

**CCC Meeting Notes by Jim**  
**February 27t, 2013**  
**2:30–4:00pm, Fillipi Conference Room**

Present: Ed, Rebecca, Cynthia, Paul, Sharon, Jim, Jennifer, Chris

1. Update Syllabi?

Should the CCC should request chairs and directors to submit a current syllabus for designated courses. After discussion and questions (one per course or one per sections? Every year or every semester?) the underlying motivation be clarified. The CCC has some concern that once department and or faculty may consider the designation process ‘complete’ the content and purpose of the course may shift or evolve from the Learning Goal(s) for which it was designated. We noted the most likely cause of such movement – instructors who simply are unaware or unfamiliar with the designation and the corresponding learning outcomes. Jim was advised to consider ways of reaching out to chairs and program directors to address this concern.

2. WID Discussion and Provisional Designation.

The Habits of Mind Working Group received and reviewed 7 proposals for sophomore-level WID courses to be taught in 2013-14. They are for existing courses that well-encorporate writing throughout. The HoM WG agrees all are clearly viable (with, not surprisingly, various parts of each that we feel could and should be further developed). However, the HoM WG strongly holds that simply designating the courses and letting the instructor fend for themselves would be a mistake. While each of the instructors is no doubt a good writer, none are experienced writing instructors, with a background in scaffolding assignments or with training in how to grade to guide students toward better writing.

Jim noted that the CCC also find itself in a different place for WID’s than with ‘normal’ designations. If the CCC gives thumbs up or down on a particular SHCU course, say, that does not greatly impact any student’s prospects of graduating. However, if we the CCC give thumbs down to a department’s WID course, then we’ve prevented students from finishing. This does not, obviously, indicate we should give carte blanche, but rather suggests a different role, one of working with proposers and instructors to make sure that their courses are become the exemplars of writing that we’d all like to see. (It was noted that this is actually not that far from the work the other WGs do with proposals.)

After discussion the CCC agreed that the submitted courses be given ‘provisional’ designation, pending instructors participation in a workshop. Tereza Kramer, Director of the Center for Writing Across the Curriculum (CWAC) and Jim are to plan this 2 day retreat, to be given in late May. Included would be

- Supported work in designing final syllabus and scaffolded assignments

- Pedagogical training: Primer in how to teach writing, how to grade writing. Grading vs. editing. How to build upon English 5.
- Discussions of 'W'riting (big, rich, multi-layered developed pieces) and/vs. 'w'riting (all the other sorts of written displays of disciplinary expertise that non-writers sometimes don't realize are also very important)
- Building assessment into the course structure, work with Chris Procello
- Discussion of meanings of, teaching toward WID learning outcomes
- Consideration of generic (common?) grading rubric
- Appointment(s) with subject librarian
- Hopefully off-campus (overnight?) and supported by stipend (for pedagogical growth)
- Stipends for faculty development/pedagogy.

The CCC recommended that workshop be made available, perhaps via applications, to other interested faculty. There was also a brief discussion of the role of the CCC and the Office of Faculty Development in promoting the growth of pedagogical skills that faculty likely don't receive during their graduate school training, the teaching of writing and teaching in Community Engagement courses being the two most obvious.

### 3. Engaging the World (EtW) Experiences.

Model 1 explicitly expects students to meet the EtW goals via experiences. Because of the concentration over the past eighteen months to provide course-based methods to satisfy the learning goals, the CCC has yet to carefully consider this aspect of Model 1. This initial discussion began to rectify this. Questions: How to identify these experiences? How to approve them? How to measure whether a student's experience merits meeting a goal?

- (a) It was agreed that the CCC should develop a standard list of qualifying experiences that most students would use. (In exceptional cases, of course petitions will be considered.)
- (b) To begin to establish this list, we would use the experiences provided to us by the Social Justice Coordinating Committee (see attached), and then reach out to other campus groups for suggestions. Jim is to contact the International Area Program, the Intercultural Center, The Women's Resource Center, APASA & BSU, Student Senate, Campus Ministry, Student Life, Athletics, Center for International Programs, First Generation.
- (c) Whether or not the student is paid or given financial support as part of the experience is viewed as irrelevant. What is most important is a student's demonstrated learning, reflection, and association of the experience to their education. In concluding this we relied considerably upon the points expressed in the SJCC memo (attached).

- (d) It was generally agreed that the CCC should consider creating a website guiding students toward building a portfolio that could be used to demonstrate their satisfaction of the appropriate learning outcomes. This website would prompt students toward the types of thinking and activities, at the appropriate times, that we believe would lead toward meeting the outcomes. Jim is to discuss this with one or more of the portfolio experts on campus. He and Ed will discuss the technological options for such creations.
- (e) Should students be rewarded only by goal completion, or by goal completion and course credit (say, .25cr)?

GaelXpress has the ability to provide only goal completion. Whether students should receive course credit may depend on the nature of the experience, and cannot be taken up now. For reference, the UEPC definition of .25cr courses includes the following:

*1) .25 or .5 courses designated as academic focus on a specific body of knowledge/method of study and have a specific connection to the College's curriculum in an academic department or program. They must meet the following criteria to receive approval:*

*a) The course must be taught by a faculty member (appointed to an academic department or program of the College)*

*b) The course must require that work—such as in-class discussion of assigned readings, written work based on assignments, oral presentations in class or other “performance-based” projects—be submitted for evaluation.*

*c) The course must require a minimum of 32.5 hours (for .25 credit) or 65 hours (for .5 credit) of combined classroom time and out-of-class assignment time. A maximum time commitment must be specified if it exceeds these norms.*

#### 4. Assessment Update from Jim

- (a) SHC Assessment underway

Scoring complete. Spring semester goal is to write report, starting from Chris, and successively involving Jim, Jennifer, SHC WG, SHC Chairs. Provide final report and recommendations at start of fall semester.

- (b) b) Other Assessments

i. Writing: alignment project (Seminar & Composition) underway. Gather artifacts fall 2013.

ii. E. Rigsby doing Shared Inquiry assessment.

iii. Critical Thinking – standardized test to be given spring 2014(?)

iv. Information Evaluation – hopefully overseen by Library

- (c) Assessment and WG's and Designation length

There are three interrelated issues Jim suggests the CCC work through this spring.

- Part 1) PtK and EtW assessment. How?  
 Due to the differences in their goals and faculty makeup, Chris Procello and Jim suggested that they would like the various WG's to develop their own assessment plans, and will prepare some sort of guidelines for WG Chairs to use to begin this conversation.  
 Question: How detailed is this assessment? Enough to point out courses and departments where the outcomes are not being sufficiently met? Or only enough to close some loop.  
 Question: How to have some consistency in the work expected, year to year?
- Part 2) How long is the undefined designation approval good for?  
 Designations, unless otherwise stated, are good through at least the 2014-15 school year. We have been carefully imprecise about how much longer they last, although we can't continue this forever. So, for how long?  
 Answer A: We tie the re-designation schedule to the PRC schedule. This has an advantage of tying these departmental assessment and renewal cycles, but somewhat pulls it away from Core assessment. Jim and Chris will be discussing this with the PRC  
 Answer B: We tie the re-designation schedule to assessment. Areas showing weakness should be re-evaluated and asked to re-apply. This concentrates on Core needs, but also expects a somewhat rapid
- Part 3) What is the role of the WGs now that the bulk of designations have been made?  
 Jim suggested he would like the Working Groups to be the group primarily responsible for overseeing the learning goal, including campus-wide promotion and coherence, pedagogical development, assessment, review of syllabi, evaluation of designation proposals. Perhaps move toward elected members, and Working Group Chair an elected position, and as CCC which would consist of WG chairs and would be the 'department' responsible for overseeing the full core. He suggested we are not ready for this, but if our education is not to be a collection of 4-year silos but major-silos growing out of the gen ed experience, then we need a way to provide more cross-departmental pedagogy discussions.

Chris indicated that Program Review, Program Assessment, Designation Renewal need to have connected cycles. It was noted that, perhaps by happenstance, each of the WG's oversees two different sets of goals, except for SHC. The fear of increased workload was indicated, leading to the suggestion that maybe some WG's could be folded together – for example, an eight member PtK WG, rather than four different four member groups.

It was decided that the WG chairs would call together their WG's to talk assessment. Food and drink to be supplied. Question: How to improve pedagogy around the learning goal. Chris and Jim would put together a document to help structure the conversations, including a menu of possibilities. Included in the

discussion could be

- how often should assessment be done?
- how many learning outcomes can be done per cycle?
- what sort of scope and depth of assessment is the group interested in
- which LO would you start with?
- Does the learning outcomes language reflect accurately its meaning?
- How does learning goal language play out in the specific of courses?

It was agreed that a target date of 3/22 for response to J&C's questionnaire was appropriate.

To: Jim Sauerberg, Ph.D.  
CCIC Chair

Cynthia Ganote, Ph.D.  
Chair of the Common Good/Community Engagement Working Group

Paul Zarnoth, Ph.D.  
Chair of the Global Perspectives/American Diversity Working Group

FROM: Jennifer Pigza, Ph.D.  
Chair of the Social Justice Coordinating Committee

DATE: February 20, 2013

RE: Possible non-academic experiences for “Engaging the World”

The SJCC thanks you and your CCIC colleagues for seeking our participation in providing information toward your deliberation about how learning from non-academic experiences can qualify for “Engaging the World” learning outcomes.

Today we generated 20 experiences and programs that could serve as a reference point for developing the criteria and process for a student to document their learning in any of the four areas (CG, CE, AD, GP). On the final pages of this memo, we list the names the programs and host departments and notes of explanation.

Upon reviewing the opportunities that we generated, we noted several patterns:

- More than half of them include in-depth education and action-reflection components.
- More than half of them are one year in length or include an intensive summer component. (These first two elements trend together.)
- At least eight of the opportunities include a 1/4 credit course.
- Almost all of them include some financial benefit to students.

The SJCC welcomes the opportunity to continue to participate in the delicate and difficult puzzle that is determining how students can meet Engaging the World learning outcomes through non-academic experiences. Our continued participation could happen in many ways – you can visit our committee to gather more information or to receive feedback on draft policies and procedures, we can provide feedback based on written drafts without your presence, and/or I and other SJCC members are willing to visit your committee to actively contribute as the policies and procedures are developed.

This is exciting stuff.

Thank you, and happy reading.

## Post-Script about Paid v. Unpaid Experiences

Given our noticing of the financial benefits across the majority of the programs and experiences we generated, I shared with the SJCC that your committees will be considering whether paid experiences can be the foundation for documenting the learning associated with the Engaging the World learning outcomes. Though you did not ask for feedback about this pending question, the group did have a strong reaction that I thought I would share with you.

The group unanimously agreed that the fact that an experience is paid should not disqualify the learning that may emerge from it. These reasons surfaced:

- The focus for gaining core credit is related to the *learning* that is associated with an experience (before, during and after), and *not the experience* itself; whether or not someone was paid should be of no consequence.
- The types of experiences that, we suspect, are deep and wide enough to qualify for documenting the learning outcomes make great demands on students' time and talents; therefore, they are frequently paid.
- Working is an economic necessity for most students; if the learning associated with paid experiences is eliminated, then the option for gaining credit through non-academic experiences will disproportionately benefit wealthy students.
- Campus-based programs often pay students through federal work-study, a type of financial aid which enables students to meet, in part, their financial obligations to the College by working. Disallowing learning from paid experiences could disadvantage economically needy students.
- In the case of the Saint Mary's programs listed here, the wage/stipend is far less than students would receive in other types of external employment. By choosing these commitments, students are making a value statement and investment in their education (and the campus).
- Whether an experience is paid or unpaid has little bearing on potential learning. As one committee member put it, "What you earn has little bearing on what you learn."
- There is precedence on campus for students gaining credit for the learning that emerges from paid experiences, when combined with learning goals and outcomes – credit-bearing internships (<http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/forms/academics/registrar/forms/internship-petition.html>). Though meeting the learning goals of Engaging the World is clearly different than an internship, we share this as an example of receiving payment for work combined with meeting academic goals and gaining credit.

**SJCC Meeting**

**February 20, 2013**

**Feedback to the CCIC -- Possible non-academic experiences toward Engaging the World learning outcomes**

<b>Program/Opportunity</b>	<b>Potential Engaging the World Category</b>	<b>Department/Host</b>	<b>Notes</b>
High Potential Peer Mentors	AD, CG	Academic Advising and Achievement	Year-long training, development, and implementation; includes 1/4 credit course*
Bonner Leaders	CG, CE	CILSA	Year-long training, development, and community action
Micah Summer Fellowship	CG, CE	CILSA	summer intensive training, development, and community action; 1/4 credit course
Alumni Summer Fellowship	CG, CE	CILSA	summer intensive training, development, and community action, reading and writing components
Jumpstart	CG, CE	CILSA	Year-long training, development, and community action
Student Leaders in Community Engagement (SLICE)	CG, CE	CILSA	1 credit independent study in major + 1/4 credit CILSA synthesis/application course; community-benefitting project
Engaged Learning Facilitators (ELF)	CG, CE	CILSA	Year-long training, development, and assistance with CE, CG, SL, CBR courses
Peer Health Educators (PATCH)	CG	Health and Wellness Center	
Intercultural Development Leaders	AD	Intercultural Center	Year-long training, development, and implementation; includes 1/4 credit course*
Student Leaders in Diversity Education (SLIDERS)	AD, CG	Intercultural Center	Year-long training, development, and implementation; includes 1/4 credit course*

Faith in Action Team (FIAT)	CG, CE	Mission and Ministry Center	Year-long training, development, and implementation of retreats, service, educational programs, sacraments
Orientation Leaders	CG	New Student and Family Programs	Spring/summer intensive training, development, implementation; includes 1/4 credit course*
Military Reserves/ROTC	any	off-campus	
Internships/other employment	any	off-campus	
Resident Assistants	CG	Residence Life	Year-long training, development, and implementation; includes 1/4 credit course*
Residence Hall Association Advocacy Chairs	CG, CE	Residence Life	
Living and Learning Programs Student Leaders	CG, AD, GP	Residence Life and Sponsoring Departments	Lasallian, Santiago, Sustainability, Global, Honors; some of these programs also include 1/4 credit course
Student Government Officers	CG	Student Involvement & Leadership	
Campus Activity Board Social Justice Chair	CG, CE	Student Involvement & Leadership	
Club Leaders	any	Student Involvement & Leadership	Several clubs have missions and activities that fit the learning outcomes.
Student Interns	CG	Women's Resource Center	

\*The 1/4 credit course referenced with the asterisk is a leadership course based in the social change model of leadership and the theory of relational leadership, a well-researched and deep leadership theory utilized in campuses across the country. It is taught by qualified staff in student life and academic affairs. The other 1/4 credit courses are designed to meet the learning objectives of those particular programs, and are taught by their staff.