

EPCC minutes

January 6, 2009

Those in attendance: John Bolen, John Pauley, Rick Spellerberg, Gwen Schroder, Mike Hadden, Ann Woldt, Hannah Landgraf, Julie Summer, Ron Albrecht, Tracy Dinesen, Steve Griffith, Walter Pearson

I. December 9th Minutes approved

II. Policies

a. Policy L

- i. Change in Language looks good.

b. Policy J

- i. It seems to express the direction that the faculty member who brought this up was concerned about. The Dean feels that it eliminates many steps (department chair, division head etc) and it seems to be overkill. The important thing is that there is a written policy. More than likely it won't get to the Dean's level. It is nice that the language is clear that the limits are purely mathematical.

- c. Pauley moves, Spellerberg seconds; the committee approves to send to the faculty.

III. Dead Week

- a. What is our purpose? To not make finals due the final week of classes and ensure that faculty use the final exam time? OR Make sure that students have time to prepare for final exams?
- b. Classically it has been thought that no new projects or assignments will be given and there will there be no tests or papers due.
- c. The final exam or final paper/project will be due during the final exam time.
- d. What about college sponsored events during dead week that require student absences? It is even rare for athletes to be gone. It should be brought up in rationale even if it could be violated.
- e. Mark will make revisions to language and we will work on it next meeting.

IV. Point of Clarification.

- a. Late Proposals for May Term. The requirement for Junior/Senior status has been removed for ENG 297 (Carasquillo's course) and will be numbered 397.

V. Routing questions to Mark as chair

- a. While questions are welcomed it will probably be most beneficial if we address questions to the chair of department/proposer.
- b. Dean seconds that to the committee in order to make committee meetings more efficient.
- c. Bolen adds: If your department is proposing a new program please don't call the registrar to put students in it prior to faculty approval.

VI. Sociology Proposal

- a. Can you talk about the elimination of field experience and seminar which has in the past served as the capstone for majors?
 - i. It was a split decision; each one of the department members was divided. The goal was to give students more of a choice, either a field work experience, or taking on the second methods class, doing their own research projects. Additionally, students had to do field work in every area they specialized in meaning that some students were doing 3 field experiences. If the capstone requirement for major is approved the department will reconsider field work but will also look at the idea and goals of a capstone course.
- b. Where are you assessing your program?
 - i. Right now the assessment paperwork has not been consistent and what is still consistently done is a three-way interview. They have a fair idea of the field work experience and the success. Really the assessment that is done is related to the field experience itself, not in capping the education in criminology/sociology/etc. In reality it is not a true capstone course.
- c. For CJ there are 2 electives required but there are 11 possible choices. That seems like an awful lot of electives to be staffing and have in the catalog.
 - i. The issue for the department is: how far outside of the discipline should they encourage students to go? How far is too far? There isn't a course listed there that the department hasn't considered not teaching. Most of them come from the elective list that they had before. They are trying to maximize student choices.
- d. Are these electives consistent with other programs?

- i. He doesn't know personally, Fred Jones would say that it is better than other programs in the region.
- e. Is it appropriate to only have 2 courses as electives? Can the advisor advise the students as to what electives to take instead of having a list?
 - i. That is certainly a possibility and it is what they have done in the Master's Program.
- f. How can you put field experience in the same category as regular course experiences? This is what makes us stand apart. Isn't it?
 - i. This was Freyberg's argument:
 - 1. How?
 - a. We want to get down to 10 courses and we need to maintain flexibility for the students. The second methods course will be more beneficial for those headed to graduate school.
 - 2. You could add a sheet that discusses what is important for graduate school versus moving into the work force.
- g. This is consisted with recommendations from governance boards for CJ and there are things that they would like to do but they don't have the resources to do.
- h. Have Political Science and Psychology signed off on the proposal?
 - i. Yes and they even talked to the instructors of the courses added.
- i. Language on Page 3: Second concentration and the footnote
 - i. Will change from any to either
- j. Pg. 22 List of reported changes. It has been the committee's practice in the past the renumbering require a course change form. Even if the descriptions don't change you should submit the form.
 - i. Can submit forms.
- k. What do we want to do about departmental names? Do we need a policy/procedure?
 - i. In the past it was always reported as a name change. If we want to make a change in practice/policy we need to make it known and create the procedure and information needed.
- l. Pauley moved to approve the proposals with necessary amendments; seconded Spellerberg and approved to send to faculty for the 28 day wait.

VII. Adjourned.

VIII. Next meeting is the 27th of January. Don't forget the meeting next Tuesday with BCC and FPC at 4:30 in McNeil 107.