

EPAG Minutes

Monday, February 2, 2009

3:30-5:00

Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer (chair), Terry Fishel, Terri Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Ann Minnick, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Eric Wiertelak, Tom Varberg

1. The minutes from the meeting on January 26, 2009 were approved.
2. Guests from Hispanic Studies: Molly Olsen and Leila Lehnen joined us to clarify their intentions regarding the addition of a new path in the Hispanic Studies minor. From EPAG's perspective, this is just another way for students to craft their minors, and doesn't need approval. Kathy asked about resources, given the statement that some new course proposals will be coming. Molly talked about how the current audience is bilingual Spanish and Portuguese, and in the future we will have the courses taught solely in Portuguese. Terry Fishel asked about library resources.
3. The General Education Assessment groups are nearly fully formed. Kathy added her perspective on the scope of this assessment of the Gen Eds.
4. Gen Ed demand and capacity: While there is no way to measure unmet demand, Jayne will report on capacity and enrollments after the drop/add deadline.
5. Restructuring EPAG: We decided to look at some of the individual parts of the whole document. What about five-person committees, including EPAG? There is importance in having overlap; different ways of thinking. The chair currently does 99 percent of the work, and this doesn't have to be the case. What about elections – with so many members it's hard to call it an election. It's more like an appointment of willing volunteers. More people (a larger committee) might be trusted more. There are other models like faculty senates with appointed committees, or everyone serves on something. We seem not to be in favor of a five-person EPAG. What about divisional representation? It seems we need a more explicit statement that divisional representation is about ways of thinking in various disciplines and not about representing the interests of the division in the political sense. Kendrick read the exact language about from the bylaws. There was some discussion of interdisciplinary departments being formally represented, Department chairs and program directors want to play more of a role. One suggestion was that Admissions could report to the chairs instead of EPAG, although that is a formally stated responsibility of EPAG. Kathy reported that she sees a difference with chairs discussing what they want to be doing, especially with regard to the major committees. If EPAG happens to have a department chair as a member, this communication happens – if there is no chair on EPAG then there should be an EPAG representative at the chairs' meetings. Also, given the current economic climate, we can't avoid the questions of how to handle possible elimination of programs. These discussions should happen before any such necessity arises.
6. Biology Dept review: We suggested questions for the reviewers. The questions should address the following discussions. Flesh out the department's question

- about the emphases – how many students use them and what load does that place on the department? Are the numbers sufficient to warrant having particular emphases? How do the department and its curriculum fare when compared to the broader world – we asked a really good question in the music department review that we could use again for this review. Is the major so demanding that it limits other opportunities for students, given our liberal arts mission?
7. David reported that the Internationalism Subcommittee rejected two fourth-year language courses. However, some other language courses have been approved in prior semesters. The Subcommittee seeks advice from EPAG. What should they do going forward? The conclusion was that we should judge each course by its goals. If the primary goal of the course is language acquisition, then it should not be approved for the internationalism requirement in future semesters.

Adjourned at 5:00

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne Niemi, Registrar