

Committee on Educational Policy and Planning: 5 March 2003 (meeting #21)

Present: Michael Arnush, Catharine Bookhout, John Brueggeman (for Chuck Joseph), Pat Fehling (chair), Hugh Foley, Pat Oles, Amelia Rauser, Ray Rodrigues, Patricia Rubio, Gordon Thompson.

The meeting commenced at 11.15am.

1. Approval of minutes from Feb. 19<sup>th</sup> (meeting 19) and Feb. 26<sup>th</sup> (meeting 20).
2. Invitation to Karl Broekhuizen, VP for Business Affairs, to meet with CEPP: the committee decided to postpone extending an invitation to Karl to meet with the committee until it seems appropriate.
3. Subcommittee on increasing the size of the student body: GT summarized the subcommittee's work to-date, focusing on its first meeting on Monday, March 3<sup>rd</sup>, with Ann Henderson. The subcommittee focused on two methods to increase the number of students (and, concomitantly, the revenue stream): increase the number of enrolled students via changes in Admissions policies, or increase the retention rate of matriculated students. Like the '01 optimization committee, chaired by Chuck Joseph, this CEPP subcommittee thinks that increasing retention is a more productive avenue in terms of the overall quality of education and of the student body. For a summation of the subcommittee's work, see the memorandum (dated 4 March 2003) submitted by GT to CEPP.

Discussion:

- MA shared data from the Honors Forum, whose high retention rate suggests that proper programming and coordination between the academic and the co-curricular experience in the first two years can prove successful.
- PO, JB and HF all emphasized the need to examine Admissions data currently not collected – e.g., the observations of guidance counsellors' on applicants' behavior. PO and RR suggested we reexamine our commitment to male students, and JB wondered whether CEPP should ask Admissions to consider both gender and academic balance – i.e., could Admissions identify students with potential behavioral problems?

PF asked committee members to read GT's report and send comments to him.

4. First-year experience: CEPP received two proposals ("FYI" and "Investigating Education") intended to address in part some of the same issues regarding the first-year experience that CEPP has discussed. In the interests of time and the need for CEPP to move forward on academic vision, the committee agreed to respond to the "FYI" proposal next week, and postpone consideration of "IE" for now in light of Sarah Goodwin's decision to give the "IE" proposal further examination
5. External grants: JB asked CEPP to coordinate with Barry Pritzker, Dir. of Foundations and Corporate Relations, to provide sufficient consideration of external funding opportunities for faculty curricular proposals.
6. PF reported that she had not yet heard from CJ regarding funding for the May 19<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> CEPP retreat.
7. A lengthy discussion ensued in response to the charge from CJ to focus on academic vision. The discussion eventually worked its way to the need for CEPP to focus on academic vision, and that the current structure of meetings (reports first, vision second) prohibited sufficient consideration of the basis for a vision. GT advised that the committee could probably agree on what is fundamental to a Skidmore education. HF posed that we need both to reflect on who we are, and contemplate who we want to be; PF added that we do so in the context of available resources and possible reductions. PR commented on a recent meeting between the depts. of Foreign Langs. and Lits., and Management & Business, on the topic of interdepartmental majors, and the pressing need for the faculty, and CEPP, to connect missions and values, articulating connections and enhancing academic experiences for the students. RR advised the committee to determine what data we need for the May retreat. Many committee members, urged on by JB, suggested that our next meeting focus on academic vision with a series of deadlines to complete our tasks.
8. PF decided that meeting #22 on March 12<sup>th</sup> would include one hour on "who we are," and 15 minutes on Tina Levith's "FYI" proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Arnush