

CCC Draft Agenda February 18th 2014

Spring Meetings:

March 4th: Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00–4:30pm

March 18th: Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00–4:30pm

April 1st: Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00–4:30pm

April 22nd: Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00–4:30pm

May 6th: Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00–4:30pm

1. Announcements, Updates, Small Items

- (a) S/D/F in Jan Term? Still at AARC.
- (b) How should split majors satisfy their Writing in the Disciplines? At the AARC.
- (c) TRS 153, 154, 155, 156: Under consideration for Global Perspectives.
- (d) Transfer: Top 100. Please provide feedback.
- (e) Can Artistic Understanding Creative Practice .25cr requirement be met in January Term? At Jan Term Committee
- (f) CCC course reassignments. Conversation with provost, vice provost, ccc chair, senate chair on 2/26.
- (g) Orientation. Starting this summer, new first year students will be placed into courses before arriving for orientation. The new orientation will then have more time for faculty-led small group discussions introducing to academics at SMC. Do we want to be involved in guiding the placement-ers, or in creating the guidance for those discussions?
- (h) PtK and EtW counting: Sophs have registered for half their SMC courses. Seems a good time to check on their progress toward fulfilling PtK and EtW requirements – is it easier or harder now? Gregg Thompson is looking into looking into this.
- (i) Transfer Courses. Jim asked Craig Means for the departmental level articulation agreements (e.g. which math courses at DVC do we accept as which SMC courses).
- (j) CCC Elections and Working Group duties. Jim's plan
We elect at large, from schools (as now). In May the new CCC will have a wine and cheese to determine WG positions. We recognize the advantages of continuity (staying with same WG) and expertise (someone familiar with the learning goal/goals) but realize that in any particular case these can and often should be trumped the the Core First rule. Namely, 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. While any attempt to provide a liberal arts education must instantiate itself into particular courses and departments, our focus must be on the education and not where it resides. Further, since we expect all our students to become somewhat proficient in these various skills appearing in the learning goals, then we as faculty should also be sufficiently skilled at all to provide leadership.
- (k) R&T language
Jim would like to see 2.6.1.1 Additional Criteria of 2.6. Statement on Criteria for Promotion and Tenure in the Faculty Handbook include a more explicit expectation that faculty tenured to the college are responsible, as appropriate, for supporting the Core.

(l) WiD and .5 cr

A department was considering proposing a .5cr course as their WiD. The HoM WG discussed this and the consensus was that a full credits worth of work, perhaps spread over tw courses, was necessary. Thoughts?

(m) Jan Term Petitions

I have received several petitions that Jan Term courses satisfy Core requirements. (Obviously for learning goal(s) for which the course was not designated.) All Pathways to Knowledge petitions get an automatic no.

From now on, I intend (1) To expect that the petition also include the course syllabus. And (2) If the petition is successful, I will ask the Registrar's office to give that EtW credit to all members of the course.

Comments: Note that (1) Students who petition in spring 2016 for a Jan Term 2013 course are going to be in tough shape. And (2) is tantamount to including the course in the Core without consulting with the instructor. Are are ok with these?

(n) Other?

2. Pathways to Knowledge and Writing in the Disciplines

We have received each year one proposal that a course designated as WiD be also give PtK designation. Jim, in consultation with some, (but perhaps mostly with himself?), did not allow this, using the reasoning that a PtK course is to be "primarily" focused on those learning outcomes, and a course that is rhe introduction for how to write in the major would be so substantially focused on that that it could not be primarily PtK. After some pushback from proposers I took this formally to the Habits of Mind Working Group.

They recommend that the PtK designation decision stand or fall solely on merits of the proposal: If the course is primarily focused on the LO's of the goal and uses writing as a/the way to reach those outcomes, then designation is appropriate. If, on the other hand, there is such an emphasis on teaching the skills and techniques of writing and research in that discipline that the course that disciplinary content (and methods etc.) plays second fiddle, then no. But we should not make categorial decisions. Thoughts?

3. Designation Renewal: Jim proposal's

- (a) Renewals are expected when the learning goal language changes, when the course catalog language changes, or every 4 years years, whichever comes first.
- (b) Failing to participate in the renewal process will result in the loss of designation.
- (c) There will be a list of which courses which are to be renewed in each year. The schedule will be set to try to not overly impact any particular Working Group or department, ie. to try to spread the work across the years.
- (d) The Renewal Report will consist of
 - i. cover sheet of data - course name, proposer, goal, etc. A lot like now.
 - ii. Affirmation that department still feels the LO's are appropriate for class. Affirmation that department will oversee that LO's are taught in all sections of the course, in a reasonably uniform way. Affirmation to participate in assessment.

- iii. Explanation as to how the department ensures consistent learning outcomes across multiple sections of this class, which includes all instructors and likely multiple years. And how will this process is used or adapted to ensure common learning of core LOs.
 - iv. All syllabi from all section from the last two semesters. (Or most recent syllabus if only taught occasionally.)
 - v. Some (only the best?) assignments and prompts that illustrate how students are being asked to show their master of/development toward the LO's.
 - vi. Some reflection on changes in course?
 - vii. To be due February 1st of each year.
- (e) As with designations, the renewals reports will go first to the WG's who will recommend to the CCC for decision.
 - (f) Process to begin during 2015–16.

Note 1: Once we agree on a plan it will be sent it to UEPC and Senate. (GPSEPC less important - but clear that with their chair.)

Note 2: Having actual assignments and prompts as part of the package will fit very nicely with assessment, since that will frequently be about assessing student responses to these very prompts!

4. Learning Goal Assessment

Jim's current thinking: My expectations have evolved. Last spring I would have settled for a goal of getting the various Working Group instructors involved and learning something about their joint thinking. This spring, however, I think we are well into the second year of the Core and I would like us move toward trying to learn something about what students are actually learning. And I think that needs actual student work.

So I am leaning toward expecting each WG to construct a plan this spring that would outline the steps toward

- (1) next fall gather student artifacts that are meant to show learning of (some part of) a learning outcomes
- (2) evaluate those artifacts next spring, and
- (3) produce a (small) report containing summary of process, conclusion(s) and recommendation(s) by the end of summer 2015.

Notice that the PtK groups are unlikely to have many new proposals next year, and any re-designation process wouldn't begin until the following year.

5. Parking Lot and Upcoming Issues

(a) Engaging the World Experiences

What constitutes an experience? How do we designate them? How do we find them? How to 'approve' them? How to measure whether a student's experience merits meeting a goal?

- 1) Jim thinks only 'approved' experiences should be standard. i.e, we should have a list. (Others can be petitioned). How to gather and decide?

- 2) Pay is ok
 - 3) We should set up a portfolio-building website or handout. Advertise via student life and FYAC's before summer. How to build/write?
 - 4) How to measure 'completion'? Two different cases: Those students who already are reporting to someone (e.g., Bonner Leaders), and those not (Travel Abroad).
- (b) How to support teaching within Collegiate Seminar, Jan Term, Engaging the World?
 Pathways to Knowledge courses are staffed by chairs, who have incentive and ability to supply ranked faculty. This is not true for these CS, JT and EtW. The college as a whole has a responsibility/desire to similarly staff CS, JT and EtW, but it is less clear who has the authority to do so. How can we assist in this?
 How does tenure to the college relate? If 25–30% of the courses are CS/JT/EtW, what does this mean for schools, departments, faculty?
- (c) Core Level Assessment.
- (d) CCC membership:
 Current Senate prescribed membership: Chair, six at-large faculty; VPUA, VP Student Life, Registrar, student (all 'permanent'); Dean of Advising, Institutional Research, Library Rep ('during rollout').
 Jim's thought: Chair, six faculty elected to chair WG, VPUA, Dir Institutional Effectiveness, Library Rep, VP Student Life? Student?
- (e) Is it possible to have four .25 cr courses total toward an Artistic Understanding?
- (f) Mission Integration. Is there desire, room, value in a "mission intensive" designation?
- (g) Vice Chair for CCC?
- (h) Departmental courses in jan Term - should they hold their designation? (Consider Math 13. Jim's current word parsing is that Math 13 is a departmental course, and the department offering it is responsible for delivering its content in a pedagogically appropriate way, no matter if the course is in a long semester, Jan Term or Summer; further that it is clearly not a Jan Term course because its designation is not Jan Term 13 but Math 13. Does this hold water?)
- (i) January Term designations
 Have requested a revised proposal system, which should make it more obvious to faculty what is expected of them. Will apparently always have the twin challenges of (a) Jan Term not completing its decisions until May, and (b) many Jan Term courses taught by folks relatively unfamiliar with the college.