

**CCC Notes**  
**February 17th, 3:00–4:30pm**

Present: Jim, Chris, Elena, Michael, Zach, Greg, Richard

1. Updates

(a) Ranked Teaching in Jan Term and Seminar

The Senate will meet in closed session on February 25th to determine whether this will appear on an open session agenda.

(b) Designation Renewal

The UEPC has made no progress. Unlikely to be in place for 2015-16. An inconclusive discussion about how this might affect the CCC's work next year occurred.

(c) LEAP & BALOS

BALOS is done. (They are still in discussion with AARC about necessary courses.)  
LEAP had their Feb 1st deadline pushed to March 1st. There are still some issues.

(d) CLEP Exams

Can the general CLEP Exams be used to satisfy learning goals? The informal discussion hinted 'no.' Jim will send around information for an informed discussion (hopefully leading to a decision) before next week.

(e) Integral Program

The Provost accepted the December 10th Senate recommendation waiving Core requirements for students in the classes of 2016 and 2017, excepting Community Engagement. Senate is still in discussion with Provost on responding to her rejection of their recommendation that Integral be outside of the Core. Our conversation with Integral is in hiatus awaiting the conclusions.

(f) Language Requirement and the Core Curriculum

Jim and Elena are meeting with language folks on February 20th.

(g) Designations Update

About 75 proposals were considered. Most were designated. Only a few are outstanding.

(h) Elections for CCC in March: SEBA and SoLA three-year positions

(i) CCC Chair: Jim spoke to the Senate Executives about the need to determine the process to select the next chair (to begin three-year term in 2016). He suspects they will be heavily swayed by any CCC recommendations.

It was tentatively agreed that the CCC should propose a process for selecting the next chair, and that process should lead toward someone with good familiarity with the Core and the work of the CCC. Jim suggested the CCC also speculate about the upcoming work of the CCC, and think about the skills needed to lead that work.

## 2. Assessment Projects

Each Working Group Chair briefly outlined the status of their assessment project(s).

CCC Learning Goal Assessment Generic Plan: (agreed upon spring 2014)

- May 2014: A 1 page written plan was due.
  - Summer 2014: Finalize logistics (particularly for evidence collection). Ensure that all instructors have prompt for student work that will be collected.
  - Fall 2014-Spring 2015: Implement plan: collect and analyze evidence. Begin drafting report.
  - March 1st 2015: 1 page progress report due
- (a) Critical Thinking:
- i. Plan posted: Coordinating with Composition, using the CAAP (see attachment)
  - ii. Test given twice thus far, once more in spring
  - iii. Data to be analyzed summer 2015
- (b) Written and Oral Communication:
- i. Composition/Seminar Alignment project plan finalized 2013
  - ii. Survey given 2013-14. Analyzed spring 2013-14
  - iii. Final Report posted. (See attachment)
- (c) Shared Inquiry:
- i. Collegiate Seminar study of Shared Inquiry plan posted
  - ii. Student writings from first two seminars collected and analyzed
  - iii. Report posted (see attachment)
- (d) Information Evaluation and Research Practices:
- i. Library/Composition project plan finalized 2013
  - ii. Survey and study performed in 2013-14
  - iii. Final report posted (see attachment)
- (e) Artistic Understanding:
- i. No Plan posted.
  - ii. Requested artifacts from Creative Practice instructors in December. Have not yet examined materials received to see how complete the response was. Will have Working Group do a analysis, along the lines of “does not meet, meets, exceeds” the desired outcome.
- (f) Social Historical Cultural Understanding:
- i. First round assessment complete in 2012. Report posted.
  - ii. SHCU WG planning to work with SCHU faculty on effective assignments that better link/design assignments related to the LO’s of the LG. The goal is to improve the quality of artifacts before the next round of assessment. Tentative plan is to assess the same LO as the first round.
- (g) Theological Understanding

- i. Plan posted. Studying LO #2: “Demonstrate an understanding of basic methods and tools used in scholarly interpretation of biblical texts”.
  - ii. Collected artifacts from nearly all Fall 2014 TRS 97 and TRS 189 instructors,. Study LO #2. Basic methods and tools. Norming and reading starting next week.
- (h) Scientific Understanding
  - i. Plan developed (not posted)
  - ii. Pre-survey and content understanding gathered(?). Reading to be ??
- (i) American Diversity
  - i. Inherited and tweaked the posted plan. Studying LO #2: how structures of power affect the human person
  - ii. Did trial assessment in fall 2014. Decided that there were too many different types of (misfitting) assignments. Drafted a common assignment: one sentence prompt, 300 work response. To be given In class, or turn in, or on Moodle. To be analyzed after spring 2015 semester.
- (j) Community Engagement
  - i. Plan posted. Studying LO #3: “Students will express their understanding of the interconnections between their experience and their responsibilities as members of social or professional communities.”
  - ii. Nearly all CE instructors from Fall 2014 submitted artifacts. Will be scheduling times for norming, hopefully before spring break. An informal scan suggests that most assignments/prompts look good, perhaps due to the CILSA training most instructors have had.

Common issues and notes:

- Faculty have agreed to participate in norming and assessment exercises via their course proposals. The WG Chairs must be willing to remind them of this, and ‘encourage’ participation.
- For extensive assessment work, the CCC may be willing to stipend faculty.
- ‘Helping’ the process by writing assessment prompts for faculty may be counterproductive, as it may suggest that the assessment measures something that is outside of the main thrust of the class.
- Peer-to-peer exchange (i.e., faculty talking to faculty about what and how they teach) seems a goal. Assessment projects should lead to more of this. Will help faculty do a better job of writing assignment/prompts toward the LO’s.
- Embedded assessment (artifacts that arise from student work that was going to be assigned anyway) is what we’d really like.

3. How to share the assessment work with the Community?

The Soda Center has been reserved: September 30th, 2015 1:00–2:30.

It was agreed that while the assessment reports, and especially their conclusions and recommendations *do* need to be presented, placing them in a broader context – perhaps umbrella observations about the Core as a whole – would likely be more interesting to the faculty at large.

It was suggest that Faculty Committee Day (the Tuesday in August) would be a good venue for governance-related concerns (re-designation, connection to R&T, etc.)

We will discuss this further.

4. Fall 2014 Designations: A Review. Not discussed