

EPAG Minutes  
October 14, 2010  
11:30 to 1:00  
Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Janet Folina, Cary Franklin, Gerbrand Hoogvliet, Taren Kingser, Terry Krier, Ann Minnick, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Chad Topaz, Tom Varberg (Chair)

1. The minutes from the October 7<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved as circulated.
2. Art and Art History Department Review: We were reminded of some allocations history – basically that there was a request made last year for an art history tenure-track line (not granted) and there was a resignation this past summer. The review comes at a time when the department might benefit from it most. Does this mean we anticipate two allocations requests this spring? While that is conceivable, it seems unlikely. The reviewers noted enrollment issues and offered some possible solutions (all faculty teaching drawing courses, fewer offerings of 300 level courses, broader survey courses among them). The department seems in disagreement, and wants to approach enrollment issues by increasing recruitment efforts. We wondered whether recruitment on its own could really be effective. We looked in the catalog and confirmed that Art 170 and 171 are not listed in the major requirements for Art, and are not listed specifically in Asian Studies requirements either. We also noted that individual department faculty may at any time propose courses to meet the Q requirement. Similarly, an increase in hours for the Department Coordinator position requires the department to submit a request to that effect in order for the possibility to be considered. We were pleased with the department's response to suggested class scheduling changes with the goal of having fewer conflicts for students, and we look forward to seeing those changes and positive results from them. We commend them for rethinking the question of photography in the curriculum and hope that thought continues to a point where they can "own" the decision that they reach. We encourage the faculty and staff to work carefully as a department to engage with the new architects. When the time comes to make an allocation request, they should be prepared to provide evidence of the progress of their plans. In our letter we want to capture the enough of our discussion so that it is useful to the department and the Provost so they can work together to move the department forward. Tom will draft a letter for us to review and edit.
3. The Discontinuance Document: We perused a draft of a more public version of the document. There was discussion about changing the focus of the introduction from why such decisions are gut-wrenching to why it is so important to have a process at the ready. Maybe the rationale is that we have a lot of guidance about how to add programs, but only one line exists about how to subtract one. We want to be sure that a deliberative process exists, so that the absence of process does not allow for an abrupt decision-making event. We discussed the four existing proposed options. There was consensus that the document is good and with some tweaking can be ready as planned. After the announcement at the

November faculty meeting, the on-line open forum will run for the remainder of fall. We will convene a meeting in early February where we present our best single option, and we hope to bring a motion to the March faculty meeting.

4. Our next EPAG meeting is on November 4<sup>th</sup>. We'll do the MAX center review. Tom will email those documents out. He will also probably send his proposal about major committee election times and meeting schedules. After some questions were pondered on that subject, we were adjourned.

Adjourned at 12:58

Respectfully submitted,  
Jayne Niemi, Registrar