

CEPP Minutes, 2/2/05

Present: Gordon Thompson (chair), Meaghan Fair '05, Hugh Foley, Matthew Hockenos (scribe), Chuck Joseph, Ruth Andrea Levinson, Pat Oles, Ray Rodrigues, Paty Rubio, Linda Simon

1. No minutes approved
2. Writing Enriched (WE) Proposal:

Discussion about whether the Q&A section of the proposal addresses all the questions that might arise at the 2/11/05 CEPP forum on the WE proposal. Chuck wondered whether some faculty might want to know why we have writing across the curriculum requirement but not quantitative reasoning across the curriculum requirement. There was strong support among CEPP members for the WE proposal. It was approved and Gordon agreed to present it as a CEPP motion at the 2/4/05 faculty meeting.

3. Academic Affiliations (AF) Guidelines:

Gordon and Matthew presented their revised AF guidelines. There are at present 4 types of academic affiliations: Skidmore Programs, Approved Programs, Articulation Agreements, and Exchange programs. There was strong support among CEPP members for the revisions Matt and Gordon made to the first two (Skidmore Programs and Approved Programs) but concern that the last two types of affiliations (Articulation Agreements and Exchange Programs) were still unclear and needed further revision. The concern, first voiced by Hugh, focused on the question whether Skidmore offers or might offer in the future an opportunity for students to study at another domestic institution, e.g., NYU, and under which heading this type of affiliation might go. Clearly a semester in Washington or at NYU is neither an Articulation Agreement nor an Exchange Program and certainly not a Skidmore Program or an Approved Program. So it was decided to tentatively approve the document with the agreement that Matt and Gordon would add a fifth type of affiliation or revise the last two types of affiliations to take into consideration the possibility of a student studying for a semester or year at another domestic institution and receiving credit from that institution.

Pat recommended that the Curriculum Committee also be given a chance to read and consider the AF guidelines.

There was also much discussion, although no agreement, about which office on campus might be given authority over all of Skidmore's affiliation programs or whether authority for the affiliations should be divided between the Office of International Programs and (perhaps) the Dean of Studies Office.

Meagan suggested that individual departments need to do a better job making visible the various academic affiliations they're involved with by posting them on their department web pages.

4. Assessment:

Ray began by making the point that in order for Skidmore to be accredited it must get its assessment plan up and running. He posed two questions: 1) Does CEPP need to approve the plan or bring it to the faculty floor? 2) Do we need an office/body to oversee assessment and if so, who?

There was much discussion about whether a new committee or task force or a hand-pick group of individuals connected with the VPAA would be best suited to oversee the implementation of the assessment plan. There was some agreement with Chuck's suggestion that the implementation of the assessment plan fall under the purview of the VPAA office. The VPAA office would establish a "task force" that would include: 1 registrar representative, 1 CEPP member, 1 Curriculum Comm. member, Dean of Studies representative, and 2 or so faculty members with some interest in assessment.

Gordon agreed to talk to John Anzalone, chair of CFG, to get his recommendations on this issue.