

Committee on Educational Policies and Planning

17 November, 2004

Present: Michael Arnush, Chuck Joseph, Ruth Andrea Levinson, Matthew Hockenos, Hugh Foley, Meghan Fair, Patricia Rubio, Molly Appell, Pat Oles, Ray Rodrigues, Gordon Thompson (scribe)

- 1) Minutes: Foley minutes for previous week to be read
- 2) M&B proposal for Union MBA 4+1
 - a) MA has discussed the proposal with J Kennelly that would allow Skidmore students the opportunity to earn an MBA by attending Union College's program for one year after completing their Skidmore MB major.
 - b) CEPP recommends proposing this program to the faculty for approval at the December agenda.
- 3) London Freshman Seminar
 - a) MA emails to Cori Filson and Mike Hall re the caps on the seminar (currently 18 students rather than the 15 of on-campus FYS). MH argues that money should not be driving our decision.
 - b) CEPP discussed the ramifications of having 18 students in these sections (increased number of advisees, academic quality of students, administrative load in London, assessment)
 - c) CEPP will leave the proposal on the floor. ~~MA reports that totalitarianism is much more effective than democracy.~~
- 4) Assessment
 - a) Question for Barry Pritzker re Mellon grant to college to participate in a faculty exchange
 - b) MA recommends Phyllis Roth as the assessment person (also participating in program)
 - c) CEPP discussion ensued, supporting that suggestion
- 5) CEPP chair, Spring 2005
 - a) MA discussed CEPP's dilemma with John Anzalone, CFG
 - i) Recommendations: CEPP finds a chair from within, CFG appoints a chair from recent CEPP members.
 - ii) Discussions: shared chairing responsibilities with a nominal chair
 - iii) CEPP will discuss after the break
- 6) Guidelines for a FYS (Foley and Ennis-McMillan)
 - a) CEPP will read and respond to MA by Thursday.
- 7) Earth and Environmental Studies

- a) Additional discussants (Science Planning Group): Barry Pritzker, Bill Standish, Bob DeSieno, Marianne Foley, Sarah Goodwin, Dick Lindemann, Corey Feeman-Gallant, Karen Kellog, Mark Hofman
- b) MA: review of process related to proposal (faculty lines, etc.)
- c) Should CEPP move the EES proposal to the faculty?
 - i) The SPG has significant reservations about this proposal. The DoF does not want to see this proposal on the floor without significant support.
 - ii) KK: ES needs GS as part of their program and is committed to interdisciplinary study.
 - iii) CFG: the evolution of the GS towards environmental geology.
 - iv) DL: not sure either that the proposal is deleterious or providential. Concerned that GS (or Environmental Geology) would become marginalized. Environmental Geology would be interdisciplinary (chemistry and mathematics).
 - v) BDeS: the proposal seemed to be moving in the right direction, a “natural confluence” in the directions of ES and Geology.
 - vi) Discussion: faculty lines and commitment. Sharing resources between departments, merging resources, merging departments. Would this merger be beneficial to the sciences at Skidmore? Would the academics be strengthened? What are the staffing and funding consequences? Would a larger department be better funded and staffed? How do we compare with peer institutions?
 - vii) CEPP wants the SPG to reach a consensus on the proposal. What does this mean for the sciences at Skidmore? How does this fit into the Strategic Plan? How does this position the sciences at Skidmore for future development? (BP: foundations support collaboration. Either way could work.) What does this mean to the students?
 - viii) CEPP will delay presentation to the faculty until after the SPG can have further discussions.