

EPAG Minutes

February 19, 2015 3:00 – 4:30

Campus Center 214

Present: Kendrick Brown, Ernie Capello, Terri Fishel, Susan Fox, Geoff Gorham (chair), Ari Hymoff, Erica Lee, Mark Mazullo, Ann Minnick, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Karen Saxe, Jaine Strauss, Joelle Vitiello
Agenda

1. Approval of minutes for 02.12.15 (google) - Minutes approved as distributed.

2. Chair communications

- Moodle forum has been set up for continued response to current concentrations; have heard from others around campus who plan to respond; sense is that the concentration directors are more supportive of current version.
- Regarding data science minor - Susan and Karen left for the discussion. In light of questions directed to Geoff by Tom Halverson, Geoff asked EPAG support in responding to Tom's questions. First, EPAG's 2/15 letter simply requests confirmation of MCSC's previous assurance that the new minor does not require new courses or sections. Second, the EPAG minutes reflect various opinions expressed at the meeting; the settled opinion of EPAG itself is represented in the 2/15 letter.

3. Proposed Handbook changes on Curricular Committees and Academic Integrity (moodle)

We reviewed the rationale on changes proposed for faculty handbook and discussed the appeals process. Study Away appeals can only be based on curricular issues, not based on a preference for semester. This year there were a higher number of appeals for Study Away decisions. Due to poorly written applications, permission to reapply was given to students who had been denied permission for study away programs. Resubmitted applications were sent to SARC. While it was allowed this year, students denied due to poorly constructed applications will not be permitted to reapply next year. EPAG supports the handbook changes on first glance.

Regarding the Academic Integrity Policy, while we have had a policy in place, most of the documentation has been on the web site and in the student handbook. What wasn't documented was the appeals process. Appeals are managed by Academic Standings Committee minus the director of Academic Programs. All curricular committees are subcommittees of EPAG and all have members of EPAG on them. A concern was raised that some faculty don't report plagiarism or violations of academic integrity, but this may be more a matter of more communication and education. A question was raised about students reporting other students and the issue of an Honor Code came up, but it was agreed that would not be an issue for this year's EPAG. Ann will put the document in Google for comments and editing and we will look at next week and then forward to faculty.

4. THDA major (google) - Continued discussion about draft version of letter in Google docs. Reviewed points in letter and discussed some of the communication challenges due to changes in the chair and the person who submitted the original response. The main point is that the letter should express the need to build a major they can staff now. The proposed model for assigning (and banking) teaching credit for team-teaching in particular is not something EPAG can support. It was pointed out that the focus of their plan is on majors, but what about serving the general population? For example, a history of theater could be a means of satisfying the distribution in fine arts and would lead to more exposure to a larger group of students. Members of EPAG endorsed this suggestion. Geoff will edit the letter and then send out.

5. Internationalism GE requirement (moodle) - contd discussion. There were three recommendations from the task force with the first being against the wholesale replacement with transnational requirement. Geoff, perhaps along with Ernie, will meet with Andrew Latham and Erik Larsen to discuss EPAG's intention to endorse this first recommendation.

The recommendations of the task force are ambitious and came out of reviews of other colleges many of whom included foreign language requirements within broad requirements. It was pointed out that the second language proficiency revision with the new cultural aspects along with the study away changes occurred during the review of the internationalism requirement. In addition, with the emphasis on learning outcomes, it is recommended that there be further deliberation on not only these changes, but to focus on learning outcomes. It was also suggested that we should be looking at how internationalism could complement USID. EPAG members are aware of the long standing tensions between USID and internationalism, but endorse spending more time focusing on recommendation #2 and learning objectives in the hope of getting the revised requirement completed this spring. Geoff asked everyone to re-read the GERC arguments and proposal and come prepared to talk about the two documents and move forward within a couple of meetings. The internationalism requirement document and review will be on next week's agenda.

6. Allocations Committee planning (moodle) - students left at this point. Geoff reminded us of the Handbook language - section 4 p. 16 - on Moodle allocations site. All proposals are posted along with the CDP and data, and documents supporting requests. We have 7 departments with 8 requests. We identified case managers for each department and hope to have reviews done by April 2nd and plan for two longer meetings in order to come to consensus about recommendations.

7. New Business - none

8. Adjournment

We adjourned at 4:30.

Respectfully submitted by Terri Fishel, Library Director