

EPAG Minutes
October 7, 2010
11:30 to 1:00
Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Janet Folina, Cary Franklin, Gerbrand Hoogvliet, Taren Kingser, Terry Krier, Ann Minnick, Kathy Murray, Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Chad Topaz, Tom Varberg (Chair)

1. *Minutes*: The minutes from September 30th were approved as circulated.
2. *Philosophy self-study*: Do we have any questions we want to have the reviewers address? Patrick and Tom will be the EPAG participants in the review visit. Suggestions for questions: Is the current approach and configuration still the best going forward? Are there new directions or other trends that we might see at schools that are similar to us? What are the biggest gaps in how we cover philosophy, and how might they be addressed? What is the department's relationship to the Macalester-specific mission? From the CDP submissions from last year we know of an expressed interest in a science, technology concentration – could we see more specifics on that interest? A sharp-eyed reader noted that current juniors would have started in Fall 2008, not 2007 – this means that the self-study paragraph data must also change. Tom will draft the questions and send them to Kendrick.
3. *Brief updates from those who attended Board of Trustees meeting*: Tom represented us at the Academic Affairs session, where Kathy updated the BOT on current events (JWFA, IGC, number of courses with civic engagement component). Chad attended the Admissions session. There was quite a bit of discussion about the affect of need-aware decisions in the Admissions process. Are there concrete measurements of what happens to admitted students by ranking and/or financial aid – indeed there are, and Dan Balik can provide those numbers. We note for the record that admitted students are different than deposited (yielded) students. The Student Life session was attended by Janet. They addressed the proliferation of student organizations, and possible discontinuance of less popular organizations. Tom also was at the plenary session of the board and enlightened that group about the CDP process and result. Kendrick also attended and spoke about the discontinuance discussions. The BOT interest level was high in the faculty decision making process, and yet they understand their own role.
4. *Scheduling issues*: Next week we will discuss the Art and Art History review, and also continue the discontinuation discussion. Tom will be out of town on the 21st, so our options are to have a substitute chair, find a different time, or cancel that meeting. It may help to remember that we have six meetings after fall break. On our fall agenda we know there are the following: MAX center review, CDP proposals, FACT proposals, and the IGC search as well as discussing, crafting and editing the discontinuance proposal. We decided to cancel the meeting on the the 21st. Ann will use that time slot for a small group discussion on advising, and

she will contact those who indicated interest in participating. There was some discussion about the role of EPAG in the IGC search process, and whether candidates should meet with all of EPAG, a subset of EPAG, or only the designated EPAG search committee representative. The earlier faculty town hall meetings generated a mandate that a successful candidate should be more interactive and proactive with faculty. We decided that Chad represents EPAG on the search committee, and he will be the conduit of any necessary information. We also discussed the ad placement and the input of divisional representatives to that ad placement advice.

5. *Elimination/discontinuance discussion:* Tom did a quick review of his version 2.0 of our options. We talked about our process going forward. We favor a layered process: establishing some comfort among EPAG members with the various options, announcing them at November faculty meeting, opening a Moodle forum, having an open meeting, and bringing a proposal to the faculty. We chatted about the difference among some of the options are the current version, particularly options 1 and 2. Where are the starting points to an elimination proposal? One logical starting point is with Allocations recommending to the subsequent EPAG that xxxx be eliminated. That would ensure some difference in the committee that initiates the proposal from that which considers it. There should be required consultation with the department that is the subject of the proposal. One question that came up is whether and how we can eliminate the feeling of bullying that might erode trust in elected committees. A revised version of this document will be coming.

Adjourned at 1:02

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne Niemi, Registrar