

CEPP minutes, February 3, 2004

Present: Michael Arnush, Megan Fair, Hugh Foley (scribe for 1.-2.), Frank Gonzalez (scribe for 3.-4.), Chuck Joseph, Nick Merrill, Pat Oles, Ray Rodriguez, Paty Rubio, Linda Simon, Gordon Thompson

1. Amended and approved minutes from PR (1/27)

2. GT reports

a. The procedure for termination of a program doesn't require a faculty vote, so faculty don't have to vote on the termination of the Biosphere program. CEPP simply notifies the faculty of the termination of Biosphere.

b. So far responses to the subcommittee proposals have been positive.

c. CEPP has other work on the horizon, including a discussion of Honors and a proposal to create a separate Dance department.

d. GT met with Joanna Zangrando (JZ) regarding proposed changes in the structure of the LS program. JZ is concerned about the proliferation of programs and the attendant difficulty of providing courses needed by departments and programs. JZ also suggested that, if the faculty approve a change in LS, an extensive discussion of the changes take place in a group that meets over the summer. CEPP then engaged in a preliminary discussion of the way in which we might proceed. CEPP talked about selection of membership of the working group (volunteers? selected members?). CEPP also talked about the pros and cons of requiring the working group to meet over an extended period. It was decided that we would return to this issue next week.

3. Extensive discussion of GT's revisions of the Vision components:

a. Is the description of citizenship not sufficiently student-focused or too student-focused? PO asked if there should not be a value or ethics component in citizenship.

b. Who or what is the subject of the Vision document? MA observed that the document is currently inconsistent: the section on critical thinking speaks of students and faculty; the section on communication speaks only of students; the section on citizenship speaks of the entire community.

c. Who is the audience of VISTA?

d. LS asked what the words "actively engage" and "embrace" mean in the section on citizenship? Can the language not be made more specific? MF and NM offered to rewrite this section.

e. MA asked if the document is clear enough with regard to the difference between what we are already doing and what we want to do? What part is reflection and what part is vision? Others questioned whether this distinction can be made.

f. RR suggested using the present tense throughout the components section, e.g., "Skidmore students communicate effectively . . ." rather than "Skidmore students must have the ability to communicate effectively . . ."

g. MA expressed reservations about making the document longer through the addition of the "comments" section. It was decided that this section should probably be taken out.

h. There were objections to 'adolescent garden' and 'creative thought matters' in the section on critical thought.

- i. Should 'service learning' be explicitly referred to in the document? The consensus appeared to be that it is already implied under collaboration.
  - j. There were then some specific changes suggested to the wording of the section on collaboration. "We create innovative projects that link the scholarly interests of faculty with the lives of students in order to exploit the educational power of co-curricular involvements" became "We create opportunities that link the scholarly interests of faculty with the academic interests of students in order to realize the educational potential of co-curricular involvements" (at least, these were the only changes the scribe was able to keep track of!)
  - k. MA suggested that "risk taking" should be made more explicit as an expectation of students. Could this be given more emphasis in the Preamble? CJ remarked that "creative" thought already implies risk-taking, but agreed to try to give this more emphasis in the Preamble. There was then some discussion of the meaning of "risk-taking" as well as of current disincentives to risk-taking (specifically: grades).
4. There was then discussion of what CEPP is presenting at Friday's faculty meeting and what kind of endorsement it is seeking. It was decided to present for endorsement only revised versions of the Vision components.