

EPAG Minutes

January 31, 2013

3:00-4:30 Campus Center

Zach Avre, Holly Barcus, Kendrick Brown, Terri Fishel, 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 last semester were approved, after revising the section about specific department review questions. The questions are more accurately recorded in the letters kept in the Provost's files.
2. Course changes were approved and will be circulated to the full faculty.
3. We discussed the curricular visioning deadline, and decided not to extend it.
4. EPAG rep to the Ed Studies review: The review is on February 11th and 12th. Chad can do it if he's given a lot of flexibility. Joelle is only available on the 12th. Their names will be sent on to Ruthanne Kurth-Schai, who will attempt the daring feat of scheduling all parties.
5. We discussed Mark Davis's question about the GPA threshold for Honors GPA. Ann relayed some information related about the GPAs of past Honors recipients. We discussed some options given that there is so much variation in grading among disciplines. Is there a problem with each department setting a higher GPAs than the all-college mean/median, or using other criteria to judge potential projects? A research project does not have to be done for "honors". Some departments may have resource issues when it comes to sponsoring non-honors projects. GPA is indication of practical preparation to pursue an honors project that reflects a body of work. Is the problem that the quality of Honors Projects vary across disciplines and departments. Although we will decline to take action on Mark's suggestion, we will thank him for asking it and prompting some interesting discussion that is worthy of more follow-up. Maybe a Talking About Teaching, or Windows on our Work session on this topic would be appropriate. Ann gathered some questions to research across the departments. All of this may lead to better shared communication and perhaps a change in the language about capstones.
6. Emeriti Voting: We discussed the background of this motion intended to be brought to the faculty by Tom Varberg, including a reminder that a 30 day notice is required for constitutional changes. The subject of who is eligible to vote has come up in years past (in 07-08, when a quorum was called, for example). We have heard about it in other conversations when controversial votes were the subject. We clarified the reference to electronic voting – that is currently used only for committees. Other issues are still voted on the faculty floor. There was some expression of discomfort with how we are defining who votes, and why we think they should or should not vote. Aren't emeriti faculty more committed than visiting full-time temporary folks who are not discussed in this motion. Will this potential disenfranchisement alienate emeriti faculty? Do we need consistent language about the people voting on "working conditions" that applies to both emeriti and various flavors of visiting faculty? The actual question before us is whether EPAG endorses Varberg's specific motion. Kendrick has queried other colleges' about voting privileges and emeriti, and we are unusual to include them. He did not ask the same question about non-tenure-track visitors. This brings up other voting issues that come from changes in technology that might allow absentee voting electronically for eligible

faculty who are away. Voting issues ARE important. Sonita will summarize our discussion for Tom invite him to meet with us in person.

7. MESIC Review: We need more data than was provided. Jayne will try to fill in the blanks.
8. Future business items: We'll be reviewing the Handbook changes next week, but will likely be the March meeting at which they are considered. Curricular Visioning documents will be dealt with in the last 2 weeks of February. Next week be prepared with your calendars to set up March allocations meetings. There was a question about which things EPAG must approved – courses but not substantive changes in major requirements, for example. Should we be returning to this? There are other things coming towards us (writing, quantitative thinking, among others, including reviews.

Adjourned at 4:24.

Respectfully submitted by Jayne Niemi, Registrar