

**CCC Agenda**  
**November 19th, 3:00–4:30pm.**  
**Filippi Academic Hall 205.**

Upcoming Meetings

December 3rd. Filippi Academic Hall 205

1. Announcements

(a) Jurisdictionals

I have been working to clarify the CCC's authority. Here is my 11/15 email to the chairs of the Senate, UEPC, GPSEPC and CCIC as summary of the current situation.

*I believe there are still several outstanding issues.*

*1) Undergraduate-level Institutional Learning Outcomes*

*As suggested by their name, if/when adopted by the Academic Senate these **will** apply to all undergraduate-degree granting programs. Will the GPSEPC also be considering them, or has it ceded any authority in this area?*

*2) Does the Core Curriculum apply to those undergraduate programs under the authority of the GPSEPC? And who decides?*

*(At the moment 'those programs' are LEAP and BALOS, but in principle there could be others) Below I assume the answer to 2) is "yes".*

*3) Are current Gen Ed exceptions/waivers ending? Or will they be adapted and continuing? If so, who does the adapting?*

*Here are a couple of examples to clarify this question:*

*(i) TUG transfer students are currently required to take one seminar per year of full-time equivalency. Is/will this be true of the Core?*

*(ii) 3&2 Engineering students are currently required to take only one religious studies course. Will the obvious modification be true in the Core?*

*(iii) LEAP students are currently not required to fulfill the language requirement. Will this be true in the Core?*

*The CCIC & CCCs working assuming had been that the answer to continuing was Yes. And that the CCC had the authority to do the adapting. Because the UEPC has recently determined that the CCC did not have that authority for 3&2 Engineering, I must assume we have the authority over none.*

*There is a second layer to this issue. The Core has not only revised requirements, but also new ones (e.g, Creative Practice, The Common Good). Does the CCC have authority to waive any of these for particular programs or students? Or does any such proposal also need to come to the EPCs, and then to the Senate?*

*4) Does the CCC have the authority to require English 5 (or equivalent) to be a prerequisite for departmental WiD courses? The UEPC has decided yes. The GPSEPC has not yet weighed in.*

*We do need fairly rapid resolution of issues 2&3. The first transfer seminars (CS 102) are being taught in the spring. If those incoming students are actually required to take four seminars, they need to know asap. Likewise, LEAP and BALOS will begin recruiting very very soon for their summer/fall 2014 incoming classes, and the directors of those programs need to know what is expected of them.*

(b) CCC Language Assessment

The Department of Modern Languages (DML) proposed to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness that the Level 3 Intermediate Proficiency requirement of the Core Curriculum be assessed. From the proposal:

*Project title: Assessing Intermediate Level Language Proficiency*

*Context: The DML completed its program review in spring 2013. Part of the review includes assessment projects for the Spanish and French major/minor programs, respectively, and these have already submitted and received grant assistance. This action item, assessment of the Core Curriculum language proficiency requirement, is long overdue. Although not a degree-granting program itself, the language proficiency requirement is a key element of the undergraduate degree.*

*Project goals*

*1) Revise the learning outcomes to more clearly align with the stated aims of the Core Curriculum and to better articulate the skills associated with intermediate level proficiency as defined by the American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).*

*2) Measure the degree to which students are meeting the outcomes.*

*3) Implement a process for regular exit-level proficiency testing across languages*

*4) Revise the curriculum and methodology to address gaps in achievement....*

*The current learning outcomes written in the Undergraduate Catalog are stated as follows, "After completing levels 1-3, students will be able to:*

*1) Engage successfully in basic conversation (e.g., ask and answer questions in every day social situations).*

*2) Read and understand simple texts*

*3) Write short compositions using past, present, and future tenses appropriately."*

*These outcomes will be further developed. For the purposes of this grant, we are especially focusing on the third outcome related to writing.*

Director Procello didn't feel this was a perfect fit for the ongoing Departmental Assessment project, as this really is assessing part of the Core, but agreed to fund half of the proposal if the CCC funded the other half. I agreed.

(c) WiD Update

The Habits of Mind Working Group has considered proposals for Writing in the Disciplines courses for Art History, Biology, French, Liberal and Civic Studies, Mathematics, PERFA - Music, PERFA - Theatre, and Physics. We are confident that all (but one) will be a successful WiD course. As we did last year, I have told instructors to plan on teaching these as WiD next year, pending final CCC approval and their attendance at a WiD Workshop/Retreat in the spring.

(d) Other

2. WG Recommendations: issues – concerns – questions – updates

The following notes from October 10, 2012 may (or may not!) be helpful:

*(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 students 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 ccd on any serious communication between WG chair and proposer.*

*(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 submitted supporting documents), PERF, decision email from Jim to proposer will be archived. Successful proposals will have syllabi and proposal posted on the CCC website.*

*(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*

*Bring food and drinks.*

*Continually concentrate peoples 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.”*

Others?

3. Plan for CCC review of WG recommendations

When will we meet? Apparently no one is teaching in jan Term.

4. Community Engagement recommended service hours: ‘how much is enough’ for CE.

From Zach: The CE/tCG WG recommends 20-30 hours per semester working with the community partner for a normal service-learning course. For a Community Based Research course, there is probably just an initial consultation or two and a final presentation. In that case, probably just 4-6 hours on site. I am less worried about defining CBR hours. I am interested in giving guidance for normal service learning courses, since there have been applications who required too few (less than 20) and one at least that required way too many (i.e., 60).

5. Transfer Courses PtK: Who decides which off-campus courses meet the Learning Goals?

The Registrar's office has build up a large collection of lists indicating how the myriad off-campus will transfer to SMC. Those lists no longer apply. Who will create new ones?

Thus far we have accepted classes via transitivity. (If the Chemistry Department accepts DVC Chem 1/2 as equivalent to SMC Chem 8/9, and if the CCC counts Chem 8/9 as Scientific Understanding, then the CCC will accept DVC Chem 1/2 as Scientific Understanding.) Do we wish to continue with this?

According to the Registrar, the large majority of transfer courses come from about 25 schools. It is not overwhelming to sit for a day and comb through the various catalogs and make decisions. Is there appetite to do this? (I will pay.)

6. Transfers Courses EtW: How to proceed?

Issue: At the moment, when a course from (say) DVC enters Colleague, if it enters as equivalent to an SMC course, then it automatically gains all designations. (If DVC History 2 is counted as SMC History 18, then it carries both SCHU and AD.) This is no doubt appropriate in some cases, inappropriate in others.

What to do:

(a) Request that Colleague's programming be changed.

This seems a large project. To continue the History example, among the possibilities are

DVC History 2, which meets SHCU and AD and History 17.

DVC History 3, which meets SHCU and AD but not History 17.

DVC History 4, which meets SHCU and History 17 but not AD.

DVC History 5, which meets only SHCU.

DVC History 6, which meets only History 17.

(There are actually eight possibilities, but I am now tired). This would also have to be done for History 1, 2, 4, 5 and 18.

(b) Nothing

Such is life. Let's just move onto other things.

(c) Disallow any transfer course from satisfying EtW, and instead require one EtW per year of residency.

(d) Other?

7. Provisional Designation Implementation.

On October 1st we agreed to provide the possibility of "provisional designations" for EtW courses. (Such designations will apply for one year only and are intended to lead to a permanent state – either the EtW LOs are a good fit for the course and a full proposal will be made, or despite the good faith effort of the department/instructor the course should not continue to be responsible for these LOs. The Chair of the CCC and Chair of the appropriate WG (AD/GP or CE/CG) are empowered to give such a designation. The Chair of the CCC is responsible for record keeping.)

How to go about announcing and implementing?

8. The Common Good update

How to encourage participation in Core?

Jim believes the college should believe it is necessary to make it clear that participation is expected, both by individuals and by departments.

1. In Job ads

Quotes from current ads:

- The candidate may offer to teach in the colleges core Collegiate Seminar and January Term programs as appropriate.
- The successful candidates will teach undergraduate courses in the [department], as well as have the opportunity to teach in Saint Marys January Term and Collegiate Seminar (Great Books) programs.
- In addition to teaching in the [department], teaching may also include courses in college wide programs such as Collegiate Seminar and January Term.
- She or he is also expected to contribute to the mission of the College and support its Catholic traditions, Lasallian principles, and liberal arts orientation.
- The faculty member will teach [departmental] courses at the undergraduate and/or the graduate level.

Jim thinks job ads should include a line such as “In addition to departmental responsibilities, the successful candidate will be expected to contribute broadly to the Core Curriculum of the college, which includes our signature programs of Collegiate Seminar and January Term.” He would also like to see tenure to the college mentioned.

2. During candidate interviews

Should or must a candidate meet with a representative of Jan Term, Seminar, the Core? Or is the department responsible for this?

3. In R&T standards

FHB: “It is the responsibility of faculty members to present clear evidence of their teaching effectiveness. The College recognizes several ways in which this can happen:

“1. The development of courses appropriate to a faculty member’s major field, the general education program of the College, and special curricular initiatives. Courses should reflect coherence, unity, and an appropriate balance between engaging a subject matter in depth and addressing the broad aims of a liberal education.”

The R&T Committee reads the commas as or’s. Doing a great job in Seminar will get you a few brownie points, but avoiding Seminar will have no impact.

Should it be changed to “The development of courses appropriate to a faculty member’s major field *and* the general education program of the College, and, *when appropriate*, special curricular initiatives.”

4. Class visitation for Jan Term and Collegiate Seminar

Whose responsibility are these?

5. In course responsibilities

Jim believes the “department first” viewpoint is dominant. Meaning “My department doesn’t have enough faculty. So if I teach CS/JT then we will have to hire a part timer which will be bad for the students” is commonly expressed. But “CS/JT doesn’t have enough faculty. So if I teach a departmental class then we will have to hire a part timer which will be bad for students” is not. Is he correct? If so, what to do about it?

6. Within construction of departmental and dean R&T letters

7. During the Program Review process

Program Review Guidelines: Current, as of 11/14/13

“III. Curriculum Design and Pedagogy

D. For undergraduate programs, discuss how your curriculum is aligned with the Core Curriculum. Which courses have been approved with Core designations, and what are your plans, if any, for seeking further approval?”

Jim’s suggestion: *D. For undergraduate programs, discuss how your department or program contributes its share of Pathways to Knowledge and Engaging the World courses to the Core Curriculum of the college, as well as its share of ranked faculty to the Collegiate Seminar and January Term programs.*

8. In October I queried the deans about some of this, to see what the current practice is.

Dear Deans

I've been asked many times about the 'requirement' of tenure-track faculty vis-a-vis teaching in the Core Curriculum, and I've finally decided to try to understand our current practice. And (lucky you!) I've now reached the deans.

Would you please respond to the following:

1) Does your school have any standard or required language for tenure-track job ads referencing participation in the Core (including Seminar and January Term)? If so, what is it? Does the job ad mention "tenure to the college"? How, if in any way, does your tenure-track interview process incorporate the Core?

2) What is your school's expectation for Departmental Form B's and consideration of the applicants participation in the Core? (E.g., Ever teaching Seminar is an optionally cherry on top, or, Is absolutely required and success expected, or, Is never considered, etc) Does your Dean's letter take the lead from the department letter on this issue, or do you have an independent perspective? If so, what is it?

- Response 1a) There is no standard expectation, either in ads or in R&T reviews, that faculty teach core-designated courses in their home program. If they do so, that can be cited as evidence under the special criteria for tenure and promotion (i.e., needs of the program and the college).

Standard job ad language does not mention tenure to the college but it says "The candidate is expected to engage in scholarly activities as required by the institution, and to regularly participate in two core Liberal Arts programs: the Collegiate Seminar Great Books Program and January Term."

- Response 1b) The language we use in our postings is "Teaching may also include college wide programs such as Collegiate Seminar and January Term." We do not mention tenure to the college in the posting, but it is standard in the interviewing process, as is talking about Seminar and Jan Term, as well as the rest of the core in varying degree of detail.
- Response 1c) No. They do not mention these things at all.
- Response 2a) Form B's typically but not always address seminar and jan term participation. What counts as 'regular participation' varies across programs for various reasons, some more valid than others. I routinely mention the expectation in my letters, invite faculty to reflect on their experiences in these programs, and I nudge chairs to allow their faculty to meet the expectation when it is appropriate for me to do so. Evidence of teaching effectiveness in these programs is given the same weight as teaching departmental courses in my letters.
- Response 2b) The dean adopts an independent perspective from departments regarding participation in Seminar and Jan Term. Given the chronic shortage of tenure-track faculty, it would have been unrealistic to consider Jan Term and Seminar as absolutely required for all tenure-track faculty. It has been encouraged and considered very favorably.
- Response 2c) We treat CS and JT as cherries on the top – a way to demonstrate commitment to the College outside of school. There is no requirement or participation. Faculty talk about it like they are doing service, or worse, donating something. I would really like to change this.