

Minutes for CEPP meeting of September 29, 2010

In attendance: Logan Brenner (student representative), Terry Diggory, Rubén Graciani, Mimi Hellman, Chris Kopec, Susan Kress, Josh Ness, Bob Turner (Chair), Sarah Goodwin (ASC) and Lisa Christenson (ASC)

- I. **Approval of minutes.** The minutes of September 22 were reviewed and approved.

- II. **Assessment.** Sarah Goodwin and Lisa Christenson joined the Committee to continue assessment discussions from the Sept 22 meeting. They provided two handouts from the college catalogue describing the “Academic Environment” and “Academic Requirements and Regulations” (highlighting the presentation of these two as distinct issues) and drew attention to areas in the curriculum where goals for student learning (knowledge, intellectual skills and practice, personal and social values, and transformation) could be assessed. Discussion focused on several issues:
 1. Opportunity costs – specifically, how to maximize the effectiveness of resources applied to the issue of assessment.
 2. How to motivate chairs and departments to recognize the value of assessment. The potential to link assessment with the evaluation of new or proposed initiatives was discussed, as was the creation of a work group with representatives from CEPP, the Assessment Steering Committee and faculty not affiliated with either committee. Possible timelines for that group to meet were discussed (January and/or June). RG and CK volunteered to participate in subgroups focused on delivering the "effective communication" and “breadth” portions of the Goals for Student Learning, respectively.
 3. The group discussed the consequences of the separation of “Academic Environment” and “Academic Requirements and Regulations” as communicated to public by the College catalogue, and weighed the value of creating a hybrid (or hyperlinked) document.
 4. Prospects for mapping goals for student learning in the curriculum and in co-curricular activities.
 - We discussed the extent to which the four goals for student learning are addressed in and by the majors (and hence, departments) versus in the all-college breadth requirements. The draft curriculum map demonstrates that the departments and majors have the greatest capacity to deliver content that supports the goals. However, the majors and departments deliver discipline-specific content in a heterogeneous fashion. The challenges were summarized by noting that “these goals are our aspirations for every student and the general education requirements are the only thing we require of every student”.
 - We discussed the perception by some students that breadth requirements were a box to check rather than the points in the curriculum “where we demonstrate the value of a liberal arts education”. LB discussed potential for encouraging students to be more intentional in linking the expectation of breadth to other portions of their education.
 - The contrast between the LS courses designed to “combine and synthesize modes of thinking” and the courses currently offered by departments to non-majors to satisfy breadth requirements were discussed. FYE was identified as a prospective site for introducing the value and justification for breadth at the onset of the college experience.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Josh Ness