

<sup>th</sup> faculty meeting.

3. Discussion of the open forum held on April 15<sup>th</sup> on the “Transition and Transformation” draft. Faculty in attendance raised a variety of issues of varying concern:

- the allocation of scarce resources to administrative staff instead of faculty lines
- process leading to the current draft and the role of faculty governance in that process; what portions of the draft should come before the faculty for a vote, and whether those portions should be disaggregated from the remainder of the proposal
- the vision that resulted in the draft derives from the Strategic Renewal document, which was never discussed at a faculty meeting
- the participation of untenured faculty in the forum
- the draft represents an institutional paradigm shift, from, as one faculty articulated, “mind and hand” to “mind and hand-holding”
- the impact of the marketplace on the curriculum
- faculty workload and a perceived increase in faculty responsibilities
- implications for the faculty personnel process and a lack of consultation with CAPT
- the value of credit-bearing internships
- the language, and meaning, of “High Impact” practices, and whether that term, coined by George Kuh, suggests a “crisis of relevance”
- the subordination of a liberal arts education to vocational education
- whether a problem exists that necessitates this proposal, and what data support this programmatically

CEPP discussed the value of this open forum, in particular the merits of a discussion of a proposal that cuts across all areas of the college, and that asks the faculty to respond to a draft based on scholarly literature, and that includes other constituencies – alumni, parents, donors, etc. The committee also considered whether disaggregation of the proposals parts made sense, and what portions constitute curricular, educational policy. CEPP discussed viewing this prc42(w) (s)3( pr)-s1(t)-13