

CEPP Meeting — March 2, 2005

Present: Molly Appel, Meghan Fair, Hugh Foley, Matt Hockenos, Chuck Joseph, Ruth Andrea Levinson, Pat Oles, Ray Rodrigues, Paty Rubio, Linda Simon, Gordon Thompson (Chair)

Minutes:

CEPP approved minutes for 2/16/05 and 2/23/05.

Chair's Comments:

GT said that the issues raised by CEPP (e.g., diversity) were still being discussed on IPC. The change in status of Jack Ling's position seemed worth discussing as well. IA is pressing for a Director of International Studies. The Strategic Plan addresses the issues of diversity and international studies, but has no implementation plan.

Writing Requirement Proposal:

- Based on an array of feedback, GT felt that there was not a lot of support for the proposal.
- LS thought that with three options, it's not clear where opposition might be directed.
- MA talked about the importance of writing from a student perspective.
- PO asked what the benefits of the current proposal might be.
- LS argued that other colleges focus on writing across a student's career (e.g., Stanford). The proposal illustrates the college's stake in developing students' writing skills.
- MH pointed out that the proposal was also a statement that writing can and is taught across the curriculum.
- HF argued for the importance of establishing an administrative structure for implementation of writing requirement, with LS agreeing that a Writing Board is needed.
- GT was not convinced that the proposal would pass. He felt that CEPP should withdraw the proposal and examine it carefully to achieve a broad buy-in for the proposal from the faculty. He felt that more time was needed to discuss the proposal and then go forward or not. At the faculty meeting, he thought that going into a Committee of the Whole might be a good mechanism for discussion.
- RAL thought that it was premature to stop discussion with a vote. Furthermore, she hoped that student input would be useful.
- MA felt that it would help to have members of CEPP come to a Senate meeting.
- PR thought that we could make do with the current Writing Requirement for one more year.
- MH pointed out that although we would like broad buy-in for the proposal, it's not absolutely essential.
- PO observed that lately CEPP has put forward proposals and then withdrawn them in the face of emails from opponents.
- PR (and others) thought that the process undertaken for the FYE was appropriate, though some on CEPP disagreed.
- RAL argued that the faculty were not fully aware of the issues.
- HF asked about the implications of a negative vote, presuming that CEPP would eventually revise the writing requirement with some future proposal. Some members of CEPP agreed that a negative vote was not disastrous and others disagreed. After some discussion, PO's idea of deferring the vote until the April meeting was viewed as attractive to many members of the committee.

- PO observed that we need some kind of structure to deliver any writing requirement.
- GT talked about some political aspects of the discussion (resource issues relating to class size and the size of the English Department). He thought that it would be prudent to put together a task force to create a writing requirement, because doing so would create a greater sense of legitimacy than the current proposal has.
- PR thought that any writing requirement should address how students' writing will build on their experiences in Scribner Seminars.
- MH focused on WI courses, thinking that it would be best if more departments put forth WI courses (which is a resource issue). LS noted that WI guidelines are clear, but that few departments have stepped forward to offer such courses.
- CJ would prefer that CEPP put forth a stronger proposal for a writing requirement. HF presumed that a discussion of writing would continue regardless of the outcome of the faculty vote, but others on the committee thought that passing the proposal would be the end of discussion of writing.
- CEPP decided to move forward with the "third option" (WI required by second year and two WE courses thereafter). Though he had deep reservations about any proposal, GT would put forward the "third option" and a rationale for the changes. He would also check with the Parliamentarian about the process for delaying the vote until April. In the interim, CEPP would make an effort to solicit input from students.

Assessment:

- RR talked about a plan to assess student writing by collecting samples of student writing. Over the summer, a group would look at the writing samples as a first step in the assessment process.
- CEPP then discussed the final composition of the Assessment Task Force:
 1. Representative from CEPP
 2. Representative from Curriculum Committee
 3. Member of the faculty-at-large, but from the Assessment Group
 4. Vice President for Academic Affairs
 5. Dean of Faculty
 6. Representative from the Dean of Student Affairs Office
 7. Student representative
 8. Registrar/Director of Institutional Research
- CEPP will focus on assessment at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugh J. Foley