## EPCC Minutes November 11, 2008

## Attendance:

Colleen Johnson Dea Hoffman
Tony Tovar Ellen Krieger
Sally Mielke Darren Dutto
Mike Pierce Miriam Munck

Janet Jessup

## Decisions:

- 1. Move to approve minutes 10.28.08 APPROVED
- 2. Discussed EPCC membership language and the importance of having a member serve on EPCC to represent the students in the program formerly known as DDE.
  - Darren and Mike felt that the language should not be so limited. They believe the sentence should end
    at and a member of administrative faculty. The rest of the sentence that was suggested (who has an
    understanding of the unique needs of off-campus students as pertains to curriculum and other EPCC
    issues) should be omitted.
  - The suggested language presented to EPCC for discussion was moved to approve by Darren and seconded by Ellen.
  - Mike asked if he could bring the wording back to the college of business and get input before approving.
  - In order to follow proper meeting rules, it was required that the discussion be tabled since it had been moved to approve with a 2<sup>nd</sup>. When Mike asked for the discussion to be tabled, no-one seconded that motion.
  - After further discussion a motion to vote was recommended. Members voted with 8 in favor and 1 opposed.
  - Mike requested that the minutes reflect that the issue was discussed at length and still remains an issue for members of EPCC.
  - Organization language as presented was APPROVED.

## **Discussion:**

- 1. The committee reviewed the process for EPCC action requests (the form created by Tony). Mike asked how the form would be used? Tony indicates that it would be used as a reference for individuals completing the required EPCC forms so they would understand the process. Suggestions for change were discussed and Tony will provide a revised form. Once the form has been reviewed again, it will be posted to the EPCC webpage as reference. The committee agreed.
- 2. The committee discussed the process for GEC Course Requirements (the form created by Darren and Tony). The group discussed questions in regard to the audience the form would be used for. Phase I (approving new GEC courses) and phase II (reviewing current GEC courses to see if they meet the GEC criteria). More discussion is necessary.