

EPAG Minutes
December 16, 2010
11:30 to 1:00
Campus Center 214

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

- 1 Minutes from the last meeting were approved as circulated.
- 2 Announcements: Huzzah! It's the last meeting of fall semester, and we've done a lot of work. Tom rewarded us with homemade treats!
- 3 HMCS proposal: Because there are so many terms that are "inter-something" and units, and courses of studies, Tom reviewed the terms for our benefit. The Provost designates departments as disciplinary or interdisciplinary. May an interdisciplinary department offer a departmental major? Section 7 is agnostic on that. The Provost is clear that the department is interdisciplinary. Tom shared with us the last allocation report (2008) that describes the department's commitment to journalism courses and how the chair's release is expected to work. Tom asked for comments, concerns, or questions about the memo he is nearly ready to send. There was discussion of possible confusion between MCS and MSCS departments. We noted the need to clean up the College's language about majors – disciplinary vs. interdisciplinary.
- 4 Various forms of "health" in the CDP: We returned to a discussion of population health and other terminologies, definitions, broadness and specificity of each term. But we are not yet sure whether the CDP should include such a thing. Is there a more inclusive term that would broaden what we want to say in the CDP? The emergent theme that comes from the two years worth of responses to the CDP call indicates that this interest is hot in the curriculum. Other names? Cultures of Health and Illness? The breadth across the curriculum is what we can't seem to capture in a word or phrase. Liberal Arts Perspective on Health? Health and Society? Some combination of Ann and Chad's documents will work. Tom will circulate a draft of the combination. The CDP will be posted on the Provost's web page, which will be referenced in the allocations call. Following that, Tom will send an email to the faculty with a link to the CDP. The allocation call should go out next week.
- 5 Discontinuance options: We can definitely eliminate the royal decree model. We are going to have to write up more on each option. Are we going to discuss criteria? We think that many faculty are looking for that. We are searching the handbook for language pointed to in one of the posts about deletions in Section 7. There is also some reference to discontinuation in the department review section. Cost, student interest (broadly conceived and across time), appropriateness to the liberal arts (the core) – these are all possible considerations. We might describe

the kind of information we collect to evaluate and weigh the decision, rather than specific criteria. Now back to the models: we have three left. Empower a specially elected committee with no larger review, the so-called "house of lords" option, and supermajority for veto. We note that parallels to FPC are useful – a body that has much information and time to deliberate on that information to come to a decision that is less emotional. We're now down to option numbers 2 and 4.

With best wishes for the break, we adjourned at 1:02.

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne Niemi, Registrar