EPAG Minutes

Wednesday, September 24, 2008

4:00 to 5:30

Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Stephanie Ewbank, Pete Feuderer (Chair), Terri Fishel, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Terence Steinberg, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak

1. Minutes: Some corrections and improvements were noted, and with that, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements: There is a Teagle conference in Northfield, and Karl Wirth has asked for additional Macalester participants, if possible. The letter to Mike Monahan has been delivered, and Pete has had a positive conversation with him. Pete attended the Grants Committee meeting and gave a brief report. He also attended an IGC Strategic Planning Committee meeting. There, the topic of conversation was how programming might change in the future in the context of the IGC founding principles. He attended an IGC Advisory Committee meeting as well. Carleton can’t attend Advancement committee meeting that was scheduled. Tom will attend in his place. Kendrick reported that the Multiculturalism Gen Ed Subcommittee is pulling together some observations and recommendations for EPAG. The deadline for Study Away applications is looming and the Study Away Review Committee will be reading and meeting in the weeks that follow.

3. Course changes: the summary of courses changes was approved, with one addition and some corrections to the Gen Ed section. Jayne will have someone else proofread it before the circulation date.

4. Pete distributed a summary document entitled Issues Raised about Concentrations. We discussed some, but not all of them. The concern about the culminating INTD course being limited to 2 credits was raised. We recalled previous discussions about this, and the deliberate decision to limit the credit so that faculty would be committed to doing such a course as an overload, and also to keep the students from being overburdened since a capstone is already required for each major they complete. We discussed team-teaching and the fact that there is no clear policy to be found about it. Kathy will work on that for the future, and we all agreed that team-teaching should be supported. We talked about the college catalog and how concentrations should be presented in it. We agreed that EPAG does not want to join forces with the Mellon Advisory Committee to review the concentrations and their courses.

5. Programs and Concentrations: We reviewed the latest draft of the letter to program directors. As part of that conversation, we discussed the timing of reviews, and tried to anticipate the
workload for EPAG. How many reviews can be accomplished in a semester? Pete will continue to craft the letter, using the suggestions made in the meeting and any that are sent to him via email.

6. Handbook revisions: Pete pointed out that our revisions to part of Section 7 have caused other parts of that same section to seem redundant. He will take a first pass at making revisions to it for next week.

7. Geography Department’s Response to Review: We wondered what caused the reviewers to request a “formal statement of expectations for junior faculty”. While we don’t think that there should be such a formal document, it’s important for everyone to be on the same page about the College’s expectations. Clarifying the Personnel committee role for chairs could become a regular occurrence.

8. EPAG restructuring considerations caused someone to ask Pete whether all major committees should be restructured at the same time. Kendrick spoke on behalf of the Ad hoc committee, confirming that they realize the interconnected nature of the major committees, and have been thinking broadly. The Academic Liaison Committee might be helpful in any restructuring discussions, and Kathy will schedule their meetings with that in mind.


Respectfully submitted,

Jayne Niemi, Registrar