

EPAG Minutes
Tuesday, March 30, 2010
3:00-4:30
Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Max Cady, Pete Ferderer, Terri Fishel, Gerard Hoogvliet, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Kathy Murray, Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Tom Varberg, Eric Wiertelak

1. The **minutes** from the last meeting were approved.
2. We lauded David's letter to the proposers of the **Biochemistry concentration** – it summarized our discussion well. It shall be sent.
3. **Student Learning Committee Proposal:** Kendrick launched discussion of this proposal. The academic liaison group has reviewed it and their feedback has been incorporated. RPC and FPC are willing to endorse this in principle. The primary job of the Student Learning Committee would be to pull together the various efforts at assessment of student learning, as well as to provide advice recommendations to the administration. At the start, Kendrick wants to work with the full community to develop student learning outcomes, in and out of the classroom. **He would like EPAG's endorsement.** Terri would like the information fluency information included, and wonders if the library can be included on the committee as contributors and representatives. David questioned the purpose of committee and the faculty governance issues that come up in the minds of some. Kathy reminded us of the learning goals set earlier by MASC. This is a process to get community buy-in on these learning goals. The consciously examination of student learning is something that we should want to do in general, not just for accreditation purposes. Kendrick acknowledged and responded to all comments and requests. We had further discussion about library representation. We also returned to the issue of curricular oversight. David offered some new language that clarifies that the evaluation is of the extent to which we are meeting goals, not the goals themselves. **REPRESENTATION:** If an EPAG representative is required it should not be the GERC representative. Also, if it is an EPAG representative, it should be a one-year appointment. Or, it could be a liaison to EPAG who reports back to the committee instead of being an EPAG representative. It should be a tenured member of the faculty who has experience on EPAG. Initially, we think it should be an EPAG member, for a one-year renewable term. The alumni representative would ideally be 5-10 years out. Pete suggested an older graduate who has a child searching for a suitable college could provide valuable feedback.
4. The role of the chair was taken over by Tom, for the purpose of discussing languages taught at Macalester, and how it is decided which languages should be taught. Seventeen responses to our request were collected. We questioned our aim – what's our goal? A planning document? Since we didn't have an end game in mind, we began our discussion very generally. Discussants are not identified in the summary below.

5. *This is a topic of discussion around campus. * There are creative solutions and collaborative work with our ACTC colleagues and other Twin Cities institutions. Especially in languages, resources are a challenge on other campuses. *ACTC resources should not influence our decisions, even though we should collaborate and share. We structure our curriculum first, based on our principles. *One of the letters is persuasive that such decisions are made on the strength of allocation requests. The choices then take place through allocations. *The pragmatic approach is that there should be no difference between languages and other respondents to the call for allocation requests. *How, for example, was Chinese added? * It was noted that language faculty expressed a consistent view. *Several expressed little hope for consensus on this issue. *We learned a lot reading these reaction letters. *Is it valuable for the college to know about and document the concrete costs of language learning? *Doing introductory language courses requires one to sacrifice other academic time and goals. *Language acquisition begins when language instruction ends. *Languages should be looked at individually. *Setting up criteria before there is a case will cause a lot of angst, and not guide us to a meaningful outcome. *There were 18 possible criteria proposed. *Allocations is not suitable for deciding about programs. *Why did we ask this question – what problem were we trying to solve? The challenge was to find an easier way to discontinue or add language instruction. *We want to avoid the feeling that it's a zero-sum game that will come to the floor of the faculty. * We learned so much that we don't want this learning experience lost to those who come to this question again. *What about if a non-language department had a dearth of majors and begins to drop away? *This is why the discontinuance policy discussion is so important for EPAG to take up. *Individual is won over by the disciplinary arguments made in one letter. *Discussion of "difficult" languages, those taught in high schools, resources to mount a major, and the tenure status of those who teach languages here. *Are there certain languages that could be taught on a university model, i.e., with language instructors instead of tenured professors. *Why do this when the U of MN provides this, although at a high cost. *Do we want to pursue this further? *Could others learn from a synthesized version of this document? *All responses will be posted on the Moodle site.

Adjourned at 4:34

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne Niemi, Registrar