

CCC/CCIC Meeting Notes, by Jim
Aprile 12th, 2012, 3:00-4:30pm
Founder's Dining Room

Present: Michael, Kara, Sharon, Zach, Bob, Lisa, Chris, Sam, Cynthia, Vidya, Jim

1. Welcome new Director of Educational Effectiveness Chris Procello
2. Sam: WASC Requirements

By the end of next week we will have more complete information. We know we will need some report in 2013 with some aspects of learning discussed, due last spring or hopefully early fall. It will be reviewed off-site, with the on-campus visit fall 2014.

The requirement on core competencies have been suspended temporarily, because of UC and Stanford objections. It is unclear what will happen with this - it may come back in some form in the future.

Once more of the details are set, Sam will distribute an outline of what will need to be in the report.

3. Discussion Jim's proposal for using 'Foundational' to describe the relation between HoM learning outcomes and the courses housing them.

We have previously decided that "primary" and "integral" are good ways of describing the relationship of the Pathways to Knowledge and Engaging the World learning goals to the designated course. To help us best work with the non-traditional undergraduate population (LEAP, BALOS, and perhaps Integral) Jim suggested that we should adopt a similar term for the Habits of Mind to help us indicate how much is "enough" for the HoM goals.

This was discussed for about an hour. The term was debated (foundational? fundamental? main focus?) as was the purpose of such a description. The problem the term was to fix was not sufficiently clear to most.

The eventual recommendations were:

- (a) That all undergraduate programs must have a full two-course expectation in writing. That is, that all undergraduates must have

(the equivalent of) English 4 followed by (the equivalent of) English 5.

- (b) That all students must take one seminar-like course per year of full-time year equivalent, with this course focusing on the Critical Thinking and and Shared Inquiry learning goals.
- (c) That all programs must have a Writing-in-the-Discipline experience, which must have English 5 (or equivalent) as a pre-requisite.
- (d) That these (b) – (d) together will satisfy a student’s HoM Requirements.

What was not made clear was authority for approval. Suppose there is a split decision between Composition and the CCC on whether a proposed writing course is satisfactory. (*Mutatis muntandis* for Seminar.) This was purposefully left left unresolved.

4. Working Groups for next year: how should members be gathered?

It was agreed we would wish some mixture of experience while also involving new people. How should we go about this? It was decided that Jim will thank all current members, reminding them that they were appointed by the Senate in 2011 for this year, and that it is time to develop the Working Groups for 2012-13. Ask them about their willingness to continue on their WG (or desire to switch to another), and thank them for their efforts. This will be shortly followed by a email to the full faculty asking for volunteers.

Jim reminded the group that it is the responsibility of the CCC to pursue “a mix of disciplinary experts and interested non-experts fitted to the specific responsibilities of each Working Group” (from Faculty Handbook) and that once nominations and volunteers were gathered, the CCC will need to compose the WG’s.

It was suggested that, due to the wide number of departments (and disciplines) covered, the SHC and Artistic WGs should be learn toward being expert-heavy.

5. Update on TU/TE

- (a) The CCC (in a discussion that went up the chain of command) has determined to read the Theological Understanding learning goal

language to indicate that students must take a Christian Foundations course before taking their Theological Explorations course. Note that this is only for Core requirements; we are not expecting TE courses to have a CF course as a formal pre-requisite.

- (b) Future years are likely to see a large number of courses proposed for inclusion in the Core under the Theological Understanding/Theological Explorations banner. Before we start considering these specific proposals, it would be valuable to have a better understanding of the meaning of the learning outcomes. Jim is going to send the following questions to the TU WG for their consideration in the hope that experts can relatively easily provide mainstream answers.

Learning Outcome #1:

a) What is a 'religious tradition'? At what point does a belief system become a religion? What are the criteria by which to judge? (For example, when did the schism started by Luther become a religion? When did Mormonism? Scientology?)

b) What is a 'subfield'? Does its use refer to topics (e.g. the coming of Catholicism to Mexico) or method (e.g., Talmudical Hermeneutics), or both? Is any instructor-defined area of study to be accepted as a subfield?

Learning Outcome #2:

a) The rationale indicates that the believers perspective and the one provided the academy are distinct. Are they to be different? Opposing? Contrasting? Is the 'academic' perspective be from outside the religion/religious tradition?

b) Does the phrase 'from the critical perspective of the academy' imply any temporality? Meaning, must the academic perspective be developed after the religion, or can one apply an earlier (perhaps, much earlier) critical framework to a later religion? Must (should?) this perspective be modern?

c) What does 'critical' mean? Is it a critique of the belief system? Of the believers? Of the way in which the belief system answers certain moral and/or existential questions? Must it be a critique at all, or can it be a theoretical examination of the beliefs?

Suggestions for improving these questions should be sent to Jim.

6. Gen Ed or Core?

- (a) Jim has e been trying to shift to saying "current general education requirements" when referring to the Area-requirements system, and "core curriculum" when discussing the new thing. This seemed reasonable.
- (b) It has been a trouble to figure out a way to easily indicate to students (and advisors) who will be a gen-ed-er and who will be a core-er. Entrance year doesn't work (because 2012 frosh are core while 2012 jrs are gen ed), and graduation year doesn't make sense. Jim has starting suggesting doing this simply by incoming credits displayed in a chart like the following

First Term at the College	Credits	Core or Gen Ed
Fall 2012	<9	Core Curriculum
	≥9	Gen Ed Requirements
Jan Term 2013	<13	Core Curriculum
	≥13	Gen Ed Requirements
Spring 2013	<14	Core Curriculum
	≥14	Gen Ed Requirements
Fall 2013	<17	Core Curriculum
	≥17	Gen Ed Requirements
Jan Term 2014	<21	Core Curriculum
	≥21	Gen Ed Requirements
Spring 2014	<25	Core Curriculum
	≥25	Gen Ed Requirements
Fall 2014 or later		Core Curriculum

The idea of a chart seemed good, with the understanding that those more closely involved with transfer students would make the determination of the credit values.

7. Jan Term 2013

Approximately 50 faculty indicated in their Jan Term proposal submission that their course may include Engaging the World goals. Jim, Cynthia and Paul will be emailing these faculty to help them begin the Core submission process. The desire is to provide them a simple form in which they would briefly say how their course will meet the appropriate learning outcomes. Proposed forms were distributed, and

Jim requested attendees read them and make comments/corrections to him.

In the email Jim is also to send to all faculty, he will be sure to use the term “integral” as well as to indicate this is only for frosh, and to say that each instructor will be expected to be able to provide student work in which the students demonstrate their progress toward achieving the outcomes.

8. Applications for 2012.

Jim is thinking to open designation applications to all other courses next year, and let departments make their own decisions. It was agreed that it is more appropriate for departments to decide when their courses should be incorporated into the core. We should be reminded departments that courses taken only by juniors and seniors can wait one more year. We should also be aware of the workload that a glut of courses may be for the Working Groups.

9. The 2012-13 ‘Flyer’ was distributed

Send comments, corrections to Jim

10. Future Meeting Topics

A desire for section by section approval for EtW goals was indicated. This should be rediscussed.