

EPAG Minutes
Monday October 12, 2009
3:30 – 5:00
Campus Center 214

Present: Pete Ferderer, Terri Fishel, Cheng Gu, Terry Krier, Carelton Macy, David Martyn (chair), Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Robert Strickling, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak

1. Minutes. Approved.
2. CDP

David outlined his concept of what the CDP should be. There is a need for a CDP that is larger than the Allocations Plan, but we want to follow the language in the handbook. He wants to move forward on a more modest Allocation Development Plan while also conferring with departments. He wants to include the following:

- Acknowledge distinction between replacement requests and new requests
 - Make a decision not to send a line back to department – outline some specificity of what could be done if a line opens up (denied request)
 - Announce to whole college that there is an open line- hold that position open for the following year in order to look at all requests to compare
 - Make the CDP very clear – not about maintenance of what allocations or what curriculum is – articulate what we would do with open lines
 - CDP focused only on areas where college wants to grow

Discussion – allows us to think more globally about where things should go. Canvassing can help drive it. Ask each department to list two best things and two items in terms of where departments see things going in the future – 2 things only. The document should be practical. How is WorldClass Education defined – we need to know what we can quit doing and downsize. How will concentrations grow into departments? Unless we are willing to say that someone has to give up a line because an interdisciplinary department is emerging, we won't be able to develop new programs.

It was felt this would empower the committee to make tough decisions, which would greatly help the person who is new to EPAG and allocations. Emphasis on the five criteria outlined in the handbook, of which one is the CDP. The creation of a two-year cycle was seen as a benefit of improving the process. Guidelines and basis for denying a request need to be developed. Analogously of the Joint Committee Report, the CDP could become a document that is used for a long period of time, the background vision to inform decisions year after year.

It was mentioned that concentrations don't have input for allocations, but they can have input on curriculum development, and that it is important that everyone is empowered- departments, concentrations, department chairs, and individual faculty. All voices should be represented in the CDP.

The questions was raised as to what happens if the committee refuses a request from a small dept. and they fall under the fewer than 3. The suggestion was that the line goes into escrow while the college figures out what to do with the dept.

What does the CDP look like –

- looks a lot like the joint report – bigger with a rolling period of time to allow for changes
- includes census elements – lists of vision of growth
- includes desired areas of growth – opportunity spaces

Document consists of a list of Curriculum opportunities – examples of possible “opportunities” could be the following:

- Arabic language and culture
- History before 1700
- New media
- History across the curriculum
- Liberal arts perspective on the law
- Social science perspective on China
- Physical chemistry

First part of document – guidance on what supports a good request/ grounds on reasons for rejecting. It would include:

- preamble – written by Patrick
- five criteria from the handbook

Are we looking at handbook language changes? We could go to the faculty in November with handbook language changes. Language in handbook says primary and secondary – the CDP could contain language that clarifies primary and secondary.

For report to faculty on Tuesday - Summarize discussion as a “shared consensus that our re-allocations need to be more nimble.” Reallocation is not defacto automatic. Handbook says reallocations go back to the college. Crisis of the economy is an opportunity to not continue in the same way. Something has to change.

Last meeting this semester – Dec. 14th. No meeting on Dec. 21st.

Adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Terri