

## EPAG Minutes

Thursday, April 14th, 2016

3:00- 4:30, Campus Center 214

Attending: Andrew Beveridge, Kendrick Brown, Darcy Burgund, Ernie Capello (Chair), Caroline Duncombe, Susan Fox, Geoff Gorham, Cynthia Kauffeld, Mark Mazullo, Ann Minnick, Karine Moe, Jayne Niemi, Cory Stern

1. Minutes for April 7, 2016 -- Approved as circulated.
2. Chair communications -- Following the faculty's approval of the NTT motion, we are charged to have a voting rights conversation and motion, and that will be happening in October. While that timing is not in accord with the earlier non-binding resolution, the timeline was agreed to by RPC, FPC and NTT representatives. There will be some conversation with NTT faculty before then. The Task Force on Distribution Requirements will be reporting soon, according to Mark.
3. Cognitive Science Response: We discussed the response from the Cog Sci steering committee. We expect two documents to be forthcoming: a response to the Neuroscience Studies external review, and we also expect to have a proposal for a new major, perhaps a bit after the review response. The response to outside reviewers will come from Eric Wiertelak, and the new major proposal from Brooke Lea. Next year's conversation on these topics will have to be chaired for EPAG by someone other than Darcy, so the continuing members will arm-wrestle over that opportunity.
4. CDP Planning Conversation: Today's mission: What exactly is a curricular development plan? Karine enlightened us about how this would play with the potential of any upcoming capital campaign. We discussed how the Strategic Priorities might inform the CDP. Many thoughts about the CDP were bandied about. Some consider it a translation of curricular goals into a way of considering allocations requests. Others look to it as a place for creative curricular development to happen across departmental lines. It doesn't always have to be about allocations. It was mentioned as an opportunity to think about doing things differently instead of continually doing the things we already do. Also a framework for consultation, encouragement to be restless, an engine for innovation. It could be used when talking about distribution requirements, gen eds, core values, etc. Must it be a document of substance or could it be a list? What do some of the terms really mean -- "student demand", for example? How do we update the CDP -- because of new TT hires, new courses are offered, has the CDP had an effect on what or how people are teaching, taking something out of the plan might mean it has enough momentum to continue on its own. These could all cause changes to the document.
5. Adjourned at 4:29
6. Next meeting: NTT folks will join us.

Submitted by Jayne Niemi, Registrar