

EPAG Minutes

February 28, 2013

3:00-4:30 Campus Center

Zach Avre, Holly Barcus, Terri Fishel, Janet Folina, Ezequiel Jimenez Martinez, Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Sonita Sarker (Chair), Jaine Strauss, Chad Topaz, Joelle Vitiello, Harry Waters Jr.

1. Approval of minutes: The minutes from February 14th were approved, with some of the details about Holly's plans deleted.
2. Course changes: Those on the memo and added to it verbally were approved, and Jayne will circulate the updated memo to the full faculty.
3. Reminder: Board of Trustees is meeting next week.
4. Curricular Visioning: We reviewed the comments made on the shared spreadsheet about areas of Strength, Vision, Requests and Connections. These categories were created to help guide our reading and highlight trends. Some of the themes that came across were interdisciplinarity, many things Asian, global health, computation, world literature, all things global, sustainability. One purpose of this work is to identify strengths already on campus to support new initiatives that are being dreamed. Although we asked for a curricular vision, we noted that growth in departments without growth in physical space and staffing would be problematic. One example was the high value we place on faculty/student collaboration, but such collaborations can be difficult to administer and coordinate. In other words, equipment, staff support, and space are often tied to curricular change. It was surprising to some of us that study away was not mentioned much, and that there were fewer references to civic engagement than expected. If some of these visions are to be realized, is it possible to hire differently or categorize FTE differently? That appeared in a number of documents, perhaps because everyone is so aware of our need to be budget-neutral. This exercise and resulting documents should aid the Provost, as she would be a primary agent of change when it comes to the possible conversion of these visions into positions.
5. QT report: Our goal is to bring a motion to the faculty at the April meeting. No one is in favor of another survey to solicit feedback from the faculty. Comments could be directed to the Moodle Forum site so that feedback can be conversational. It's not the requirement itself, but the course approval criteria that is being changed. Does it really require a vote of the full faculty? The language of 2005 is about voting to endorse changes and rationales for those. Sonita will confirm with Kendrick what the faculty vote actually covers. We certainly want the faculty to know what's expected for a course to qualify as Q1, 2, or 3. What about student input into these changes, and how can that feedback be "bundled" in a way that the feedback will be constructive? We agreed that student input and understanding is important. Zach and Ezequiel will work through student government to solicit feedback.
6. Allocations Prep: (students are excused) Sonita reviewed the "who, where, what, when and how" of allocations. She will be forwarding the instructional document to the group.

Adjourned at 4:35

Respectfully submitted by Jayne Niemi, Registrar