

**CEPP Subcommittee on the First Year Experience
Minutes for November 21, 2003**

Present: Phil Boshoff (minutes), Terry Diggory, Hugh Foley (chair), Kate Leavitt, Ruth Andrea Levinson, Tina Levith, William Lewis, Michael Marx, Nick Merrill, Ben Porter, Anita Steigerwald, Gordon Thompson

1. The committee met from 2:00 – 3:30p.m. in the Case Center Intercultural Lounge.
2. Hugh: Asked members to discuss two issues: I) ways we might integrate advising/mentoring in the first-year seminar (FYE). II) values of changing from a two-course (LS1 & 2) model to a one-course first-year model
3. Phil B. Mini report on HF 101: First-Year Honors colloquium: Enrollment of 39 students, interdisciplinary focus on time, five guest speakers. Students enjoy the course format and theme. Course offers students opportunities to discuss majors, careers, advising and residential issues in dinners and trips. Potential model for first-year seminar. However, cautions that such a course requires considerable faculty time and effort. Some faculty might not welcome time and after-class-day demands of such a course. Would all faculty teach first-year seminar?

I. Discussion of Advising-FYE model:

- Will all faculty be asked/required at some point to teach FYE? How will they be selected/participate?
 - Proceed cautiously, make course look attractive, possibly 5-credit faculty course load as incentive for teaching FYE, faculty teach just one section.
 - Need to work with Ann Henderson on how course would work in terms of scheduling.
 - How would advisees be assigned, shuffled after classes begin with drop/add, sports practice conflicts, etc.?
 - Need workshops and clear articulation of goals, expectations and needs for teaching FYE; such articulation would attract as well as winnow out some faculty.
 - Need to find out what DOF's office would support for such a model (5 credits, extra money for trips, meals, speakers; role/weight in reappointment, tenure, promotion consideration, etc).
 - Discuss with President's Staff, DOF, Advancement creating a Center for First-Year Experience and Director.
 - Value in creating team approach to FYE; team-teaching faculty members as instructors/advisers/mentors; upper-class students as peer advisers/tutors.
 - FYE sections combining advising-mentoring need limited enrollments (15-17).
4. **Ruth-Andrea L. on coordinating Advising-FYE with VISTA statement:** Need to develop and implement a Center for Interdisciplinary Initiatives to coordinate internships, service learning, FYE curriculum and academics, and all residential and civic experiences related to FYE. Research shows that grant dollars and support are available for such an initiative.

II. Discussion of shifting from 2 courses (LS 1 and LS 2) to a single-course FYE:

- If we cut LS2 and move to a one-course FYE, we need to look at where students would go. Ask Ann Henderson where students would likely enroll *sans* LS2.
- Ask Kate L. for “true sense” of which LS2 faculty would be willing to teach their LS2 courses as Advising-FYE.
- Terry: Favors placing the FYE in current LS1 framework as single-course model. Advantages of LS1: tested by time, we know it can be delivered, already has thematic organization, and LS1 faculty trained in and have experience engaging in common discussions about curriculum. Favors common texts for all FYE students--provides more foundation than common themes. Whatever the shape of FYE, common texts, not just common themes, needed across FYE sections.
- Ruth Andrea: Learning experience in residence halls offer a common community in different ways than our current LS1 arrangement.
- Hugh: LS1 large lecture sizes are at odds with small-class size and the faculty-student ratio beneficial to first year experience.
- Michael: LS1 students are not in large lectures as a passive learning experience. LS1 has included outside speakers, performances, visits to the Tang. Stressed benefits of bringing students together. How might we do this more creatively?
- Bill L. Large lectures in LS1 have been unsuccessful, likes move toward more common events. Regarding common texts, some LS1 faculty feel that even though common texts are assigned in the curriculum, faculty do not feel they are sharing common reading assignments (texts). Does not believe common texts should be central to FYE.
- Terry: Need to be guarded against too many common thematic approaches; a curriculum with rich texts in common allows for multiple disciplinary reactions, while still providing a curricular anchor (e.g. *Frankenstein* this past fall). Reminder that the student’s RAP (Reflection and Projection) would also provide common experience in the FYE.
- Hugh: favors announcing yearly theme or themes and letting faculty pick texts.
- Michael: What would be relationship of theme-based FYE courses to current theme-based EN 105’s. What’s the merit of two theme-based courses?
- Hugh: FYE’s would be theme-based clusters of courses taught by faculty from across the disciplines who find a thematic cluster attractive; emphasis on writing, but FYE would be interdisciplinary and not a writing seminar.
- Bill: FYE must have at its core rigorous investigation of a topic
- Phil: concern that FYE might receive so much attention that it would make sophomore experience dull to students; worries that students could lose valuable common textual experiences that have been hallmark of LS1, likes faculty knowing that students have read common texts to which faculty can later refer.

5. For next meeting:

- Hugh: 1) provide us with copies of Michael Arnush’s model for FYE; 2) find out from Ann Henderson where LS2 students are likely to enroll *sans* LS2.
- Kate L: report on LS2 faculty’s willingness to offer their course as FYE.
- All: email discussion: how “common” an experience should FYE be for all frosh?

Adjourned at 3:25 p.m. Minutes, Phil Boshoff