CEPP Minutes

November 8, 2018

Scribe: Bina Gogineni

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

1. Discussion re: last week’s minutes in response to revisions suggested by email. Minutes approved pending the amendments discussed.
2. The discussion of revised minutes spilled into a more substantive discussion of the qSET forms and how we might make our process more transparent for, and open to, the faculty body. We hope to update the faculty of our progress at a faculty meeting in the near future (whether the last meeting of this term or the first meeting of next term). To execute CEPP’s charge to assess the qSET forms, we have decided to pursue the following 3 items: 1. quantitative assessment of the qSET (all-college quantitative evaluation) form; 2. qualitative assessment of the qSET form; and 3. how qSET forms are being used by departments and ATC/PC. We will explain that we are currently addressing the quantitative forms, and we will share the crux of our discussions thus far (i.e., the 3 main dimensions of the qSET forms we are investigating) as well as our plan of action. We are considering calling for a forum to solicit feedback from the faculty.
3. Discussion of how to handle deferred agenda items when we are unable to get to them in the designated meeting.
4. Further discussion of qSET forms, particularly the merging of HR self-identifying demographic data with Institutional Research Office qSET data. Everyone seemed on board that we should not be afraid to face the results of the data we are seeking as to whether bias is undermining the effectiveness of particular questions on the qSET form. Some considerations/questions we have: will small sample size of certain minority groups lead to statistical distortions (i.e., false negatives); if so, how might we get more robust data sets (perhaps longitudinal or fuller cohort studies?). We plan to put these and any other statistical questions to the Institutional Research Office, and to find out the data processing possibilities and limitations on their end. We will invite IR to attend a future CEPP meeting to inform us thus.
5. Discussion of a colleague’s concerns about how minors are established and approved at Skidmore. That colleague is particularly concerned about faculty involvement—or lack thereof—in those processes; resources potentially going toward minors and away from majors; the prospects of full-time faculty hired into a minor that gets eliminated ad hoc by the administration. In the context of those broader concerns, we reviewed aloud the process by which the Black Studies program was recently vetted. CEPP, in consultation with other faculty stakeholder groups, had developed a proposal for a minor that was submitted to CC. While expressing support for the creation of the minor, CC requested more specifics regarding the courses that would constitute the minor. The decision was made jointly to hire a director to assist in developing the curriculum for approval by CC. The recollection of that process led to a broader discussion about the authority of faculty-elected bodies (e.g., CEPP and CC) to represent the faculty on the issue of minors. Should faculty, as a whole, have a more direct voice in the formation and approval of minors? We will continue that discussion and think about whether/how to open it up further after each CEPP member reviews the FHB language on minors in advance of the next meeting. Our goal is to review the existing process by which Skidmore forms and approves minors.
6. We reviewed the Bridge Experience Pedagogy Clusters document. ADOF will consider revisions to the summary paragraph to better reconcile dashboard language and original GE curriculum proposal language. (For example, making it clear, per the more recent dashboard draft criteria, that Science would be eligible, whereas the original language that was voted on does not.)
7. We looked at the CC follow-up on Sr. Coda. Soon we’ll be looking at particular proposals. CC seemed to suggest that diversity of offerings poses a potential problem, but we do not necessarily agree. We then discussed possible unifying features, such as a RAP-like reflection for each Coda. Of course, this raised the issue of who would read/evaluate these RAP-like reflections. Would it be primarily professors already advising capstones? If so, how do we compensate them for the additional burden? These questions don’t need to be addressed very soon. We have until the class of 2024 comes through. However, we do need to provide scenarios to NY State rather soon. We plan to consult with Ron Seyb and the Registrar as to how much specificity needs to obtain in these scenarios provided to the State.
8. We concluded the meeting by planning further qSET discussion in our next meeting.