

**CCC/CCIC Meeting Notes, by Jim  
February 16th, 2012, 3:15-5:00pm  
Founder's Dining Room**

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

1. Update on planning for the spring

The CCI/C will meet as a full group on March 15th, April 12, May 3rd. Otherwise, the CCIC and CCC to meet individually, concentrating on ongoing tasks.

The CCIC will be doing training for faculty and staff on how to talk to pre-frosh. Organized on the 'why' are you doing this, and 'what' are the pieces to do. Zach distributed a draft of a power-power presentation that will be used to help with this. By the end of spring, most faculty will need to know this information.

2. Update on designation process

Jim announced the 2012-13 courses to the Senate and the faculty via email. (There is one course whose status still has to be determined.) Thus far, at least, there seems, for the most part, contentment at the results.

3. Announcements from Sam.

WASC director Ralph Wolf recommends that WASC not benchmark two core competencies. (There was much rejoicing!) SMC will still need to measure the five competencies.

DEE interviews ongoing. Two more open meetings with candidates: 2pm Monday, 11am Wednesday.

4. Designation Process: Open discussion

The remaining time was spent discussing the recently-concluded designation process. In each area, I have indicated some of the main points voiced, and any conclusions.

(a) Catalog language.

Most individual courses in the Catalog of Courses currently indicate whether they satisfy an area requirement. Should we continue

this? How to make the designation information as clear as possible?

It was noted that course which meet an area requirement do so forever, so there is no danger when students access an old catalog. This is much less likely to be the case in the future. Instead, this information should be kept online.

**Decision:** Keep the designation list online. Put it in one place on the college webpage, and put the URL in the Catalog of Courses. Create a single place where all information on the core for students is kept. Keep only current year there.

**Decision:** Keep archive of former years on CCC page.

(b) Applications.

**Decision:** 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 as to why the course learning outcomes subsume them be given.

Most WGs very quickly realized that applications which addressed the teaching and learning of the learning outcomes points by point were the easiest to evaluate. We should indicate we expect such a format in the future.

**Decision:** The applications should be online, with a smarter interface. When the user selects a learning goal, they should be prompted to address the teaching of learning outcome #1, then the student learning of outcome #1, then the teaching of LO #2, etc.

(c) Feedback Forms.

Were these useful? If so, for whom? Should they be used solely to guide internal WG discussions? Some groups did give proposers feedback via the form – was that a good format? Was 'sufficient/insufficient' a sufficient choice? Or should a more graduated scale be given?

**Decision** They seem useful as a summary of the teaching and learning expected, and as a prompt or gathering for internal con-

versation. They do not need to be **F**eedback **F**orms, but just feedback forms.

(d) Assessment.

Does the CCC get a say in how much internal assessment (i.e., grading) occurs in the course? A couple of courses had a large number of learning outcomes, and rather little collected work. Can we be bothered if there is not enough grading to imply that the core learning outcomes are not integral/primary?

What about if we are concerned that the assessment that goes on in the course is not going to be sufficient for us to gather reasonable artifacts? Or should this be folded into the portion of the application that deals with how the course has its students demonstrate they are achieving the learning outcomes?

Among the many comments:

- Simply must be sufficient gathered to address the Core LOs'
- Stay out of the professor's business about grading. Courses have autonomy.
- Do need to know how professor is assessing LO.
- Graded material helps determine integral/sufficient.
- We should decide if all artifacts must be graded 'high stakes' work, or we will accept any artifact.
- Define "Primary" as students cannot do well in the course without meeting the core learning outcomes. Is this enough? What, then, would "Integral" be?
- Don't legislate about rogue cases.
- Must tell proposers who rely on oral exams that they will be videotaped.
- Must have assessable artifacts for each LO.
- Assessing developmental LO's are complicated. UD Writing will occur at very stages.

**Decision: Table this and wait for the DEE.**

(e) WG/applicant correspondence.

Should the CCC chair should be cc'd on all email between the WG chair and the applicant?

Some groups did this, some did not. In the recent round, Jim was caught out of the loop a couple of times when concerns arose. Otoh, this is rather big brotherly.

**Decision:** Create separate CCC email, and do have WG chairs cc on every email.

- (f) What summary should WG Chairs give to the CCC?

A variety of things were discussed, without a conclusion.

- The WG chair should provide some summary of the conversation.
- There should be one round of discussion, then vote, then decide which to do.
- Perhaps provide a 1, 2, 3, 4 points vote, with spot for comments.
- Talk to DEE about this.

- (g) Timeline

**Decision:** For 2013-14, applications due October 15th, WGs complete their work by Dec 1st, CCC handles easy ones early in December and allows January for communication with proposers about the others.

- (h) Timeline for Jan Term

Should JT decision be first, since it is foolish for the Core WG's to spend time on a proposal for a course that won't run. Or should the WG/CCC give approval first, and have the JT committee use this as part of their consideration? Discuss with Jan Term committee.

- (i) Document storage.

There needs to be a better way. Jim will work with DEE.

- (j) Other records

What information should be kept about the applications? Surely application and syllabus. Others, like correspondence or evaluation information. Three or five years down the road will anyone care about this information?

Strongest suggestion was that we should spend our time and energy on norming, not archiving.

Jim will talk to DEE.

(k) Length of designation

While a few courses the CCC did designate for one year only, and are expected to reapply next fall, the rest were given sorta a blank check. To prevent a repeat of the massive number of Artistic, SHC, and Math/Science apps in five years, we will need to space them out somehow. How?

- Let CCC decide.
- If LO's really change, will have to re-do all.
- Leave as blank. Hint that will be asking for re-apply in 3 or 5 years. Pull off table if don't need to have people reapply.
- Perhaps attach to program review cycle. Re-submit all of your courses during that time. Would perhaps cause dept to think of themselves and the core.
- In future, will have assessment. Don't reapply the ones with great assessment results.

**Decision:** Jim suggests a 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.

(l) Gripe Session

**Decision:** Hold session to request feedback from chairs/proposers. Some wed common period. Zacn and Jim. Reach out in email and in person.