

CCC Meeting Notes

November 28th, 2012

Present: Jim, Sharon, Ed, Cynthia, Rebecca, Jennifer, Paul, Lisa Manter. Chocolate Cake.

Notes by Jim

1) English/Composition 4 & 5 redevelopment

Lisa Manter was present to discuss the final draft of the guiding documents for English 4 & 5.

English 4 focuses on the Critical Thinking and Written Communication learning outcomes. The big shift here is the emphasis on the outcomes, as opposed to types of essays. Roughly, instructors have considerable freedom over the types of writing they assign, but must explicitly link the outcomes to the writing.

English 5 focuses on the Information Evaluation & Research Practices outcomes. Two essays are required, including a sizable final paper. This class had less structure previously than did English 4 so it is thought the guidelines will be beneficial.

Syllabi are all collected, which will help to assess 'compliance' with the new outcomes and structure.

There was a brief discussion on how to promulgate the 'new' compositions. (1) Put on website. (2) Jim/Lisa email. (3) Jim to discuss in WID. (4) Seminar faculty.

2) Planning for CCC proposal review meetings December 10th and 11th

December 10th 2-4pm, December 11th 3-4:30pm.

This is a closed meeting, open only to the faculty members of the CCC.

As they finalize their Working Groups recommendations, WG Chairs are to

a) Clearly post a final syllabus and application and supporting document, and PERFA for each proposal.

While it may be worthwhile to keep older versions for reference, it is not expected that CCC members will review these. Rather, CCC members are expected that CCC members will be familiar with the final version of each proposal before Monday's meeting.

b) Provide some simple summary of proposals and working group recommendations
For the proposals that do not currently merit strong recommendation, WG Chair should be prepared to discuss. We suggest using "Strongly Recommend", "Recommend", and "Do not Recommend". Votes should be reported in the cases in which the WG was unable to come to consensus.

c) While every proposal will be individually considered, as keeping with our procedures, those proposals that have merited a 'strong recommendation' from the Working Group will be considered with some alacrity, so that we may spend more time on the proposals that may have weaknesses.