

CEPP Meeting, February 24, 2004

M. Arnush (scribe), M. Fair, H. Foley, F. Gonzalez, C. Joseph, N. Merrill, R. Rodrigues, P. Rubio, L. Simon, G. Thompson (chair)

1. Minutes: 2/17 approved

2. CEPP chair next year: MA

3. Academic Vision

- First-year Experience: MA and LS will draft a 1<sup>st</sup>-year proposal by the end of spring break, ready for CEPP's consideration at the 3/23 meeting. GT and MA will attend the annual conference on the 1<sup>st</sup>-year experience at Wesleyan on 3/17-18.
- GT is working with Joanna Zangrando to arrange a meeting between the LS faculty and CEPP. Tentative date: Fri., 2/27, noon, F/S club.
- CJ circulated from Phyllis Roth a "History of the Vision Statement" and a "Summary of IPC Goals and Means," which together read more like a strategic plan than an academic vision, but nonetheless validate the work of CEPP on vision.
- CJ shared with Academic Staff on 2/20 the possibility of tabling the motion brought by CEPP at the 2/13 faculty meeting. Terry Diggory subsequently suggested that CEPP bring the preamble rather than the "4 C's" as a motion seeking faculty approval, and then move on to the details. CJ will fold the responses to the 4 C's from T. Diggory and David Karp into the preamble and then share with CEPP.
- GT will meet with DOF staff on 2/25 to discuss staffing and classroom issues related to the 1<sup>st</sup>-year experience.
- CJ made a number of suggestions: 1) we are more likely to be able to field 40 rather than 50 1<sup>st</sup>-year seminars; 2) newly tenured faculty have demonstrated support for the FYE and would like the themes to remain in place for a couple of years. CJ also asked to meet with LS and MA to discuss staffing implications of a FYE; 3) the overarching priority for the FYE is to create and deliver small first-year seminars linked to mentoring; 4) CEPP members should write to him regarding the incorporation of the 4C's into the preamble.
- LS and MA urged that CEPP refrain from extensive discussion of the FYE until they meet and begin the formulation of a proposal.
- Discussion ensued about the relationship between the FYE, the LS program and interdisciplinary programs, particularly those that rely heavily on and have invested substantially in LS2 for their curricula (e.g., IA, LAS, WS, CL, ES). Recommendations included the need for ID programs to adapt (so, e.g., WS101 may be offered both as a first-year seminar and as a separate course in the spring, with no net gain in the number of sections of WS101 overall); the need for CEPP to be cognizant of these programs' commitment to interdisciplinarity and to work with them in the shaping of the FYE, particularly since programs' constituencies are housed in departments where support for

interdisciplinarity and programs varies widely and frequently; and the continuation of LS as a program, with course listings in the catalogue. Discussion also addressed whether themes or goals should be the overarching commonality among the FYSEminars; and the need for an institutional shift, particularly among the faculty, that supports the VPAA/DOF requiring academic departments and programs to contribute to the FYE. LS and MA intend to consider all of these issues in the formulation of a draft proposal.

- CJ asked whether the FYE was the make-or-break issue for the ViSta, and GT responded affirmatively, noting its relevance to college life, retention, etc.

4. CEPP and the Curriculum Committee: Grace Burton contacted GT, concerned that the process by which the IA proposal has come to the faculty reveals that the Curriculum Committee, and not CEPP, is setting the agenda for academic policies. Her concerns speak as well to a perceived direction of the institution in terms of the proliferation of ID programs. PR suggested that CEPP should play a role in the earliest stages, specifically regarding the creation of a new major, and leave the examination of the details to the Curriculum Committee. Members of CEPP noted that the two committees used to share minutes and exchange representatives.