CEPP Minutes

November 15, 2018

Scribe: Feryaz Ocakli

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

1. Discussed the minutes of the last meeting (11.08.18). There were some revisions to be made. Discussed the details of the process of establishing a minor. There were a number of different interpretations of the language in the Faculty Handbook. The difference was in whether a new minor initiative should first be taken to CC, or can it go to another college committee prior to CC. One of the committee members argued that this has to be clarified, otherwise the processes we, as faculty and administration, have to abide by is being corroded. Various other changes were suggested to make sure the minutes reflect the nuances of the discussion that took place on 11.08.18. Approved the minutes pending the amendments discussed.
2. Updates: There were no updates to report.
3. Continued the discussion of policy around creation and elimination of minors. We decided that CEPP may invite the concerned faculty member to a meeting to hear his concerns. We have already had a fairly detailed conversation about the existing process of establishing minors. However, the CEPP agenda is currently full. So, we decided to postpone this discussion to early Spring 2019.
4. Discussed progress on review of qSET form. Ginger Clark, USC, has officially accepted to visit Skidmore on Thursday, March 7, 2019. She will visit CEPP, the peer observers group, a meeting of chairs and program directors, and possibly address the faculty as a whole. One committee member suggested that we may want to have a Committee of the Whole prior to Clark’s visit. This would take place on March 1, 2019, and serve to prepare the faculty for Clark’s visit and the wider conversation we hope we will have on student evaluations. We may want to hold a second CoW after her visit as well. A representative from Institutional Research is going to visit CEPP, possibly on December 6, 2018. One committee member communicated an impression he got from a prior meeting with a representative of Institutional Research that CEPP may want to ask questions to which there are no clear answers in our minds. If we suspect that there may be bias in student responses, why spend the scarce resources of Institutional Research to investigate this question? A number of CEPP members responded by arguing that we may have a suspicion about the presence of bias, but ultimately we do not know for sure. So, we need the data. There was a strong sense in the committee that we should go ahead and ask Institutional Research to spend the time and the resources necessary to do this important analysis about bias. A committee member mentioned that if we decide to ask Institutional Research to analyze all the questions of qSet, the analysis may take months. We have to make a decision, as CEPP, about what questions to ask in the analysis of the qSet forms. This may or may not result in the analysis of all questions on the form.
5. Discussed the Bridge Experience subcommittee’s meeting. The subcommittee is working through Curriculum Committee’s questions. Because many of the questions are logically complex and, in some cases, contingent upon the answers to other questions, the subcommittee requests not to have preliminary decisions recorded in the CEPP minutes in case subsequent deliberations require rethinking early decisions. The subcommittee is striving to ensure that clarifications of the criteria are in keeping with the language of the Bridge Experience requirement that was passed by the faculty in April 2017.
6. Concluded the meeting at 11:47 am.