**CEPP Meeting Minutes 9.13.18**

Scribe: Bina

Attendees: Crystal Moore, Feryaz Ocakli, Marta Brunner, Steve Ives, Riley Filister, Bina Gogineni, Michael Orr, Pat Hillerin

1. Reviewed and approved minutes from 9.6.18 meeting, with the addendum that Pat Hillerin, too, had been present at the meeting.
2. We engaged in lengthy brainstorming as to how to structure, and who to recruit as panelists for, the workshops on the various “In the Major” literacies, which are meant to generate criteria for assessment. The structure of each workshop (one per literacy) might be in two-parts: first a panel discussion with particular point people from across the college with expertise in the various literacies (we considered who these various people might be); and then, attendees would break into smaller groups to refine criteria for assessment relevant to their specific departments. Faculty panelists would be given a small honorarium enabled by the Mellon grant, and would be recruited with an eye toward divisional representation.
3. We discussed how CC and CEPP might collaborate on fine-tuning criteria of the new General Education curriculum, particularly the Bridge Experience and the Senior Coda, for which the CC has requested greater clarity. What would the process look like, and how would populate the subcommittees?
4. We spent quite a bit of time clarifying our own understandings of the Bridge experience in terms of its content. Among these clarifications: Bridge courses would address power/justice, would have a US focus, and a hands-on/real-world component; unlike the FYE, Bridge courses need not be brand new, need not be offered by every faculty member or even every department, and need not fit a singular mold; though sophomores are the ideal target of the Bridge courses, the students need not be sophomores. We also clarified that not only Bridge, but all the non-FYE Gen Ed courses can fulfill up to two total Gen Ed requirements. These courses would have much more flexibility. For example, existing courses could add a 1-credit hands-on component to qualify as a Bridge course.
5. We also spent quite a bit of time clarifying the process around Bridge and Coda refinement of criteria. Refinement done in keeping with the spirit of the criteria voted in by the faculty would need only sub-committee approval, but any substantive modification of criteria would require faculty approval. We generally felt that faculty should remain well apprised of these further refinements (via CEPP dashboard) so that interested parties can register their views in real time. As well, it would be imperative to educate the faculty about these refined criteria so as to streamline the approval process for Ged Ed courses. There are Mellon funds to host workshops for precisely this faculty instruction. Per the grant application, the initial focus of those workshops shall be on the Bridge Experience, since that is the major lacuna right now: we are going to need the most number of new courses in that part of the new Ged Ed curriculum. We discussed the prospect of reconvening members of the former Bridge sub-committee with the Chair of CC—at least as an initial step toward figuring out the constitution of this year’s subcommittee(s). An immediate goal would be to elicit/collect syllabi from existing courses that fit the bill so as to test out the criteria already developed by the sub-committees; those test cases would indicate where criteria needs to be refined.
6. Support for faculty developing new courses: There are funds for pedagogy clusters (3-4 faculty per cluster). These clusters would allow faculty members from across the college to brainstorm about pedagogies for courses in the new curriculum. These clusters would not only help toward building communities (i.e., working across differences toward a common goal), thus potentially improving climate, but also would help to “norm” the curriculum fruitfully. That initial “norming” would help later when approving assessing courses, a second level of consistency.
7. Tabled item #3 on agenda until next week: Discuss path forward on developing subcommittee to review of quantitative student evaluations of teaching (SET) or “Deans cards” forms.
8. Per FEC’s request, we reviewed the criteria for our committee membership to see if there’s anything we can loosen up so that FEC has more flexibility. We decided the divisional and tenured/non-tenured diversity is necessary in order to ensure the broadest educational vision, and the 3-year term important for cultivating the Chair of the committee.
9. Finalized status of Assessment director on CEPP; discussed suggested change in language to the faculty handbook. We discussed the *ex oficio* status of the assessment director: the director would serve in a consultative/advisorial role, but would not be a voting member of CEPP. It would be important, too, for the assessment director to liaise between CEPP and the effectiveness assessment committee on IPPC.