CCC Meeting Notes, by Jim
October 10th, 2012, 2:30–4:00pm
BJW 213
Ed, Jen, Jim, Greg, Paul, Cynthia, Rebecca, Richard

1. Reports & Updates:

   - Jennifer: Seminar 1

     Formation process happening, lots of energy. Maybe 40 to 50 faculty participating. The formation process is two semesters long; one before teaching and one while teaching. Things are moving!

   - Ed: Seminar 2&3

     Reading list, curricular guidelines, possibility of standardized "context" for the texts all under discussion. Have drafted a rubric that will help spread the 'developmental' goals across the later three seminars and help guide text selection.

   - Greg: Balos & Leap. Having a meeting set-up.

   - Cynthia: CE & Hub

     An centralized administrative structure for overseeing and supporting faculty & courses in Community Engagement is being implemente. It is being called The Hub. Associate deans, UAVP, CILSA, CCC reps as membership. The details are under discussion, but we expect to make fairly quick progress.

   - Rebecca: FYAC

     All should complete the survey, including those who have not done FYAC.

   - Jim: WID. Late Jan Term Proposals.

     Tereza will be reaching out to propspective WID proposers. In collaboration with CG and PZ Jim is making decision about late Jan Term proposals.

   - Student Member: Jane is willing to help us find a member. Is such a voice important? Jim will discuss this with Jane and Keith Ogawa, chair of the Committee on Committees.

2. Designations

   About 30 proposals have already been submitted, with likely more to come. The remainder of the meeting was a discussion of the designation process with potential Issues and concerns highlighted.

   (a) Dropbox.

       Getting accounts for the CCC went easily. Jim will enlarge the Working Group folders to share with the WG membership.

(b) Learning Outcomes and Syllabi

All submitted syllabi must include the appropriate learning goal(s) learning outcomes among the course outcomes. These outcomes need not be the only ones, and they can certainly be written in language that is appropriate for the discipline/program/course. But they must be clearly present, or an explanation should be provided as to why not.

(c) Student Work: Grading and Assessment

Our evolving sense of assessment is such that we will not be requiring artifacts each semester. However, it is appropriate that instructors supply a sufficient explanation of how they will be measuring their student's progress toward achieving the learning outcomes. The amount of student work should correspond with the "primary" or "integral" nature of the goal. We also noted that our concern is with the wholistic-ness of student evaluation, with the specifics of assignments up to instructor. If a WG has concerns, the Chair should simply ask "How do you propose to document student learning of this particular outcome?"

(d) WG – proposer correspondence

Jim should be cc'd on any serious communication between WG chair and proposer.

(e) How will the PERFs be used?

In three ways. For the proposer, so they understand how their courses will be evaluated. For the WG, to structure the internal conversation and be used to capture notetaking. For the CCC, to serve as a base of the recommendation of the WG.

(f) Records and Archiving

If there are revisions to the proposal documents, the WG Chair should ensure there are "final" versions available for the CCC. These final documents – proposal, syllabus (and other submittted supporting documents), PERF, decision email from Jim to proposer – will be archived. Successful proposals will have syllabi and proposal posted on the CCC website.

(g) Length of Designation

Jim's suggestion: We expect a department to resubmit all of its courses for all goals in the year before their next program review is due. Courses not successfully (re)designated during this year will lose their designation. Theology may be the one exception to this, allowed to have two years. At the moment, we are not acting on this.

(h) Proposal guidelines:

Can a WG post a tip sheet on the CCC website? We want to stay with a standard proposal form, but a tip sheet might be really helpful. There seems no concern with this.

(i) Transitivity

Transitivity applies for PtK but not for EtW. That is, a DVC class counts as Anthro 1, and if Anthro 1 fulfills SHC, then we will count the DVC class as doing so. However, if Anthro 1 is also American Diversity, the transferal to DVC is not automatic, and would require a student petition or faculty action. The same holds, by the way, for courses from Barcelona and Berkeley, etc. This all has been explicitly discussed and agreed upon by the CCC last year.

Jim and Jen (and Susie Miller-Reid) should discuss possibly regularizing some of the semester-abroad courses tranferrals.

(j) .25cr and multiple EtW goals.

We are open to considering .25cr courses for designation for the Core, while understanding that the rigor must be present.

(k) Suggestions on WG process

Review proposals beforehand, but do bring a hard copy of each document.

Take turns recording notes on the PERFS, perhaps electronically.

Chair needs to manage discussion – provide quick summary after discussion, and then move forward.

Think of a first session or two to work through all the proposals. After revise and resubmit, then meet for another long session.

Bring food and drinks.

Continually concentrate people's attentions on the learning outcomes – how does the course do these?

When asking for revisions, try to suggest to proposal we are trying to be helpful: e.g., "working with you to strengthen your proposal before it is submitted to the CCC."