

**Educational Policy and Governance (EPAG) Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2008**

Present: Aaron Brown, Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer (Chair), Terri Fishel, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Kathy Murray, Tom Varberg
Absent: Stephanie Ewbank, Jayne Niemi

I. Approval of Minutes from December 3, 2008 Meeting - approved

II. Announcements/Reports

- a) Spring 2009 EPAG Meeting Time: Monday, 3:30-5:00 p.m. It was agreed that Pete would aim for sending out the agenda on Friday along with readings.
- b) Grants Committee update – At least one potential donor was excited by the concentrations offered at Macalester. The “pathways” created by concentrations not only enable our students to better navigate the curriculum to meet their interests, but also help those external to the college to better understand how our curriculum speaks to societal issues (e.g., Humanitarianism and Human Rights, and Community and Global Health).
- c) Institute for Global Citizenship Advisory Committee update – Topic for the spring Civic Forum – Race, Leadership, and Civic Life in the Post Election Era. Topics for future forums include new media, and immigration. When the Janet Wallace Fine Arts buildings come back online, there will be a forum focused on the arts.
- d) 12/9/2008 Faculty Meeting Attendance \cong 93. Pete wants to design a web-based faculty-staff survey in May to determine the impact of change in meeting time and invite narrative for feedback. Currently the IR stats show 170 FTE for faculty. Pete will use Google Docs to design a survey and then distribute to faculty who are eligible to vote.

III. Ongoing Business

- a) Chair of EPAG for the 2009-10 AY - Pete opened the bidding for the Chair’s position. It was determined that a third year committee member should serve as chair and David Martyn had been nominated. David was elected by acclamation.
- b) Transfer student form for Gen. Ed. Requirements – Tom had designed a form for QT with the learning goals included for students who want to request credit for a course they completed prior to transferring. Students then have the form to fill out and demonstrate how the class met the goals. He shared the form as a template for other GenEd requirements that could be adapted according to the goals for that requirement.
- c) Chinese Minor – Prof. Suzuki sent a response to EPAG concerns. It was agreed to put their request forward at the next faculty meeting.
- d) Concentration Rules – Pete shared an exchange with a Program Director about the rules governing concentrations and asked for EPAG’s guidance on three issues.

1. Culminating course – There was a discussion about faculty teaching load for the culminating course and resources for staff. Programs are to be self-sufficient without additional resources, including staff. The culminating course must be taught as an overload. It was reiterated that programs are not to become departments.
 2. Required Courses - Programs determine which courses do and do not count for the concentration. If they decide to allow most of their courses to come from one department they can do so. We must trust that the program faculty has the integrity of the program in mind. EPAG has already approved the concentration, so unless the language is changed, all concentrations conform to the same minimum requirements.
 3. It was requested that the Registrar is the one who should collect information on the concentration as opposed to the person in charge of the concentration. It was agreed that EPAG (Pete) needs to check with Jayne.
- e) Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Restructuring EPAG – Pete summarized the proposed change to 2A as follows: EPAG puts out the call for positions after reflecting on strategic interests of the college. Proposals for positions are sent to the Provost who sends her/his recommendation, along with entire proposal submitted, to the Allocations Committee. The Provost participates in the Allocations Committee discussion of proposals, but steps out while the Allocations Committee makes its final recommendation. The Allocations Committee sends its recommendations to the Provost. The Provost makes the final decision. It is important that the Provost communicate how her/his final decision does or does not differ from the Allocations Committee recommendation.

Discussion followed with these concerns:

What about reallocations? Is it a call only for new allocations? EPAG's role is to look at the curriculum strategically and then send out a call based on the strategic direction of the curriculum. Plan for a year ahead. It was suggested that there be a summer retreat to discuss principles. It was also pointed out that Proposal number 4 invites more inclusion of Chairs in the discussion. It was suggested that the process include a contemplative role for Chairs and that new ideas could surface as opposed to automatic refills of retirements. For example, if sustainability is determined to be an issue to support, and the Psychology Department has a hire coming up, it could focus on sustainability in its request. It was suggested that there be no automatic fills, and that no requests should be taken for granted. It was also suggested that we don't want a process that becomes too competitive, but rather need to have balance. Time ran out and we moved on to the New Business.

IV. New Business

Music Department Self-study (Review takes place February 23-24). Carleton Macy was asked if there was anything he wanted to add. He described how the student/faculty ratio reported on page 5 was calculated and argued that this reported figure does not accurately reflect the actual burden faculty in his department face.

Three questions from the Handbook (included in Lynn's memo) are always asked. EPGA identifies other questions. The questions the group came up with are: Are there more ways to tie in the music programs with other programs or departments on campus? Are there ways to have more interdisciplinary connections? We want the review team to tell us about the state of the art in curricula. We want them to be familiar with the department, the college and the state of the industry. How does the department/program compare to those at other colleges? Are there features of the Mac dept/program that distinguish it from those at our peer institutions? Do these features enhance the experience of Mac students? Are there features we are missing? What are the important trends in music curricula at the college level over the next decade? Is the Mac Music dept well positioned to take advantage of these trends? Pete will compose the questions and send them in an email for folks to react to.

Terry Krier volunteered to be the EPAG member to meet with the review committee.

V. Adjournment for the Semester at 5:30 p.m.

Next meeting first day of classes, Jan. 26. 3:30 – 5:00

Respectfully submitted by Terri Fishel, Library Director.

Addendum - 3 questions composed by Pete for Music Review

1. Are there additional ways that the Music Department can develop connections with other programs or departments on the Macalester campus?
2. What do you consider to be the state of the art in college music curriculum? Are there particular colleges that stand out in this regard? How does the Macalester Music Department compare to these programs? In what areas does Macalester fall short? In what areas does Macalester distinguish itself from the others?
3. What are the important trends in music over the next decade? Is Macalester well positioned to benefit from these trends?