

CEPP Minutes March 9, 2011

In attendance: Michael Arnush, Rochelle Calhoun, Muriel Poston, Rubén Graciani, Chris Kopec, Josh Ness, Thomas Rivera, Bob Turner (chair).

- I. Minutes of Feb. 23 approved. Minutes of March 2 approved with revision.
- II. The committee briefly discussed Dave DeConno's proposal to revise the drop/add deadline on the Academic Calendar. Currently, we have one date for the Drop/Add Deadline. The 2011/12 Academic Calendar reads:

September 13 Tues Drop/Add Deadline

Dave proposes that instead we list two separate dates - an add deadline (5 days from the start of classes, same as the current drop/add date) and then a drop deadline (two weeks from the start of classes). This is how that would look for next academic year.

September 13 (Tues) Add Deadline

September 21 (Wed) Drop Deadline

Dave writes, "It represents what we actually practice and would make things clearer for both students and faculty."

CEPP approves proposed changes.

- III. The committee discussed two proposed Articulation Agreement for Business with RIT and Syracuse. The committee raised specific questions regarding the agreements:

- Can students take a gap year before articulating to the new program, or is their only option a seamless transition?
- Will Skidmore students get preferential admission to the RIT program?
- Is there data in regards to the number of Skidmore students who have, or are taking advantage of similar articulation agreements?

A procedural question arose regarding the guidelines for implementation of these agreements and whether or not they required a faculty vote. Bob and Muriel will follow-up on the procedural questions, and CK will take CEPP's questions to Timothy Harper of Business and Management.

- IV. Bob relayed the status of the current work by the CEPP-CAPT Subcommittee on Student Rating Instruments. Kate and Bob, along with guest Janet Sprague, will invite department chairs and a guest to a forum to be held April 8th. The forum is an effort to provide information for the departments regarding “best practices” in long form evaluations. This is an effort to begin looking at the feasibility of creating more cohesion across the college in regards to how individual departments create their long-form evaluations. Muriel suggested the sub-committee have a more specific goal in mind when bringing the long-form evaluation to the faculty group for review. CEPP discussed that the forum could investigate gender and racial bias in long form evaluations as a way of opening the conversation to broader discussions of the long forms themselves.

Additionally, the Sub-committee has a draft of the new Student Ratings System survey and will be meeting with various faculty contingents to review working through a few questions, including:

- How to most effectively analyze and present the data?
- What is the appropriate amount of data to share with DOF?
- How do we use this data to improve teacher or instructor performance?
What is the appropriate point of comparison?

The Sub-committee is working on an in-house pilot study/survey, but is also considering the possibility of hiring a vendor to design a survey and run it. This brought up a broader discussion of the possibility of moving all of these ratings and evaluations on-line.

- V. There was robust discussion concerning the College-wide Assessment Plan for 2011-2016. The primary focus was the continued tensions in the relationship between the ASC and CEPP. Language in the current document makes the ASC’s current role and relationship to CEPP concrete. CEPP discussed making the ASC a stand-alone committee. It was decided to take that discussion to FEC while continuing to look for an alternative structure.

Next meeting is devoted to TNT.