

CEPP Meeting Notes

February 23, 2026 @10:10-11:10am
Bolton 380

Present: Amy Frappier (Chair), Corey Freeman-Gallant (ADOF), Lila Glanville (SGA), Heather Hurst (Faculty), Natalie Koegler (SGA), Ryan Overbey (Faculty), Robert ParkeHarrison (Faculty), Javier Perez-Moreno (Faculty), Kelly Sheppard (Assessment), Natalie Taylor (Interim DOF/VPAA), Jamin Totino (Learning Commons, representing DOS/VPSA)

Scribe: Ryan Overbey

1. Notes from 16 February 2026 were approved with minor amendments.

2. Announcements

Upcoming Events: CEPP's Staff Forum on course evaluations is today, Monday, Feb. 23 from 3pm-4pm in Emerson Auditorium.

Middle States Accreditation Reminders: please mark the Peer Review Team's campus visit on Monday-Tuesday March 30-31, and plan to attend the team's *Report to Community* read-out on Wednesday April 1, 10:10am in Gannett Auditorium. Please attend if possible and encourage others to do the same. Schedule is coming Soon™ so be prepared if team wants to meet with CEPP members.

Skidmore is looking into updating the Mission Statement.

David Cohen has drafted some language for FHB revisions for CEPP to look over in preparation for the move to online ratings.

Jamin Totino has a slate of guests that can talk about accessibility; they will come on 16 March meeting.

3. CEPP Business

a. Discussion about Curricular Efficiency and the All-College Requirements, with Corey Freeman-Gallant (ADOF) and Kelly Sheppard (Assessment)

CFG and KS gave a presentation to CEPP members on how the Huron recommendations and ongoing efforts towards budget reductions in Academic Affairs intersected with Skidmore's curriculum. They discussed the various levers the College could pull to achieve the target budget reduction, and the effectiveness/efficiency of those levers.

The main question discussed today was: would changing or eliminating specific all-College curricular requirements be an effective way to achieve cost savings? CFG and KS presented evidence suggesting that changing or eliminating different GenEd requirements would not achieve the savings we need to achieve. The office of the DoF does not see GenEd as a lever for achieving a reduction in faculty lines. There were four main points:

1. If you run the numbers on the potential impact of eliminating one or another GenEd requirement, the effect on number of lines is minimal compared to other levers.

Likewise, the data shows that reducing academic programs such as cutting majors or eliminating small departments does not significantly affect the budget, and is not a useful strategy for achieving budgetary aims. DOF does not see cutting majors or small departments as a pathway to achieve our financial goals, particularly considering the central value of disciplinary breadth in a liberal arts education.

2. The General Education curriculum is about our values as an institution, about the learning goals (starting with the Student Goals for Learning and Development) that animate our collective enterprise, and changing our pedagogical values merely for budgetary reasons should not be on the table. Changes to the General Education curriculum should be animated by our institutional values and our goals for student learning.

3. Even if one *did* want to change the General Education curriculum for budgetary reasons, curricular changes require a long deliberative process that takes many years to unfold, and we need to address budgetary issues without delay.

4. In response to a question previously asked on the floor of the Faculty Meeting, on whether making changes to the Scribner Seminar program would yield cost savings, the presenters noted that Skidmore is excelling at first-year retention compared to peers and aspirants, and the data shows that the Scribner Seminar is a major driver of that retention. Backsliding on first-year retention would only amplify budgetary problems.

After the presentation, there was robust discussion in the CEPP committee about levers for cost reductions that are available to individual departments and programs, and folks who serve as department chairs noted that they would appreciate more concrete data-driven guidance from the Fourth Floor about how their specific departments and programs could effectively contribute to cost reductions.