

EPAG Minutes  
September 16, 2010  
11:30 to 1:00  
Campus Center 214

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

1. The minutes from September 9<sup>th</sup> were approved as corrected.
2. Committee assignments: When last we met, the Student Learning Committee and GERC assignments were still pending. Sonita Sarker will serve on the SLC, and Patrick Schmidt will serve on GERC.
3. Proposed agenda items for the 2010-2011 academic year:
  - a. Second round of proposals for the CDP – on our agenda for today.
  - b. Development of guidelines for the FACT (Fund for the Advancement of Collaborative Teaching) – on our agenda for today.
  - c. Proposed revision of the Handbook language concerning the creation of new study away programs. We think it should also include some oversight of existing programs, and how to handle discontinuance of a program should that be necessary. We'll work on that this fall.
  - d. Shifting the timing of committee elections – Tom Varberg will bring a proposal this term.
  - e. GERC's report on Writing GER -- this will be coming to us for consideration.
  - f. Recommendations for Dean of the IGC Search – this will also be on our agenda. Chad Topaz will serve on that search committee.
  - g. Department Discontinuance Plan – this is something we should begin to address this year. An ad hoc committee that included many former chairs of EPAG had recommended that such a plan be hammered out. We expounded on why we might need to create a process. At this point the question of department discontinuance falls to the faculty, so if any changes to how this happens are to occur, the faculty has to vote on handbook changes.
  - h. Grade inflation is of interest to some. Do we want to explore this in some way? If so, we could consider a subcommittee to gather information and/or state the problem. Or is there another way to approach it? It's difficult to define the problem. Latin Honors data are of interest, and were reminded of the change that is effective with the graduating class of 2010-2011.
  - i. Other ideas and suggestions: Take a look at the capstone projects. Can we help Ann with advising issues, or helping her to help faculty and students? Broadening of the look at the health of writing at Macalester, and broaden the dialogue about writing, both with students and with the Board of Trustees. We were reminded of the Teagle grant that is looking at writing in the FY Courses. There was concern expressed about

advising loads and balance. The fluidity of the faculty can contribute to the imbalance of advising loads. Ann Minnick plans to share the report that was done in 2003 or so. We tried to get a sense of priorities among these items. There was advocacy to tackle the Department Discontinuance Plan. We clarified what we might want to look at for capstones – what happened the last go-round (data-gathering). On advising, other than the load issue, it's clear that there are many different approaches to the topic. At least we should define expectations. We'll keep all of these on the back burner, considering them as our time commitments develop. Perhaps we will have small subgroups tackle "issue statements" in the fall to bring back in to the full group in the spring.

4. Draft of CDP call: Tom did a brief review of CDP history for new committee members. He solicited suggestions to improve the document. Should we encourage people who submitted proposals last year to re-submit? Are there suggestions we should make to improve the proposals? We don't want to close the door on re-submissions, but we do want to encourage creativity. We should insert a link to the current CDP. Other stylistic suggestions were made. Tom will redraft and resend to all of us for a last review. We're aiming to email to all faculty Monday afternoon.
5. Proposed data release policy: This is basically publicizing the existing policies within IR and Assessment Offices, and is comparable to what other institutions have in place. We discussed and various viewpoints were expressed. We changed the "or" to "and" in Number 3. EPAG endorses this policy.
6. FACT: We reviewed Kathy's draft and made suggestions. We want to publicize this opportunity within a week or two, so proposals can be synced with planning for the 2011-12 class schedules. We tried to build some things in so that it can be evaluated at some point. Guidance was requested on whether to give preference to lower-level courses. We talked about the reasonability of a minimum enrollment of 10. Enrollment caps should be no lower than 16 – we chose 16 over 20 in case a FYC is proposed. While sustainability of such courses is desirable, one time offerings should not be excluded. Terri Fishel asked about staff being part of a team-teaching effort. This proposal doesn't address that, and we wondered whether and how it should be included. We continued to discuss various points, such as privileging lower level courses. Most of the time, the conclusion was to leave our options open for proposals. There was accord on minimum enrollment and lowest cap number of 16. Should we preference proposals that promise to meet General Education Requirements? Again, we should encourage that but not limit the proposers. What about the course being offered more than once? We agreed that it should not be required, but ask that the impact statement address the future offerings of the department. Encourage applications those exploring new connections as well as from those with existing connections that want to be advanced.

Adjourned at 1:02

Respectfully submitted, Jayne Niemi, Registrar