

EPAG Minutes

May 4, 2010

3:00-4:30

Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer, Terri Fishel, Gerbrand Hoogvliet, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Ann Minnick, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Michael Orr, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak

Guest: Chad Topaz, newly elected EPAG member

1. The minutes from the last meeting were approved as corrected.
2. The newly elected members of EPAG are Sonita Sarker, Janet Folina, Cary Franklin, and Chad Topaz. All were invited to join today's meeting, but only Chad was able to make it.
3. The change to the Interdisciplinary course (INTD) offered as part of the Urban Studies concentration was approved. The course moved from two credits to one credit. The course change memo was also approved for circulation.
4. Chinese major proposal: The motion for the faculty meeting was reviewed and discussed. This motion to add a major in Chinese Language and Culture will be on the agenda for Tuesday's faculty meeting.
5. We discussed the request for a name change from the Humanities and Media and Cultural Studies Department. Is this really just a name change? They are also asking to be a disciplinary versus interdisciplinary department. The distinction between those designations describing departments is about minimal FTE required. But when it comes to the major itself, then there is more that we need to see. We need to see what the new major will look like. We need more information about the revised curriculum they plan to offer. We would consider the name change along with a detailed proposal for the new major, as well as further information about the request to become disciplinary instead of interdisciplinary. David will write to the department asking for this information.
6. We returned to a discussion of the allocation process and how it went. The CDP started out as a tool for thinking more strategically. Was it really helpful in the allocation process? The start of a long-term process was part of the conversation. The idea of a census resurfaced as a good idea. The CDP was helpful – the process of developing the CDP really opened windows for us and provided much informative discussion to prepare us for allocations. It sent a signal to departments about what EPAG was thinking. We hope it removed some mystery from the process and made it more transparent. The proposals that went towards crafting the CDP were limiting, but we were creative in incorporating the principles embodied in the proposals. Did the strategic areas in the CDP (e.g., historical depth, the global city) really impact our decision-making? For some members at least, the final vote would have been the same. Maybe we were upping the ante in how an allocation request is made. There are questions and/or assertions made in the CDP that caused good debate and discussion. It was a very

positive process, which we want to keep alive without spending a full semester on fleshing it out. The document has to stay alive and current. We should emphasize that we are thinking about the overall college, rather than specific departments. We recommend putting out a call for proposals for the next CDP in August, allowing proposers a longer period of time to ponder and talk. We discussed the duality issue – there is a core of things at which we (and other colleges) are excellent, and also those things that make us distinct from others. During the entire process we were constantly reminded that we need to emerge from our departmental thinking to really choose what is distinctive and excellent for the college as a whole. It was useful for some to see comparison data and info about other college and our competitors. What are the norms for what is an excellent department? There are tensions and trade-offs between numbers and quality. The CDP was quite a project and an achievement! We turned to a discussion of how tenure and tenure-track positions are decided by allocations, but non-tenure-track positions are decided by the Provost. There was some discussion of the wording of the decision on the German and Russian Studies recommendation. What impact do those non-tenure-track decisions have in the long run, for example, if a program is going to continue, but taught only by tenure-track faculty.

7. We talked a bit about the archiving of materials collected this year, and the Moodle groups.
8. Next semester's meetings will be on Tuesday mornings from 8:00 to 9:30. ***[NB: This has since been changed to Thursdays, 11:30-1:00]***
9. We thanked and bade farewell to our departing members. Cheers to a year of good work!

Adjourned at 4:17

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne Niemi, Registrar