

## EPAG Minutes

March 14, 2013

3:00-4:30 Campus Center

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

1. Approval of minutes: The minutes from March 7th were approved, after some editing for clarity.
2. USM Requirement: Those who attended the Talking about Teaching session from last week reported on that good discussion. Mostly, the conversation about the proposed move from USM to USID. Town halls have been scheduled, and they are the first step. We would like more “buy in” before drafting a motion. Sonita shared the feedback gathered by the students. Most of that was about accessibility to 100 and 200 level courses and having courses across the curriculum. Overall they were receptive to the change and expressed that this shift more clearly articulates the goals of the requirement and the mission of the college. In one of the meetings with faculty, the meaning of “identity” seemed to cause the most conversation. EPAG members: Attendance at the town halls is encouraged.
3. Draft of Curricular Visioning Report: Sonita shared the document in its current draft and anticipates sending us a draft after spring break. We noted that “sustainability” came up in the documents more than we had previously noted. Some things are already in the CDP and some are newly emerging. We need to clarify what Kathy really wants to hear from us about this process, and what we intend to report to the faculty. Our spreadsheet was internal homework and would require too much editing to share with anyone. We think the summary report will go to Kathy, and eventually some version of it to the faculty. We should articulate any ideas we’ve come up with in the “next steps” section, such as ways to fulfill the wish for post-docs, or how she could be a matchmaker between departments who express a need for common things. Do we anticipate that we will do this same thing next year, i.e., ask for CV documents again? Or should there be a “second round” for those departments that didn’t choose to participate? Did we think they were useful during the allocations process? Was it useful for anything else?
4. Future agenda item noted: Does EPAG wants to weigh in on changes to individual majors, such as a change in the number of courses required? If so, it would be a motion to the faculty, since it’s a handbook change. It’s on the list for March 28th.
5. Future agenda item noted: Do we want to talk about QT now since the forum closed today at noon. What are the next steps? Does this require faculty voting on the changes to approval criteria, or do they vote to endorse the well-studied changes, or does EPAG announce the approval of the QT approval criteria. We tried to define “the line” (however jagged) for what requires approval versus announcement. If the changes aren’t radical (in the eyes of EPAG) but more of a fine-tuning, then it seems the consensus is to go the announcement route. The key is whether faculty have had enough access to this information and opportunity to comment and react. We think yes, so the next step is to present this at the faculty meeting. We want to be prepared for the question (should it arise) about why this does not require a vote? We will discuss this further on the 28<sup>th</sup>.

6. Psychology Department Review: We reviewed the draft of the letter to the department and offered suggestions for wording.

Adjourned at 4:27

Respectfully submitted by Jayne Niemi, Registrar