

EPAG Minutes

Wednesday, September 17, 4:00 to 5:30

Campus Center 214

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

1. Minutes: Typographical errors were noted for correction and the minutes were approved.
2. Announcements: Pete reported on his conversation with Adrienne Christiansen. She asked to share the EPAG letter with her advisory group for discussion. Pete is collecting info on the Fast Track approval process for allocations for our later review. He will be attending the Grants committee meeting & the Academic Liaisons committee tomorrow. In the coming weeks, we'll begin to look at the change in the faculty meeting time and its affect on attendance. There's no hard data available on attendance unless a quorum is called.
3. We reviewed the letter to Mike Monahan once again. We are asking the IC staff to do 2 things. One is to create a system analogous to the library representative system, and the second is to involve EPAG directly in their deliberations and decisions on Macalester administered study away programs. It is EPAG's responsibility to oversee this development process, according to the by-laws. We discussed what this faculty involvement might look like in practice.
4. Concentrations: A meeting convened by the Mellon pathways advisory committee was held last Thursday, and Pete attended. He found it helpful in understanding the origins of the grant and the motivation of Mellon. Kathy clarified that this is mostly about the General Education Requirement courses and the decisions students make about which of those to take. There was discussion of the goal of the grant, methods, and testing both the theory and question. Are those things that Mellon stated in the letter really a problem here at Macalester? Are there assumptions embedded in this that are not supported by data? Pete shared further details about the discussion at the meeting and the questions that arose for him.
5. Program review: This process is two-part: one is compliance, the other is review. Which of those two should be staggered? The idea is to work with the existing concentrations to come into compliance with the new rules. We agreed that the first part of the letter will request necessary information, the second part will list the criteria, and the third will suggest the year of review. For coming into compliance we need to know who the director is, the names of associated faculty (steering committee), and if there is apportioned FTE.
6. Study away and concentrations: After reviewing the options for revising the ranking criteria (doing nothing, and the two options submitted by David), we decided to use David's first version. This version essentially keeps the order in the current handbook, but adds a line that

prioritizes applicants who will use study away for a minor or concentration *after* those applicants required to have it for their major, but *before* those who are not required to study away.

7. Adjourned at 5:32.

Respectfully submitted,

Jayne Niemi, Registrar