

Educational Policy and Governance (EPAG) Committee

Meeting Minutes

Campus Center 214

April 27, 2010

Present: Max Cady, Pete Ferderer, Terri Fishel, Gerhard Hoogvliet, Terry Krier, Carlton Macy, David Martyn (Chair), Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak

1. Approval of Minutes – David sent a few corrections to Jayne. One substantive change was that the word “request” be changed to “required” in item number 5. Approved.
2. Proposal for a Chinese Major – New Documents were shared. Discussion focused on whether to make a recommendation for the Chinese major. Procedure is that EPAG makes the recommendation of the creation of a Chinese major with the accompanying rationale. Questions included:
  - a. How are prerequisites calculated? Have they exceeded the maximum number of courses required for a major?
  - b. Should their description include a statement about “encouraging” a year abroad, versus a semester in the catalog copy? Jayne will contact about this issue.
  - c. There were several questions about the catalog copy. The use of CHIN would not be used until the 2011-12. Clarification was requested for the concentration description, language proficiency and requirements, and methodology course if taken outside Asian Studies. There was concern that no “triple minors” develop. In addition, “Asian Studies” should be used consistently throughout the catalog description.

David will get back to Asian Studies regarding the suggested changes. The group agreed that the Chinese major is approved contingent on catalog copy being revised and approved.

3. Assessing the Allocations Process and the CDP  
David had a series of questions about the allocation process. Agreement was reached on the following:
  - a. Allow more time between the time when requests are initially reviewed and the time when responses are due from departments to EPAGs follow-up questions. Allow at least two weeks.
  - b. Keep an archive of memos to departments regarding allocations that the case manager can refer to. Also, we will ask Jan or Winnie to pull the last ten allocations memos for the committee to review..
  - c. Request that the Provost be very clear when communicating with department chairs after the allocations decisions about points or concerns that need to be expressed to depts
  - d. We do not take minutes for allocations discussions and thus discussions are not documented. Case manager will summarize discussion and identify strengths and weaknesses, then formulate a letter that will be sent to each requesting department after the allocations process is over. These documents would also be available for the next year’s allocation committee.
  - d. Coach departments by having CST and Kendrick meet with department chairs. There is interest in formalizing the case manager role to include a meeting with the dept. after we formulate questions for the dept. The first meeting should be the department meeting with the case manager instead of meeting with the allocation committee. Send case manager only if we have a need for clarifying questions, but even if case managers go to the department, every dept. would still have the option to come and talk to EPAG for no more than 15 minutes. It would be optional, not required for dept. to come to

committee. We would encourage that no department chair bring more than two people to the meeting.

e. Provost memo was very helpful and this was the first time that it was done in this manner. All agreed this should be repeated.

4. New members for EPAG at the next meeting. The question was whether new members should be invited to the last meeting. It has been a tradition and if the election results are known, they should be invited. There is potential for also discussing scheduling the time for weekly meetings.

Adjourned at 4:31.

Respectfully submitted Terri Fishel