

CCC Notes: January 28th 2014

Present: Jim, Chris, Sharon, Zach, Jennifer, Michael, Greg, Paul, Richard.

Next Meeting: February 18th: Filippi Academic Hall 100 3:00–4:30pm

1. Announcements and Updates from Jim

- (a) S/D/F in Jan Term? Catalog of Courses says no required courses may be taken S/D/F. But Jan Term is required by Core and JT Catalog says S/D/F is an option. Anna Novakov and Sue Fallis disagree on which trumps. Have sent this to AARC.
- (b) Transfer courses. In December the CCC agreed that the best way for the CCC to determine which courses from other schools should transfer in as which Engaging the World courses was to look through their catalogs. Jim has located and is having printed the Course Catalogs from the 30-odd school with which we have transfer agreements. It was agreed to meet on Tuesday February 4th from noon to 3pm to speed-read the catalogs.
- (c) Can the Artistic Understanding Creative Practice .25cr requirement be met in January Term? Jim talked to JT Director Fallis about this. She is concerned about opening the door even this crack. She will take it to Jan Term Committee.
- (d) Jan Term online proposals. Jim has worked with Paul Ebenkamp in the Jan Term office to try to simplify the form, and to make it more interactive. (E.g., that a text box for describing how a course fits the American Diversity learning outcomes would only appear once a person has indicated that they might be interested in meeting AD.) He will update the CCC.

2. Designation Related

- (a) Designation Process: What went well? poorly? What could be improved upon?
The group discussion suggested that faculty who were in their second or third year of proposing courses wrote clear proposals and navigated the application process fairly easily, whereas those who were involved for the first time often struggled. We reminded ourselves of the continual need to educate and update our colleagues, especially as our understanding of the learning outcomes and what suffices as an explanation as to how to teach them evolves. It is worthwhile for the WG Chair to be more proactive with these new folks, saving time by investing some earlier in the proposal writing: “If you haven’t done a proposal before, feel free to contact X who will help walk you through the process”. There is a value in consistency of timelines and frequent reminders. Paul’s framing of WG responses (“Due to the large number of proposals, it will be necessary for the CCC members to quickly and easily determine whether or not each course is a good fit for the relevant learning goal or goals. To assist in this process, the working groups were asked to help identify possible problems before the CCC begins its review.”) been very helpful. It can be useful to WG members as information spreaders.
- (b) Re-Designations: How long are designations approval good for?

- Designations, unless otherwise stated, are good through at least the 2014–15 school year. Then ... ???
 Answer A: We tie the re-designation schedule to the PRC schedule, meaning something like, all designations expire two years before the department's next program review is due. Reasoning: Program Review is an great time for departments to look at the purposes of their courses. Answer B: We tie the re-designation schedule to assessment. Areas showing weakness should be re-evaluated and asked to re-apply. Otherwise, you're good.
 Answer C: Somehow implement a rotating 5-ish year schedule.
 Answer D: ??
- Note 1: There are also times when new proposals must be required: Learning Goal or Outcome language is (significantly) changed, or course Catalog language is changed. Are there others?
- Note 2: During redesignation, because we can expect that the course has been offered at least once, and likely several times, it should be no trouble to ask for copies of recent exams, paper prompts, assignments used to measure student achievement of the various learning outcomes. This should make process easier.
- Current Numbers of long-semester designations. Artistic: 55, MathScience: 19, SCHU: 38, Theological: 36, AD: 29, GP: 23, TCG: 24, CE: 38.

After Jim outlined the situation and some candidate solutions, a long discussion ensued. Among the comments

- Departments could re-do several courses just before their Program Review and the rest afterwards.
- Question: What is end goal of redesignation? The process should come from this.
- Rather than 'application', we ask for several of the very best assignments proving how students meet LO's. The advantage of Core over opposed to Gen Ed seems to be to help students understand what they are learning. Focus on what is in the courses, not what the titles are.
- Ask departments: This is where you were five years ago, where are you now?
- Proposal should be a renewed commitment to meeting the LG/LO's, with examples of assignments.
- Courses change over time (slippage, evolution, changes in faculty, changes in major and minor). It makes sense for departments to reflect on how well the course fits the LO's.
- We should think more 'report' rather than 'application'. Is the original application still what you are doing? Tell us about what you are doing now. What have you learned and improved.
- How to ensure that contingent faculty deliver core outcomes? That you deliver outcomes across multiple sections.
- Should we ask for more frequent reports on the class (e.g., yearly)? This would build a portfolio over time.
- Evidence is useful. Probably will never do direct course-level Core assessment. However, if repeatedly see assignments that don't seem to match LO's, can work backwards toward classes.

- There was a sense that the PRC schedule is not ours. PR also feels a large undertaking for departments, and to be seen to be adding to it is perhaps politically unwise.
 - Timeline? Three years is too frequent. Four years seems good - that would be once during each student's career.
 - Ask for facts, not explanations. Current proposals must be 'how will you teach', but renewals can be 'show us what you have done'.
 - Do need to ask for syllabus – all the syllabi that were taught last year.
 - Question: How do we encourage/support chairs work with contingent faculty who are teaching core courses.
 - Need a name that differentiates from designation.
- (c) Is Fall still the best time to do designations? Or would spring somehow do a better tie-in with scheduling?

Fall seems best. Folks are sorta used to it, and there seems little advantage to changing. It was noted that we are pretty much accepting EtW 'provisional' proposals anytime (since these need only the WG & CCC chair). Full designation proposals, however, are accepted only during the normal time.

Re-designations could be done in spring.

Question: what about new faculty and new courses? This was left unresolved.

3. CCC-makeup issues

(a) Faculty Positions.

CCC positions are three years, tied to school representation. Working group positions appointed by CCC chair. Would it be better to elect to Working Group chair? (Note: any such change would need to go through Senate)

Note1: Persons in Theological and AD/GP are up for election this spring.

Note2: Senate language says CCC makeup is to be reviewed this year.

There was a wide ranging discussion. Eventually, the following viewpoint seemed to become the consensus: Ownership of the whole core is the primary role of a CCC member. We are not representatives from disciplinary-like areas of the Core all meeting together to form a whole, but have as first duty that whole. That there has been considerable work to move away from a department-dominated gen ed, and the make up of the CCC should reflect this progress. That if we expect all our students to become somewhat proficient in these various skills, then we as faculty should also be sufficiently skilled at all to provide leadership. That members are CCC first, and WG second.

(b) CCC course reassignments

The Provost agreed to support the Core with nine course reassignments during its first three years: Three to the chair, one each to the six faculty members. Those three years are now ending. Are course reassignments still needed? (yes!) How many, and to whom? *“once the Core has been fully implemented, the Chair of CCC, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, and the Provost will meet to*

determine if the level of service expected of a member of the CCC demands continued compensation.”

Jim’s initial thoughts. 1 course reassign over a year buys 4.5–6 hours per week. Such a workload is unlikely to continue for PtK WG chairs. More likely for EtW chairs.

Suggestion:

1 reassign for CCC Chair for being chair

1 reassign for CCC Chair for overseeing designation process

1 reassign for CCC Chair to oversee HoM assessment

1 reassign for each EtW chair: for Jan Term work, course development, portfolio (experiences) building

2/3 per year to specific WG chairs to perform assessment during that year

In a brief discussion, it seemed that there was perhaps sufficient work not being done currently (e.g., Whole Core assessment and development) that 1 course reassign per person was needed. Jim is to discuss this further with Richard and report back.

4. Assessment

Current Plans:

a) Written Communication: alignment project (Seminar & Composition) Fall survey gathered.

b) Shared Inquiry: E. Rigsby leading.

c) Critical Thinking: standardized test to be given 2014–15.

d) Information Evaluation:

e) Artistic Understanding: To submit plan spring 2014

f) Mathematical and Scientific:

g) SHCU: (Pilot) assessment complete. Follow-up?

h) Theological:

i) American Diversity: Submitted plan spring 2013

j) Global Perspectives: Submitted plan spring 2013

k) The Common Good:

l) Community Engagement:

Jim’s thinking: The Working Group is the group primarily responsible for overseeing the learning goal. Campus-wide promotion and coherence, pedagogical development, review of syllabi, cross-departmental coordination, evaluation of designation proposals. And assessment.

It was agreed that each Learning Goal of the Core needs ongoing full cycle assessment (i.e., data gathered, data analyzed, impacts on students and faculty from the analysis - when necessary). Assessment is not just data collection, but includes what happens before, and what happens after: does it affect what actually goes on in the classroom? That’s important.

Core-level assessment (how in total is the Core working?) is another issue, one that is currently not happening. Perhaps this duty needs to be assigned?

It was agreed that Jim, Jennifer and Chris should meet and talk about the process that worked for SHCU. Build the bones of a template that WG Chairs can take use.