Committee on Educational Policies and Planning
2010-2011 Annual Report

Membership for 2010-2011
Bob Turner, Government, faculty representative (08-11 term); Chair 2010-2011
Terry Diggory, English, faculty representative (08-11 term), fall semester
Michael Arnush, Classics, faculty representative (08-11 term), spring semester
Rubén Graciani, Dance, faculty

Arthur Vining Davis (AVD) Grant and Civic Engagement at Skidmore
Can CEPP create its own ad-hoc committees?
Development of Educational and Procedural Criteria for Establishing a Minor
Institutionalizing Intergroup Relations (IGR) program at Skidmore College

Section II. Motions, Pilot Programs, and Administrative Policies
Accepting on-line course transfer credits from other institutions
Revising the drop/add deadline on the Academic Calendar.
Articulation Agreement for Business with RIT and Syracuse.
Three Year Pilot Program for Study Abroad in Beijing and Shanghai, China

Section III. Consultation
Office of the Dean of Special Programs Mission Statement
Academic Affairs Budget Priorities and Planning
Five-Year Strategic Priorities selected by Academic Affairs
VPAA Disciplines Project
Academic Calendar 2012-2013
Reduction of CEPP Faculty Membership

I. Long Term Educational Policy and Planning Issues

Excellence in Teaching

One of CEPP's major issues for the academic year was Excellence in Teaching. On September 15, CEPP met with Paty Rubio and Beau Breslin to review the data from the Dean's Cards and Scribner Seminar evaluations on the quality of teaching at Skidmore. Our meeting emphasized the opportunity for improving teaching as well as the limits of the existing Dean's Cards and Scribner Seminar evaluation process.   CEPP is concerned that our current quantitative rating system, the Dean's Cards, do not provide faculty with sufficient information on how to improve their teaching. CEPP's concern is consistent with Rik Scarce's Report to CEPP on Quantitative Student Ratings of Faculty (2010).

CEPP subsequently formed a joint CEPP-CAPT Subcommittee on Student Rating Instruments including Bob Turner (chair), Josh Ness and Chris Kopec from CEPP, Viviana Rangil and Carolyn Anderson from CAPT, and Paty Rubio from the DOF. The CEPP-CAPT Subcommittee on Student Rating Instruments met twelve times in the Spring semester to draft a new student rating instrument and implement a pilot study of the instrument and brought in two outside experts to give presentations and lead workshops for the faculty on student rating instruments with funding from NSF ADVANCE and Teagle Foundation grants.

On December 14, 2010, Catherine Ross, the Managing Director of Wake Forest University's Teaching and Learning Center, gave a presentation at Academic Staff on "Myths and Research on Student Evaluations." The Subcommittee also provided readings about best practices in student ratings and faculty evaluations to educate the faculty about the theoretical and empirical research on student rating systems. We also created the first comprehensive list of all department and program long forms to identify the significant variation in long forms across campus. A copy of the readings and the list of long forms is available on the CEPP webpage and

was distributed to all department and program chairs. Over 60 chairs, program directors and other faculty attended the workshop. Professor Ross also met with members of CAPT and

of data generated by a longer set of questions. Second, the Subcommittee should analyze the validity and reliability issues with the pilot study questions, perhaps bringing in outside faculty with statistical training for help. Third, the Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of alternative presentation formats of the results for formative and summative purposes. Fourth, the Subcommittee should solicit the input of students, perhaps through SGA Academic Council. Fifth, the Subcommittee should continue to consult with faculty in light of new information gathered as a result of the pilot survey and the aforementioned discussions.

CEPP also reviewed the appointment and reporting structure for Faculty Network Facilitator (FNF), Erica Bastress Dukehart. The FNF currently has 6 faculty interest groups (FIGs). The intent of the FIGs is to combine building community among faculty with improving pedagogy and teaching. For example, the "Sports and Society" FIG members have had discussions about how they incorporate sports into their classes and used funding from the FNF to bring in a guest speaker to discuss Title IX and the teaching of sports. The FNF also participates in the first year faculty learning group.

The FNF is an important educational policy innovation, both for improving pedagogy at the college and identifying emerging educational policy issues CEPP should address. The new student rating instrument will provide considerably more information to faculty about their relative strengths and weaknesses in the classroom. Catherine Ross informed CEPP that identifying a faculty member who can help faculty address issues is critical for ensuring that a new student rating instrument translates into improved teaching and also reducing faculty anxiety about the new instrument. The FNF should play a critical role in mentoring with the new student rating instrument. Moreover, the FNF should meet periodically with CEPP or CEPP chair to discuss what the FIGs are doing and identify any emergent educational policy issues.

Assessment
CEPP devoted considerable attention this year to the issue of Assessment. CEPP discussed Assessment in 8 meetings during the 2010-11 year in addition to having Mimi Hellman serve on the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC). Rubén Graciani also attended an assessment conference in Chicago with Sarah Goodwin, the Faculty Assessment Coordinator. CEPP discussed the status of various assessment initiatives, how to improve assessment at Skidmore, and restructuring the ongoing relationship between CEPP and the ASC.

CEPP explored with ASC a number of the Committee's assessment initiatives including the latest draft of the Alumni Learning Census, the Teagle-supported projec

program directors and produce serious motivational issues. These concerns came to a head in reference to the ambition and scope of the Teagle proposal regarding effective communication.

CEPP identified a series of guidelines for how we believe assessment should proceed.

1. *Be focused/Keep it simple-* the ASC should focus its assessment agenda. ASC should identify one or two major assessment initiatives per year, rather than conducting many assessment initiatives.
2. *Use existing data-* A culture of assessment is gradually emerging at Skidmore. Many departments or programs are conducting quality assessment initiatives. ASC can be the repository for such data. Moreover, ASC should use data collected by departments or programs (departmental efforts at assessing writing) and professors (Professor Walzer's student culture data, Professor Ford's IGR data) to supplement its initiatives. ASC should also ask departments and programs to collect the data for ASC by using either existing data or minimally obtrusive measures.
3. *Steer not row-* It is difficult for committees to design and conduct social science research. ASC has struggled in designing its assessment initiatives. We believe ASC, to borrow an idea from the reinventing government movement, should "steer not row." It is not ASC's obligation to do assessment, but to see that assessment is done. Instead of seeking to design every assessment initiative itself, ASC should identify assessment needs by consulting broadly across the college (VPAA, DOF, CEPP, Chairs' and Program Directors' meetings), solicit proposals from interested faculty about how to best assess those goals, pay the faculty for conducting the assessment research, and then have ASC distribute the results.
4. *Close the loop-* CEPP believes we can better connect the assessment data we do collect to inform decisions that change our educational practices. If we are collecting data and doing nothing with it, or collecting data that we are going to ignore, then something is wrong.

CEPP devoted considerable attention to discussing the relationship between the ASC and CEPP. This is not a new issue. Ray Rodriguez, the first assessment coordinator, came to CEPP in 2002 to discuss what the relationship between CEPP and assessment should be, and we have continued to struggle with the reporting and institutional arrangements between CEPP and ASC during the intervening period. CEPP and ASC have concluded that the existing institutional arrangements, with ASC reporting to both CEPP and the VPAA, do not work well.

CEPP and ASC concur we should create an independent Assessment Committee. Many other colleges have independent assessment committees. We have asked Sarah Goodwin and ASC to draft a proposal for FEC about what the new committee's membership, mission, and relationship to CEPP should be. CEPP should discuss the proposed new institutional arrangements with ASC in the Fall and we can jointly present the proposal to FEC.

Finally, CEPP is committed to incorporating assessment data into its discussion of educational policy on a systematic basis. At its Summer Retreat, CEPP included assessment data as part of its discussion of each initiative it discussed at the end of the year

Transition and Transformation

In his capacity as the Director of the Faculty-Student Summer Research Program and one of the creators of the SGA Responsible Citizenship Internship Award, the CEPP Chair introduced the two programs and several student participants at the March Trustee meeting. He noted a high level of enthusiasm among trustees and students for summer research and funded internships among the Trustees.

After consulting with chairs and program directors at the disciplinary roundtables, CEPP cosponsored an Open Forum on the T&T initiative on April 15 with FEC. CEPP's goals for the forum were to broaden the conversation about the T&T initiative in general and high impact practices among the faculty. CEPP provided the faculty with the T&T working paper, data on high impact experiences and educational and career outcomes at Skidmore, two scholarly articles on high impact experiences, and an excerpt of the President's Strategic Renewal document in advance of the meeting. The Open Forum saw a very spirited and productive discussion of the "Transition and Transformation" initiative which addressed the positive and negative aspects of its educational, curricular, institutional, and pedagogical implications. (See April 20, 2011 CEPP minutes for a list of issues that were raised.) CEPP attributed the high quality of the deliberation to the high level of interest in the subject matter, the provision of theoretical and empirical readings in lieu of formal presentations, and the unstructured format for the discussion.

After the Open Forum, CEPP recognized that the T&T working paper had two significant

CEPP subsequently decided to create a subcommittee to more systematically study the Culture-Centered Inquiry component of the all-College requirements in the context of the Learning Goals

1. CEPP has consistently made use of Mixed Committees, (defined as a group whose membership consists of members of CEPP, other faculty members, some of whom are not on committees, as well as administrators) to address a wide array of curricular and educational policy issues including enrollment caps, study abroad, expository writing, DOS restructuring, academic grievance policy, and the first year experience.
2. FEC or CFG has never played any role in determining the membership of those committees.

Based upon our reading, we conclude that

1. CEPP's interpretation of the Faculty Handbook is amply supported by precedent.
2. The characteristics of CEPP demonstrated in that precedent are appropriate. CEPP's ability to recommend educational policy to the Faculty and Administration is crucially dependent on its ability to write its own charge and membership for its subcommittees.

One member of CEPP articulated that the Faculty Handbook contains a contradiction that needs to be resolved, and that CEPP's operating code should not take priority over the Faculty Executive Committee's prerogatives.

Development of Educational and Procedural Criteria for Establishing a Minor
After CEPP's summer retreat, an email discussion was had regarding the procedure for establishing an Arts Administration minor. Currently, the Curriculum Committee reviews the list of courses and their rationale for each minor's curriculum. In the past, some minors had been approved with the vote of the faculty (Environmental Studies), while others like International Affairs and Latin American Studies had not.

However, the Arts Administration minor is unique in that it would be Skidmore's first "coordinate minor". A coordinate minor is one in which only students majoring in designated majors would be able to minor (AH, AR, MU, TH, DA in the case of the Arts Administration minor). The approval of the Arts Administration minor could set an educational precedent for future similarly constructed minors in topics such as Public Health, Media Studies, Public Policy, or Inter-Group Relations.

CEPP believes the AA minor raises a number of important educational policy issues that should be addressed by CEPP. First, should Skidmore establish "coordinate minors", which can only be accessed by majors from few select majors? Second, should Skidmore establish minors or programs without a minimum amount of institutional support? Can we have curricular options that are not supported by tenure track positions and/or that require internships? Third, should Skidmore have clear educational criteria for minors/programs/concentrations or should we approve them on an ad hoc basis? Clearly there a number of other potential "coordinate minors" that might come forward- (IGR, Public Health, Public Policy, Media Studies). Fourth, what should the process be for approving minors? This is clearly FEC's purview, in consultation with CEPP and the Curriculum Committee (CC).

CEPP recognized the immediacy of this issue for the AA minor. The Catalog previews the creation of an Arts Administration minor, and CC has been approving courses under the AA

rubric. Our intent is that CEPP, FEC and CC will address these issues as early as possible in the coming academic year.

Institutionalizing Intergroup Relations (IGR) program at Skidmore College
At the Summer Retreat, CEPP met with Kristie Ford to discuss the assessment data on the educational impact of IGR and the institutionalization of the pilot Intergroup Relations (IGR) program at Skidmore College. IGR clearly has a major learning impact on participating students and supports several parts of our Strategic Plan. CEPP discussed how to allow students who take the IGR sequence to have that participation reflected on their transcript. Among the questions discussed were the merits of different programmatic designations for IGR, including a program, minor, or something akin to Honors Forum. What are the merits of different designations? CEPP also discussed CEPP's role in the process. CEPP agreed that the IGR courses would count towards satisfying the new Considering Difference requirement (see above). CEPP members raised concerns about creating a curriculum designation if there are not sufficient institutional resources in terms of faculty committed to the program. Currently, the IGR classes are taught by faculty teaching overloads or on leave from their home departments. Without making interdisciplinary-like hires in other departments where the faculty member would be committed to teaching two IGR courses, it would be difficult to commit to creating a minor in the curriculum. CEPP also discussed the potential of using a post-doc faculty hired with a Mellon grant to provide sufficient institutional support.

Section II Motions, Pilot Programs, and Administrative Policies
This section details the motions, pilot programs, or administrative policies that CEPP either introduced or approved this academic year which changed an aspect of Skidmore's educational or curricular policy.

Accepting on-line course transfer credits from other institutions
CEPP proposed changing our policy on transfer credit that would allow on-line courses from accredited institutions to be accepted.   The Motion and Rationale read as follows:

CEPP moves that effective Spring 2011, Skidmore will accept in transfer on-line course work completed successfully through an appropriately accredited institution.

Implementation: All the current requirements for the awarding of transfer credit apply, including but not limited to institutional accreditation, minimum required grade, and the need for an official transcript.

Rationale:

On-line courses have become a routine set of offerings at many regionally accredited institutions (80%), and students have the opportunity to enroll in those courses as part of the array of courses available to them.

The decisions made about course equivalency and quality should be based upon course content and student learning objectives and not on how that material is delivered. Students away on leave, completing an internship away from campus, working during the summer, or finishing in absentia would find it especially helpful to have this option available to them as a way to complete requirements.

The motion was approved by the faculty.

Revising the drop/add deadline on the Academic Calendar
The Registrar, Dave DeConno, proposed having two separate dates - an add deadline (5 days from the start of classes, same as the current drop/add date) and then a drop deadline (two weeks from the start of classes). Currently the drop/add deadline on the Academic Calendar is the same date. For the 2011-12 academic year, it would look like:
September 13 (Tues) Add Deadline
September 21 (Wed) Drop Deadline
The Registrar suggested that having two deadlines is what we actually practice and would make things clearer for both students and faculty. CEPP concurred and approved the changes.

Articulation Agreement for Business with RIT and Syracuse
CEPP, the Office of Academic Advising and the Office of the Registrar have approved articulation agreements proposed by the Management and Business Department with RIT (Saunders College of Business) and Syracuse (Whitman School of Management). The articulation agreements are modeled after the existing agreements with Clarkson University and Union College. The articulation agreements will give Skidmore management and business majors preferential admission at RIT and special consideration at Syracuse. CEPP announced their approval at the April 1 faculty meeting. (See Appendix E)

Three Year Pilot Program for Study Abroad in Beijing and Shanghai, China
CEPP approved an ACOP proposal to initiate a three-year pilot program for study abroad in China run by IES in Beijing and Shanghai, China. The proposal, with one track for students with previous language study (Beijing) and one with no Chinese language prerequisite (Shanghai), but required language study at both, comes with the endorsement of ACOP and Tim Harper, the

Throughout the year CEPP discussed academic priorities and planning, focusing in particular on the fiscal constraints that already have affected or that may in the future affect educational policies and planning. Members of CEPP attended Academic Staff meetings and retreats where these issues were discussed more broadly.

Five-Year Strategic Priorities selected by Academic Affairs
Susan Kress distributed the Academic Affairs Five-Year Strategic Priorities document to CEPP members and explained its development in response to the President's request that each division of the college identify priorities for the second half of the ten-year period covered by the college's Strategic Plan. Each unit within Academic Affairs has its own five-year plan. This list of priorities is more elaborate than the Action Agenda just coming out of President's Cabinet and now going to the Institutional Policy and Planni

Appendix A Student Rating of Teaching and Courses – Pilot Study Spring 2011

Skidmore is considering an alternative to the existing faculty and course evaluation survey. The information you provide below will be used to assess the validity and usefulness of the new questions. While your answers to this pilot test of the new questions will help instructors improve their teaching, they will not be used for evaluating the overall performance of the faculty this year. Your instructor will not receive the results until after final course grades are submitted to the registrar. We appreciate your willingness to help us pilot test the survey.

Please use a pencil or a dark ink

<div align="right">Poor   Fair   Good   Very Good   Excellent</div>

Section III. Student Information Questions:

21. Which best describes this course for you?
 	
    O   Requirement for my major
    O   All college requirement
    O   Elective for major
    O   Other requirement
    O   Elective
	22. On average, how many hours a week did you spend outside of class preparing for this course?
	
	    O 0
	    O 1-3
	    O 4-6
	    O 7-9
	    O 10-14
	    O 15+
		23. My desire to take this course was:
		
		    O Much more than most courses
		    O More than most courses
		    O About the same as most courses
		    O Less than most courses
		    O Much less than most courses

24. Overall, how much have you learned in this course?
 	
    O   Much more than most courses
    O   More than most courses
    O   About the same as most courses
    O   Less than most courses
    O   Much less than most courses
	25. Expected grade in this course:
	
	    O A
	    O B
	    O C
	    O D
	    O F
	    O Pass
	    O Fail
	    O Other
		26. Are you:
		
		    O Man
		    O Woman
		    O Gender variant

APPENDIX B Proposed Changes in the Culture-Centered Inquiry Requirements

DRAFT, May 29, 2011

Motion

To expand the Culture-Centered Inquiry (and rename it the "Intercultural Literacy") Requirement by one additional course from a newly-named and defined "Considering Difference" cluster, while retaining the Foreign Literature and Language and the Non-Western Cultures requirement, thus constituting a three-course requirement.

Rationale

Currently, students take two courses to complete the Culture-Centered Inquiry requirement: one course in a foreign language or literature, and one course from either the "Non-Western Cultures" or "Cultural Diversity" cluster. The guiding principle behind the creation of the existing Cultural Diversity courses was straightforward enough: "In completing a Cultural Diversity course students are encouraged to compare at least two markedly different cultures, one of which must be non-Western in origin." However, the emphasis placed on a Western/Non-Western binary is no longer satisfactory in determining whether a course should be provided the proposed "Considering Difference" designation. There are both historical and contemporary examples of two or more fundamentally Non-Western groups that may see one another as "markedly different." Contemporary and increasingly transnational scholarship and pedagogy also call for revisiting this principle. Several fields (including Africana Studies, Caribbean Studies, and Latin American Studies) illuminate intra-group tensions along fault lines of class, gender, ethnicity and sexuality that run as deep as those that cross racial lines.

A survey of existing Cultural Diversity courses suggests that *race* and *ethnicity* are synonymous with societal difference. However, issues of societal difference also can be analyzed in terms of *gender*, *gender expression,*l56ender   .3(oere omico)5.7(0 Tw [(eth)6(n0395city)]TJ /TT6 1

17

until senior year to take a Non-Western course. Why not earlier on?" This student had spoken with a White classmate who regretted doing precise

d. **Students examine issues of difference within populations involving interactions that are framed by constructions of social identity variables such as ethnicity, gender, gender expression, race, religion, sexuality and socioeconomic class. These courses may focus on issues of difference within an intergroup or intragroup context.**

Timeline

Spring semester 2011: CEPP prepared a draft motion/rationale, shared it with Curriculum Committee and received useful feedback. CEPP charged a subcommittee with crafting a revision by May 2nd; the subcommittee completed its work in late April and submitted its report to CEPP.

June 1st: share the motion/rationale with department chairs and program directors. Invite feedback from chairs and directors

Appendix C: Proposal to the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, "Civic Engagement in the Curriculum"

Skidmore College respectfully requests a grant of $250,000 from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations to help us launch a major initiative to advance, institutionalize and sustain a comprehensive program of civic engagement in the curriculum. The program will build on a multi-year planning effort by our Responsible Citizenship Task Force (http://cms.skidmore.edu/campuslife/community_service/upload/RCTF-Civic-Engagement-Status-Report.pdf) to develop the capacity of our faculty to undertake this transformational effort.

Background and Strategic Significance

Skidmore's president, Philip Glotzbach, has noted many times that Skidmore embodies the iconic values embedded in a classic liberal arts education. In Goal 3 of its *Strategic Plan* (http://cms.skidmore.edu/planning/), Skidmore articulates one such value: "We will prepare every Skidmore student to make the choices required of an informed, responsible citizen at home and in the world." Our recently adopted *Goals for Student Learning and Development* (http://cms.skidmore.edu/assessment/goals-for-student-learning.cfm) reflect this priority and underscore the faculty's commitment to it.

During the last academic year, President Glotzbach led an extended period of constituent outreach to explore the "value added" of a Skidmore education in light of the ongoing effects of the current economic crisis as well as the considerable cost of excellence here and at our peer institutions. One of the conclusions we reached as a result of those conversations is that, while a liberal education is the best possible preparation for life, we can do more to prepare our students for the transition from college to further studies or to the working world. As we reflect on how our courses and, as an extension of teaching and learning, our advising and mentoring practices, might change by situating them in the context of a larger developmental arc that extends beyond the classroom and into the community, we have decided that we can achieve the most profound and lasting impact by integrating civic engagement—in particular, service learning and community-based research that involves students—more fully and intentionally into our curriculum.

The Project

In 18 of Skidmore's 32 academic programs that offer undergraduate majors, faculty members have integrated civic engagement within their curricula. An ethos of civic engagement is particularly strong in our pre-professional and interdisciplinary programs. This group, however, despite its steadfast commitment to civic engagement, does not constitute a critical mass, either in faculty numbers or in curricular impact. Our challenge, given the considerable demands on the faculty, and in the context of a recessionary economic climate, is to expand the reach of civic engagement more intentionally and into a larger number of our academic programs, especially those in core liberal arts disciplines and in

of civic action, and to act as important resources for first- and second-year students looking to get involved in local, national, or international communities.

Faculty Development Funds: An important component of the program as a whole is the availability of a broad category of faculty development funds. These will be used for a range of activities, including course devel

Appendix D. History of CEPP subcommittees, working groups and advisory panels

Below is a list of the thirteen past and present subcommittees, working groups, and advisory panels that CEPP has formed going back to 2003 that Bob Turner was been able to identify from the CEPP annual reports. It is not complete or exhaustive. I categorized the subcommittees into three categories based upon the definitions:

> **Mixed Committee**- subcommittee consists of CEPP, and other faculty members, some of who are not on committees, as well as administrators (7/8)
> **Joint Committee**- membership is from CEPP and other official committees (1/2)
> **Task Force** – charged by VPAA (2)

The review suggests that
> CEPP has consistently made use of Mixed Committee to address a wide array of curricular and educational policy issues including enrollment caps, study abroad, expository writing, DOS restructuring, and the FYE.
> FEC or CFG has never played any role in determining the membership of those committees.

List of Groups- where applicable, the language was taken from the CEPP annual report for that year.

1. **CEPP and CAPT Subcommittee on Revising the Dean's Cards,** members of CEPP, CAPT and the DOF, Mixed Committee
2. **Culture Centered Inquiry Subcommittee- 2011**- CEPP, CIGU, faculty, Mixed Committee
3. **Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Programs (ACOP) –2005- present -** CEPP, faculty, admirs   – Mixed Committee
4. **Assessment Steering Committee** – 2008-present - a Mixed Committee
5. **Committee on Educational Policies and Planning (CEPP) and Curriculum Committee (CC) Enrollment Cap Subcommittee -** Joint/M 0 TD.0007 ricult Cap Su4 TD.0007.7(pi(135 TD6e)Tj/TT4

CEPP met with Michael Ennis McMillan (DOS), Ann Henderson (Registrar and Director of Institutional Research) and Tillman Nechtman (Chair, CAS) to discuss the need for an academic grievance policy. CEPP also received correspondence from Mary Stange (CAFR) citing the need for a coherent policy. CEPP decided to create a

<u>Task Force</u> Membership was not reviewed by FEC.

13. **CEPP Subcommittee on Study Abroad and Diversity**

Fall '03 Membership J. Anzalone (FLL), M. Arnush (chair), L. Aronson (AH), S. Bender (AN), M. Ennis-McMillan (AN), M. Fair (CEPP), C. Filson (OIP), R. Ginsberg (GO), K. Graney (GO), J. Ling (DOAA), N. Merrill (CEPP), M.-B. O'Brien (FLL/IA), M. Odekon (EC), P. Rubio (FLL), J. Ramsey (DOS), G. Thompson (*ex officio*, CEPP chair) This subcommittee will make recommendations to CEPP for consideration   <u>Mixed committee</u>

Appendix E Articulation Agreements with RIT and Syracuse

CEPP, the Office of Academic Advising and the Office of the Registrar have approved the following articulation agreements proposed by the Management and Business Department:

I. RIT (Saunders College of Business) – M.B.A. (Master's in Business Administration)
II. Syracuse (Whitman School of Management)
    i. M.B.A.
    ii. M.S.A. (Master of Science in Accounting)
    iii. M.S.F. (Master of Science in Finance)

The articulation agreements are modeled after the existing agreements with Clarkson University and Union College. The Saunders College of Business and Whitman School of Management (#59) rate comparably with Clarkson University (#97) and Union College (Rank Not Published)).

Supporting Information:

Link to College and Department Mission
A key component of the Management and Business Department's missions "is to prepare global citizens committed to a process of life-long learning and capable of pursuing careers in management, in the professions, and in community leadership". Affording Skidmore's business majors the opportunity to attend the Whitman School of Management or the Saunders College of Business enhances the likelihood of the desired end-goals. Further, we seek to develop global citizens possessing a unique ability to assess personal and professional dilemmas. Students who take part in these articulation agreements will gain critical insight and unique perspectives with which to analyze pervasive and rare human dilemmas and business situations. The implementation of the articulation agreements is consistent with Skidmore's current emphasis on the post-graduate transition period of our graduates.

MBD Prerequisite Courses in the Context of the Articulation Agreements
Generally, students majoring in Management and Business at Skidmore will have the opportunity to enroll in the courses that serve as foundation requirements in these articulation agreements. However, there exist a few courses; namely, MB 314, Organizational Theory and MB358, Human Resource Management which are not offered every academic year. Students may seek alternatives such as summer courses, study abroad or early admission into the MBA program as a means to fulfill the foundation requirements involving these courses.

Student Interest
Students who have a passion for their undergraduate studies, specifically, business in a broad sense or set of elective courses in a functional area such as Marketing or Accounting, may seek to continue their studies to attain a higher level of understanding and deeper level of engagement. Also, students tend to be interested in these types of programs when it is perceived that they can increase their perceived value to various types of organizations. In addition, students sometimes view these types of programs as a bridge to further graduate studies such as a PH.D.

Factors influencing Student Participation

Factors such as the state of the economy, job market supply and demand patterns, the perceived value of graduate education vs. work experience and students' estimations of their academic ability influence the flow into these programs.

Appendix F Summary of Skidmore in China Proposal

TO: Committee on Educational Policy and Planning
FROM: Cori Filson, Director of Off-Campus Study & Exchanges
             Rubén Graciani, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Programs
             (ACOP)
DATE: April 29, 2011

RE: **PROPOSAL FOR RESTRUCTURING OF SKIDMORE IN BEIJING
             PROGRAM AND DEVELOPMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM TO EXPAND
             PROGRAM TO INCLUDE SHANGHAI**

The Office of Off-Campus Study & Exchanges, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Programs and the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, propose to the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning (CEPP) the establishment of an expansion of the current Skidmore in Beijing program. We propose to offer a pilot program that would consist of opportunities in two cities – Beijing and Shanghai – with two distinct tracks in each city. (See Appendix A for a schematic of the proposed program structure.)

The proposed changes have been precipitated by dwindling student interest and the lack of sufficient student enrollments in the program for the past two years, resulting in canceling the program for fall 2010 and 2011. (See Appendix B for program enrollments from fall 2006 to fall 2011.) Enrollments show sporadic peaks in interest in Beijing (and not always on Skidmore's program) and consistent interest in Shanghai even though students must petition to participate in those programs. Feedback from students and faculty indicates that students perceive the language pre-requisite and required field studies course to be significant barriers to participation in the current Skidmore in Beijing program. Even those who are interested in Chinese studies chose not to participate due to these factors. Faculty have mentioned the same barriers. Conversations with faculty from various disciplines over the years have confirmed that certain departments would prefer options in Shanghai, specifically Management & Business.

With this in mind, OCSE proposes this new program structure. We would continue to partner with IES Abroad to deliver the Skidmore in China program. IES Abroad has program centers in Beijing and Shanghai and would be able to host our students in both centers. We have been very pleased with our relationship with IES Abroad and have found them to be extremely accommodating to the academic and student services needs of our students. Therefore, we are confident that they will continue to offer a high quality program for our students. (See Appendix C for details on IES Abroad and their Customized programs.)

Specific changes to the restructured program would include:

Programs open to students of all language levels with a prerequisite of 1 year of Mandarin for the language intensive track in Beijing only; all other tracks will have no language pre-requisite.

Required common course, "Understanding China", to provide all students with a context for their academic and co-curricular work.

Week-long pre- and post-program seminars in Beijing and Shanghai respectively.

Expanded internship options in both cities.

Please note: We are proposing a **three-year pilot program**. Given the struggles we have faced in recruiting for this program, we believe it is time to make significant changes to the program itself in an attempt to serve the needs of a larger cohort of students. We believe the enhancements outlined here will help us do just that. However, if in three years we do not see an increase in enrollments, Skidmore must seriously reconsider the need for a Skidmore presence in China.