

## **CEPP Minutes, Meeting #2, September 12, 2003**

Present: Michael Arnush, Hugh Foley, Meghan Fair, Frank Gonzalez, Chuck Joseph, Pat Oles, David Peterson, Paty Rubio, Gordon Thompson (chair)

### **1. Minutes**

Minutes of the 9/5/03 meeting will be reviewed for approval at the next meeting.

### **2. Information**

- GT met with Katie Hauser (CFG) to discuss the procedures for the Academic Vision discussion. She agreed that the subcommittee approach makes sense.
- GT distilled the Academic Vision document to present the core ideas to Academic Staff.

### **3. Discussion related to the Academic Vision document**

- MA had heard comments that the Vision document was focused on students and not on faculty.
- PO noted that the Strategic Plan has a faculty focus, and viewed the Vision document as a subset of the Strategic Plan. He also suggested producing an additional document with a faculty focus.
- CJ thought that we could flesh out the Vision document so that there was no need for a separate document that focused on faculty.
- FG noted that a good teacher must be a good student, so the focus of the document may not be limited to students.
- PR related concerns that the document doesn't talk about inquiry, especially regarding critical thinking.
- MA noted that the portion of the document that focuses on study abroad tends to focus on administrative details.

### **4. Discussion related to the presentation of the Academic Vision document on 9/19**

- MA wondered if there was any need to review the document, on the assumption that most faculty will have read the document.
- MA argued that CEPP needed to present the Vision document to the faculty as a "living document" and not as a fait accompli.
- CJ stressed the need to listen to faculty and to ascertain that faculty agreed to the four principles.
- FG felt that our presentation needed to focus on the process whereby the document would be discussed throughout the year.
- DP didn't anticipate hearing much specific feedback from faculty at the meeting. He also stressed the need to be responsive to future faculty feedback relative to the nature of subcommittees and topics of the fora.

### **5. Discussion related to the process of discussing the Academic Vision document**

- MA noted that to date there has been little discussion in the electronic fora.
- GT plans on two fora for the semester (mid-October and mid-November).

- MF noted that students were not yet aware of the impending discussions. PO reported that he and Nick Merrill had discussed mechanisms for disseminating the document to students.
- We discussed the composition of the potential subcommittees, with some disagreement on the number of members of each (3-10?), whether or not faculty should be able to "run" for particular subcommittees or should simply express a willingness to serve in the process and then be assigned to subcommittees by CEPP, and what the charge to the subcommittees might be. We seemed to agree that members of CEPP would chair the subcommittees. We seemed to agree on keeping the number of subcommittees small, with three potential subcommittees at the outset: *First-Year Experience* (focusing on seminar and advising), *Diversity and Study Abroad*, and *Content/Process* (or *Disciplinarity/Interdisciplinarity*).
- GT wondered what would happen at the 10/3 meeting regarding the Vision Statement. CJ thought that the meeting may be too packed with other business, so that the next opportunity for discussion might be at the November faculty meeting.
- We agreed to continue discussion at the 9/19 meeting and to invite Michael Marx and Kate Leavitt to the 9/26 meeting for a discussion of LS1 and the Vision document.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hugh J. Foley