Present: Sandy Baum (Chair), John Berman, John Brueggemann, Pat Fehling, Frank Gonzalez, Mike Meguerdichian, Pat Oles, Linda Simon, Janet Sorenson

The meeting was brought to order at 11:15 am in the President's conference room.

- 1. The minutes from meeting #5 and 6 were approved.
- 2. Sandy will decide how CEPP will move forward with the topic of distance learning. Sandy has received a copy of the Middle States document on the assessment of distance learning courses. Copies will be distributed to CEPP members.
- 3. The remainder of the discussion was about the Strategic Planning document. Specifically, what is CEPPS's role in this process?

Pat O. voiced a concern that there are other aspects of the document that may be over looked, such as, the residential program, or the co-curricular aspect.

Frank posed the question- what are all of the issues or implications of the current plan?

Pat O. provided information on the IPC "teams" work.

Sandy listed what she saw as policy issues from the document;

- i. The mind-hand question
- ii. The role of pre-professional programs
- iii. The issue of discipline vs. interdisciplinary based curriculum
- iv. The issue of the number of programs and majors

John Brueggemann stated that CEPP should be working off of some official document. The issue now is the faculty has questioned the current Strategic Planning Document, and we are not sure of the status of the document from the small group of faculty (led by Reg Lilly). John suggested that CEPP go to IPC and ask what, if anything, IPC needs from CEPP. John also asked John Berman what is the timing of the next steps.

John Berman stated that the small faculty group (led by Reg L.) is only rewriting the first three pages of the current Strategic Planning document. The work of this small faculty group, and that of the IPC "teams" will report to IPC, and there will be an IPC subgroup that will rework the Strategic Planning document

It was then suggested, by several CEPP members, that we take the bulleted items from the Strategic Planning document, and list the items that related to either educational vs. institutional goals (as suggested by Terry Diggory at the last faculty meeting). For those items that are linked to educational policy we should amplify or clarify why these are issues for CEPP or the college. Sandy asked that all members of CEPP have this work to her by Friday, so that she could review all of the input prior to our next meeting. Linked to the above statement, it was noted that there is an immediate issue facing CEPP. There seems to be a proliferation of new majors and or programs. Since the college does not have a policy on this specific issue how does the college decide if we approve new majors or programs?

Meeting was adjourned at 12:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Fehling