

CEPP minutes, September 19, 2003

Present: Michael Arnush, Megan Fair, Hugh Foley, Frank Gonzalez (scribe), Chuck Joseph, Nick Merrill, Pat Oles, David Peterson, Ray Rodriguez, Paty Rubio, Gordon Thompson

- 1) The minutes for the meeting of September 5 were approved.
- 2) The announcement of the Administration's decision to eliminate the Men's Hockey Team led to some discussion of CEPP's role in this and other related decisions. To the extent that the athletics programs are considered a part of the educational mission of the college, it seems that CEPP should play an active role here and not simply be informed of deliberations and decisions after they have taken place. On the other hand, there is a genuine need to keep difficult and sensitive decisions that affect individuals and programs as confidential as possible. It was decided that CEPP's role needs to be clarified. Gordon agreed to collect relevant data and put this item on a future agenda.
- 3) Gordon briefly reported on committees he has been involved in and also announced that Sarah Goodwin wants to meet with CEPP at some future date regarding the possibility of moving from written to electronic (on-line) evaluations. Several members of CEPP suggested that it was time for CEPP to discuss the purpose and benefit of having student evaluations in the first place.
- 4) There was discussion of what role the issue of assessment should play in the current work on the Vision statement. Can discussion/approval of the Vision statement be separated from the issue of assessment? It was agreed that CEPP must take ownership of assessment and address the concerns it raises. One way to do so is to form a subcommittee dedicated to this issue.
- 5) Several questions were raised and answered regarding the subcommittees that will be formed for work on the Vision statement

- i) How will the subcommittees be formed?

CEPP members will chair; other members will be appointed from a list of those who express a willingness to serve.

- ii) What will be the size of each subcommittee?

Four to eight members.

- iii) What will be the makeup of the committees?

Faculty only, though with the understanding that these faculty members will occasionally

consult relevant administrators.

iv) What subcommittees will be formed?

Provisionally, CEPP will seek to form the following subcommittees:

a) First Year Experience

b) Special Programs/Diversity

c) Content versus Process as the broad category, with the question of disciplinaryity versus interdisciplinarity falling under it

d) Assessment

6) Several questions regarding the running of the September 19th faculty meeting were raised, i.e., the part of the meeting devoted to the Vision statement. How will the meeting be run? Who will speak and in what capacity? How will the sentiment of the faculty be recorded? It was decided that after introductory remarks by Gordon and Chuck, there would be a switch to a Committee of the Whole so that President Glotzbach would be able to participate in the discussion. Initially it was thought that Gordon would chair, but it was noted that in this case he would not be able to respond to questions. Therefore, it was decided that another member of CEPP should chair and Paty Rubio volunteered (or was volunteered?) It was agreed that it would be better not to seek any kind of formal faculty approval of the Vision Statement at the September 19th meeting: to seek a very vague and general approval of the Aspirit@ of the document would not be very helpful and informative, while to seek any more substantive approval would be premature. It was decided that the role of CEPP at the meeting would instead be to listen to faculty questions and concerns and emphasize that the Vision Statement was a work-in-progress that needed active faculty involvement.

The schedule was briefly discussed and it was agreed that the subcommittees would be chosen by October 3 to run until the end of the semester.

Respectfully submitted,

Francisco J. Gonzalez