**CEPP Minutes**

**February 26, 2015**

Present: Kelly Sheppard (acting chair), April Bernard, Beau Breslin, Rochelle Calhoun, Amy Frappier, Sarah Goodwin (scribe), Samuel Harris, Renee Schapiro, Peter von Allmen

1. Minutes from 19 February 2015 were approved.​
2. **New Business** (moved ahead of Old Business in response to IPPC for reasons of time): CEPP recommends to IPPC the MALS motion. Details of implementation remain to be worked out. The report is on our website and has gone out to the faculty. We endorse the motion both to phase out MALS and to consider the role of graduate studies at Skidmore in the future.

**Old Business**:

1. The Working Group has a time set up to meet next week March 5 and 12 at 11:00 in PMH 402.
2. Two chairs' roundtables this spring--Social Sciences and Humanities--will be dedicated to the proposal.
3. Discussion followed of how to promote our proposal effectively with faculty.

* How do we correct misinformation that was floated on the faculty floor? Should the Dean speak? Or do we hold a CEPP Q&A?
* One important point: There are resources to be garnered (and re-allocated) from reducing requirements. Another: enrollments don't drive decisions (or not exclusively). Another two points, for a rationale: this is not CEPP's curriculum, but the college's curriculum and we've consulted widely; also, the proposal is data-driven. We are giving the faculty what we have heard you want.
  + - What seems to be missing is a Wow factor. Consensus building tends to move away from the Wow factor.
    - We have to remember that the curriculum we have is seriously flawed, so it is actually a choice between two curricula.
    - We need to be careful not to present this as a compromise that no one likes.
    - Territoriality is a problem.
    - In the rationale, can we try to emphasize anything Wow-like? Or is this a red herring? Would something more clearly distinctive generate more positive energy? People who are somewhat negative about the proposal are not coming back with new ideas or alternatives. Could we highlight more emphatically the connections with the co-curriculum as a key integrative learning piece?
    - Could we incorporate the idea of creative thought? The one we are proposing is doing that: the themes are big ideas that are being approached creatively. Thought has to come from a foundation--and signature work combines the two. (There's a creative piece, a thought piece, and a matters piece. If our curriculum did that, it would be distinctive.) Could we integrate the three dimensions of CTM explicitly with our current proposal?
    - We agreed that it would be good to hear from Lisa Christenson next week about what she learned at the AACU meeting on general education last week: many colleges are navigating processes very similar to ours.

1. **Other Old Business**: The Institutional Assessment Plan: We looked at the language in the plan relevant to CEPP. CEPP agreed that we should insert language about the timing of the approval of the assessment plan. We will take up the approval itself next meeting.