

CCC Meeting Notes
April 3rd, FAH 100
2:30–4:00pm

Present: Jim, Jennifer, Cynthia, Greg, Sharon, Chris, Rebecca, Richard, Paul

1. Reminders

- (a) Upcoming Meetings
 - April 17th, Founder's Dining Room
 - May 1st, Filippi Conference
 - May 15th, Filippi Conference.
 - Year-end dinner. 5/15?? Invite new committee members?
- (b) Meeting Times for 2013-14 Tuesdays 3:00–4:30.
- (c) 1 course reassign for 2013-14.
- (d) Elections for CCC complete by next Monday

2. Updates

(a) Year End Report

We are obliged to give a year-end report to the Senate. Jim's goal is to complete it in time for the Senate's April 25th meeting. His working topics include the following. Please review and suggest additions

- i. Successes
 - A. Designation process. Number of courses.
 - B. Jan Term 2013 and 2014
 - C. SHCU Assessment project, other assessments underway, Seminar-Composition alignment
 - D. CE HUB, CE planning, integration with CILSA
 - E. Support of VP and Provost - course releases
 - F. Thank departing members - CG, ET, RJ
- ii. Plans for 2013-14
 - A. Integration with PRC process, designation renewal
 - B. CCC membership: Move to election of WG chairs? School representation? How to choose WG members? Non-faculty membership.
 - C. Role of WG's, Assessment/Continuous Improvement, strengthening the faculty's understanding of the Core.
- iii. Challenges
 - A. Document management, clerical workload
 - B. Workload for WG members. Not 8 hrs/weekend but actual committee.
 - C. Workload of CE/CG and AD/GP WGs – three and two cycles of designation consideration, respectively.

D. Faculty: How Core and Core participation should be part of hiring and retention.

E. PtK course are roughly departmental responsibilities already. How to move EtW from individuals to Departments/Schools.

(b) Spring Advising

Information posted on CCC website. Distributed to faculty soon. Including spring flyer.

(c) Seminar-Composition Alignment Project – ongoing

(d) Summer Duties(?)

Currently not expecting any. June 19th orientation to be covered by Rebecca, others by Jim

(e) Expect program-level designation proposals from Integral and 3&2 Engineering for discussion 4/17.

(f) Working Groups 2013-14

Once elections are complete, Jim will begin work to construct the membership. Goal – two new, two returners. He will be contacting WG chairs for their assistance.

(g) Jan Term 2014

Nearly 70 applications. Electronic process worked very well, and was quite simple. The assistance of the Jan Term folks (Paul Ebenkamp, in particular) was excellent. Paul Z will contact them about their timeline for approvals, and we will determine ours from that.

(h) Seminar: pre-reqs and C-

Traditionally Seminar consisted of 4 courses students needed to pass. So D-'s sufficed. In addition, it was not unusual practice for a student who failed Greek in the fall to be allowed to take Roman in the spring (so long as their failure wasn't too abysmal) with the goal of keeping them closer to 'on track'. (Said student did need to retake Greek at some point.) After discussion, the CCC was unanimous that Seminar is now developmental, with each seminar a pre-req for the following, and so a C- is necessary in Seminar N before a student may take Seminar N+1.

Jim has asked José Feito to take this to the Seminar Governing Board for their consideration.

Unfortunately, formal pre-requisite language about Seminar is not in the Catalog of Courses, and it is probably too late to get it into next year's Catalog.

There is concern about to a student who fails Seminar 1 this spring? Must they wait until next spring to retake Seminar? How to advise students who may get a D – are they eligible to go on?

(i) Stipend policy recommendations

Jim has provided the Provost and Vice Provost with a brief outline of thoughts on a potential ‘stipend policy’. It is available on the webpage. Discussion of this topic included the following reflections: Such a policy relates to expected and actual workload, to the R&T process, to shared expectations and responsibilities. A listing of activities that might result in stipends would be related to a listing of duties that are part of the standard load. That without merit pay or additional compensation or other workload reductions/additions, chairs and deans have little ability to demand a specified workload from full professors. That the faculty has, over the past ten years, declined to endorse any shared governancing of each other. That this is part of a broader conversation, but one that no one seems willing to take on.

(j) Spring CE proposals

We are very happy to have received about 16 proposals for new CE courses by the March 18th deadline. We are grateful to the CE/CG WG for considering these new courses, and are especially deeply really grateful to Cynthia Ganote for her efforts to drum up these proposals.

3. Fall 2013 course designation proposal form discussion

The prompt for the discussion was the paradox of specificity. To wit, often when considering course proposals we ask proposers for detailed information about what they do to promote the teaching and student learning of the course learning outcomes. At the same time, we feel that any aspect of the proposal (e.g., the syllabus) ought to be generic enough to faithfully represent all sections of a course while also containing the sort of detail that our WGs have been requesting. How to balance sufficiently generic with fully detailed? Related to this is our desire and need to remind Chairs about syllabi, that core courses must be compliant to LO’s.

After discussion the following suggestions seemed to have merit and support:

- (a) Make clearer on the proposal that a PtK proposal is to apply to *every* section and *all* instructors.
- (b) Include a choice to be explicit about whether an EtW proposal is for all sections or for an individual instructor’s sections.
- (c) Make clearer that *every* syllabi must meet the LO’s and every section *must* teach the LO’s.
- (d) It was noted that the proposal form is combination of pedagogical content and legalistic details. So perhaps we break the form into two parts. One is the course content section, completed by applicant who need not be the chair, and which addresses the teaching and learning of the outcomes. And another must be completed by the chair, and references consistency and assessment issues.

- (e) We should ask the chairs, How does your department ensure consistent learning outcomes across multiple sections of this class, which includes all instructors and likely multiple years? How will this process be used or adapted to ensure common learning of core LO's?

It was pointed out that SEBA chairs have agreed to common course outcomes, with about 70% of course content to be common across all sections, and the remainder left to individual instructors. Such information would very likely suffice as a response to the above questions.

- (f) It was noted that we need to keep our focus on student learning, and so on the teaching and learning of the LO's. That the syllabus is a means, not an end.

4. SHCU Assessment.

The draft SHCU assessment report was discussed. CCC members are asked to forward comments and concerns to Jim, Jennifer and Chris. Significant time was spent reviewing the conclusions and recommendations. These can be considered accepted by the CCC.

Notes:

- 1) We want to be careful about how the report is presented to our pedagogical colleagues. We want to make sure that assessment is seen as useful process, and set a good tone for future work.
- 2) Process made very clear the link of assessment to pedagogy – the whole issue is one of pedagogy. How much are students learning?
- 3) It is important to include the set of recommendations about the process itself.
- 4) A 3 point rubric perhaps not detailed enough. 4 maybe better.
- 5) We decided that our main conclusions were that both the methodology sub-goals and interpretation sub-goals are “sufficient”, that we are currently teaching and learning them at a sufficient level. However, we need to do better for the interpretation sub-goals, and assignments must better fit the outcomes.
- 6) The SHCU WG is very interested in working with designated courses to better align their assignments with the LO's.
- 7) What is considered sufficient will change over time, as we learn how to better teach to the LOs.
- 8) Once Jennifer, Jim and Chris finalize the report, it will be electronically distributed for final, formal adoption by the CCC. Jim and Jennifer will then present it to the Academic Senate.

5. WG Continuous Improvement discussion.

Several WG chairs reported on their initial conversations with their WGs on the proposal that WG's take on responsibility for overseeing the coherence and development of their LG(s), and commented as follows:

- a) How to help faculty meet the LO's? Workshops on alignments and assignments and accountability. But how to find the time to do this?

- b) Link success with Core courses to R&T and professional development
- c) The WG moved relatively quickly from ‘impossible!’ to ideas and excitement. Found a manageable project that addresses a question we are really interested in.
- d) Strong push back against idea of assessment. Jim noted that the CCC’s role includes the development of our colleagues, which includes helping them to understand the difference between grading and assessment, and the link between pedagogy and assessment.
- e) Both indirect and direct evidence are worthwhile.
- f) “Continuous” improvement is maybe poor choice of names; we don’t always have to always improve. Sometimes we are doing well enough and can be satisfied with that.
- g) Be honest that at some stage assessment will be detailed enough to isolate individuals. Don’t promise otherwise.
- h) Jim indicated that, especially in this first round, a successful project and successful process are as important as meaningful results.

6. Parking Lot

- (a) Non-course EtW Experiences – need to provide some guidelines
- (b) Designation Renewals and Program Review Committee Cycle
- (c) Use of Community Time
- (d) Core and R&T and Departments: How does participating in the Core become a regular obligation of the faculty? A regular obligation of Departments?
- (e) Cross-listing of Courses: Are there any issues here to worry about? For EtW, likely not. For PtK?
- (f) Mission Integration: Common Good, Mission & Ministry, Cummins Institute
- (g) Petitions: Suppose a student petitions for designation-credit for a course that a department has declined to propose. Can we give designation 'over the head' of a department?
- (h) Jan Term integration
- (i) .25 credit course issues
 - i. Can the Artistic Understanding Creative Practice .25cr requirement be met in January Term?
 - ii. Is it possible to have four .25 cr courses total toward an Artistic Understanding?
- (j) Other?