

EPAG Minutes  
March 31, 2011  
11:30 to 1:00  
Campus Center 207

Kendrick Brown, Gerbrand Hoogvliet, Taren Kingser, Terry Krier, Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Sonita Sarker, Patrick Schmidt (Acting Chair), Chad Topaz, Harry Waters Jr,

1. The minutes from March 24<sup>th</sup> were approved.
2. Course Change Memo: All changes were approved.
3. Advising reflections: Ann started us off on this topic, which she views as the beginning of an ongoing conversation about advising. She expanded a bit on the institutional advising perspective. She's been developing a resource page and welcomes the conversation. One question to consider is the state of advising currently. The subcommittee thought needed the broad goals first. Then we can assess where we are and what needs improvement. We reflected a bit on things like faculty development and the developmental stages of a student. Are these components as described in the document sufficient? There is the macro picture which includes institutional processes and broad goals and measures. Then there is the micro picture – are students getting what they need in individually advising? EPAG is charged with overseeing advising – not the micro-management of it. We would like to motivate good advising in ourselves and others. Gathering and sharing information would be valuable to the entire community. We talked a bit about how different everyone's expectations are and we can educate students and faculty/staff. Let us keep our focus on what the Advising Office of the institution can do to support faculty advising, while recognizing that advising is a team sport. Lots of information is available, but much of it is not used. Ann wants to know how best to communicate with faculty and students, especially when there are new resources. Survey? One to students and one to faculty? There is other information than what can be gathered by surveying – we still need to shed light on what the goals should be. Could we also use the survey to get feedback on the Essential Components document, or parts of it? There are also other models, like focus groups to gather information. We returned to the topic of institutional goals and discussed the variety of advising relationships from whole-person to more limited academic advising. Ann hears from faculty (especially the new ones) that they need training and information on expectations for advising. Ann wants to know if EPAG will endorse the Essential Components document, and then use surveying and other info-gathering to respond to the needs of the faculty. All of us are invited to send comments to Ann on the document and she will incorporate as appropriate. It will come forward again in the fall.
4. Humphrey proposal: We agree that if we approve this proposal, it should have to come to the full faculty for approval. Also, if approved there should be a formal written agreement between the institutions. We discussed the plusses and minuses of the proposal. We had many questions about the proposal, one of which was how this might work, practically speaking, for a student. Others were about

the references to the IGC Dean, the supervision arrangement in the shared year, and what are the positives for a Macalester student. Patrick will draft a response letter for our perusal.

Adjourned at 1:03

Respectfully submitted,  
Jayne Niemi, Registrar