

## **Committee on Educational Policies and Planning**

---

30 March 2004

Present: Michael Arnush (scribe), Meghan Fair, Hugh Foley, Frank Gonzalez, Chuck Joseph, Nick Merrill, Pat Oles, Paty Rubio, Linda Simon, Gordon Thompson (chair)

### Minutes

- ♣ 30 March 2004: Arnush
- ♣ Approval of 23 March Rubio Minutes; discussion of 29 March Simon notes of meeting between CEPP and Pres. Glotzbach (to be disseminated internally only)

### Chair's Comments

- ♣ Special Programs discussions concerning the establishment of an MFA: Bob Boyers, speaking for the creative writing program, didn't think there was much faculty interest due to other commitments; the Theater Dept. and Regis Brodie of Studio Art, however, have expressed interest in an MFA program. Discussions will continue. Committee members asked whether this program be of sufficient quality, since it would carry the imprimatur of Skidmore College with a Skidmore diploma, and whether CEPP's role is consultative or does it have jurisdiction to approve such a proposal and then bring it as a motion to the faculty? What is the relationship between Special Programs and Academic Affairs, with CEPP as the implementer of policy? Until that is resolved, CEPP may need to put this issue on hold.
- ♣ Dance Department proposal: GT has notified Dance that we have received the proposal but the Committee has not yet reviewed it and will do so in F'04.

### First-year Proposal

- ♣ 29 March meeting with the President: members of the Committee viewed the President's response as supportive, and while some members of the Committee were surprised by the President's comments that the FYE – and indeed, the curriculum – is not a particularly supportable proposition by donors (though would be indirectly through the creation of endowed chairs), others found comfort in the President's position that adding lines is “business as usual.” CJ stressed that he continues to work with the President to identify the number of lines – i.e., as many as the 15 first articulated during the development of the Strategic Plan, and in the end a precise number – and that he needs to make the case, based on hard data, for specific lines. PO argued that the FYE might not be the best vehicle to argue for new lines, but it is a place of convergence for all departments and programs in terms of contributions to the all-College requirements. PO also thought that the President correctly noted that the shift of advisees after the first year might be a weakness in the proposal;

the FYE proposal has tried to approach this issue with maximum flexibility.

- ♣ LS reported the latest responses to the FYE: the Expository Writing Committee (EWC), and the EN department, may see the FYE as duplicating to some extent the current EW requirement; there is also some skepticism about the definition of writing in the proposal. The central issues are ownership of writing by the College rather than the EN department, and how the faculty assume that ownership, guided by CEPP. Linda urged that CEPP speak with the EWC, which will share with CEPP later today comments on the FYE. The two points they will address are 1) what is the role of writing in the FYE and 2) what will be the continuity of writing enrichment beyond the FYE? MF argued that students, particularly in the sciences, need the requirement to guarantee that they will practice writing and writing in the disciplines. LS said that such a requirement need not be housed in the EN department but could reside instead within departments.
- ♣ Final comments on proposal: MA proposed two revisions to the first paragraph of the now-labelled “Rationale” that emphasize excellence and rigor. HF proposed two revisions, one in the motion that emphasizes the curricular shift from LS1 and LS2 to the FYS and FYC, and another under “Administration” that leaves the future structure of the FYE’s administration to the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Student Affairs (see the final draft of the FYE, sent as a separate attachment).
- ♣ Forums and meetings: the EWC wishes to meet with CEPP; CJ noted that we would need an exit strategy for such a meeting. PO proposed that we ask the EWC to support the proposal and to work towards revising and/or eliminating the EW requirement, if the faculty on the EWC see fit to do so. LS said that the EWC might propose an additional motion to eliminate the EW requirement at the April 30<sup>th</sup> faculty meeting and argue for the centrality of writing in the FYE. LS suggested that we might add language to the section in the FYE on “Written and Oral Communication” to satisfy the EWC’s concerns, such as “... according to consistent guidelines to be worked out in the summer workshop in consultation with the EWC.” FG supported this approach. This opens up the larger issue of meetings between the April 2<sup>nd</sup> and April 30<sup>th</sup> faculty meetings, which could reveal potential friendly amendments to the FYE motion.  
**[NB: I have not done so; shall I now, before we release the FYE later today, or wait until we meet with the EWC?]**
- ♣ Meetings: with Science Planning Group, Tues. April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2.30-3.30; with Program Directors, Fri., April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 8.30-10am; with the students’ Academic Council on Mon., April 5<sup>th</sup>, 9pm, Ladd 106. All members of CEPP are invited to attend all such meetings. For an unscheduled meeting with the EWC: it usually meets Tuesdays, 11-12.