

EPAG Minutes  
Monday, October 5, 2009  
3:30-5:00  
Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer, Terri Fishel, Cheng Gu, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn (chair), Kathy Murray, Michael Orr, Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Robert Strickling, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak

1. Minutes: With two corrections to the attendance roster, the minutes of September 28<sup>th</sup> were approved.
2. CDP: The discussion began with the review of some of the posts on Moodle. Pete's example of very concise wish lists is where we started. It's important to get information from departments – the experts! It might provide information on overlap. Some of this is what Terry talked about in her post – thoughts from departments on the trends of the future, as well as their achievements. Terry described what had happened at Notre Dame, which was a good learning experience. So there would be 40 statements? Terry is looking for a slower path and a more visionary, richer result – separate from allocations. What about things that happen across departments? We might pick up trends. But are the interests of all faculty going to come through in departmentally-based documents? Terri has been trying to find an example framework, and distributed copies for study. So if we solicit statements from departments -- then what? Do we write a CDP? Then what? We start allocations review? Pete would find it helpful to have a broadly based document that could be studied prior to the allocations reading and process. A census, a map? Are there really two things – one broad, and one specific to allocations? David's document is focused on the practical and very functional. He tried to describe the advantages of starting with the function and following with the form. Patrick expressed concerns about a less clear-cut example for outright rejection than the easy ones we have used to illustrate such a case. There still need to be principles to guide allocations. Patrick's post about a point system piques interest – it seems more nuanced than “primary” and “secondary”. We do need to articulate principles. The CDP is meant to elaborate on what is already in the handbook. Perhaps we need to articulate the link between allocations and curriculum. So if we start with the CDP as the kernel it would be fine, but we still need the less concrete, more visionary, more long-term census of the college. The CDP is a list of growth areas that can be supported through allocations. That would be the benchmark against which allocations are measured. Kathy asked if last year's later timeline would work this year? That would allow, perhaps, the development of the CDP in the way we wish it. Everyone seems to agree with the concept of a line lying fallow for a year after denial of an allocation request, although in following years it could get muddy. Look forward to more discussion of the CDP next week.
3. EPAG response to Biology Department review and response: After further editing, the letter was deemed ready to send.

4. Request for Lorne Robinson to visit: The invitation letter was edited, in part to make clear that we want enough time for questions and answers. Perhaps a 10 minute presentation, leaving 20 minutes for Q and A.
5. Course changes: The draft memo on course changes was reviewed and approved. Jayne will circulate it to the faculty, after changing the General Education statement to reflect the change to a rolling deadline.

Adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jayne Niemi, Registrar