Committee on Educational Policies and Planning
2010-2011 Annual Report

Membership for 2010-2011
Bob Turner, Government, faculty representative (08-11 term); Chair 2010-2011
Terry Diggory, English, faculty representative (08-11 term), fall semester
Michael Arnush, Classics, faculty representative (08-11 term), spring semester
Rubén Graciani, Dance, faculty representative (09-12 term)
Mimi Hellman, Art History, faculty representative (09-12 term)
Josh Ness, Biology and Environmental Studies, faculty representative (10-13 term)
Chris Kopec, Management and Business, faculty representative (10-13 term)

Susan Kress, Vice President for Academic Affairs, administration representative, Sep 1-Oct 31
Muriel Poston, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, administration representative, Nov 1 – May 31
Rochelle Calhoun, Dean of Student Affairs, administration representative

Logan Brenner, SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs, fall semester
Thomas Rivera, SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs, spring semester

CEPP members served on several committees, subcommittees, task forces, and initiatives, including:

- Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Programs (ACOP), a standing CEPP subcommittee (Rubén Graciani)
- Assessment Steering Committee, a standing CEPP subcommittee (Mimi Hellman)
- CEPP and CAPT Committees Subcommittee on Revising the Dean's Cards, (Bob Turner, Chair, Josh Ness, Chris Kopec)
- Institutional Policies and Planning Committee (Bob Turner)
- Revising the Culture Centered Inquiry Requirement Subcommittee (Michael Arnush, Chair)
- Transition and Transformation Faculty Working Group (Bob Turner)

Michael Arnush and Janet Casey were elected to three-year terms and will replace Bob Turner and Terry Diggory/Michael Arnush, who have rotated off the committee. Josh Ness will chair CEPP during the 2011-2012 academic year.

The 2010-11 Annual Report is divided into three sections: long term educational policy and planning initiatives; motions, pilot programs, or administrative policies changed; and educational policy and planning issues that were discussed.

Section I. Long term educational policy and planning initiatives
- Excellence in Teaching
- Assessment
- Transition and Transformation
- Revision of Cultural Diversity Requirement

- Arthur Vining Davis (AVD) Grant and Civic Engagement at Skidmore
- Can CEPP create its own ad-hoc committees?
- Development of Educational and Procedural Criteria for Establishing a Minor
- Institutionalizing Intergroup Relations (IGR) program at Skidmore College

Section II. Motions, Pilot Programs, and Administrative Policies
- Accepting on-line course transfer credits from other institutions
- Revising the drop/add deadline on the Academic Calendar.
- Articulation Agreement for Business with RIT and Syracuse.
- Three Year Pilot Program for Study Abroad in Beijing and Shanghai, China

Section III. Consultation
- Office of the Dean of Special Programs Mission Statement
- Academic Affairs Budget Priorities and Planning
- Five-Year Strategic Priorities selected by Academic Affairs
- VPAA Disciplines Project
- Academic Calendar 2012-2013
- Reduction of CEPP Faculty Membership

I. Long Term Educational Policy and Planning Issues

Excellence in Teaching
One of CEPP's major issues for the academic year was Excellence in Teaching. On September 15, CEPP met with Paty Rubio and Beau Breslin to review the data from the Dean's Cards and Scribner Seminar evaluations on the quality of teaching at Skidmore. Our meeting emphasized the opportunity for improving teaching as well as the limits of the existing Dean's Cards and Scribner Seminar evaluation process.   CEPP is concerned that our current quantitative rating system, the Dean's Cards, do not provide faculty with sufficient information on how to improve their teaching. CEPP's concern is consistent with Rik Scarce's Report to CEPP on Quantitative Student Ratings of Faculty (2010).

CEPP subsequently formed a joint CEPP-CAPT Subcommittee on Student Rating Instruments including Bob Turner (chair), Josh Ness and Chris Kopec from CEPP, Viviana Rangil and Carolyn Anderson from CAPT, and Paty Rubio from the DOF. The CEPP-CAPT Subcommittee on Student Rating Instruments met twelve times in the Spring semester to draft a new student rating instrument and implement a pilot study of the instrument and brought in two outside experts to give presentations and lead workshops for the faculty on student rating instruments with funding from NSF ADVANCE and Teagle Foundation grants.

On December 14, 2010, Catherine Ross, the Managing Director of Wake Forest University's Teaching and Learning Center, gave a presentation at Academic Staff on "Myths and Research on Student Evaluations." The Subcommittee also provided readings about best practices in student ratings and faculty evaluations to educate the faculty about the theoretical and empirical research on student rating systems. We also created the first comprehensive list of all department and program long forms to identify the significant variation in long forms across campus. A copy of the readings and the list of long forms is available on the CEPP webpage and

was distributed to all department and program chairs. Over 60 chairs, program directors and other faculty attended the workshop. Professor Ross also met with members of CAPT and CEPP.

On April 8, 2011, Joey Sprague, Professor of Sociology at the University of Kansas, gave a talk and led a workshop, "Student Ratings: Evaluating Teaching or Evaluating Gender?" for department chairs and program directors. Professor Sprague's trip was funded by the NSF ADVANCE grant to Support Women Faculty in STEM Disciplines at Skidmore and Union Colleges (C. Berheide, P.I.). Over 45 faculty attended the workshop. She also met with individuals from CAPT and CEPP. Professors Ross and Sprague provided specific advice regarding the design of the rating instrument and the process for facilitating a faculty discussion. Both presentations emphasized the importance of using multiple methods to evaluate teaching, the validity of student rating systems as one measure of teaching, and the importance of utilizing well designed student rating instruments. Further, both speakers emphasized that "homemade" student rating instruments are susceptible to gender/racial/interpretation bias (by students and faculty alike) and rarely allow us to capture externalities that may be important in interpreting responses

The CEPP-CAPT Subcommittee on Student Rating Instruments also met twelve times in the Spring semester to draft an alternative rating instrument and discuss how to interpret and present information from these forms. Members of the subcommittee conducted separate focus groups with untenured faculty, tenured faculty, faculty on contingent appointments, writers and artists in residence, and teaching associates. The focus groups discussed the questions in the rating instrument and how the new information will be used and distributed. The Subcommittee also met with Joe Stankovich (Director of Institutional Research) and Kate Berheide and reviewed a number of options to discuss how the data should be analyzed and presented to faculty. We also discussed the administration and implementation of the new rating instrument, including the possibility of moving all of these ratings and evaluations on-line, with Joe Stankovich, Justin Sipher and members of IT.

At the end of the semester, we conducted a pilot study of the new instrument (see Appendix A). 32 tenured full and associate professors volunteered to participate in the pilot study, providing 56 classes, with a healthy mix from different disciplines and levels (15 social science, 16 natural science, 16 humanities, 7 performing arts; 19 classes at the 100 level, 22 at the 200 level, and 15 at the 300 level) and approximately 1,200 students. IR is scanning the survey results. Faculty participants will be provided with the results for their class. The results will not be shared with the DOF or Chairs. We have also been very clear with our participants that the pilot is a draft. In our letter to the volunteers, we wrote: "The pilot is intended to test the performance of the new form only. It does not mean that a new student rating system will be implemented in the future. It does not mean that the questions cannot be changed. It does not mean that the format has been changed."

CEPP and CAPT have agreed that the CAPT-CEPP Subcommittee should continue next year, with the incoming chair of CAPT, Greg Pfitzer, replacing Viviana. Bob Turner has been asked to stay on the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee has several important issues to address next year. First, the Subcommittee will review the data from the Pilot Study to assess the usefulness

of data generated by a longer set of questions. Second, the Subcommittee should analyze the validity and reliability issues with the pilot study questions, perhaps bringing in outside faculty with statistical training for help. Third, the Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of alternative presentation formats of the results for formative and summative purposes. Fourth, the Subcommittee should solicit the input of students, perhaps through SGA Academic Council. Fifth, the Subcommittee should continue to consult with faculty in light of new information gathered as a result of the pilot survey and the aforementioned discussions.

CEPP also reviewed the appointment and reporting structure for Faculty Network Facilitator (FNF), Erica Bastress Dukehart. The FNF currently has 6 faculty interest groups (FIGs). The intent of the FIGs is to combine building community among faculty with improving pedagogy and teaching. For example, the "Sports and Society" FIG members have had discussions about how they incorporate sports into their classes and used funding from the FNF to bring in a guest speaker to discuss Title IX and the teaching of sports. The FNF also participates in the first year faculty learning group.

The FNF is an important educational policy innovation, both for improving pedagogy at the college and identifying emerging educational policy issues CEPP should address. The new student rating instrument will provide considerably more information to faculty about their relative strengths and weaknesses in the classroom. Catherine Ross informed CEPP that identifying a faculty member who can help faculty address issues is critical for ensuring that a new student rating instrument translates into improved teaching and also reducing faculty anxiety about the new instrument. The FNF should play a critical role in mentoring with the new student rating instrument. Moreover, the FNF should meet periodically with CEPP or CEPP chair to discuss what the FIGs are doing and identify any emergent educational policy issues.

Assessment
CEPP devoted considerable attention this year to the issue of Assessment. CEPP discussed Assessment in 8 meetings during the 2010-11 year in addition to having Mimi Hellman serve on the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC). Rubén Graciani also attended an assessment conference in Chicago with Sarah Goodwin, the Faculty Assessment Coordinator. CEPP discussed the status of various assessment initiatives, how to improve assessment at Skidmore, and restructuring the ongoing relationship between CEPP and the ASC.

CEPP explored with ASC a number of the Committee's assessment initiatives including the latest draft of the Alumni Learning Census, the Teagle-supported project regarding "Effective Communication," the College-wide Academic Assessment Plan for 2011-2016, and the mapping of student learning goals in curricular and co-curricular activities. We also reviewed a number of assessment reports including the Periodic Review Report and the 2010 NSSE results.

Based upon our extensive involvement, CEPP has made a number of suggestions about the future direction of assessment at Skidmore. We are concerned that we may be trying to do more assessment than we can be expected to do reasonably well or that we have the ability as an institution to respond to. CEPP is very concerned about the potential for "assessment fatigue." Specifically, imposing numerous assessment initiatives may overload department chairs and

program directors and produce serious motivational issues. These concerns came to a head in reference to the ambition and scope of the Teagle proposal regarding effective communication.

CEPP identified a series of guidelines for how we believe assessment should proceed.
1. *Be focused/Keep it simple*- the ASC should focus its assessment agenda. ASC should identify one or two major assessment initiatives per year, rather than conducting many assessment initiatives.
2. *Use existing data*- A culture of assessment is gradually emerging at Skidmore. Many departments or programs are conducting quality assessment initiatives. ASC can be the repository for such data. Moreover, ASC should use data collected by departments or programs (departmental efforts at assessing writing) and professors (Professor Walzer's student culture data, Professor Ford's IGR data) to supplement its initiatives. ASC should also ask departments and programs to collect the data for ASC by using either existing data or minimally obtrusive measures.
3. *Steer not row*- It is difficult for committees to design and conduct social science research. ASC has struggled in designing its assessment initiatives. We believe ASC, to borrow an idea from the reinventing government movement, should "steer not row." It is not ASC's obligation to do assessment, but to see that assessment is done. Instead of seeking to design every assessment initiative itself, ASC should identify assessment needs by consulting broadly across the college (VPAA, DOF, CEPP, Chairs' and Program Directors' meetings), solicit proposals from interested faculty about how to best assess those goals, pay the faculty for conducting the assessment research, and then have ASC distribute the results.
4. *Close the loop*- CEPP believes we can better connect the assessment data we do collect to inform decisions that change our educational practices. If we are collecting data and doing nothing with it, or collecting data that we are going to ignore, then something is wrong.

CEPP devoted considerable attention to discussing the relationship between the ASC and CEPP. This is not a new issue. Ray Rodriguez, the first assessment coordinator, came to CEPP in 2002 to discuss what the relationship between CEPP and assessment should be, and we have continued to struggle with the reporting and institutional arrangements between CEPP and ASC during the intervening period. CEPP and ASC have concluded that the existing institutional arrangements, with ASC reporting to both CEPP and the VPAA, do not work well.

CEPP and ASC concur we should create an independent Assessment Committee. Many other colleges have independent assessment committees. We have asked Sarah Goodwin and ASC to draft a proposal for FEC about what the new committee's membership, mission, and relationship to CEPP should be. CEPP should discuss the proposed new institutional arrangements with ASC in the Fall and we can jointly present the proposal to FEC.

Finally, CEPP is committed to incorporating assessment data into its discussion of educational policy on a systematic basis. At its Summer Retreat, CEPP included assessment data as part of its discussion of each initiative it discussed at the end of the year

Transition and Transformation

In our first meeting of the year, CEPP decided to make the Transition and Transformation initiative one of our major issues. The Chair of CEPP, Bob Turner, participated in a faculty working group that discussed the director of experiential learning component of the T&T initiative. CEPP invited the Transitions and Transformations faculty working group to its Winter Retreat to discuss the plan to reorganize Career Services and also the work of the Coordinator of Experiential Learning. CEPP reviewed an excerpt from President Glotzbach's Strategic Renewal document, George Kuh's report on high impact educational practices, data on the occurrence of high impact experiences at Skidmore and the learning outcomes associated with these experiences, a working paper on a collaborative, cross-divisional approach for supporting students as they work to identify, prepare for, and achieve post-baccalaureate goals. CEPP agreed that the T&T issue was a priority for the committee and wanted to broaden our discussion of the issue. CEPP and Corey Freeman Gallant agreed to cosponsor presentations on T&T at the disciplinary roundtables of chairs and program directors organized by the DOF - Humanities, Science Planning Group, Social Sciences, and the Arts, followed by an Open Forum in the Spring.

At the roundtables, we briefly reviewed the history of the T&T initiative, but spent most of our time discussing the philosophy and programmatic components of the proposal. From these disciplinary meetings we discovered that many departments and programs are engaging in a wide variety of experiential learning activities such as internships, undergraduate research, civic engagement, partnerships with local organizations, and service learning. There is a significant variation in the level of experiential learning among departments and programs. It is an explicit component of some departments' curriculum (Social Work, Education, Arts Administration, Management and Business), capstone classes (Art History, Environmental Studies), and is a key cocurricular component of others (Dance, Studio Arts, Theater, Music). Other departments are starting to explore and identify experiential learning activities. In some programs, these activities are supported by a Teaching Associate (Exercise Science, Environmental Studies); in others a committed single faculty member (Foreign Language, Government). Many of these initiatives have evolved organically in response to student interest or the commitment of an individual faculty. There was a lack of awareness of what other departments and programs were doing, even within the same discipline.

In these roundtables, we identified three persistent themes. First, the experiential learning activities identified in the transition and transformation proposal are not new, but are something many, but not all, departments and programs and faculty are doing. Second, there is a significant concern about the time intensive nature of these activities. Identifying the opportunity, managing the relationships with external organizations, and overseeing the educational experience for students all require faculty time. There is a concern about the impact of providing these activities on faculty workload, especially in departments which are already stretched thin. Third, there is an unevenness in the perception of need for the initiative among the faculty. Some feel these activities are valuable, but can only be done in their departments and programs, and do not see the value of a faculty Coordinator of Experiential Learning and a centralized model. Others were very excited about learning best practices and having someone other than departments provide these services. Other chairs felt undertaking these initiatives would pose a new burden that they did not have resources to provide.

In his capacity as the Director of the Faculty-Student Summer Research Program and one of the creators of the SGA Responsible Citizenship Internship Award, the CEPP Chair introduced the two programs and several student participants at the March Trustee meeting. He noted a high level of enthusiasm among trustees and students for summer research and funded internships among the Trustees.

After consulting with chairs and program directors at the disciplinary roundtables, CEPP cosponsored an Open Forum on the T&T initiative on April 15 with FEC. CEPP's goals for the forum were to broaden the conversation about the T&T initiative in general and high impact practices among the faculty. CEPP provided the faculty with the T&T working paper, data on high impact experiences and educational and career outcomes at Skidmore, two scholarly articles on high impact experiences, and an excerpt of the President's Strategic Renewal document in advance of the meeting. The Open Forum saw a very spirited and productive discussion of the "Transition and Transformation" initiative which addressed the positive and negative aspects of its educational, curricular, institutional, and pedagogical implications. (See April 20, 2011 CEPP minutes for a list of issues that were raised.) CEPP attributed the high quality of the deliberation to the high level of interest in the subject matter, the provision of theoretical and empirical readings in lieu of formal presentations, and the unstructured format for the discussion.

After the Open Forum, CEPP recognized that the T&T working paper had two significant shortcomings. First, there was a lack of clarity about which components of the proposal were administrative in nature, and thus the purview of the Dean of Student Affairs and the IPPC, and which were educational policy and thus the appropriate purview of CEPP and the Faculty. CEPP agreed to disaggregate the administrative from the educational aspects of the initiative. The restructuring of Career Services will proceed under the Dean of Student Affairs, in consultation with CEPP and other institutional interests as appropriate.

Second, there was a lack of clarity about whether some of the provisions in the working paper were aspirational or curricular goals, specifically: "Advise all students into high impact experiences prior to graduation …" and "Engage 100% of all students in one or more high impact experiences by the end of their junior year of college. Students will understand the value of these experiences in the context of post-baccalaureate planning and success." CEPP recognizes that we need to clarify the curricular and advising language as part of a final proposal. There is also significant faculty uncertainty about the Coordinator for Experiential Learning (CEL) position. CEPP will form a working group to discuss the CEL position and the curricular and educational policy aspects of the T&T proposal. Josh Ness and Chris Kopec will draft a charge. Based on what the charge looks like, CEPP will decide whether to do this in-house or as a working group with membership from the broader college community.

Revision of Cultural Diversity Requirement
At the Winter Retreat, Winston Grady-Willis presented his Survey and Analysis of Culture Diversity Courses at Skidmore Report. CEPP agreed that the theoretical definition of cultural diversity has evolved since the original CD rationale was written. We decided we needed to articulate a new set of criteria which included gender, class, religion, and sexuality for the CD requirement. The refined definition would allow additional courses to satisfy the CD requirement.

CEPP subsequently decided to create a subcommittee to more systematically study the Culture-Centered Inquiry component of the all-College requirements in the context of the Learning Goals and Strategic Plan of the College. The subcommittee was chaired by Winston Grady-Willis, the co-chair of CIGU, and Michael Arnush of CEPP. The Subcommittee was asked 1) to evaluate the criteria for which courses would count toward the Cultural Diversity requirement, 2) whether to increase the number of courses students must take to satisfy the requirement, 3) whether to allow other required courses to count for the Culture-Centered Inquiry requirement (double counting) and 4) whether students should be required to fulfill the Culture-Centered Inquiry requirement by the end of their sophomore year.

The Subcommittee drafted a Culture Centered Inquiry proposal (see Appendix B) which would expand the number of courses students need to fulfill the requirement from 2 to 3. Students would be required to complete one course in a foreign language, one course exploring non-Western culture(s), and one course exploring issues of difference within a national or international context. It also renamed and expanded the old Cultural Difference requirement into a Considering Difference requirement.

At its Summer Retreat, CEPP agreed to present the proposal at the June 1 Chair and Program Director Meeting. CEPP is planning on consulting with departments and programs in September and October to identify additional courses which would meet the new guidelines and they would be willing to count towards the requirement. We plan on presenting a faculty motion at the November Faculty Meeting and voting in December.

Arthur Vining Davis (AVD) Grant and Civic Engagement at Skidmore
Responsible citizenship is one of the key goals of the Strategic Renewal document based on the *Strategic Plan,* which states "We will prepare every Skidmore student to make the choices required of an informed, responsible citizen at home and in the world." In 2011, Skidmore received a $250,000 grant from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations to advance civic engagement in the curriculum. The institutional grant was largely based on the research and planning of the Responsible Citizenship Task Force.

While the grant proposal was composed and submitted by a working group of administrators and faculty, and subsequently supported by the foundation during the academic year, CEPP did not see the proposal until Monday, May 9th, for consideration on Tuesday, May 10th, at the end-of-year CEPP retreat. The proposal states that "Each academic program will articulate how the public value of its disciplinary major curriculum helps students become informed, responsible citizens and will develop a strategic plan for greater civic engagement," and "We will double the number of courses for majors in the traditional liberal arts disciplines with a civic engagement component." The goals articulated in the AVD proposal will require faculty deliberation. With the grant already in hand the College will proceed with its implementation, but the extent to which departments and programs will adhere to these goals remains unclarified and undetermined.

At its summer retreat, CEPP discussed the AVD grant and the assessment data on civic engagement at Skidmore with David Karp, Associate Dean of Student Affairs. His presentation

addressed a number of issues including the number of service learning courses at Skidmore, student expectations and experience with civic engagement at Skidmore, the impact of service learning courses on academic and civic engagement, and what other peer institutions are doing. CEPP also reviewed the Final Report of the Responsible Citizenship Task Force, Civic Engagement at Skidmore College, January 2011, and the Arthur Vining Davis grant proposal (See Appendix C). David stated his belief that the AVD grant will be used to fund workshops and other incentives to encourage willing professors to develop courses that promote civic engagement (broadly defined) and not a mandate for departments or programs to change their curriculum.

In expectation of an increase in the number of civic engagement and service learning activities and courses resulting from the AVD grant, CEPP agreed to two goals at the retreat. First, one member of CEPP has participated on the Responsible Citizenship Task Force Subcommittee (Chris Kopec in 2010-11). CEPP should continue this participation to stay in touch with the curricular and educational policy initiatives that may emerge from AVD and from RCTF. Second, there are no official criteria for which courses count as Service Learning and Civic Engagement courses. Currently, professors tell David Karp whether the courses are service learning or not. David presented different language for designating courses. CEPP briefly discussed the merits of having higher versus lower standards for Service Learning and Civic Engagement courses. CEPP should work with the RCTF to develop curricular criteria for Service Learning and Civic Engagement courses which could be used in the course catalogue to distinguish these courses.

Can CEPP create its own ad-hoc committees?

During the debate over Transition and Transformation, one of the procedural/governance issues which emerged was whether CEPP has the ability to convene its own subcommittees, advisory committees or working groups. FEC does not believe it does. The current FEC believes that CEPP can form subcommittees with members of other committees (referred to as "joint subcommittees" by FEC), but that it cannot form mixed subcommittees with members of faculty who are not on a committee without FEC's approval. In support of this interpretation, FEC cites the Faculty Handbook which reads, "FEC also participates in the appointment of faculty representatives to various all- College committees;" as well as "Members of the Administration may appoint, in consultation with the FEC, ad hoc committees as the need arises."

However, CEPP's operating code reads: "CEPP may appoint such subcommittees from among its members or from the College community at large as it deems helpful to facilitate its work." The Faculty Handbook also reads, "CEPP may appoint such subcommittees from among its members or from the College community at large as it deems helpful to facilitate its work." CEPP believes that the Faculty Handbook clearly gives CEPP the ability to create subcommittees as it sees fit to advise it on educational policy issues.

Our interpretation of the Faculty Handbook is supported by a review of the precedent. The Chair of CEPP reviewed the past 9 CEPP annual reports and identified thirteen past and present subcommittees, working groups, and advisory panels that CEPP has formed going back to 2003 (See Appendix D). The review suggests that

1. CEPP has consistently made use of Mixed Committees, (defined as a group whose membership consists of members of CEPP, other faculty members, some of whom are not on committees, as well as administrators) to address a wide array of curricular and educational policy issues including enrollment caps, study abroad, expository writing, DOS restructuring, academic grievance policy, and the first year experience.
2. FEC or CFG has never played any role in determining the membership of those committees.

Based upon our reading, we conclude that

1. CEPP's interpretation of the Faculty Handbook is amply supported by precedent.
2. The characteristics of CEPP demonstrated in that precedent are appropriate. CEPP's ability to recommend educational policy to the Faculty and Administration is crucially dependent on its ability to write its own charge and membership for its subcommittees.

One member of CEPP articulated that the Faculty Handbook contains a contradiction that needs to be resolved, and that CEPP's operating code should not take priority over the Faculty Executive Committee's prerogatives.

Development of Educational and Procedural Criteria for Establishing a Minor
After CEPP's summer retreat, an email discussion was had regarding the procedure for establishing an Arts Administration minor. Currently, the Curriculum Committee reviews the list of courses and their rationale for each minor's curriculum. In the past, some minors had been approved with the vote of the faculty (Environmental Studies), while others like International Affairs and Latin American Studies had not.

However, the Arts Administration minor is unique in that it would be Skidmore's first "coordinate minor". A coordinate minor is one in which only students majoring in designated majors would be able to minor (AH, AR, MU, TH, DA in the case of the Arts Administration minor). The approval of the Arts Administration minor could set an educational precedent for future similarly constructed minors in topics such as Public Health, Media Studies, Public Policy, or Inter-Group Relations.

CEPP believes the AA minor raises a number of important educational policy issues that should be addressed by CEPP. First, should Skidmore establish "coordinate minors", which can only be accessed by majors from few select majors? Second, should Skidmore establish minors or programs without a minimum amount of institutional support? Can we have curricular options that are not supported by tenure track positions and/or that require internships? Third, should Skidmore have clear educational criteria for minors/programs/concentrations or should we approve them on an ad hoc basis? Clearly there a number of other potential "coordinate minors" that might come forward- (IGR, Public Health, Public Policy, Media Studies). Fourth, what should the process be for approving minors? This is clearly FEC's purview, in consultation with CEPP and the Curriculum Committee (CC).

CEPP recognized the immediacy of this issue for the AA minor. The Catalog previews the creation of an Arts Administration minor, and CC has been approving courses under the AA

rubric. Our intent is that CEPP, FEC and CC will address these issues as early as possible in the coming academic year.

Institutionalizing Intergroup Relations (IGR) program at Skidmore College
At the Summer Retreat, CEPP met with Kristie Ford to discuss the assessment data on the educational impact of IGR and the institutionalization of the pilot Intergroup Relations (IGR) program at Skidmore College. IGR clearly has a major learning impact on participating students and supports several parts of our Strategic Plan. CEPP discussed how to allow students who take the IGR sequence to have that participation reflected on their transcript. Among the questions discussed were the merits of different programmatic designations for IGR, including a program, minor, or something akin to Honors Forum. What are the merits of different designations? CEPP also discussed CEPP's role in the process. CEPP agreed that the IGR courses would count towards satisfying the new Considering Difference requirement (see above). CEPP members raised concerns about creating a curriculum designation if there are not sufficient institutional resources in terms of faculty committed to the program. Currently, the IGR classes are taught by faculty teaching overloads or on leave from their home departments. Without making interdisciplinary-like hires in other departments where the faculty member would be committed to teaching two IGR courses, it would be difficult to commit to creating a minor in the curriculum. CEPP also discussed the potential of using a post-doc faculty hired with a Mellon grant to provide sufficient institutional support.

Section II Motions, Pilot Programs, and Administrative Policies
This section details the motions, pilot programs, or administrative policies that CEPP either introduced or approved this academic year which changed an aspect of Skidmore's educational or curricular policy.

Accepting on-line course transfer credits from other institutions
CEPP proposed changing our policy on transfer credit that would allow on-line courses from accredited institutions to be accepted.   The Motion and Rationale read as follows:

CEPP moves that effective Spring 2011, Skidmore will accept in transfer on-line course work completed successfully through an appropriately accredited institution.

Implementation: All the current requirements for the awarding of transfer credit apply, including but not limited to institutional accreditation, minimum required grade, and the need for an official transcript.

Rationale:

- On-line courses have become a routine set of offerings at many regionally accredited institutions (80%), and students have the opportunity to enroll in those courses as part of the array of courses available to them.
- As recommended by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) official transcripts rarely identify the mode of instruction. It is nearly impossible to identify on-line courses from the transcript and catalog description alone.

- The decisions made about course equivalency and quality should be based upon course content and student learning objectives and not on how that material is delivered.
- Students away on leave, completing an internship away from campus, working during the summer, or finishing in absentia would find it especially helpful to have this option available to them as a way to complete requirements.

The motion was approved by the faculty.

Revising the drop/add deadline on the Academic Calendar
The Registrar, Dave DeConno, proposed having two separate dates - an add deadline (5 days from the start of classes, same as the current drop/add date) and then a drop deadline (two weeks from the start of classes). Currently the drop/add deadline on the Academic Calendar is the same date. For the 2011-12 academic year, it would look like:
September 13 (Tues) Add Deadline
September 21 (Wed) Drop Deadline
The Registrar suggested that having two deadlines is what we actually practice and would make things clearer for both students and faculty. CEPP concurred and approved the changes.

Articulation Agreement for Business with RIT and Syracuse
CEPP, the Office of Academic Advising and the Office of the Registrar have approved articulation agreements proposed by the Management and Business Department with RIT (Saunders College of Business) and Syracuse (Whitman School of Management). The articulation agreements are modeled after the existing agreements with Clarkson University and Union College. The articulation agreements will give Skidmore management and business majors preferential admission at RIT and special consideration at Syracuse. CEPP announced their approval at the April 1 faculty meeting. (See Appendix E)

Three Year Pilot Program for Study Abroad in Beijing and Shanghai, China
CEPP approved an ACOP proposal to initiate a three-year pilot program for study abroad in China run by IES in Beijing and Shanghai, China. The proposal, with one track for students with previous language study (Beijing) and one with no Chinese language prerequisite (Shanghai), but required language study at both, comes with the endorsement of ACOP and Tim Harper, the chair of the Department of Management & Business. (See Appendix F.)

III. CONSULTATION
College officials bring various issues to CEPP to discuss. In the 2010-11 year, CEPP discussed the following issues:

Office of the Dean of Special Programs Mission Statement
Jeff Segrave joined the Committee for a review of the proposed revisions to the mission statement for the ODSP. The mission no longer accurately reflected the efforts and goals of the ODSP. Conversation focused on the how to explain the new directions, new emphasis, and re-purposed goals of the ODSP.

Academic Affairs Budget Priorities and Planning

Throughout the year CEPP discussed academic priorities and planning, focusing in particular on the fiscal constraints that already have affected or that may in the future affect educational policies and planning. Members of CEPP attended Academic Staff meetings and retreats where these issues were discussed more broadly.

Five-Year Strategic Priorities selected by Academic Affairs
Susan Kress distributed the Academic Affairs Five-Year Strategic Priorities document to CEPP members and explained its development in response to the President's request that each division of the college identify priorities for the second half of the ten-year period covered by the college's Strategic Plan. Each unit within Academic Affairs has its own five-year plan. This list of priorities is more elaborate than the Action Agenda just coming out of President's Cabinet and now going to the Institutional Policy and Planning Committee (IPPC). CEPP discussed the issue twice. In the future, this issue may require more discussion as a way for CEPP to ensure the faculty's educational priorities are consistent with Academic Affairs Strategic Priorities.

VPAA Disciplines Project
This project arose from community conversations last year about the liberal arts in general and Skidmore in particular in the Town Hall meetings, in Skidmore 101, in the discussion group (run by Michael Arnush and Pushi Prasad), in the community discussion of the learning goals, as well as on the themes in President Glotzbach's report, "Strategic Renewal: Reframing our Priorities at the Midpoint of the *Strategic Plan*." Questions about the disciplines *as disciplines* also arose in the discussions ensuing from the administrative call for departments and programs to collaborate (where appropriate) to recruit faculty.

CEPP discussed how to build on the faculty presentations and conversation about disciplinary issues at the Academic Staff Retreat and how to achieve the following goals:
- To promote better understanding about the work of the disciplines across campus
- To motivate conversation about disciplinary goals within the major and within general education
- To motivate conversation about learning goals
- To motivate conversation about the public value of the disciplines
- To motivate conversation about the relationship between disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity

Academic Calendar 2012-2013
In May, CEPP discussed and endorsed the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar proposed by Ann Henderson. Owing to the quirks of the 2012-13 calendar, it was possible to create a Thanksgiving week break. CEPP decided against creating a Thanksgiving week break for the 2012-13 calendar since we would not be able to offer one in future normal calendar years and it would create confusion for students and faculty.

CEPP Reduction
CEPP discussed whether to downsize the number of faculty on the committee and decided to inform FEC that it intends to retain the current composition of six elected faculty.

Appendix A Student Rating of Teaching and Courses – Pilot Study Spring 2011

Skidmore is considering an alternative to the existing faculty and course evaluation survey. The information you provide below will be used to assess the validity and usefulness of the new questions. While your answers to this pilot test of the new questions will help instructors improve their teaching, they will not be used for evaluating the overall performance of the faculty this year. Your instructor will not receive the results until after final course grades are submitted to the registrar. We appreciate your willingness to help us pilot test the survey.

Please use a pencil or a dark ink pen and fill in the bubbles completely.

Section I. Course Questions: Please respond to the questions using this scale by filling in one bubble per question.

Section I. Course Questions: Please respond to the questions using this scale by filling in one bubble per question.

1.   The course content was well organized
2.   The course objectives were met
3.   The readings/handouts/videos made a valuable contribution
4.   The methods of evaluating student learning were appropriate to the course goals.
5.   The course helped me learn information, concepts and methods…
6.   The course developed my ability to communicate clearly about the subject
7.   The course enabled me to think independently about the subject matter
        Disagree Strongly, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree, Agree Strongly, NA

8.   What is the overall rating of this course?

        Poor   Fair   Good   Very Good   Excellent

Section II. Instructor Questions: Please respond to the questions using this scale by filling in one bubble per question.
9.   The instructor presented the course material clearly
10.   The instructor was prepared for class
11.   The instructor answered questions well
12.   The instructor stimulated interest in the subject
13.   The instructor gave assignments related to the course goals
14.   The instructor provided clear criteria for grading
15.   The instructor was willing to meet with students outside of class
16.   The instructor suggested ways students could improve
17.   The instructor returned graded work in a reasonable amount of time
18.   The instructor treated students with respect
19.   The instructor set high standards for students
        Disagree Strongly, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree, Agree Strongly, NA

20.   What is the overall rating of this instructor's teaching?

Poor   Fair   Good   Very Good   Excellent

Section III. Student Information Questions:

21. Which best describes this course for you?	22. On average, how many hours a week did you spend outside of class preparing for this course?	23. My desire to take this course was:
O Requirement for my major O All college requirement O Elective for major O Other requirement O Elective	O 0 O 1-3 O 4-6 O 7-9 O 10-14 O 15+	O Much more than most courses O More than most courses O About the same as most courses O Less than most courses O Much less than most courses
24. Overall, how much have you learned in this course?	25. Expected grade in this course:	26. Are you:
O Much more than most courses O More than most courses O About the same as most courses O Less than most courses O Much less than most courses	O A O B O C O D O F O Pass O Fail O Other	O Man O Woman O Gender variant

APPENDIX B Proposed Changes in the Culture-Centered Inquiry Requirements

DRAFT, May 29, 2011

Motion
To expand the Culture-Centered Inquiry (and rename it the "Intercultural Literacy") Requirement by one additional course from a newly-named and defined "Considering Difference" cluster, while retaining the Foreign Literature and Language and the Non-Western Cultures requirement, thus constituting a three-course requirement.

Rationale

Currently, students take two courses to complete the Culture-Centered Inquiry requirement: one course in a foreign language or literature, and one course from either the "Non-Western Cultures" or "Cultural Diversity" cluster. The guiding principle behind the creation of the existing Cultural Diversity courses was straightforward enough: "In completing a Cultural Diversity course students are encouraged to compare at least two markedly different cultures, one of which must be non-Western in origin." However, the emphasis placed on a Western/Non-Western binary is no longer satisfactory in determining whether a course should be provided the proposed "Considering Difference" designation. There are both historical and contemporary examples of two or more fundamentally Non-Western groups that may see one another as "markedly different." Contemporary and increasingly transnational scholarship and pedagogy also call for revisiting this principle. Several fields (including Africana Studies, Caribbean Studies, and Latin American Studies) illuminate intra-group tensions along fault lines of class, gender, ethnicity and sexuality that run as deep as those that cross racial lines.

A survey of existing Cultural Diversity courses suggests that *race* and *ethnicity* are synonymous with societal difference. However, issues of societal difference also can be analyzed in terms of *gender*, *gender expression, religion, sexuality*, *and socioeconomic class*, both in national and international contexts. The proposed Considering Difference guidelines should reflect this fact, particularly given the growing number of courses that apply an intersectional analytical frame that explicitly interrogates relationships among gender, race, class, sexuality, religion and other variables.

Three-Course Intercultural Literacy Requirement

There has been discussion in some quarters of expanding the current Culture-Centered Inquiry Requirement for several years. A key issue informing the discussion has been the relationship between the number of courses in the requirement and the particular point in an individual student's journey in which she or he chooses to enroll in such courses. CIGU already has endorsed "A Survey and Analysis of Cultural Diversity Courses at Skidmore College," a December 2009 report that urged CEPP to consider a proposal expanding the requirement. "That a student can complete this requirement by enrolling in only one such course—perhaps in her or his final semester at Skidmore—raises legitimate concerns about the seriousness with which we view our commitment to intercultural literacy, as well as intercultural and global understanding," the report noted. This issue has also emerged with regularity in exit interviews with graduating students of color. Last year, a graduating senior remarked, "I hate that so many students wait

until senior year to take a Non-Western course. Why not earlier on?" This student had spoken with a White classmate who regretted doing precisely this. "Waiting until senior year makes it feel like it's unimportant."

Evidence that supports the proposed three-course Intercultural Literacy Requirement over the existing two-course Culture Centered Inquiry requirement is not exclusively anecdotal. The 2010 NSSE survey provided highlighted continued growth in terms of some measures of diversity, including the impact of Skidmore's robust off-campus study experiences. However, some NSSE data also pointed to areas of concern, especially in terms of the curriculum. When students responded to (1e) "Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments," their answers represented a seven-point drop among Skidmore seniors in 2003 and 2007, a three-point drop among Skidmore seniors in 2007 and 2010, and a nine-point drop among our seniors in 2007 and 2010 when compared to seniors at peer institutions. The Goals for Student Learning and Development call, among other things, for our students to "understand social and cultural diversity in national and global contexts," to "interact effectively and collaboratively with individuals and across social identities," and to "interrogate one's own values in relation to those of others, across social and cultural differences." These tasks can be accomplished more effectively if students confront these issues explicitly in a robust three-course general education requirement. While it also would be desirable to require students to complete the requirement early in their academic careers, we lack the resources to offer a sufficient number of courses to do so.[1]

Existing Language for the Culture-Centered Inquiry Requirements
Students fulfill this requirement by completing one course in a foreign language plus a second course designated as either non-Western culture or cultural diversity study.

- Foreign Literature and Language: All students must choose one course at the appropriate level in a foreign language or foreign literature in its non-translated form.
- Non-Western Culture: Students may fulfill the requirement by successfully completing one 3- or 4-credit course designated as Non-Western (NW).
- Cultural Diversity Study: Students may fulfill the requirement by successfully completing one 3- or 4-credit course designated as Cultural Diversity (CD).

Proposed Language for the Intercultural Literacy Requirement
Students fulfill this requirement by completing one course in a foreign language, one course exploring non-Western culture(s), and one course exploring issues of difference within a national or international context.

- Foreign Literature and Language: All students must choose one course at the appropriate level in a foreign language or foreign literature in its non-translated form.
- Non-Western Cultures: Students must fulfill the requirement by successfully completing one 3- or 4-credit course designated as Non-Western (NW).
- Considering Difference: Students must fulfill the requirement by successfully completing one 3- or 4-credit course designated as Considering Difference (CD).

---

[1] Approximately 67% of students complete the requirement in years 1-2, 20% in year 3, and 13% in year 4.

Intercultural Literacy Guidelines: [note: ~~original language~~ **new language**]

Non-Western Cultures: [no change from current language]

In completing a Non-Western Cultures course students are required to study culture(s) that are neither European, nor derived from European culture.
a. The students may focus on a particular dimension of a culture or culture-area (e.g., social institutions, artistic productions, religious beliefs, historical experiences) as an organizing principle, but that dimension must be continuously placed in reference to others that also significantly shape the culture(s) in question;
b. If the context for these courses is comparative and cross-cultural in nature the students must study in depth a culture, cultures, or culture area; such comparative courses will be focused on a small number of cultures;
c. The NW course will normally include the cultures of Asia, Africa, Oceania, and the indigenous, pre-European cultures of Australia and of the Western Hemisphere. Courses concerning areas with both Western and non-Western elements such as the Near East or the Western Hemisphere must include a signif
icant focus on non-Western culture or cultures, e.g., American Indians in the case of the Western Hemisphere, or Muslim peoples in the case of the Near East;
d. If the context for the course material is historical in nature, the students will not deal primarily with cultures from which Western culture is derived, e.g., ancient Greece or ancient Israel, nor with cultures that are primarily influenced by Western culture, e.g., modern Israeli, Brazilian, or Afro-American culture history, unless such a course meets criterion "c" above.

~~Cultural Diversity~~ **Considering Difference**:

In completing a ~~Cultural Diversity~~ **CD** course students are encouraged to compare at least two markedly different ~~cultures, one of which must be non-Western in origin.~~ **groups by analyzing issues of difference within a given national or international context, with particular emphasis on their impact on societies.**
a. Students investigate the interaction of peoples from ~~culturally~~ **historically** distinct origins within a given socio-political context. These courses may focus on diversity in the United States or ~~on inter-cultural relations in other contexts. However, at least one of the groups examined will have non-Western origins~~ **elsewhere**;
b. Students examine the non-Western cultural forces that are manifest in the interaction of peoples of non-Western origin with peoples of Western backgrounds, and they pay particular attention to the cross-cultural influences that shape such interactions. These forces and influences will be examined from the perspectives of the peoples involved;
c. ~~The socio-political context for the interaction between the groups studied need not be non-Western~~ Students study interactions between ~~two~~ populations, **as well as within one population,** ~~one of which must be~~ **that are** non-Western in origin. These may include diasporic populations that are not traditionally considered to be Western in origin (e.g., African-Americans, ~~Asian-Americans, South African Indians,~~ **Afro-Brazilians, Asian South Africans, European Roma**) as well as commonly included non-Western populations;

d. **Students examine issues of difference within populations involving interactions that are framed by constructions of social identity variables such as ethnicity, gender, gender expression, race, religion, sexuality and socioeconomic class. These courses may focus on issues of difference within an intergroup or intragroup context.**

Timeline
- Spring semester 2011: CEPP prepared a draft motion/rationale, shared it with Curriculum Committee and received useful feedback. CEPP charged a subcommittee with crafting a revision by May 2nd; the subcommittee completed its work in late April and submitted its report to CEPP.
- **June 1st: share the motion/rationale with department chairs and program directors. Invite feedback from chairs and directors between June 1 and the start of fall 2011 (reminder will go out at the end of August).**
- September: CEPP to review feedback from chairs and directors
- September-October: share the motion/rationale, with any revisions, with Curriculum Committee, IPPC, and interested individual departments, programs and faculty
- November: bring the motion/rationale to the floor of the faculty. Hold one or more open fora to discuss the motion/rationale
- December: bring the motion/rationale, with any revisions, to a vote
- Spring semester 2012: solicit courses for both existing NW and new CD clusters
- Implementation: 2012/13 or 2013/14

Appendix C: Proposal to the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, "Civic Engagement in the Curriculum"

Skidmore College respectfully requests a grant of $250,000 from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations to help us launch a major initiative to advance, institutionalize and sustain a comprehensive program of civic engagement in the curriculum. The program will build on a multi-year planning effort by our Responsible Citizenship Task Force (http://cms.skidmore.edu/campuslife/community_service/upload/RCTF-Civic-Engagement-Status-Report.pdf) to develop the capacity of our faculty to undertake this transformational effort.

Background and Strategic Significance

Skidmore's president, Philip Glotzbach, has noted many times that Skidmore embodies the iconic values embedded in a classic liberal arts education. In Goal 3 of its *Strategic Plan* (http://cms.skidmore.edu/planning/), Skidmore articulates one such value: "We will prepare every Skidmore student to make the choices required of an informed, responsible citizen at home and in the world." Our recently adopted *Goals for Student Learning and Development* (http://cms.skidmore.edu/assessment/goals-for-student-learning.cfm) reflect this priority and underscore the faculty's commitment to it.

During the last academic year, President Glotzbach led an extended period of constituent outreach to explore the "value added" of a Skidmore education in light of the ongoing effects of the current economic crisis as well as the considerable cost of excellence here and at our peer institutions. One of the conclusions we reached as a result of those conversations is that, while a liberal education is the best possible preparation for life, we can do more to prepare our students for the transition from college to further studies or to the working world. As we reflect on how our courses and, as an extension of teaching and learning, our advising and mentoring practices, might change by situating them in the context of a larger developmental arc that extends beyond the classroom and into the community, we have decided that we can achieve the most profound and lasting impact by integrating civic engagement—in particular, service learning and community-based research that involves students—more fully and intentionally into our curriculum.

The Project

In 18 of Skidmore's 32 academic programs that offer undergraduate majors, faculty members have integrated civic engagement within their curricula. An ethos of civic engagement is particularly strong in our pre-professional and interdisciplinary programs. This group, however, despite its steadfast commitment to civic engagement, does not constitute a critical mass, either in faculty numbers or in curricular impact. Our challenge, given the considerable demands on the faculty, and in the context of a recessionary economic climate, is to expand the reach of civic engagement more intentionally and into a larger number of our academic programs, especially those in core liberal arts disciplines and in our First-Year Experience (FYE). While we are gratified that our recent efforts to educate faculty and students broadly about service learning and community-based research has yielded an impressive array of courses and research projects, we

recognize that comprehensive integration and institutionalization will require a shift in faculty culture and a newfound commitment to practical implementation at all levels of the curriculum.

Our project will link two inextricable aspects of our educational program: classroom instruction, and advising and mentoring. We will begin by asking our faculty to re-examine the public value and purpose of their disciplines; how they engage students in articulating how they will use their education to make a meaningful contribution to their local and global communities; and how they ensure that majors graduate with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to respond effectively to public issues and concerns.

At the same time, we will ask faculty to engage in advising that embraces the importance of civic engagement. Targeting second-semester students and sophomores through the advising relationship is a critical way to enhance civic engagement among a population of students that is searching for institutional connections. Linking this work with first- and second-year students to a more intentional focus within the majors will provide the comprehensive approach to enhanced civic engagement in the curriculum that we seek. In a related pilot initiative, we will work with our Skidmore off-campus study programs to create civic engagement opportunities for our students studying abroad.

The elements of our program are as follows:

Faculty Retreats: In the first two years we will offer four 2-day retreats, one each for faculty from the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and performing and visual arts. Each retreat will be facilitated by an external expert and will be designed to explore broad questions, such as the ones discussed above, and prepare participants to take the next steps in capacity building, further engagement of their peers, and curricular development.

Civic Fellows: Seven faculty members—"civic fellows"— (two for the humanities, one for the social sciences, two for the natural sciences, and one for the performing and visual arts) will, in conjunction with the program director and the director of the FYE, coordinate project activities. Each will work with a student assistant, who will help with research on best practices within the divisional disciplines, outreach to majors, and logistical support with curriculum development and implementation. The civic fellows will develop and connect with best practices in civic education by attending relevant conferences and workshops. Their primary responsibilities will be to engage faculty in considering the issues discussed above and to host a series of dialogues that lead to a clear articulation of how the FYE and each academic major will advance the College's strategic goal of educating students to become informed, responsible citizens. The director of the FYE will also develop a cluster of Scribner (first-year) Seminars with a central civic learning component. Local directors of Skidmore programs abroad will oversee that part of the initiative.

Scribner Seminars: In addition to encouraging Scribner Seminar faculty to teach service learning courses and organizing a cluster of Scribner Seminars around a common theme of civic engagement, we will enhance the ways that peer mentors—upperclass students assigned to each of the Scribner Seminars—instill civic education in the minds of the first-year students. Our goal is to "train the trainers" to work closely with first-year students to instill in them the importance

of civic action, and to act as important resources for first- and second-year students looking to get involved in local, national, or international communities.

Faculty Development Funds: An important component of the program as a whole is the availability of a broad category of faculty development funds. These will be used for a range of activities, including course development, workshops, student-faculty research projects, travel for dissemination of projects and best practices, team teaching, community outreach, development of civic opportunities during study away, and conference travel.

Program Director: The entire project will be overseen by a faculty program director, whose job it will be to implement various components of the program. The program director will work with the civic fellows, organize the faculty retreats and the peer mentor training, and implement the assessment of each segment of the program. S/he will also serve as a resource for technical assistance to faculty and departments; act as a liaison among the faculty, administration, and community agencies; and promote civic engagement campus-wide. In this, we will use the highly successful model of our Director for Intercultural Studies.

Project Goals

The entire project is meant to achieve the following goals:

- ➢ Each academic program will articulate how the public value of its disciplinary major curriculum helps students become informed, responsible citizens and will develop a strategic plan for greater civic engagement.
- ➢ We will double the number of courses for majors in the traditional liberal arts disciplines with a civic engagement component.
- ➢ We will offer each year a cluster of civic engagement courses in Skidmore's First-Year Experience.
- ➢ We will train upper-class students to work with first- and second-year students as civic engagement role models, mentors and resources.
- ➢ We will create civic engagement opportunities in Skidmore's off-campus study programs.
- ➢ We will develop a faculty advising initiative embracing the importance of civic engagement.

Assessment

In conjunction with the College's Assessment Director, the faculty coordinator will develop instruments to assess the progression of the program toward the attainment of the stated goals. Assessments will be both formative and summative.

Appendix D. History of CEPP subcommittees, working groups and advisory panels

Below is a list of the thirteen past and present subcommittees, working groups, and advisory panels that CEPP has formed going back to 2003 that Bob Turner was been able to identify from the CEPP annual reports. It is not complete or exhaustive. I categorized the subcommittees into three categories based upon the definitions:

- **Mixed Committee**- subcommittee consists of CEPP, and other faculty members, some of who are not on committees, as well as administrators (7/8)
- **Joint Committee**- membership is from CEPP and other official committees (1/2)
- **Task Force** – charged by VPAA (2)

The review suggests that
- CEPP has consistently made use of Mixed Committee to address a wide array of curricular and educational policy issues including enrollment caps, study abroad, expository writing, DOS restructuring, and the FYE.
- FEC or CFG has never played any role in determining the membership of those committees.

List of Groups- where applicable, the language was taken from the CEPP annual report for that year.

1. **CEPP and CAPT Subcommittee on Revising the Dean's Cards,** members of CEPP, CAPT and the DOF, Mixed Committee
2. **Culture Centered Inquiry Subcommittee- 2011**- CEPP, CIGU, faculty, Mixed Committee
3. **Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Programs (ACOP) –2005- present -** CEPP, faculty, administrators **–** Mixed Committee
4. **Assessment Steering Committee** – 2008-present - a Mixed Committee
5. **Committee on Educational Policies and Planning (CEPP) and Curriculum Committee (CC) Enrollment Cap Subcommittee -** Joint/Mixed Committee, Paty Rubio as Ex Officio
6. **Center Study Group**, In spring 2008, Susan Kress, VPAA, charged *The Center Study Group* consisting of two members of CEPP, one member from FDC, the college librarian, the director of FYE and the Registrar and Director of Institutional Research. Task Force Membership was not reviewed by FEC.
7. **Dean of Studies Restructuring Review October 6, 2008**
This report is jointly submitted by the Dean of Studies Restructuring Review subcommittee and the Committee on Education Policies and Planning. In Spring 2007, the Committee on Education Policies and Planning (CEPP) formed a subcommittee to review the restructuring of the Dean of Studies Office (DOS) and charged the group with the following: CEPP charges a subcommittee (consisting of two members of CEPP, one member of the Committee on Academic Standing [CAS], one member of the Faculty Executive Committee [FEC], and one representative from the Registrar) with reviewing the restructuring of the Office of the Dean of Studies and the relationship between the Office of the Dean of Studies and the new Office of Student Academic Services (SAS). Mixed Committee
8. **Academic Grievance Policy**

CEPP met with Michael Ennis McMillan (DOS), Ann Henderson (Registrar and Director of Institutional Research) and Tillman Nechtman (Chair, CAS) to discuss the need for an academic grievance policy. CEPP also received correspondence from Mary Stange (CAFR) citing the need for a coherent policy. CEPP decided to create a subcommittee to study the issue. The Academic Grievance charge was discussed and approved at the May CEPP retreat. Dan Nathan, next year's chair of CEPP, will contact the CAS, CAFR and the SGA to populate the committee. One member of CEPP will also serve. 2007-08 <u>Joint Committee</u>

9. CEPP convened a subcommittee—the **Physical Activity subcommittee**— consistent Physical Activity Subcommittee to the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning April, 2006- The Athletic Council asked CEPP to evaluate several of these issues, and, as a result, CEPP convened a subcommittee—the Physical Activity subcommittee— The Athletic Council asked CEPP to evaluate several of these issues, <u>Mixed Committee</u>

10. **Task Force on Expository Writing Proposal**- In order to facilitate the development of such a proposal CEPP is creating a task force consisting of representative faculty and students. The charge of the task force is to gather feedback on the teaching of writing that will inform the proposal, and to report to CEPP its recommendations. At its first meeting in early May 2005 the task force will draft an agenda and schedule for the coming months. <u>Mixed Committee</u>

11. **A Student's First Years (Liberal Studies, Advising-Mentoring).**
    In the fall of 2003, CEPP charged a subcommittee chaired by Hugh Foley to make recommendations to CEPP. The subcommittee included Phil Boshoff, Dan Curley, Terry Diggory, Kate Leavitt, Ruth Andrea Levinson, Bill Lewis, Pat Oles, and Ben Porter. Advisors to the subcommittee included Tina Levith, Michael Marx, Anita Steigerwald. Gordon Thompson also sat on this subcommittee ex officio. <u>Mixed Committee</u>

12. **Assessment Task Force- VPAA Charge** Date: October 10, 2005 3:30:26 PM EDT

    The assembly of the Assessment Task Force follows the good work that our former Director of Assessment, Ray Rodrigues, accomplished during his three years at the College with the support of the Christian Johnson Endeavor. At the end of our work over the next two years, we will report to CEPP, and CEPP then to FEC. Having consulted with CEPP, I am pleased to announce the membership of the
    Task Force: Jordana Dym, History - representative from Curriculum Committee
    Beau Breslin, Government - representative from CEPP
    Pat Hilleren, Biology - faculty member at large
    Sarah Goodwin - representative from the DOF Office
    Michael Marx, English - representative from the committee formulating the assessment plan.
    Ann Henderson - representative from the Registrar's Office
    Dan Moran, Vice President for Academic Affairs, SGA - student representative
    Sue Layden, Associate Dean of Student Affairs - representative from Student Affairs
    Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Acting Director of MALS - representative from the Office of Special Programs
    Chuck Joseph, VPAA, Chair of the Task Force
    Linda Santagato, Secretary, Assessment and Honors Forum

<u>Task Force</u> Membership was not reviewed by FEC.

13. **CEPP Subcommittee on Study Abroad and Diversity**
Fall '03 Membership J. Anzalone (FLL), M. Arnush (chair), L. Aronson (AH), S. Bender (AN), M. Ennis-McMillan (AN), M. Fair (CEPP), C. Filson (OIP), R. Ginsberg (GO), K. Graney (GO), J. Ling (DOAA), N. Merrill (CEPP), M.-B. O'Brien (FLL/IA), M. Odekon (EC), P. Rubio (FLL), J. Ramsey (DOS), G. Thompson (*ex officio*, CEPP chair) This subcommittee will make recommendations to CEPP for consideration   <u>Mixed committee</u>

Appendix E Articulation Agreements with RIT and Syracuse

CEPP, the Office of Academic Advising and the Office of the Registrar have approved the following articulation agreements proposed by the Management and Business Department:

I. RIT (Saunders College of Business) – M.B.A. (Master's in Business Administration)
II. Syracuse (Whitman School of Management)
   i. M.B.A.
   ii. M.S.A. (Master of Science in Accounting)
   iii. M.S.F. (Master of Science in Finance)

The articulation agreements are modeled after the existing agreements with Clarkson University and Union College. The Saunders College of Business and Whitman School of Management (#59) rate comparably with Clarkson University (#97) and Union College (Rank Not Published)).

Supporting Information:

Link to College and Department Mission
A key component of the Management and Business Department's missions "is to prepare global citizens committed to a process of life-long learning and capable of pursuing careers in management, in the professions, and in community leadership". Affording Skidmore's business majors the opportunity to attend the Whitman School of Management or the Saunders College of Business enhances the likelihood of the desired end-goals. Further, we seek to develop global citizens possessing a unique ability to assess personal and professional dilemmas. Students who take part in these articulation agreements will gain critical insight and unique perspectives with which to analyze pervasive and rare human dilemmas and business situations. The implementation of the articulation agreements is consistent with Skidmore's current emphasis on the post-graduate transition period of our graduates.

MBD Prerequisite Courses in the Context of the Articulation Agreements
Generally, students majoring in Management and Business at Skidmore will have the opportunity to enroll in the courses that serve as foundation requirements in these articulation agreements. However, there exist a few courses; namely, MB 314, Organizational Theory and MB358, Human Resource Management which are not offered every academic year. Students may seek alternatives such as summer courses, study abroad or early admission into the MBA program as a means to fulfill the foundation requirements involving these courses.

Student Interest
Students who have a passion for their undergraduate studies, specifically, business in a broad sense or set of elective courses in a functional area such as Marketing or Accounting, may seek to continue their studies to attain a higher level of understanding and deeper level of engagement. Also, students tend to be interested in these types of programs when it is perceived that they can increase their perceived value to various types of organizations. In addition, students sometimes view these types of programs as a bridge to further graduate studies such as a PH.D.

Factors influencing Student Participation

Factors such as the state of the economy, job market supply and demand patterns, the perceived value of graduate education vs. work experience and students' estimations of their academic ability influence the flow into these programs.

Appendix F Summary of Skidmore in China Proposal

TO: Committee on Educational Policy and Planning
FROM: Cori Filson, Director of Off-Campus Study & Exchanges
            Rubén Graciani, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Programs
            (ACOP)
DATE: April 29, 2011

RE: **PROPOSAL FOR RESTRUCTURING OF SKIDMORE IN BEIJING
            PROGRAM AND DEVELOPMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM TO EXPAND
            PROGRAM TO INCLUDE SHANGHAI**

The Office of Off-Campus Study & Exchanges, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Programs and the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, propose to the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning (CEPP) the establishment of an expansion of the current Skidmore in Beijing program. We propose to offer a pilot program that would consist of opportunities in two cities – Beijing and Shanghai – with two distinct tracks in each city. (See Appendix A for a schematic of the proposed program structure.)

The proposed changes have been precipitated by dwindling student interest and the lack of sufficient student enrollments in the program for the past two years, resulting in canceling the program for fall 2010 and 2011. (See Appendix B for program enrollments from fall 2006 to fall 2011.) Enrollments show sporadic peaks in interest in Beijing (and not always on Skidmore's program) and consistent interest in Shanghai even though students must petition to participate in those programs. Feedback from students and faculty indicates that students perceive the language pre-requisite and required field studies course to be significant barriers to participation in the current Skidmore in Beijing program. Even those who are interested in Chinese studies chose not to participate due to these factors. Faculty have mentioned the same barriers. Conversations with faculty from various disciplines over the years have confirmed that certain departments would prefer options in Shanghai, specifically Management & Business.

With this in mind, OCSE proposes this new program structure. We would continue to partner with IES Abroad to deliver the Skidmore in China program. IES Abroad has program centers in Beijing and Shanghai and would be able to host our students in both centers. We have been very pleased with our relationship with IES Abroad and have found them to be extremely accommodating to the academic and student services needs of our students. Therefore, we are confident that they will continue to offer a high quality program for our students. (See Appendix C for details on IES Abroad and their Customized programs.)

Specific changes to the restructured program would include:

- Expanded locations to include programs in Beijing and Shanghai.
- Expanded curricular tracks to include an Intensive Language Program and an Area Studies Program in Beijing and a Business Studies Program and 21st Century China Program in Shanghai.

- Programs open to students of all language levels with a prerequisite of 1 year of Mandarin for the language intensive track in Beijing only; all other tracks will have no language pre-requisite.
- Required common course, "Understanding China", to provide all students with a context for their academic and co-curricular work.
- Week-long pre- and post-program seminars in Beijing and Shanghai respectively.
- Expanded internship options in both cities.

Please note: We are proposing a **three-year pilot program**. Given the struggles we have faced in recruiting for this program, we believe it is time to make significant changes to the program itself in an attempt to serve the needs of a larger cohort of students. We believe the enhancements outlined here will help us do just that. However, if in three years we do not see an increase in enrollments, Skidmore must seriously reconsider the need for a Skidmore presence in China.