

EPAG Minutes  
February 17, 2011  
11:30 to 1:00  
Campus Center 214

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

**I. The minutes from February 10<sup>th</sup> were approved as circulated.**

**II. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussing the Town Hall Meeting and the discontinuance document.**

*A. Given the schedule, it's wise to have a final motion drafted at our next meeting, so that there is ample time for faculty to review it before the Faculty Meeting.*

*B. None of us were surprised by the way the Town Hall Meeting went. We discussed our impressions about the various points raised.*

*C. We began to review, discuss and edit the most recent draft.*

*We decided to include AAUP language within the proposal.*

*We also support the inclusion of language about the curriculum being the purview of the faculty while personnel issues are not.*

*We need to call attention to the fact that there is already language in the handbook about what responsibilities the College has to faculty if their department is eliminated. We*

*could possibly spell out the steps that happen in the event of discontinuance.*

*We added language about students to the proposal – that students with a declared major in a discontinued department would be allowed and helped to complete the major. We believe that declared minors are likely to be able to finish as well. Once EPAG has decided to move to full consideration of a discontinuance proposal, a moratorium will begin on the declaration of majors and minors in the department.*

*We turned to the question of how to replace faculty members who recuse themselves from the EPAG full consideration. We reaffirmed our commitment to all divisions being represented, even if no EPAG alum from the division is available. We struggled with what to do if the faculty member is from an interdisciplinary department. More language work is required on that piece.*

*We confirmed that if EPAG recommends to retain the department, no further work is required.*

*The language about voting was discussed, and we went back to our original choice that a motion must be made to overturn EPAG's recommendation. Regarding the suggestion that people absent from the meeting be allowed to vote, Roberts Rules presumes that that voters are present at the meeting to hear the discussion. There is advance notice of the vote. People must be present to vote – ability to skype notwithstanding!*

*We discussed the pros and cons of the five-year grace period if EPAG's recommendation is defeated – whether it should be a hard or soft five-year moratorium, or at the discretion of EPAG. We softened the language slightly.*

*We reviewed the list of considerations and pondered possible improvements. Comparison data seemed to be troublesome to some, but we think we need it – not as a sole criterion, but for context.*

***Tom will make changes, circulate the revised version we'll discuss it next week. We still need handbook language, which Tom will draft for our reading pleasure. We discussed the need to delete the word "deletion" from the other part of the handbook. Tom pointed out the language in the Constitution about delegating powers.***

***As a side note, we're all looking forward to a more easily searchable handbook - coming this summer, thanks to Kendrick. More thanks to Terri for taking notes at the Town Hall Meeting.***

Adjourned at 12:58

Respectfully submitted,  
Jayne Niemi, Registrar