

CEPP/Curriculum Committee Joint Meeting  
September 29, 2004

Present for CEPP: Michael Arnush (Chair), Meghan Fair, Hugh Foley, Matt Hockenos, Chuck Joseph, Ruth Andrea Levinson, Peter Logan, Pat Oles, Ray Rodrigues, Paty Rubio, Gordon Thompson

Present for CC: Molly Appel, Grace Burton, Michael Ennis-McMillan, Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Ngina Chiteji, Mary Correa, Becky DiSciaccia, Sarah Goodwin, Ann Henderson, Monica Raveret-Richter, Judy Stephens, Joanna Zangrando

1. Review of clarifications to the FYE/FYS proposal.

- FYS will serve as the student's introduction to the college
- CEPP decided that the FYS should not count for other requirements, but that the issue would be revisited in two years to assess whether or not the position should be modified
- several CC members spoke in favor of the CEPP position, though they expressed concern about the resource issues that seem intrinsic to the proposal (e.g., mentoring issues)
- CJ pointed out that with ~200 faculty, even though not all would participate in the FYS, faculty should not have to teach the FYS routinely (e.g., once every 3-4 years).
- SG acknowledged that the FYS proposal is asking faculty to re-commit to FY students.

2. What do we mean by interdisciplinary teaching and learning?

- CEPP's position is that the FYS should be interdisciplinary
- How did members of CC perceive interdisciplinarity?
- JZ sees ID as looking at a topic from the perspective of more than one discipline in terms of questions, methods, and conclusions.
- ME-M argued for a broadening of the notion of interdisciplinarity.
- PR thought that the old LS IV notion of interdisciplinarity might well be influencing faculty still, particularly those in the sciences.
- MF argued for the external validity of an interdisciplinary approach.
- SG felt that some faculty might be uncomfortable with methodologies from other disciplines, which might well argue for team-taught courses.
- GB discussed the advantages of taking an interdisciplinary approach, though she also noted that concentrating solely on method may concern some faculty.
- EB-D also thought that team-taught courses would be attractive to faculty.

3. What do the two committees envision as the next steps, assuming passage of the proposal?

- ME-M introduced a proposed timeline as well as a form that could be used to convert an existing course to a FYS.
- Added to the timeline was the selection of a director for the FYE in early October.
- MA proposed a workshop for participating faculty in January.

-----

CEPP-only meeting

- MA circulated the proposal for the creation of a separate Dance Department, as well as a letter of support from Denise Smith (Chair of Exercise Science, Dance, and Athletics).
- CEPP discussed several criticisms of the proposal (e.g., faculty who believe that the proposal is explicit about creating a PYS program, but other aspects, such as the RAP and the residential component, appear in the document, but are not mentioned specifically in the proposal) and considered responses.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugh J. Foley