

CEPP Meeting of 3/2/04

Present: Michael Arnush, Meaghan Fair, Hugh Foley, Frank Gonzalez, Chuck Joseph, Ray Rodrigues, Paty Rubio, Linda Simon, Gordon Thompson (Chair)

- Minutes of 2/24/04 were approved.
- GT discussed a proposal from the MA department (through Curriculum Committee) to modify the QR requirement such that students must satisfy the QR requirement by November of their first semester. Doing so would allow the MA department to offer MA 100 only in the spring. GT will bring a final version of the proposal to the committee next week.
- !After consultation with Lary Opitz, GT will withdraw the Academic Vision proposal at the faculty meeting, rather than tabling the motion.
- !The Dance Department has a proposal forthcoming to become a separate department, which CEPP will review this spring.
- Regarding the Honors Proposals from Jon Ramsey, GT suggests that CEPP act on only a part of the proposal, identifying the portions that might benefit from more immediate attention and deferring discussion of the rest of the document until next year.
- We initiated discussion of the 2006-2007 calendar, though there was no pressure to arrive at a final decision immediately. As a result, given concerns about the length of Orientation, the length of Senior Week, and the date on which Commencement might take place, we decided that CJ would contact Ann Henderson to determine when CEPP would need to reach a final decision.
- GT has been in discussions with Mark Hofmann regarding ways in which the sciences might contribute to a revised LS program.
- CEPP discussed the memo from Kate Berheide in which she raised concerns about staffing any revised LS program.
- GT alerted the committee to a discussion with LS faculty on Friday, 3/5, from 12-1.

- !MA raised concerns about staffing the courses. HF related concerns from members of the subcommittee that a class size of 15 is not perceptibly different from the current class size of 17, and that additional advising responsibilities may make participation in the program less attractive to faculty, without additional incentives. MA responded that 15 was different from 17.
- !MF talked about the attractiveness of team-taught courses intertwining different themes.
- !The issue of advising was discussed, particularly strategies for ensuring that someone could offer an LS course in consecutive years without becoming overburdened with advisees.
- !PO suggested that if coercion of faculty was needed (e.g., tithing), then the plan is flawed. CJ responded that conscription would emerge only as a solution to a worst-case scenario.
- !The advantage of adding new faculty lines was discussed, with CJ noting that 13 new lines would cost ~\$26 million. PO noted that so many new lines would also require space for offices, labs, etc.
- !PO noted that the linking of teaching an advising in the FY course is found as many other institutions, so would not be viewed by a prospective students as particularly noteworthy.
- HF raised the issue of staffing revised LS courses with adjunct faculty.
- !LS suggested that the advising component of the proposal would not kill the proposal and that money for new course development would serve as an incentive for faculty participation.
- !MA noted that with 30-34 faculty participating in LS1/LS2, we would only need to attract 10-15 new faculty. We need to determine how to proceed in order to be ready to bring the proposal forward at the April faculty meeting.
- PR noted the importance of thinking of mentoring instead of advising to clarify the nature of the relationship that we are seeking to develop.
- !GT closed the meeting asking the committee to look over John Brueggemann's email about orientation for discussion at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted.
Hugh Foley