Called to order by Vice-Chair Stellwag at 1:02. Quorum established.

Agenda Item: Approval of minutes of October meeting

Discussion: NONE

Action Taken: Motion to approve made by Glascoff, Seconded by Taggart.

Approved unanimously.

Agenda Item: Name change from the Department of Rehabilitation Studies to the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation

Discussion: Dr. Goodwin explained the rationale for the proposed name change—attraction of students and external funding are two primary reasons. Questions raised regarding: (a) similarity of department’s proposed name change to other such departments in the state / country; (b) rationale for ordering of words in proposed name; (c) $DSM$ is incorporating the term, “addictions” in its newest edition, as this term is “gaining steam;” (d) whether the word “studies” should be added to the end of the proposed name.

The committee engaged in considerable discussion about the right of units to autonomy in selection of the best words or phrases to use in naming. Specifically, since the members of a unit are most familiar with the words and phrases commonly used to convey a certain meaning in their discipline, which in this case was either “addictions” or “substance use”—shouldn’t they be better able to judge the best name for the unit?

Action Taken: Motion made by Glascoff to amend the title and conditionally approve a name change (with the addition of the word “Studies”) to the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies, provisionally, upon approval of the department’s faculty.
Agenda Item: Establish a Master of Science in Health Informatics and Information Management (HIIM), in the Department of Health Services and Information Management

Discussion: Dr. Bell presented the rationale for establishment of this new graduate program, based primarily on the societal need for trained professionals to deal with the burgeoning growth of electronic health records. Requirements for admission were explained. Master’s program in HIIM will include 36 core hours and 12 hours in one of three concentration areas; entire curriculum will be available on-line. Twelve of 20 courses necessitated by this degree program already exist in the department. The proposed program will be aligned with national accreditation standards within two years. Although existing resources will be reallocated, two new faculty positions are being requested—one, each, at the beginning of years two and three. Discussion ensued regarding the proposed budget associated with establishment of this degree program—is it fiscally prudent? Bell and Zeng indicated they would be able to initiate the proposed master's program without the additional resources requested. Griffin clarified that documents already submitted by the department outline contingency plans, should additional funding requested for the new degree program not be available (in whole or in part).

Action Taken: Motion to approve the establishment of the Master of Science in Health Informatics and Information Management made by Kasparek.
Approved unanimously.

Agenda Item: Department of Kinesiology Unit Academic Program Review

Discussion: The external Reviewers’ comments about the unit were considered to be highly critical. Three items raised by the external reviewers were determined to be those about which the department could do, essentially, nothing. A concern was expressed that the External review team visited only briefly, making it difficult to capture the essence of a very diverse department. However, it was pointed out (Griffin) that the reviewers interview each of the unit’s constituencies including faculty, staff, graduate students, and administrators.

Formatting of department’s response was criticized (i.e., Excel sheet). Viewpoints expressed by individual members of EPPC concerning the acceptability of the report varied greatly, which prompted a discussion of the EPPC evaluation criteria. Given that the two criteria EPPC is to use to evaluate a department’s program review response are:

1. Did the unit response acknowledge each of the external reviewers’ recommendations?
2. Did the unit response address each of the recommendations in an action plan that is specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound?

It was concluded that the Department of Kinesiology’s response failed to appropriately address either of the two criteria used by EPPC to evaluate their response.

Action Taken: Motion made by Kenney to send a response to the Department of Kinesiology stating that concerns raised in the external review document were addressed, but not sufficiently so, in the SMART format. Department is requested to rework the report, being sure to: (1) address all points raised by external reviewers, and (2) prepare a response in the requested format.

Approved unanimously; Griffin abstained.
Agenda Item: Clarification of elements of EPPC charge, specifically in 4C and 4D, regarding “the University Academic Standards and Resources.”

Discussion: Taggart explained a question raised by the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, regarding the charge of the EPPC. Confusion seems to exist regarding the possible existence of a document (or office?) titled the, “University Academic Standards and Resources” (as referenced in 4C and 4D of the Committee Responsibilities). No such document or office exists. Wording needs to be clarified.

Action Taken: Motion made by Kenney to replace the confusing wording, in every place it exists in the charge to the EPPC, to read, “The committee shall use information regarding university academic standards and resources as the basis for its review.”

Approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 2:27 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Susan M. Bashinski

NEXT MEETING: December 9, 2011