

EPAG Minutes
January 27, 2011
11:30 to 1:00
Campus Center 214

Janet Folina, Gerbrand Hoogvliet, Taren Kingser, Terry Krier, Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Sonita Sarker, Patrick Schmidt, Chad Topaz, Tom Varberg (Chair), Harry Waters Jr

1. Welcome to the new faces around the table!
2. Minutes were approved as circulated.
3. Announcements: Harry will represent EPAG on the Student Learning Committee. We will need to read and comment on the Sustainable Growth Task Force report. Tom will send a link to that document. We reviewed the syllabus for the term and potential agenda items.
4. We need a new representative for the Department Chairs meeting. Janet will serve, since she will be there anyway as chair of the Philosophy Department this semester.
5. Course changes were approved after brief discussion of the process.
6. Geology Department review: Do we have additional questions for the reviewers besides the standard three questions? We should ask something about faculty workload and clarity of expectations. Are there ways to generate courses that encourage more links across departments and divisions, encouraging the progress that has already been made? Tom will draft the questions and send them on to Kendrick. We need one or two EPAG representatives to meet with the review team. Both Tom and Harry volunteered.
7. Departmental Discontinuance: Tom did a quick review of what's been done thus far. Timing-wise, we should quickly send out a "save the date" email for the open forum, to be followed by the document. We want to bring the proposal to the March faculty meeting. We now have a draft dated 1/21/11 to work on, drafted by Tom and reviewed by Patrick and Terry. Is this a change to the handbook or the by-laws? We think it is a handbook change. We talked about the objection motion, and how there should be an advance notification of objection. Objections from the floor still may happen and we want to be sure that the work of the committee isn't overturned without time for thoughtful reflection about the recommendation and the objection. We talked about rephrasing the part about the department meeting individually or as a group, and how explicit we should make it. We reminded ourselves that EPAG is tasked with curricular decisions, and discussions are not about personnel but curricular issues. We worked to clarify the wording about who is recused from discontinuance discussions if we are ever faced with a particular case. We also discussed the reasons for and benefits of hearing out various constituencies, and when and where those hearings should happen. We suggested a separate town hall meeting for students for purposes of transparency. Could the timeline be a bulleted list? How will resources (or lack thereof) be part of the consideration? We often see that information in the review

documents that we are looking at. Sometimes, if a department review is too recent, we may have to look at two reviews. Also, other liberal arts colleges and comparison data should be part of the consideration. Another issue for discussion, is there a "bye" after surviving a review?

Adjourned at 1:02

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne Niemi, Registrar