

**CCC/CCIC Meeting Notes, by Jim  
December 8th, 2011, 3:00-5:00pm  
Founder's Dining Room**

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

1. Designation Application Update

Working Groups are starting to review designation proposals. These seem to fall into three broad categories. (1) Very well organized and complete, 'accepted' with relative ease. (2) Complete, but with difficulties in matching the course goals (& coursework) with the core goals. For these, the proposers are being asked for revisions. (3) Incomplete, with a simple 'yes' response to the questions. The proposers of these are being queried for further work.

Other comments included:

- It is not clear using the Feedback Form ahead of time is helpful. Posting the application on an overhead and reviewing it during the WG meeting has worked for some groups.
- One WG has assigned each application to a WG member, who will 'present' it to the others.
- WG chairs might think on dividing their eventual recommendations to the CCC into a 'consent agenda' – those applications about which they have little or no doubt, and those that need discussion.
- Remember in thinking about activity courses (e.g., .25 cr creative AU requirement) the standard expectation from 'lecture' courses of 2 hours of student work outside of class for every class hour is reversed.
- Some portions of the of the application form and feedback forms are being misinterpreted. These should be fixed before next year.
- More generally, it was noted that we should review the application and review process once we finish it.

Note: It is Jim's assumption that the applications and supporting material will become public (i.e., appear on the website), at least those courses which receive designation. This will help with 'institutional memory' as well as provide examples for the future.

2. Community Engagement Costs: How to pay?

Engaging the World courses will have costs that are new to the college: costs for transportation students and faculty to and from sites, and security (finger printing, background checks, etc.) If we guesstimate \$100 transportation and \$50 background plus fingerprinting, we are looking at \$90,000 to \$100,000 per year. In addition, we will need additional staff support for doing the security checks, and for working with community partners. How will all this be paid for? Directly via tuition, or indirectly via course fees?

The staff time clearly must be paid for in budget line, i.e., paid via tuition. After discussion, the groups recommendation was that the majority of the other costs should also be supported via tuition. Since a CE course is a requirement of the college, it should be paid for by tuition. More specifically, the group felt that CILSA/CCC/Richard's office should have a budget line which would cover the security costs and contribute a set amount toward transportation costs. (If a faculty member has a non-standard transportation cost for their class, the extra will need to be paid for with course fees.)

The running discussion of the need to get more faculty offering EtW, and the difficulties therein, was briefly continued.

### 3. BALOS/LEAP

The Bachelor of Arts in Leadership and Organizational Studies (BALOS) and the Liberal Education for Arts Professionals (LEAP) programs are both undergraduate programs, and so are responsible for meeting the requirements of the new core. As non-traditional, adult-based programs they have radically different audiences and so have traditionally been excepted from some of TUG graduation requirements. They intend a good-faith effort toward the new core but will have difficulties satisfying all of it. What portions of the new core do we see as absolutes? Where might we allow exceptions, where will be strict?

We understand and respect the benefits of each program, to their students and to the college. That the more requirements that are expected of their students, the harder time the programs will have in attracting and graduating students. At the same time it is our role to see that the standards for an undergraduate degree adopted by the college are kept.

A wide ranging discussion ensued, with the general sense that the CCI/C worried less about language, art lab, sci lab –type issues, and more about HoM and PtK goals, as well as the oversight of courses and contents. Note: The programs will be expected to go through a CCC approval process, as will Integral, in which they justify (in some cases, in a holistic manner) how their students satisfy the core requirements for which they are responsible.

Below are the main points of consensus we reached, along with the current situation.

- 1) We are willing to waive the 'laboratory' portion of the Scientific Understanding requirement for BALOS and LEAP. (This is currently waived.)
- 2) We are willing to waive the 'creative endeavor' portion (i.e. LG #2) of the Artistic Understanding requirement for BALOS. (This requirement is new.)
- 3) The Jan Term requirement does not apply to either program. (The is currently waived.)
- 4) Each graduate must have taken at least one course that satisfies either the Christian Foundations or Theological Explorations portions of Theological Understanding. (Currently neither program seriously fulfills the TRS requirement.)
- 5) We are willing to waive the 3-semester competency language expectation for both.

(This is currently waived.)

6) Both programs are expected to include a sequence of writing. English 4 (or equivalent), whether by course or exam, must occur before English 5 (or equivalent).

Both programs are expected to satisfy the UD writing requirement. LEAP is likely to adopt the standards of Fine Arts, BALOS the ideas of one of the departmental social science requirements/capstone. (This is a new requirement.)

7) There was significant concern that both programs are trying to cram a large number of LG's into a small number of courses. That their 'Critical Perspectives I&II' (their versions of Collegiate Seminar) is being asked to play too many roles. In particular, it is worrying that the CP courses seem to be expected to carry both Shared Inquiry/Critical Thinking as well as much of the Engaging the World responsibilities.

Zach was asked to bring our reflections back to these programs, along with the message that CCI/C feels any more 'flexibility' would seriously impact the credibility of the curriculum.