

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

Present: Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer (chair), Terri Fishel, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Andrew Meeker, Ann Minnick, Kathy Murray, Terence Steinberg, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak

1. Minutes from Feb. 23, 2009 meeting were approved with minor edits. Added “s” to #3 to make “courses” and a question mark after “artistic expression” in #12. (revised copy attached)

2. Firm Allocations Committee Meeting Dates:
Monday, March 30, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m. (regular EPAG meeting time) AND
Tuesday, March 31, 5:45-8:45

If you have special dietary requests, please contact Jan Peterson.

3. A Moodle Group course will be prepared for EPAG. Pete will contact Barron Koralesky to request a course be set up.

4. Update on Program Accordance for Legal Studies and MESIC. Pete doesn't have anything more to update. Khaldoun Samman will come to EPAG next Monday.

5. January course issue was resolved.

6. Terry K. met with the external reviewers for Music.

7. Governance – By-Laws and Handbook Language for the Restructuring of EPAG. We reviewed Tom Varberg's draft. Kendrick asked about the expectations regarding faculty response. The group suggested that the purpose was in strengthening communication, not in changing governance. In discussing the faculty response, Pete suggested adding an EPAG representative to attend the Chair's monthly meeting. Tom will add that to item g of his document.

Carleton shared information and email exchanges on his section regarding the duties of the Presiding Officer and Secretary of the Faculty. The question was how best to resolve changes that are made in one part of the handbook to confirm that there are not inconsistencies elsewhere in the handbook as a result of the changes. Discussion about how to review when the committee is making substantive changes on governance docs. EPAG serves as the rules committee. It was suggested that EPAG should be reviewing and troubleshoot as things come up, but that it wasn't necessary to add another layer of complexity to the process by adding ad hoc committees to review the changes. It was suggested that a reader could read and review for inconsistencies, but that it doesn't require specific expertise. Pete suggested that we need to be more careful at

looking at our footprint. It was determined that Carleton does not need to pursue writing up a section on changing the duties of the Presiding Officer and Secretary of the Faculty.

8. Student appeals of academic policy. EPAG has handled a few appeals this year. Study abroad applications that have been turned down, for example, but any appeal goes to EPAG. This includes GER. Ann Minnick is the chair of the Academic Standing Committee, but not the final decision. Currently, the process for grade appeals go first to the faculty member, then the chair and faculty member and then to Kathy Murray and the chair. Student members of EPAG expressed the view that appeals to EPAG provide a more diverse range of opinion. It was mentioned that only appeals that have procedural issues should be reviewed. It was then suggested that the new Associate Dean of the Faculty could determine if there had been a procedural error before the appeal is sent to EPAG. If no procedural basis, the appeal ends. Terry K. will work on the language for this piece and circulate by midweek.

Other issues are still coming.

9. Gen Ed Assessment and report from Internationalism Group. The third of reports was shared. Pete will be meeting with Karl Wirth and Nancy Bostrom to get the correct language for the IDEA form. After discussion it was determined that some minor wording should be suggested to rephrase #3 to read “Understanding the tension between *local and* broad international or transnational *issues such as* globalization or diasporas.” Pete will return suggestions to Linda Shulte-Sasse.

10. Revising policy for incompletes. Laurie Hamre requested that Ann, Jayne Niemi, Jim Hoppe and Terry Krier look at the incomplete policy and clarify how we define “unusual circumstances.” We reviewed the proposal that Ann had shared with the group. The question of difference in length of time between the end of the semester and the first day of class for Spring versus Fall semesters was discussed. Could we use 5 weeks from the end of any semester for consistency? This document does not need faculty approval, but it does need to be announced to the faculty for feedback. We did not reach closure on this topic, so we will return for further discussion.

11. Report on the Campus Summit. Andrew and Terence reported on the Saturday Summit of student representatives from various campus committees. This was the first meeting, and the plan is to have monthly meetings in order for students to share what their committees are working on. The goal is to improve networking and communication. Topics included the tenure process, IGC, student org spaces, space in the library, and responsible investments. Pete asked if students talked about curriculum in this venue. Terence reported that they didn’t, but that students aren’t that critical of curriculum. Terence also reported that a survey is being prepared to ask students about which general education requirements they have filled. We had to conclude at this time as guests for the next item on the agenda arrived.

12. Suzanne Hansen, from the Sustainability Office along with two students from her Environmental Studies senior seminar met with EPAG to discuss how our curriculum addresses or should address sustainability. This initiative is based on the fact that President Rosenberg has signed the Presidents Climate Commitment and we have to come up with a plan and a date to

reach being climate neutral. In addition, the plan has to include how sustainability will be included in the curriculum and co-curricular activities. Students in Suzanne's class are writing up a plan to reach neutrality by 2030 or 2050 as part of their work for the class. Suzanne reported on some events already targeted for the faculty including a faculty wine and cheese event, and faculty survey, but she wants to know how best to work with EPAG and how to share the information they receive. The sustainability strategic planning process is currently underway and they have had several meetings with staff, but have not had a lot of faculty input.

Discussion included sharing information with the students on the process to create a concentration, and how the multicultural gen ed requirement was created. Terence suggested pursuing grant funding as a means of developing a program that would reach a broad audience. A concentration would be limited to those who were interested, while developing a means to include a requirement would reach a broader audience. Terry Krier asked about the course management system as a means of improving sustainability, as well as course content. The recommendations that Suzanne's class are preparing will be given to the President. We ran out of time for further discussion.

Adjourned at 5 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Terri Fishel, Library Director