

CEPP Meeting Minutes
08.21.2020

Zoom Conference 11:00-1:00 pm.

Scribe: Feryaz Ocakli

Attendees: Steve Ives, Feryaz Ocakli, Michael Orr, Leigh Wilton, Rachael Borthwick, Jina Mao, Peter von Allmen, Pat Hilleren, Sean Heaney, Riley Filister, Mahesh Shankar, Joshua Woodfork, Malchijah Hoskins, Mariel Martin, Janet Casey, Barbara Black, Mary Crone Odekon, Beck Krefting, Cerri Banks, Eliza Kent

- 1) Discussed the use of Student Ratings and Feedback in Fall 2020 for tenure and promotion cases with representatives of ATC and PC. Chairs of ATC and PC presented their respective committee's positions. ATC's unanimous position, and PC's majority position, was that if CEPP recommends that faculty not be required to include Fall 2020 evaluations in their tenure and promotion files, these committees would accept this recommendation. However, despite arriving at a tentative recommendation unanimously in the previous CEPP meeting on 08/10/2020, CEPP could not reach a conclusive recommendation on this question. Student members of CEPP diverged sharply from majority faculty opinion regarding the use of Student Ratings and Feedback in Fall 2020. The faculty opinion in CEPP reflected the outcome of the conversations that took place in the faculty meeting organized by FEC on 08/14/2020. The faculty meeting revealed a widespread desire to limit the use of Student Ratings and Feedback in Fall 2020 due to the unprecedented challenges created by the pandemic. Student members asked that all evaluations be seen by all parties that usually have access to them (including ATC and PC). As a result of this strong division in opinion, CEPP could not arrive at a conclusive recommendation regarding Student Ratings and Feedback in Fall 2020. Our current recommendation, as of 08/21/2020, is only that the college holds Student Ratings and Feedback online in Fall 2020.
- 2) Discussed the ways in which bias response at Skidmore relies on student evaluations with members of the Skidmore Bias Response Group. This wide-ranging conversation explored a variety of issues:
 - a. The distinctions between hate, harassment, and assault on one hand, and bias and microaggressions on the other (explained by Joshua Woodfork).
 - b. Our current system of bias response and its shortcomings (explained by Cerri Banks, Malchijah Hoskins, Joshua Woodfork, and Mariel Martin).
 - c. The role Student Ratings and Feedback play in providing students with an avenue to report bias incidents in their courses anonymously.
 - d. The fact that Student Ratings and Feedback are only small parts of an institutional structure that has to respond to bias incidents, and how Skidmore needs more robust accountability mechanisms.
 - e. The need to start a broader conversation across campus on the issue of bias response and accountability which would include a wide range of stake holders.

We did not arrive at any conclusions in this conversation other than agreeing on the need to have a broader institutional conversation to create robust mechanisms of accountability in response to bias incidents. We noted that structural problems require institutional solutions that go beyond Student Ratings and Feedback or the limited jurisdiction of CEPP.

Meeting ended 30 minutes after the scheduled time, at 1 pm.