

CEPP Minutes September 15, 2004

Present: M. Arnush (Chair), H. Foley, M. Hockenos, C. Joseph, R.A. Levinson (Scribe), P. Logan, M. Fair, G. Thompson, P. Rubio, P. Oles

Michael met this past week with two sub-committees: Middle-States Report on the FYE and the Advisory Committee on International Study (ACIS). Meetings were also scheduled to discuss FYS with HEOP and Curriculum Committee (CC).

The majority of the meeting was devoted to discussing issues that had been raised through emails and conversations with colleagues about the proposed FYS. CEPP discussed each issue so that we could further develop our own understandings and positions in preparation for the Open Forum meeting on Friday the 17th at 3:30pm.

Aspects of the FYE that were addressed included:

HEOP advisors being acknowledged clearly in the FYS since HEOP advising is a critical feature of the HEOP program. CEPP understood the issue and didn't see being assigned a mentor with the FYS as in conflict with also having a HEOP advisor.

The RAP –Several concerns had been raised about the RAP making an extra advising burden for faculty especially in terms of the perceived placement of the RAP in a portfolio and assessment. CEPP concluded that we should present the RAP as a tool (yet to be developed) for mentoring (expanding the definition of advising). At a later point, the FYE implementation committee could further explore its place in a portfolio and assessment.

4th credit hour: CEPP clarified that this was a flex hour that currently didn't exist for faculty or students for advising. The 4th credit hour would be supportive of time spent on individual advising, group discussions, co-curricular events, etc. With the FYS, mentoring and advising become part of our definition of teaching. CEPP pondered a new system of gaining credit for mentoring within the tenure and review process. CEPP also recognized that we needed to work further to delineate “advising” and “mentoring.”

In response to concerns raised about the so-called “failure” of LSI, CEPP decided that we wanted to emphasize in our comments to faculty the continuity of interdisciplinarity and the positive features of the LS identity. However, we wished to show how the new features of the FYS with mentoring and bridging and the living learning experience improved the students' first year experience. Also, we should emphasize that in the proposed FYS students could exercise a considerable degree of choice in selecting a FYS. With the FYS, we are cultivating the intentional learner from the start of the college experience. If we needed to show data about LSI staffing issues, Michael could show figures on the declining participation by tenure track faculty.

CEPP discussed what would be the authority and staffing support from the DOS for the proposed FYS Director. Chuck assured CEPP that the DOF would be assertive about staffing needs from departments and the program would be fully supported (to the best of his ability).

CEPP talked about Grace's comments (#12 from her email to Michael) regarding the role and pay of FYS Peer Tutors. We thought that Peer Tutors could be combined with being an RA in some cases, and that it would be advantageous to have these Peer Tutors/RA's be upper class students.

CEPP equivocated about whether the FYS could count as a gateway to a major or satisfy any all-college requirements. We “left the door open” on that question.