

EPAG Minutes
Monday, May 4, 2009
3:30-5:00
Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer (chair), Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Andrew Meeker, Ann Minnick, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Terence Steinberg, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak, Terri Fishel

1. Approval of Minutes from April 27, 2009 Meeting. Approved with minor corrections.
2. Announcements/Reports/Questions
 - a) Wine and conversation – Kathy would like to host an event at her house and we agreed on 4:30 May 12th. Jan will send further details.
 - b) Meeting times for next year – Mon. 3:30 – 5:00; to be verified next Monday when Patrick attends
 - c) Update on Allocations for 2008-09 – Next week we will review a fast track allocation request. Leila Lenhen, Hispanic and Latin American Studies, is leaving.

3. Ongoing Business

a) Finalize Revisions to Handbook Section 7 (Draft #4 from Kendrick)

Pete shared three recommendations he received from a group of faculty related to reducing committees:

- Recommendation #1 - cut the IDIM committee
- Recommendation #2 - Study Away committee responsibilities could be handled by IC staff
- Recommend #3 – do away with Academic appeals committee

We had an extensive discussion on various aspects of the proposed revisions and recommendations. Concern was expressed that there is vocal support amongst some faculty for diminishing the role of shared governance for faculty. Regarding the IDIM committee, EPAG had already reviewed and agreed that the committee needed to exist. Regarding SARC, the Provost has already charged the IC staff with tasks that came out of the RPC report that included reviewing recommended programs and balancing fall and spring study away. We briefly reviewed voting members on the committee, and left voting language as is.

Discussion focused on the merits of reducing the GER committee from its current structure to a single group. Concern over workload with the committee reduced to a single group with only one member from EPAG could mean that instead of a workload distributed amongst four EPAG members, a single member would have a larger burden. There was also concern expressed that if the EPAG member had to be someone in their second year, there was potential for a single person to go from being chair of the GER committee to chair of EPAG, again with an imbalance of workload for an extended period. Although questions were raised about the criteria for the requirements themselves, there are no changes anticipated until there have been four class years that have gone through the GER requirements.

During the course of discussion, three views were expressed and supported by various EPAG members. One view sees the advantage of having a single, smaller committee who would be familiar with all aspects of the GERs including QM and writing, etc. Others view that having more people on the four committees allow for more faculty to be exposed to what the requirements are which helps in terms of advising students. A third view suggested that EPAG leave the GER committee structure in place for another two years and then revise criteria and structure at the same time. Because the GER committees are new compared to the other committees, it was suggested that more time was needed on which to experience the current structure before revising it. We reached no consensus on this issue, but agreed that EPAG would present two options to the faculty with a list of strengths and weaknesses for each position. It was also recommended that a closed ballot be used to collect the vote at the faculty meeting.

Members felt that by presenting options, it was critical that strengths and weaknesses for each option were shared. Concern was also expressed that while faculty would hear the arguments that the two options be separated into two motions, discussion might not include a broad range of individuals. The first motion would focus on revision of the committees that have existed for some time, and the second motion focus on the GER committees. It was reiterated that this motion needed a written, closed ballot.

The deadline to get the options with the strengths and weaknesses to the faculty for review before the meeting next week is Wed. afternoon. Pete will draft by mid-afternoon on Tuesday. Ann shared a copy of the draft revision with typos corrected.

At this point Pete turned to new business and tabled the last two agenda items:

- c) The Curriculum Development Plan (CDP): A Proposed Outline
- d) EPAG-sponsored Campus Forum (Moodle-based) to discuss the Macalester College Curriculum in light of the recent financial crisis.

5. New Business

- a) Report of the Strategic Planning Sub-Committee for the Institute of Global Citizenship

We had a discussion of the report submitted by the Strategic Planning subcommittee for the IGC in order to provide the Provost with feedback prior to a meeting with the President regarding the document. Concern was expressed about faculty buy-in and that despite certain goals that seemed to be encouraging more broad participation by faculty, the document did not go far enough to recognize departments that are already engaged in curriculum that embraces global issues. One member felt that originally there was potential to have the IGC celebrate how we bring internationalism into every course, but that this potential had not been realized in the current report. Several members expressed concern that there was too much emphasis on programs and not enough on courses and curricular issues as well as a lack of critical thinking in terms of the meaning of “global citizenship.” On the positive side, one member expressed that

there is potential for the IGC to be an important resource by helping the college identify what those strengths are and then focus on those strengths. It was suggested that the CST be used as a model of a successful endeavor that solicited feedback and input from faculty in order to develop a program that overcame initial faculty resistance. Due to running late, there was no resolution of this discussion other than to express opinions on the initial report.

At one point, an EPAG member expressed the view that this had been a “great meeting.”

Adjourned 5:10

Respectfully submitted by Terri Fishel, Library Director