

CEPP minutes, Friday, December 5, 2003: 9:00 AM

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

- 1) The minutes for the meetings of November 14 and 21 were approved.
- 2) Gordon requested Spring schedules from all CEPP members sentenced to additional service next semester.

3) Discussion re. VISTA timetable:

GT recommended that CEPP meet at least once in January (to consider revisions to the VISTA preamble) in advance of the February faculty meeting. This would seem necessary if CEPP were to move adoption of the VISTA preamble by the March 2004 meeting (with April as a fall-back). *NOTE: the consensus is that CEPP will seek "faculty support for the spirit of the document", rather than a formal vote on precise language.* MA noted that our current preamble language contains a charge for "curricular change", which would require a formal vote by the faculty for adoption. MA also believed that elimination of that charge would undercut our core principles. Members seemed in agreement that the entire document is at risk of being scuttled by debate over particular elements (i.e. elimination of LSI). PR stated that CEPP should provide faculty with a timetable of exactly when and how they will be permitted further input before formal changes are proposed. GT agreed to explore the possibility of a retreat in January to continue work on VISTA.

4) Discussion re. Subcommittees:

It was noted that the work already undertaken by RR's assessment group (Core Curriculum Study Group) would be extremely valuable to any subcommittee charged with considering assessment, as it relates to VISTA. It was suggested that the "willingness to serve" for this subcommittee, should include a statement that those *not* appointed to the subcommittee could still be called upon, as necessary, for advise and assistance. It was also suggested that CEPP query the faculty on specific concerns re. assessment. GT agreed to draft a charge for this subcommittee.

Discussion shifted to a charge for the proposed Content & Process subcommittee. The question, "how do we articulate the relationship between content and process" was suggested as a starting point. It was noted that "process" might be better defined as "critical thinking". RR posed the question, "is there a body of knowledge that all students should possess by the time they graduate?" In other words, when we speak about "content" are we speaking in broad terms (any content is good content), or is there specific content that we would consider requisite? MA stated that he believed this subcommittee should not begin work until the final report from the First Year subcommittee was submitted (to avoid "reinventing the wheel"). HF and GT cried fowl (evoking the proverbial chicken and the egg conundrum), questioning whether that was truly

important. HF stated that the content/process topic was worthy of faculty debate independent of the First Year question, and that waiting would place an unproductive time restraint upon that subcommittee's work. Members then discussed ways of engaging faculty in the discussion. PR spoke in favor of open fora. MA felt that a subcommittee would be more useful as they could provide CEPP with a clear set of recommendations; something that fora seem unable to do. The committee seemed to agree that both (subcommittee and open fora) would be valuable.

GT then asked, "how willing are we to allow a variety of course structures for the first-year seminar (some small, independent courses, some larger team-taught courses, etc.)?" GT stated that he would draft charges for the two subcommittees (described above) by the day's end, if possible. *Editorial note: it was possible, and so he did!* The committee agreed to consider and respond to GT's drafts before the next meeting.

The next meeting will be held **Thursday, December 11 at 1:00**, unless otherwise indicated.