**CEPP Minutes 1/19/15**

**Present**: William Lewis (Chair), April Bernard, Rochelle Calhoun (Dean of Students and VPSA), Amy Frappier, Sarah Goodwin (morning scribe), Renée Schapiro (Student), Kelly Sheppard, (Charles Tetelman, student, SGA VP for Academic Affairs), Peter von Allmen, Sam Harris (student, SGA VP for Financial Affairs)

**Absent:** Beau Breslin (Dean of Faculty and VPAA)

1. Minutes from last week’s meeting were approved as amended. [I don't have the emendation--do you, Bill?]
2. **Middle States Working Group subgroup:** We talked about the idea that the Middle States General Education Review and Reform Working Group subgroup on QR2 be designated a CEPP adjunct committee, for the purpose of sharing information. It seems a good idea to have a formal relationship to clarify the ways that we are coordinating our research, especially with respect to the QR requirement and all of the data that the working group is gathering. FEC doesn't have a term for the existing relationship and will need to be consulted. We agreed this is a good idea; Bill will pursue it with FEC.
3. **Final exam policy:** In response to a memo from Jennifer Cholnoky of Geosciences, we noted that we currently have no policy to resolve conflicts when a student has two exams at the same time. Should we have a policy? Is it CEPP's business? (We agreed yes.) Currently, students must resolve it by asking one of the professors. After discussion, we agreed that we will create a form for students to make a formal request for an alternate exam time in the case of a conflict; that there should be one time slot for alternate exams; and that the deadline for submitting the form should be the same as the withdrawal deadline. This all presents challenges. Bill will consult with Dave DeConno and Corey Freeman-Gallant to gauge when the date should be for the alternate exam. We will also email the faculty early this semester to alert them to these conflicts, suggest that they resolve them soon, and let them know we're working on this.
4. **Reactions to the curricular models:** Bill circulated notes on the discussions in Academic Summit and the Chairs and Program Directors retreat (attached). Model B was the overwhelming preference. Some points:
	* We talked about the senior capstone, a challenge for some departments; maybe we could build in an interdisciplinary option. We noted a need for more information to chairs about the wide range of models for a capstone.
	* People were interested in the themes, but thought they needed more work, especially collaborative work; we thought that was a good idea.
	* There was a clear sense that B would require more advising and that people were willing to provide it.

We talked about whether and how we might refine the models in response to the feedback from these two meetings:

* The themes were viewed as inconsistent; we should refine them, perhaps collaboratively. Some of this would happen during the implementation phase.
* Clarify the roles of the co-curricular, especially in B.
* Sophomore experience: there was some interest in incorporating a sophomore integrative experience into B. Rochelle described the sophomore leadership program this year, its third year, for 4 1/2 days in January. Would this be scalable for the whole sophomore class? We agreed that there should be some SOYE in both models.
* Double-counting the FYE was controversial; we discussed eliminating that two-fer and decided to let it go.
* We will provide faculty with Peter's memo about what's not working in the current curriculum, and also should provide a detailed link to the learning goals and a timeline of CEPP's work (as was provided in paragraph form to chairs and directors).
* We need to make it clear that the QR2 work that is going on now for Middle States is being integrated in our model. We can use the QR2 group as a model for implementation--some decisions will have to be made as we implement, rather than at the outset.
* There was some concern about requiring people to get through Foundations in the first 2 years; we believe that 5 courses in two years is not too much to expect. Exceptions can go to the CAS.

We talked some about the ways science is managed in the models and possible faculty resistance to the models' conceptions of science literacy. Should we have science literacy or practice? If we have a lab, it can't be a cookbook lab, but should be a discovery-based lab (call it scientific inquiry?). It could be inquiry that is either more theoretical or more practice-based. This would open up ways to be more authentic in the approach to each of the science disciplines. We decided to change the language in B to "scientific inquiry."

For B, we changed the wording to include leadership and decision-making under the Future topic, and introduced scientific inquiry. [April and Kelly will send specific language to Bill.]

1. **Next Steps:** We decided to present only model B to the faculty, but to consider aspects of A to incorporate in B (as we have above). Bill will incorporate the changes we've suggested and will circulate it. Bill wants to work on the themes and on the SOYE and potentially other aspects of A as we refine B.
2. **Review of MALS and the report from the CSMP:** The report recommends either re-invigorating MALS or closing it down. We agreed that the report is very well done, presents useful information that bears directly on this decision, and leads us to a decision to recommend closing the MALS program. We would like to recommend that the process of closure include working closely with the current MALS employees to ensure that their contributions to the college are recognized, and that they find satisfactory alternatives to their MALS positions. We also acknowledge the report's recommendation for a serious discussion of graduate education at Skidmore more broadly, but we recommend that CEPP not take up this matter now, though perhaps it will after the committee has completed our current agenda of curricular reform. Our sense is that the UWW closure process worked well and may provide a good model for the MALS process. Final point: We would like to thank Hope in particular and the rest of the committee for outstanding work on this report.
3. **Study Day:** It's a perennial problem. We decided to rename Study Day as Fall Break Day, which means we are not prescribing what can happen on that day. (Faculty will still not be able to schedule exams or due dates on that day, nor require academic activities on that day, as on other break days.) Bill will notify the right people.
4. **Academic Council**: meets Tuesdays this semester. [Is someone going?]
5. **FL requirement and Kelly's data**: it's clear from this impressive gathering of the data that most colleges with a requirement also have waivers and/or a place-out process. Model B includes FL but includes a waiver for "students demonstrating fluency in a language other than English." We decided to retain that language and be open to discussion, bearing in mind that implementation will be a process.
6. **Next meeting:** We won't meet this Thursday but will update our draft of B and get it out to the faculty as soon as possible--this Friday or Monday?

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Goodwin