

## **CEPP**

*Minutes of meeting 30 August 2000*

Prepared by P. Ortiz

### **Present:**

A. Abramowitz ('01), S. Baum, J. Berman, J. Brueggemann, P. Fehling, P. Oles, L. Opitz, P. Ortiz

#### **1. Correction to minutes of meeting 20 July 2000:**

Part 1. D.

Change "John B. also stated his concern..." to "John B. conveyed Sandy B.'s concern..."

2. Berman stated that he would not get overly involved in the activities of CEPP since S. Bender has been engaged in the committee's business and is aware of all our activities and is actively participating on behalf of the DOF's office.

3. Brueggemann outlined his perspective of our long-term mission, i.e., items we need to focus our attention on this academic year.

- Curriculum revisions
- Distance learning
- Academic festival
- Academic year schedule
- Public humiliation and subsequent profession degradation of the CEPP chairperson on the floor of the faculty

4. The discussion of the curriculum revisions began with the suggestion that everyone e-mail an annotated listing of the other faculty they've spoken with about the proposed curriculum.

As of 8 Sept. the following reports were forwarded to this scribe:

Brueggemann:

Michael Arnush, Mason Stokes, Paty Rubio, Terry Diggory, Bernie Possidente, Leslie Mechem, Mary Lynne, Jeff Segrave, Joanna Zangrando, Giuseppi Faustini, Grace Burton and Michael Ennis-McMilan  
Ortiz:

Informal: Bernie Possidente (Biology), Elaine Rubenstein (Biology), Ray Giguere (Chemistry)

Formal: David Atkatz (Physics)

ICE: Jack Ling, John Anzalone, Jill Sweet

Peterson:

Tom Denny, Jon Ramsey, Rob Linrothe. (Peterson adds "I also spoke with Pete Stake, but as he's one of my tribe I didn't include him in my list".)

Fehling:

Jeff Segrave, Denise Smith, Judy Halstead

Oles:

Spoken only with staff in student affairs, not faculty.

5. It was suggested that Mary Lou Bates be made aware of the possible curriculum revisions since she may need to revise the information that is provided to applicants and visitors.

6. Mechanisms by which students could be made aware of the proposed revisions and how their voices could be heard were discussed. It was suggested that as chairperson Brueggemann could participate in a dinner meeting with students and also meet with the Academic Council of SGA. Abramowitz and Brueggemann will work together to arrange for these sessions.

7. Since we have several new members of the committee it was suggested all materials applicable to the curriculum revisions be collected, organized, and distributed to everyone. Baum will also work on taking the documents that have been prepared, e.g., those on the social and natural sciences, and begin to put them together as a single coherent document.

8. With respect to the revision of the curriculum, one of the most “sticky” issues is whether foreign language should be a required component of the ICE, i.e., should all students be required to complete one course, or be able to choose FL as one of three categories (the other two being non-Western and Intercultural). The answer to this may depend on whether we believe FL to be a cultural experience (an experience in understanding the “cultural other”) or a cognitive experience.

In making this decision it may be helpful to know the data for the class of '98, it shows that for the FL requirement:

26%	tested out
14%	needed to take 1 course
35 %	needed to take 2 courses
12%	needed to take 3 courses
11%	needed to take 4 courses
2%	completed by “substitution”

9. Other unresolved questions:

Should ICE be moved from proficiency to breadth?

Should ICE be in its own, i.e., neither proficiency nor breadth, category?

Respectfully submitted,

Phillip A. Ortiz

18 September 2000