

CEPP 5 November 2002

Catherine Bookhout, John Brueggerman, Pat Fehling (chair), Hugh Foley, Charles Joseph, Nick Merrill, Amelia Rauser, Ray Rodrigues, Patricia Rubio, Gordon Thompson (scribe)

Guests: Vasantha Narasimhan, Bill Standish, Bob DeSieno

- 1) Approval of minutes from 29 October 2002
- 2) Discussion of Chemistry-Physics proposal to split into two departments
 - a) PF: Distributes a summation of CEPP's discussions of the Chemistry-Physics proposal distributed earlier in the semester. History of the proposal process (questions to VN, early proposal).
 - b) VN: Current combination makes the faculty feel programmatically less strong, especially when comparing notes with colleagues at parallel institutions. External review (1993) suggested division of department into two departments. Interest in gaining more visibility. Believes that the less compelling aspect of the C-P proposal are the consequences of the current situation and would be addressed by the split.
 - c) BS: The multiple foci of the proposal were confusing. The proposal grew out of a report to the DoF. This is not the proposal to go to the floor. Previous chair suggested preparing a 3-page proposal to DoF and to then expand this. Comes to CEPP for feedback. They seek CEPP advice.
 - d) CJ: Encourages the division; wants CEPP advice and support.
 - e) BD: Asked his questions based on the prospects of external funding. Larger issue of how the College treats the Sciences. How does the external world perceive the college? Suggests that a division into separate departments would strengthen the student experience.
 - f) VN: How does a Chemist advise a student interested in majoring in Physics?
 - g) HF: Resource issue will be the most salient for the faculty: course releases, office staff, renovations.
 - h) BS: No need for the Physics chair to be on 10-month contract.
 - i) VN: Some of the costs mentioned in the proposal need to happen, even if the department does not split.
 - j) BS: The split should allow the department to grow and might require an increase in funding. Physics has begun offering fewer service courses in order to serve potential majors. The history of the department is such that Chemists used to teach some Physics classes.
 - k) BD: Chemistry is part of this too; we need to allow them to grow
 - l) Discussion: Physics will have to deal with the fallout of the division. Chemistry-Physics needs to highlight the growth of students in their introductory classes for the major.
 - m) PF: Need to specifically emphasize in the proposal that the Chemistry and Physics are already separate for many things, that the costs will not be exorbitant, and the

history and pedagogy issues that divide the disciplines. She recommended a five-part organization: (1) Proposal Statement, (2) General Rationale, (3) Regional/National Perceptions of Current Configuration, (4) Comparisons to Other Schools, and (5) Cost Implications.

3) Curriculum Committee

- a) Want to see a change in the wording of the course proposal forms
 - i) CEPP had previously written the course proposal materials
 - ii) What do we want to do?
 - iii) We need to see the documents.