**CEPP Minutes - September 3, 2013**

**In attendance:** Peter von Allmen (Chair), Caroline D’Abate (scribe), Pat Fehling, Sarah Goodwin, Amy Frappier. Absent: Beau Breslin, Rochelle Calhoun.

1. Welcome to new members
2. Need to gain new members: Special WTS for 6th faculty member and two students are called for to fully staff committee
	* CEPP Chair has drafted email and is communicating with FEC chair to initiate vote for additional faculty member
	* CEPP chair is communicating with SGA president regarding need for two student members
3. Charge of the committee: CEPP conducted a quick review of the committee’s operating code
	* CEPP noted the need to delete reference to the UWW Committee in the operating code given the dissolution of UWW
4. CEPP subcommittees: Brief discussion of CEPP subcommittees. Identified only one at this point - ACOP (Advising Committee on Off-Campus Programs). Caroline D’Abate will chair ACOP this semester, working with Cori Filson.
5. Agenda for the year: There was discussion about the key issues that are expected to be on CEPP’s agenda this year. Given that several CEPP members could not attend today, and since several new members are yet to be added, some of these issues were quickly introduced and held over.
	1. OCSE approvals: OCSE has requested CEPP’s input on adding/deleting accepted partner programs/institutions from OCSE approved program listings. In particular, the London year abroad program occasionally requires changes to the partner program listings. Namely, there are two current issues facing the London program including the removal of Middlesex University (they no longer have an IA program) and the possible addition of the University of the Arts London (which has been approved periodically via individual student petitions but is not a currently listed partner program). In sum, the question brought before CEPP is who to involve in approving the addition of new partner programs/institutions and in the deletion of current partner programs. CEPP discussed the charge of ACOP, the composition of ACOP, OCSE procedures, and how programs are currently reviewed.
	* Held over: CEPP would like to have Cori Filson of OCSE join us for a discussion as to how this fits with current protocol. CEPP would also like to include additional committee members (not present at today’s meeting) in this discussion.
	1. Course evaluation form layout issues: The midpoint anchor for evaluation categories was accepted by faculty vote in spring 2013 to be “Neither agree nor disagree”; however, CEPP has been notified that the agreed upon language does not fit on the Scantron form. Other options were suggested including: “Neither agree/disagree”, “Neutral”, or “Neither agree or disagree”. CEPP’s recommendation is to simply replace “nor” with “/”. This is the simplest change without altering the meaning of the response category.
	* CEPP chair will approach the Parliamentarian and FEC chair to determine if this is a reportable item or if it needs to go to the faculty floor for a vote. Subsequent steps include putting this on the agenda for the next Faculty Meeting and developing a motion in the event that one is needed.
	1. NYsix Teagle grant blended learning
* Held over for discussion at 9/10 meeting
	1. Mellon grant
* Held over for discussion at 9/10 meeting
	1. Gender/race/ethnicity question for evaluation form: CEPP held a preliminary discussion about biodata (gender, race, ethnicity) on teaching evaluation forms. Faculty meeting discussions held in the 2012-13AY raised a number of concerns about the inclusion of such items on evaluation forms (e.g., maintaining student anonymity versus the risk of student identification particularly in small class sizes, utilizing biodata categories that might conflict with federally-required categories). Therefore, all biodata (gender, race, ethnicity) questions were deleted from the revised evaluation form. Still, CEPP recognizes a need to consider on this year’s agenda how to address questions about student-faculty gender/race/ethnicity in terms of faculty evaluations and course experiences (for students) if such data is not included on teaching evaluation forms. CEPP noted a number of steps that might be undertaken to address this issue, including: reviewing the data that is currently available at Skidmore and whether or not it supports the extant literature’s findings (e.g., that gender/race/ethnicity of the faculty member does matter in the evaluations s/he receives and that the gender/race/ethnicity of the student does matter in the evaluations s/he gives); clarifying the need/importance of such questions on teaching evaluations, in general, and at Skidmore ,in particular; understanding how such information might be used (e.g., to better understand bias and stereotype threat on campus, to assess long-term strategic goals to reduce bias on campus, to consider how the additional data might allow us to better contextualize the ratings of faculty going up for tenure/reappointment, to use the data to identify opportunities for pedagogical development programming).
* Held over for additional discussion
	1. Review of general education requirements: A major task for CEPP this year will be to review Skidmore’s current General Education (GE) curriculum. CEPP discussed next steps in this process which include reviewing and condensing the current “Rationale for Curricular Review” document to be shared with the faculty, as well as refining the rationale for why GE review might be called for. Initial questions range from how the Goals for Student Learning and Development (GSLD) are integrated into the GE curriculum versus specific majors, whether currently available data suggests a need to integrate GSLE more thoroughly into the GE curriculum, and how specific data might illuminate strengths of the current GE curriculum or indicate gaps between the goals and currently available assessment data, to how assessment reports and alumni surveys might inform our understanding of current GE curriculum, whether there are questions that the current assessment data might not yet ask that need to be considered in future assessment efforts, and how CEPP might engage the faculty in smaller group discussions (e.g., untenured faculty, natural science faculty) and/or tap into individual faculty members’ institutional knowledge about the GE curriculum here at Skidmore. CEPP expects this to be a multi-year effort and will prioritize thorough and deliberate effort ahead of swift results.
* CEPP members are encouraged to review the current draft summarizing its rationale for curricular review, entitled “CEPP Review of the GE Curriculum”, and send revisions to CEPP Chair. Efforts to finalize the document will continue in September concluding with distribution to the faculty (and department chairs for discussion at department meetings) before October’s Committee of the Whole discussion. CEPP’s next meeting will focus on this document.