

**CCC Meeting Notes**  
**November 11th, 3:00–4:30pm**  
**Galileo Conference Room**

Present: Jim, Michael, Greg, Sharon, Cynthia, Jennifer, Elena, Chris

1. Second Language Requirement and the Core Curriculum

Guests: Lori Spicher, Helga Lenhart-Chang, Mike Riley

The proposed goal language, a new version proposed by the Department of Modern Language, and a commentary provided by Professor Cortright were considered. It was agreed that that is an administrative move, not a change in standards. And that second language acquisition naturally has an overlap of Habits of Mind and Pathways to Knowledge. (As do all the other PtK, in that all are an approach, an attitude, gaining understanding of rules of others = HoM, that also supplies skills = PtK.)

After discussion it was agreed that Jim would draft version 3, and put it on the December meeting agenda. The goal is to agree to a draft then, and take the the rest of the community hopefully in February.

2. Updates

(a) Ranked Teaching in January Term and Collegiate Seminar

Jim met with Senate leadership on 11/6 to discuss how to move this item forward. The leadership is concerned that (1) they don't know what the faculty thinks, (2) need more historical data about participation in these programs, (3) need to better understand the consequences and procedures which might result from either supporting or not supporting the statement.

Jim suggested that one cause of the delay is his inability to clearly describe the 'problem'. Ideas:

(a) Are we department "first", and we staff programs like JT and CS 'spare' faculty? Or are Jan Term and Seminar on par with departments?

(b) In some departments CS is required for tenure, in some a bonus, in some discouraged. Is this ok?

(c) What does tenure to the college mean?

(d) Truth in advertising: are faculty ok with the college selling these programs as the keys to an SMC education but having them primarily staffed by contingent faculty?

In discussion it was suggested that the reasons the CCC is involved in this include (i) January Term and Collegiate Seminar are part of the Core, and so lie within our responsibility, and (ii) If ranked faculty reject responsibility for CS and JT, then surely they are not responsible for the Engaging the World goals, and this could significantly change how we approach supplying EtW courses.

(b) Designation Renewal

The UEPC is preparing their response to our proposal, but thus far no response to our request for an ETA. (11/10 meeting canceled due to lack of agenda items.)

(c) BALOS

The final submission arrived on 11/11. Jim will review and distribute.

(d) LEAP

Subsequent notes: On 11/12 the Academic Senate adopted, via consent, a GPSEPC recommendation: “We support LEAPs request to have a one-year extension to implement the CC with the provision that checks are put into place to ensure that LEAP can implement the core curriculum in the Fall of 2015.” When asked what these checks are, the GPSEPC chair responded “Request for checks, pursuant to the discussion with Cathy Davalso (sic) at the GPSEPC October meeting, are left to the discretion of LEAP.”

In email correspondence, the Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Programs indicated that accreditation standards suggest completion requirements must be made clear in all published descriptions of a program no later than a full term before enrollment in the program begins. For LEAP this means February 1st, 2015.

(e) Core Data needs

No progress has been made.

(f) Integral students, and waiver from Core

The Chair of the Academic Senate indicates the Integral Program is preparing a petition for UEPC on the status of current Integral students.

She and the Provost have also discussed our email about different possible interpretations of the Provost’s response to the core waiver. She hasn’t met with the Director of Integral yet, and so had no update for the CCC.

(g) Provisional Engaging the World designations for “topics” courses

It was agreed these are appropriate. They are intended purely for courses whose ‘title’ is “Topics”. There are no deadlines, and Jim will decided with help of WG chairs. The designation is good only for the one-time teaching of the course.

### 3. Action Items

(a) Language Requirement and the Core Curriculum

See above.

(b) Petitions

The CCC Chair is empowered to decide upon Core petitions (“I would like this course to count for that learning goal.”) Most get no’s, but sometimes a student takes a Jan Term that should have counted but slipped through the cracks, or took a course the semester before it formally counted, etc. and then Jim may approve. So far, this is old hat.

However, as graduation for the class of 2016 draws closer, Jim is getting petitions like “I won’t graduate unless you let me do *this*,” where *this* is things like “waive this learning goal” or “count this Jan Term course for a Pathways goal.” Does the CCC chair have the power to do this already? Or does Jim need Senate(?) approval to do this? If not, who does? Or are all such requests simply automatically denied?

Note: The Seminar Director approves petitions for waiving Seminar requirements, the Jan term Director approves petitions for waiving Jan Term requirements, and department chairs approve petitions regarding requirements in the major. Does the equivalent power automatically transfer to the CCC chair? Jim has indicated to the Senate leadership his sense that the CCC chair has this authority. He has also asked the UPEC

about this, and has received from the AARC chair an endorsement of the authority of the CCC chair in this area.

Assuming it exists what factors should the decision be based upon? In discussion it was agreed:

- The default response should be “no.” That is, the waiving of a core requirement should be done only in exceptional cases.
- The standard should be “graduate” or not “commence.” Should only be done with a student is one requirement from graduating.
- A note from the advisor is necessary, explaining, for example, that the student was mis-advised, argue that the complications of the major preclude the student from meeting the goal, argue that summer work is inappropriate or impossible.

Having heard no objection, Jim intends to act as if he as the authority to decide such petitions.

(c) Written and Oral Communication

Jim believes it is time to clarify the Written and Oral Communication learning goal. For the past several years we have simply been ignoring the “and Oral” part of W&OC, assuming that Shared Inquiry is how we do oral communication at Saint Mary’s. (Indeed, we argued such to WASC in the meaning and integrity of the degree essay.) If the faculty feels this is correct, then we should remove “and Oral” from the learning goal. If this is not what the faculty want, then we need to better understand what the oral communication goal and implementation is.

The pre-proposal received mixed support, with some suggestions that there are larger issues for the CCC to deal with first.

(d) Assessment Projects: Not discussed.

(e) Working Group considerations: Not discussed.