

CCC/CCIC Meeting Notes, by Jim
October 27th, 2011, 3:00-5:00pm
Founder's Dining Room

Present: Rebecca C, Michael, Ed, Kara, Rebecca J, Sharon, Zach, Jane, Bob, Sam, Lisa, Cynthia, Paul, Vidya, Jim

1. Update on Senate Meeting

The Senate tabled our motion to move Composition 1 to the first year. We assume it will be brought up at the 11/10 meeting. CCI/C members are encouraged to attend. Zach and Jim will provide letter to Senate addressing some concerns.

2. Changes in WASC

Sam brief us on potential revisions in WASC standards. (Decision in early November.) Expectation is that undergraduates at each school be assessed as to whether they meet a sufficient level of proficiency in Written and Oral Communication, Qualitative Skills Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Diversity. Of these, at least two must be via benchmark with/against other institutions. Stanford and the UC's are against this; privates have been quieter. SMC would need to gather a group of schools, agree upon a set of learning outcomes and assessment method (for example, a shared assessment rubric) and then engage in inter-school scoring exercises.

The CCI/C had concerns that SMC has built learning outcomes, and are building assessment rubrics and plans, organically and for SMC, and we shouldn't have to change them to match external desires. Further, that this would make it appear that our assessment work is primarily to meet external forces, which is both false and undercut our work with faculty. A standardization would be contrary to our use of an 'emergent' process, and would hurt politically locally and discourage people from buying in. Concern that the CCTF, CCIC and now CCC have made good progress in building good faith and buy-in among faculty for a college-wide shared core curriculum; the appearance that our work was simply cover and the real intent was to deliver our colleagues to the assessment lions could be devastating.

In general, it is bad policy, for it would result in competitive learning outcomes; we'd be expected to cooperate to compete. Practically it would be complicated, as rubrics would have to be agreed upon, then papers collected and sent to an off-campus assessment officer who would then randomly send them back to schools to be scored, would gather that scoring information and compute our college-score off campus. The CCI/C intends to write Provost Dobkin with our concerns.

Sam indicated that our WASC "Annual Report" is due in Spring 2013, with review in Fall 2013. Onsite visit in the spring of 2014.

3. Sam: Director of Educational Effectiveness position

The job ad complete, HR is working on job description and posting ad. Search committee is being put together: Sam (Chair), Jim, Zach, Richard, Pat Kruetz, Larissa Genin, Huang Vu. Sam was thanked for his excellent work on the construction of the job ad.

4. Designation Application and Review Process

Reviewed online applications and feedback forms. Several questions and suggestions were given.

Are proposers allowed to participate when their proposal is reviewed in the WG? Should they be recused? Concern that proposal would not be fairly vetted. After discussion, Jim recommended that the WG Chair is responsible for reporting fairly strengths and weaknesses to CCC, and will include in that report any reasons that the proposal might not have been fairly and adequately vetted. However, if proposers are CCC members, they should not participate in the final CCC vote.

It was agreed that proposals need to stand on their own merits, the language must be clear enough for all to read and understanding. If additional explanation is needed then this implies the application should be rewritten.

It was discussed that WG chairs should expect the WG members to pre-read material and comment on-line before the meeting, should move very quickly through the easy applications, should expect their group to engage in a substantial first session in which many proposals are vetted so the group can become comfortable and confident in the process. The CCC will reimburse for food and drink as we wish to reward and thank our hard working WG members.

5. 11/3: Assessment Rubrics