CEPP MEETING MINUTES

09.27.18

Scribe: Feryaz Ocakli

Attendees: Marta Brunner, Steve Ives, Riley Filister, Michael Orr, Cerri Banks, Crystal Moore, Pat Hilleren, Feryaz Ocakli, and Bina Gogineni.

Meeting began at 9:48 am.

Agenda Item 1: We discussed the minutes from the 9.06.18 CEPP meeting. One of the committee members registered dissent over the language that was adopted in the minutes. The disagreement was over this sentence: “We discussed whether there would be student representation on the subcommittee and unanimously agreed it will be extremely important to include student voices in the discussion of evals.” The agreement was not unanimous. The minutes from 9.06.18 will be amended accordingly.

We approved the minutes from the 9.20.18 CEPP meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Discussed the approval of two new study abroad programs in Barcelona and Budapest.

Agenda Item 3: Discussed Gen Ed Curriculum progress and goals. Two members of CEPP will meet with the CC to discuss some of the details about the Gen ED Curriculum to address CC concerns. We discussed a number of questions raised by the CC:

1. Bridge experience should at least be a 1 credit course. The bridge experience is a course without a specific credit designation. Discussed whether pop-up courses would qualify to be bridge experience, and the potential problems that could arise.
2. How will existing courses be approved? This will be discussed when the two CEPP members join a meeting with the CC. Raised the issue of rewarding people who work for a sub-committee to approve courses in case such a sub-committee has to do intense work over the summer.
3. Discussed the potential levels (200 or 300) for the bridge experience courses. Suggestions included making the FYE a prerequisite, making sure students declare a major before taking a bridge experience course, or making sure students have a sophomore standing before they can take a bridge experience course. It was mentioned that the last suggestion might also help with sophomore retention. A bridge experience sub-committee will have to address the question of double counting for the bridge experience courses.
4. Is it possible to have a course that is not strictly in the natural sciences fulfill the scientific inquiry requirement if it checks all the boxes? The answer is yes. See the sub-committee language on the scientific inquiry course.
5. Bridge experience does not follow the FYE model.
6. Not every department will have to offer a bridge experience course every semester.
7. Discussed how having a bridge experience director may be helpful. However, the college would have to dedicate resources for such a post, which would be an extra financial burden.
8. Discussed the approval process for courses to count as bridge experience for incoming transfer students. This will be a sub-committee decision.
9. Discussed the ideal time for students to take a bridge experienced course. 2nd or 3rd year would be ideal.
10. Senior coda: What is not a coda? Sub-committee with CC will resolve this issue.
11. Discussed the global cultural perspectives requirement. Courses that qualify for the GCP will have to focus on indigenous cultures, formally-colonized cultures, or have a comparative focus on the global south. They will adopt a perspective that highlights the contributions of non-dominant cultures. “Dominant” here is in the sense of a western and metropolitan culture.
    1. The faculty proposing a course to be included in the GCP area will have to make a case for its inclusion.
    2. One of the committee members raised an objection to limiting the GCP requirement to the study of officially colonized societies, citing the significance of societies that were not officially colonized by Western powers but that are still significant parts of the global south and the global periphery. The examples of Iran, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia were raised.

Meeting ended at 10:46 am.