

CCC Notes
April 21st, 3:00–4:30pm

1. Upcoming CCC Meetings.

- May 5th, Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- Year End Party: May 5th 5:30 – ?? Jim's House

Present: Jim, Chris, Michael, Jennifer, Zach, Elena, Greg, Alice.

2. Updates and Open Items

(a) CCC meeting Dates for 2015-16

- August 25th 2015. LOCATION TBA. Morning (Committee Day)
- September 8th, 2015 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- September 22nd, 2015 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- October 6th, 2015 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- October 20th, 2015 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- November 3rd, 2015 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- November 17th, 2015 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- February 9th, 2016 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- February 23rd, 2016 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- March 8th, 2016 Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00-4:30pm
- March 29th LOCATION TBA 3:00-4:30pm
- April 12th LOCATION TBA 3:00-4:30pm
- April 26th LOCATION TBA 3:00-4:30pm
- May 10th LOCATION TBA 3:00-4:30pm

(b) Deadlines for Community Engagement courses

All (almost all?) Fall 2015 CE courses met the necessary deadlines. Yay!

(c) CE Issues

Zach and Jim met with CILSA to discuss issues that have arisen. Given the enormity of the needs we faced in 2011 all are very pleased with the current situation, even while continued progress will be made. See the attachment on Agenda.

(d) Ranked Teaching in Collegiate Seminar and January Term: At Senate

Failed to appear on 3/25 or 4/8 agendas. A 'pocket veto' is still a veto. Jim is to keep trying.

(e) LEAP – no update since last time

(f) Integral – no update since last time

(g) Incorporation of Languages into Global Perspective

Unanimously endorsed by the UEPC on 4/13. To appear on a future Senate agenda.

(h) Risk Assessment

Is being electronicalized and will soon be posted on Provost's website.

3. Discussion Item: 4–1–4 plus.

The positives (flexibility provided to students) clearly outweigh any negatives ('extra' work). Students in the large majors (Chemistry, BusAd) do have very little room left over after their Core requirements. There was concern that many students are already working at their limits and that we didn't want any students getting in over their heads.

4. Discussion Item: Designation Renewals – Do we wish to continue to push this? How hard?

Jim reviewed his understanding of the situation: Was briefly discussed by the UEPC on 4/13. It will likely be a main topic of a soon-to-be-announced 4/27 special meeting. That the UEPC discussions of the CCC's 'redesignation proposal' seems to have several implicit assumptions. Among them are

- (a) Most courses are fully (and more naturally) reviewed by their departments and so need no additional review,
- (b) The Program Review Process already results in departments doing assessment of all of their courses, and reviewing them wrt the Core learning goals, and
- (c) Asking for a routine submission of syllabi and assignments is like policing and shows a lack of trust in our colleagues.

The CCC conversation noted:

- Faculty are in various places on the Core/Distribution axis, and their views on where we are and where we should be greatly influence their reading of our proposal.
- That without robust redesignation we begin sliding back towards area requirements
- It is hard to explain Core vs. Distribution quickly, and especially to faculty who have never been on the CCC.
- Faculty seem to have a concern that the CCC proposal is a trojan horse – once it is approved the CCC will quickly inflate it into something much larger. We don't, but how to disprove a negative?
- Departmental goals and Core goals for a course can be very similar and overlap, but they are (almost?) always distinct. Even when they seem close they are not the same. Hence internal departmental review isn't sufficient.
- The revised Program Review process will concentrate on educational effectiveness and the academic profile, and so won't provide a review of how well courses are teaching for the Core.

Jim is to attempt to outline the difference between Core and Areas for the UEPC.

5. Voting Item: Jan Term 2016

Elena, Zach and Jim met April 9th to the 2016 Jan Term travel proposals, and posted their recommendations on the google docs. We will vote to endorse (or not!) these recommendations at the May 5th meeting.

6. Discussion Item: Working Group membership 2015-16

Jim reviewed the CCC's standard practices: CCC members are appointed to Working Groups by the CCC Chair, criteria including: generally desire continuity, interest and expertise.

Working Group members appointed by Senate upon CCC recommendation. We generally desire 2 continuing and 2 new members, and a mix of expertise and interested others.

CCC members are to provide Jim with (private) comments on usefulness of WG members.

7. Discussion Item: Summer Orientation

Some members volunteered to give the orientation talks. Jim will distribute a doodle poll to look for others. The summer session instructors would be good candidates. Jim and Cynthia should take a first shot at the content for the talk and maybe during final exam time distribute it for comments.

8. Discussion Item: Learning Goal Assessment

CCC members briefly outlined their WG's progress toward assessment. Most (all?) groups appear to have gathered assessment data but are struggling to get faculty together to do the norming and grading. This seems a common issues, and is one the CCC will need to more formally address before the next round of assessment occurs.

Jim reminded all to use food and drink as bait, as well as our ability to stipend faculty who spend considerable time doing Core assessment work. The final reports are due September 1st.

9. Discussion Item: Whole Core assessment

There was some brainstorming about Core assessment, especially as related to the Seminar 104 development. It was noted that once Seminar 104 is being taught it will be much harder to have those assignments modified for potential assessment use.

Chris recommended that planning for a 'whole Core' assessment project is premature. Our first priority is to finish the current projects, put them all on the table, do a synthesis & SWOT analysis, and then plan for whole Core work.

10. Discussion Item: The WASC Report and Assessment

Chris Sindt joined us. He indicated that the 2018 SMC report would focus on Core assessment, while likely include other assessment work. We need to (1) deliver a process that (2) we clearly followed and are continuing to follow, one that (3) produces evidence/results that (4) are being analyzed and result in changes in behaviors and/or content.

A somewhat contentious conversation followed. Among the issues:

- We need to assess both the Core Curriculum and the WASC Core Competencies.
- SMC has some flexibility in defining what we think the Core Competencies are. How much flexibility? Not clear.
- Can we equate our 'shared inquiry' with their 'oral communication'? Not clear.
- Can we equate our 'mathematical understanding' with their 'quantitative reasoning'? Not clear.
- It appears that assessing the WASC Core Competencies is more important (in the short run) than the assessment of the Core Learning Goals.
- How much is enough? Not clear

- The Habits of Mind area appears to contain most of the WASC Core Competencies. Does that group have the authority to do WASC assessment? Does it have the human power?
- It appears that “use of results” is quite open, and includes changed assignments, revised goal language, revised outcome language across the Core, revised outcome language within a course, changes in pedagogy in a course or across courses, training on pedagogy.

While being grateful for the assistance and honest communication, CCC members expressed concern that the WASC Liaison, Vice Provost for Undergraduates and Director of Educational Effectiveness seemed at times to have differing views on the definitions and of what is necessary. Given our struggles to complete our rather narrow first rounds of goal assessment, there was concern about our ability to layer sufficiently robust Core Competency assessment over our existing work.

Chris Sindt will return to the next meeting for further conversation.