CEPP Meeting Minutes

11.20.2019

In attendance: Andrew Bozio, Jina Mao, Pat Hilleren, Steve Ives Peter von Allmen, Michael Orr, Riley Filister, Noa Mills, Michael Marx and Marta Brunner

Absent: Cerri Banks, Feryaz Ocackli

The commenced at 2:30pm

CEPP had representatives from the language study requirement working group (Michael Marx) and former CEPP member and working group member (Marta Brunner).

The working group reported feeling stuck. Namely, the language study requirement is mostly expected to be completed in the WLL. However, in an effort to offer an alternative path for those who might be international students and already know multiple languages, and/or could benefit from bolstering their English skills, a second option, such as ELL instruction, writing (EN105), and language study (e.g. WLL) are, while related, are really divergent approaches.

An initial solution the group thought of was to create a world languages and literatures course (e.g. WLE 281), that could focus on English, incorporating culture, speaking and writing, similar to other WLL courses. This was deemed an unviable option.

Previously, there was a “pre-college” course EN095, for international students where there might be concerns for English language proficiency. Students were required to successfully complete for admission into Skidmore. Admissions has since pivoted to the TOEFL and could be viewed as more rigorous.

There was further discussion about how we are currently addressing ELL concerns and steps we could consider to formally implement ELL or ELL-like instruction and how we might screen for those who need it (e.g. webcape testing?, English DSP, etc). However, some of these approaches would require multiple courses and would create additional burden, although the goal would be bolstering self-efficacy, would create an inequity of requirements amongst students.

However, while ELL was one concern, another is that for students who might already know multiple languages (e.g. international students), the goal of the language study requirement is redundant and the students’ time might be better spent in other coursework.

In either case retaining student choice is likely important, though some may be strongly recommended to consider engaging in ELL or ELL-like instruction, better preparing such students for academic success at an institution of native English.

We discussed that perhaps the ELL aspect of the language study is really a separate matter, and that it might be the case that we retain the language study requirement, as typically conducted by students currently and likely in the new GE curriculum, and that exemption might be allowed.

CEPP ask the language study working group representative (M. Marx) to refine their proposal based upon our conversation.

The meeting concluded at 3:42.

Respectfully submitted by,

Steve Ives