

**CCC Meeting Notes**  
**September 12th, 2012 2:30–4:00pm**  
**BJW 213 Conference Room**

Present: Greg, Cynthia, Rebecca, Jen, Paul, Ed, Chris Notes by Jim.

The meeting consisted of a number of informational items, sometimes just shared, sometimes discussed.

1. Advising.

In November 2012 FYAC advisors will be helping students register for spring. By end of March students are to have declared a major, and the FYAC advisors will also help register for Fall 2013. We should provide

To help the advisors, thoughts are: (1) A “Just the Facts”-approach. This seems to be appreciated. The summer advisors sheet is a good start. (2) We also need something more interactive – a Q&A. How? An all day training session won’t work. (3) A couple ‘sample’ students with a couple weirdnesses (e.g. changing majors) would be helpful.

2. Community Engagement development

Cynthia and CISA will be running an Community Engagement Course Workshop. Two opportunities: Wed, Sept. 19, 12:40–2:10 and Thursday, Sept. 20, 3:00–4:30.

We need to reach out to folks, and offer support both in design and in implementation. CILSA has been allotted additional funds to pay for transportation, finger printing, background checks, etc. for CE courses.

Cynthia will tour SoS, SOLA, SEBA chairs to discuss, urge that CE be incorporated into courses, including upper division disciplinary courses.

Some of the money we have for faculty development will be spend here, to assist faculty developing their courses. CILSA will provide ongoing logistic support (for all CE courses). There is a need to support faculty in CE courses, as this is additional work above a standard course, in a way that a PtK or American Diversity courses is not. The CE/CG WG is mulling a proposal aimed toward providing this support.

3. Numbers: student progress toward fulfilling Core

We need to keep a running total of how many students have completed what portions of the Core. Richard is looking into finding a way to do this.

4. Faculty Development money.

The CCC Faculty Development budget is \$20k. \$10k went to Seminar, to help pay for their Seminar 1 faculty development. The remaining \$10k is mainly for CE. This is not all that much money.

5. Designation proposals announcement discussion

Jim will send reminders to chair's list and to deans.

6. 2013 Jan Term progress

The next CCC meeting is September 26th and will be devoted to designation decisions. The WG reviews seem to be going real well. Proposals are well written and aimed toward the Learning Goal, which led to a high number of positive recommendation.

Work to further streamline the process for Jan Term 2014 will begin after the designation decisions are finalized.

7. 2013 annual AAC&U conference

2/28–3/2 in Boston. “General Education and Assessment: A Sea Change in Student Learning”. Chris and Jim will attend. (Ed may be going independently as part of Kheck grant.)

8. Integral

Our discussions in May and August constitute a “1 year” designation for the Integral program. Jim met with Mike Riley, and indicated that writing and writing development needs more explicitness. Mike is amenable and will be getting back to us.

9. Assessment timing and WASC

Chris led a discussion of WASC needs. While assessment must be primarily for our own internal improvement, we must be cognizant of accreditation pressures. To make our efforts most efficient, we will likely reorder the CCC assessment timings so our Core assessment work and the WASC work align.

The new WASC handbook was just released, Friday September 7th. The WASC visit will have a streamlined format – single report due, single visit. The WASC report consists of five essays, packaged nicely. Chris will be leading the writing of Essay #4: Educational Quality. Institutions must “ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking”. Thus we will be modifying the CCC assessment plans to bump the #4 issues to the front of the line. We don't have to report on all five of these, and since four fall under Habits of Mind, we will focus on those.

This report is to cover since 2004. Since then we have defined areas (learning goals), defined appropriate student learning (outcomes), are now moving toward assessment. But we don't have all that much data to report on.

a) Information Literacy. Is in good shape thanks to Library.

b) Written communication. The fledgling Communication/Seminar alignment project can be adapted for use here, so fine here.

- c) Oral Communication. We can define oral communication as Shared inquiry. We must start from 2004 report, since SI was a major theme. There is work needed here.
- d) Critical Thinking. Again, start from Core definition. There has not been too much formal activity. Maybe we use an outside-developed assessment measure?

Jim and Chris will be taking this to the Habits of Mind WG for their input.

10. Working group reports:

- Common Good/Community Engagement – will finish review of Jan Term applications before Sept. 26th CCC meeting.
- American Diversity/Global Perspective – almost finished with review of Jan Term applications; looking at those few that needed to make revisions + two new applications. Will finish by Sept. 26th CCC meeting.
- Artistic Understanding – group hasn't met yet.
- Mathematical and Scientific Understanding – group hasn't met yet, but the group sent suggestions through email on the feedback form name (names like Proposal Assessment Form, etc.).
- Social, Cultural, Historical Understanding – Assessment is moving forward. Chris and Jen are having conversations about collection. Rubric is being revised – Chris took a stab; WG took a stab; Chairs will also take a stab. SHC accepts its current PERF (formerly known as feedback form) as is. Looks good for their purposes this year.

The forms formerly known as “feedback form” will now be called Proposal Evaluation and Recommendation Form (PERF). We should add the email address of the proposer to the PERF (as well as to the proposal application). PERF's should also have a check box for “do not recommend for designation” as well as a comment box where the WG Chair can express why they recommend or do not recommend.