

## EPAG Minutes

Monday, December 14, 2009

3:30-5:30 (5:45)

Campus Center 214

Kendrick Brown, Pete Ferderer, Terry Krier, Carleton Macy, David Martyn, Kathy Murray, Michael Orr, Ann Minnick, Jayne Niemi, Patrick Schmidt, Robert Strickland, Tom Varberg, Terri Fishel

1. Minutes from December 7th: Approved.
2. David was invited to the MCSG meeting (Tuesday evening) to talk to them about the CDP.
3. Forum discussion on Moodle has been of good quality – we want to encourage this.
4. Is it possible to schedule a retreat date in January to finish organizing and evaluating the various CDP proposals? Picking a date proved to be too big a challenge. It was agreed to have a longer meeting on the first two Tuesdays of the spring semester. Let's plan on the first two meetings, January 26<sup>th</sup> and February 2<sup>nd</sup>, from 3 to 6 p.m. (Minutes will not be required for the portion of the meeting devoted to the CDP, other than "CDP proposals were discussed".)
5. One possible approach to proposals is to have a paragraph response to each. David passed out a response to the Arabic proposal as an example. We might incorporate this into some part of the process, but probably not this first phase.
6. Diversity needs to be defined for the purpose of our discussion. We are agreed, it seems, that we should use the definition that has been used in official documents in the handbook. At the very least, we have to be clear if and when we deviate from the norm stated in the handbook. Although we are cognizant of the many ways diversity can be represented on campus, for our purposes we are construing diversity in terms of Macalester affirmative action needs.
7. Terry shared her revelations about how to think of languages, trying to come up with a conceptual rationale for which languages to keep and not keep. Truism: languages should be in the forefront at Mac and fluency is important for our mission. What is that fluency for? Perhaps being global without giving up Europe. Putting language teaching into the frame of translation studies allows a different way of thinking about which languages to teach. It could be an idea for a concentration or a graduation requirement. Documents about an existing course and a reading list about translation studies were distributed. We have many current faculty who could focus on such studies. This might help our students with more explicit job opportunities and career paths. This also tightens up the language departments and their relationship to other humanities departments. There are many angles and issues about translation studies that might work well here. Some questions: Is this appropriate for undergrads – just so new that its not seen much at that level? The common language will be English, most likely. Is this a curricular opportunity, or a way to decide which languages to teach? In some ways this was a first step towards understanding why we teach languages in

- relationship to the college's mission. There is a US government scale of expense of teaching various languages, which could be useful in our discussions. David suggests that we write an open letter to the faculty to confront this question. Cautionary notes to make sure we are not threatening any particular position or department. Also, since this did not come up in any of the proposals after the call, does that mean it is not on the mind of the faculty – even those who are experts in the field?
8. Recusal: Shall we set the bar higher, so that no interested parties discuss those proposals? Or do we need the voices of those who are interested parties to inform the discussion. We want to have the same trust that is afforded to the Personnel committee. That's the purpose of trying to hash out recusal in advance. EPAG members who were part of the authorship of any proposal should definitely recuse themselves. EPAG members who have some direct stake or would benefit from proposals should also recuse themselves. Here is our current summary of recusals: Tom from Material Science; Patrick from Legal Studies, David from Critical Theory & Comparative Literature, Eric from Neuroscience, and Carleton from Music.
  9. We began consideration and discussion of the CDP proposals. David first talked through the "other parameters" listed on his document of 12/14. Have we begun to talk about competing visions of the liberal arts? One goal may be to protect diversity of methodologies. David suggests as an example taking 4, 12, 14, 16, and 18 and put them together into a group "health and the environment from a global perspective". That's a grouping that is thematic. The conversation turned towards other issues – EPAG and vision and imagination and long-range obligations. What are we going to write here? Kendrick suggested a possible grouping – which then might help to combine things into overarching themes. Perhaps in the process of doing this, we can come to some decisions. That is our homework.
  10. The MAX Center self-study will have to be done via email. It's on Moodle under Pending Business.

Adjourned at 5:44

Respectfully submitted,  
Jayne Niemi, Registrar