

CEPP Minutes, October 31, 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 of the October 17 meeting were approved.
2. G. T. reported on committees on which he serves as CEPP Chair: the Retention Committee is looking at admission practices; FPPC is looking into possible ways of increasing enrollment; the committee examining honors and awards in the college is working on a proposal that will be brought to CEPP. There was also some brief discussion of IRC's work on information literacy and how this relates to the Vision Statement.
3. G.T. brought to the committee's attention a forthcoming proposal from John Ramsey for disaffiliation from the Biosphere 2 program. This is a proposal that CEPP will need to bring to the faculty meeting.
4. The question of on-line courses once again reared its ugly head. It was agreed that CEPP needs to return to this question.
5. Subcommittee reports:
 - a. M. A. reported on the work of the subcommittee on study abroad and diversity (SADS!). P. R. is leading a smaller group on the role of diversity in the curriculum and this group will report back to the subcommittee as a whole. Among the issues the subcommittee is discussing with regard to study abroad are the following: the preparation of students before and after study abroad; the need for more coherence and direction in the program; the criteria students must meet to study abroad (currently a 3.0 GPA); the need for strong advising in guiding students to the right programs and to the right choices regarding study abroad.
 - b. H. F. reported on the work (or absence thereof!) of the First Year Experience committee. Scheduling meetings for this large and diverse committee is still proving a great hurdle. One way in which H. F. intends to deal with this problem is by dividing the subcommittee into smaller groups that meet independently to discuss specific questions. Then perhaps the subcommittee as a whole could plan a retreat for intensive work during the course of a couple of days. M. A. asked what would happen to LS2 courses if we proposed a first-year experience that was neither LS1 nor LS2. There was then extended discussion of alternative conceptions of the first-year experience. One possibility that was considered is having several different first-year experiences from which students could choose.

6. M. A. reported on the Board of Trustees meeting. The Board is pleased with CEPP's progress and with what it has seen of the Vision statement. The Board does not appear to be worried by the proposal of radically changing the first-year experience and possibly eliminating LS1.
7. There was in conclusion some discussion of the Faculty Forum held earlier in the month. P. R. expressed surprise at the faculty complaint of there being too much jargon in the document. It was explained that the faculty were not objecting to technical language but rather to what they perceived as clichés with no determinate content. M. A. suggested the possibility of retaining only the Preamble and the specific recommendations for implementation without the part of the document expressing the four C's. H. F. suggested that if we retain the four C's, we have to make very clear what specifically we mean by them and what results they will have. C. J. raised another issue that came up in the Faculty Forum: Skidmore's uniqueness. It was agreed that this is something the committee should discuss next week.

Respectfully submitted,

Francisco J. Gonzalez