write to Satoko Suzuki with our questions.
5. Proposed change to the Human Rights and Humanitarianism concentration: approved.
6. Urban Studies INTD 401 proposal: approved and Jayne will add it to the circulation memo.
7. Latin American Studies changes to the major: No action. Raymond Robertson is revising the proposal again after conferring with colleagues.
8. EPAG proposal to modify the GE Requirement certification: We reviewed current practice. Tom Varberg's draft was discussed – it was 2-part. Part 1 allowed chairs to indicate recertification at the time the course schedule is submitted. Part 2, which had two versions, allowed multiple sections to be recertified. We discussed what we can and can't do to the process under the current handbook rules. What kind of judgment is required of the chairs? Will they be reviewing syllabi? Is the exclusion of the Writing requirement in Proposal 2 appropriate? Are "boutique" courses the only ones subject to scrutiny – would regular courses get the same review? After more discussion of the process, we decided to adopt Option 1 of the proposal, and neither version of Option 2. Pete will report this at the faculty meeting and Jayne will ask Julie to email this additional instruction to department chairs. Her email will include a link to the page of already approved sections for all semesters starting with fall 2007.

9. Ad Hoc Committee on Restructuring EPAG: Discussion continued on the role of the Provost in the allocations process. We are trying to clarify that the voice of the faculty is heard in the process, since the faculty is advisory to the Provost. One missing piece seems to be that the Provost comes back to the allocations committee not just with her recommendation, but with all the allocations requests, her recommendations and other information, and then the allocations committee acts. At the very least, the practice should be to inform the faculty not only of the Provost's recommendations, but also the recommendations of the allocations committee, in case the two sets of the recommendations differ.
10. Spring Semester meeting time: Monday afternoon 3:30 to 5:00 is proposed. We will confirm via email, after everyone has had a chance to check, rearrange and respond.
11. Adjourned at approximately 5:40.

Respectfully submitted,

Jayne Niemi, Registrar