

**CCC/CCIC Notes by Jim
May 3rd, 2012 3:00-4:30pm
Founder's Dining Room**

Present: Zach, Rebecca J, Rebecca C, Lisa, Paul, Cynthia, Chris, Sam, Jennifer, Bob, Michael, Sharon, Jane, Vidya, Greg, Kara

1. Informations and Updates

(a) TUG Chairs meeting (Zach)

Jim and Zach with the TUG Chairs and Program Directors on April 23rd to outline the challenges of next year (ensuring their faculty teach their Core courses with allegiance to the learning outcomes, next round of designation applications in the fall, writing in the discipline courses needing to be prepared, preparatino for advising for the Core) and to review the this year's designation process to ask for helpful suggestions. There was some concern over the necessity to advise students for twice as many gen ed systems (at least for the next couple of year) and questions about the WID course, but most chairs seem to be settling into acceptance if not quite yet excitement about the Core.

(b) Meeting of Chair of CCC, Registrar, Director of Articulation

On April 30th, Jim met with Julia Odom, Registrar, and Craig Means, Director of Articulation and Transfers. With as many moving parts as there are in the Core, all three wanted to check in, to make sure they were all on the same page and not making any false assumptions about the work of the others. See the notes from this meeting, which are attached below.

Happily, thanks to previous efforts, things seem to be moving smoothly. The most important issues to stress are

- i. The Registrar is comfortable dealing with section-by-section designation for EtW goals.
- ii. A credit-chart will be used to detemine which transfer students are responsible for the Core.

In response to a question, Jim noted that he has discussed with Julia and Craig the need to be 'transitive' in our considerations of AP exams and off-campus courses. This mean that if a department accepts an outside course or exam as equivalent to one of their courses, and if the CCC has designated that departmental course for the Core, then students who complete the outside course or exam will also be treated by the Registrar as having complete the Core requirement. This rule holds for Pathways to Knowledge courses, Composition courses, and the 'obvious'

Engaging the World courses (e.g., an off-campus “African American Literature” course would be seen as fulfilling the American Diversity goal). For SMC courses that fulfill ‘non-traditional’ goals (e.g., Politics 1 and Common Good), this transitive rule will not apply. It is to be understood that Julia and Craig have the responsibility, in their respective positions at the college, to use their judgements when applying this rule, and will consult with the CCC and/or departments when necessary. Jim will follow up with Craig on this.

(c) Working Group 2012-13.

Jim announced that faculty have been found for nearly all of the working groups for 2012-13. Habits of Mind could use one more member, hopefully a senior member of the faculty, and Theological Understanding is short one or two members. Jim asked for nominations (to be made to him over email.)

(d) Director of Institutional Research Sam Agronow had two updates.

i. WASC

1) Please see the document from Jill Ferguson outlining the changes WASC is undergoing. 2) WASC has removed ‘appreciation of diversity’ from its list of five core competencies, and instead has divided written and oral communication. But the five areas remain suspended, for now. 3) Our initial report to WASC is likely due in September 2013, with a visit the following fall. 4) There is no need that we benchmark our learning goals, but will need to benchmark retention and graduation rates.

Sam indicated that the CAT (Thinking Critically Assessment Test) is being used by a couple of our Catholic college colleagues. It is scored by faculty and might be worth considering.

ii. A Mission Assessment group was on campus. They suggested we might use the ‘CLA’, Collegiate Learning Assessment.

(e) Summer Orientation

Zach and Vidya will be present during the June orientations, to outline needs of Core to faculty involved. They were requested to have Russ make clear that the main morning information (or training) session for faculty will be about Core, and so attendance is strongly encouraged.

2. Beginnings of Assessment.

Chris Procello outlined the beginnings of our assessment work. He met with Zach, Cynthia, and Jim, took our 2011 original plan as a starter document, and has begun to lay out a more detailed plan. For example, he suggests we add time to do formative reflection after each area of assessment. He distributed a document with a draft of his current thinking.

This group of four decided to recommend starting our 2012 assessment with the Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding learning goal. Partially this was by process of elimination (Engaging the Worlds are just not ready, Math & Theology directly impact

too few faculty, the Habits of Mind need immediate data gathering but it will be some years before their development learning can be measured). But also because the SHC folks are a broad but not too large of a collection of faculty, all of whom should be very comfortable with the social science-type methodologies of assessment.

Chris proposed a schedule that would follow SHC with Art and then Science, suggesting that this was all still draft. Perhaps we would rearrange, should it be very important to the college's WASC preparations. (In this vein, Sam suggest separating Written and Oral assessment.)

This foursome will be meeting with the chairs (or designees) of the SHC departments on May 22nd to gather their ideas and assistance in formalizing our plans. Which are, roughly, to gather student work from one section of every course designated for SHC and taught in fall 2012, do the study of these artifacts in the spring, and then report out in fall 2013. Chris was clear that this is a pilot, and he and the CCC should be careful to move obviously and slowly, to establish a process that befits the college.

In response to some concern that we might be taking a one size fits all approach (for example, it was suggested that an assignment common across all courses might be sometimes appropriate), Chris was clear that he wasn't thinking this way. While a signature assignment might indeed occassionally work (in English 4, for example), most often it won't. Further, he indicated it is not even obvious studying direct student work is always the best method. There are a variety of ways to study our student learning, and he will be recommending ones that are most appropriate and beneficial, based upon the particularities of the goal and students and courses at hand.

3. Relationship between the CCC, Composition and Collegiate Seminar

The CCC had previous (December 8th, 2011) decided that all undergraduate programs at the college must include (among other things) a two-course sequence in writing, equivalent to English 4 and 5, and that students must complete these in order. Because the English 4 and 5 are so tightly linked to the Written & Oral Communication, and Information Evaluation & Research Practices learning goals, the question has arisen, who approves the equivalency. That is, if a program proposes a sequence of courses which they claim teaches writing and statisfies the W&OC and IE&RP learning goals, who will decide? Does Composition have the final word, or do they make a recommendation to the CCC? How is the Habits of Mind Working Group involved?

This same question arises for Collegiate Seminar and the Shared Inquiry and Critical Thinking goals. (Here the question is, perhaps, even more complicated, as it is possible that some programs will hope to have seminar-like courses that can be used to fulfill SI and CT as well as PtK goals.)

The basic argument in favor of the CCC is that we need one body on campus that is finally responsible for all Core decisions, and this is the CCC. To have Core decisions distributed in various places on campus will just lead to confusion and frustration.

The basic argument in favor of Composition and Collegiate Seminar having the final word was a disciplinary one. It was suggested that the CCC would never, for example, force the Math Department to accept a course a math over their objection; the same should hold for Composition and Seminar.

Jim reminded everyone that the Director of Composition and a representative chosen by the Director of Seminar will be on the Habits of Mind working group, and despite our occasional differences in interpretations and evaluations, we are likely close enough to make judgements about courses in ways that satisfy both the CCC and Composition/Seminar.

4. Designating sections of courses for EtW.

Thanks to the work and flexibility of the Registrar, we will be able to designate courses by section, rather than only by course. We are very happy to be able to do this, but first must figure out how. After a brief discussion, it was determined that sections of fall 2012 courses could not apply for Engaging the World designation, as we simply won't be ready in time. Surely we will be ready for fall 2013 courses, and perhaps even sooner.

It was pointed out that this decision should prompt a sizable number of applications, and, as a result, the timeline for the American Diversity/Global Perspectives and Common Good/Community Engagement working groups may need to be adjusted. For example, we may need to allow for a second round of EtW designation application in the spring.

We will take this up very early in the fall.

5. Writing in the Discipline

Jim briefly indicated that the HoM WG is aiming to outline the purpose and requirements of this course by the end of the semester, along the lines of a draft previously distributed. He welcomed comments and suggestions. There was very little time for discussion, but the need to work within the confines of the various disciplines was recognized.

6. The meeting adjourned with a round of thanks for graduating student Michael, outgoing CCC members Rebecca and Lisa, for long-serving CCIC members Kara, Bob and Vidya, and in particular for CCIC Chair Zach under whose guidance the CCIC and now CCC have successfully implemented a new core curriculum for the college.

Appendix

Julia Odom, Craig Means, Jim Sauerberg
April 25th, 2012

Conclusions

1. Once the yearly course designation process is complete (about February 1st), the CCC will inform the registrar's office about which courses will be part of the core for the next academic year. The registrar's office will ensure Colleague knows that the designated classes count for the various learning outcome requirements.

For example, should English 19 count for Artistic Understanding for 2012-13, then any student who completes English 19 during that year will see 'English 19' appearing under the "Two courses in Artistic Understanding" -part of the degree audit. This holds for all the courses listed on the yearly, published 'designated course' list.

2. For courses mean to fulfill a learning goal, by "complete a course" we mean "gains a passing grade". A grade of "D" suffices. Just as with any non-pure elective graduation requirement, a P does not suffice. The expectation here is the "4 Jan Term" requirement, in which P/F is still an option.
3. "Transfer courses that count as SMC courses will receive the same treatment as SMC courses. To make up an example, should we (Craig Means, Julia, the English Department) agree that DVC English 35 is equivalent to SMC English 19, then a transfer student bringing in DVC Eng 35 would see "English 19 TE" under their Artistic Understanding part of the degree audit.

Further, we will tend to read transfer courses generously. So, for example should "English 19" no longer be in the Core in 2013-14, we would be obliged to credit incoming transfers who had taken DVC Eng 35 in 2012-13 with having completed one AU course.

Similarly, should the situation arise, we will simply have to believe that DVC Eng 35's from before we decided it counts as AU still count as AU. That is, should we decide in spring 2012 that SMC Eng 19 = DVC Eng 35, then, for the purposes of AU, that decision would be applied retroactively when necessary.

4. It will not be permitted for sections to fill Pathways to Knowledge goals unless all sections do. That is, for PtK courses we firmly stick to the 'all or none' rule for designation.

While it probably won't appear on the glossy handouts, it will be clear internally just how long the designations last, and when they must be reapplied for.

- For Engaging the World goals we encourage departments to consider an ‘all or none’ approach. However, understanding that the some courses have a fixed topic (but varying possible methodologies) while others have fixed methodologies (but can have different topics), it may be possible for the EtW Working Groups to designate sections of courses as meeting the LG’s. Any such designation would be good only for a semester, and the faculty member involved would be responsible for their own publicity.

The Registrar is willing and able to implement this. Once drop/add is complete, students in these specially designated sections courses will be co-enrolled in the corresponding EtW Department. It will be the responsibility of the CCC to keep track of designated sections, and to work with the Registrar so that students receive the proper credit.

- Artistic Understanding

Artistic Understanding requires (at least) 2 full courses with at least .25 of this credit being in a ‘creative’ course. It is likely that we have situations in which Eng 19 counts as 1 AU, but Eng 20 counts as 1 AU + creative. Colleague will be able to handle this, and the new academic evaluations will as well.

- Incoming credits and classification.

To describe to incoming transfer students and faculty who is responsible for which graduation requirements we will use the following chart.

First Term at the College	Incoming Credits	Core or Gen Ed?
Fall 2012	<9	Core Curriculum
	≥9	Gen Ed Requirements
Spring 2013	<14	Core Curriculum
	≥14	Gen Ed Requirements
Fall 2013	<17	Core Curriculum
	≥17	Gen Ed Requirements
Spring 2014	<22	Core Curriculum
	≥22	Gen Ed Requirements
Fall 2014 or later		Core Curriculum

When placement is not clear (e.g. a student with 13.5 or 17.2 credits) the Registrar and Director of Articulation and Transfers will determine which is most appropriate for the student. (The petition process may come into play in difficult cases.)

- The new academic evaluation is nearly ready for use.
- The CCC views the Theological Understanding/Christian Foundations course as a pre-req for the Theological Understanding/Theological Explorations course. Students should not be deemed as having completed the latter requirement until they’ve completed the former.

Colleague will have difficulty handling this. Marking which students have completed their TU/TE requirement will need to be done by hand. The CCC should help the Registrar in remembering to do this.