

CCC Meeting Notes
September 3rd, 2013 3:00–4:30pm
Filippi Conference Room

Present: Jim, Paul, Michael, Richard, Wayne, Chris, Zach, Jennifer, Sharon, Greg

1. Upcoming Meetings

- September 17th. Filippi Academic Hall 205
Initial review of BALOS proposal
- October 1st. Filippi Academic Hall 205
Initial review of LEAP proposal

2. Seminar 103 development: (“MIC III”)

Seminar 1 and Seminar 2 were developed over the last eighteen months, both with contributions from the CCC. Jennifer agreed to serve on this year’s committee developing the third seminar, Seminar 103.

3. Pedagogical Background for CE Instructors

During the 2012–13 year, with the support of other areas of campus, the CCC determined that all instructors of Community Engagement courses must receive a briefing on the legalities and logistics of having students involved in off-campus educationally-mandated activities before teaching such a course. This session is now called “Legal and Logistical Considerations in Community Engagement”, and is provided by CILSA. Completion of this workshop includes certain paperwork (MOU’s between instructor and community partner, for example). The Chair of the CCC has understood his role to include the ‘enforcement’ of this yearly requirement for instructors of CE courses.

Today’s question involved pedagogy: Question: Will the CCC require instructors of CE courses to have a background in, or have received training in, the pedagogy of Community Engagement instruction in order to teach a Core-designated CE course?

The Community Engagement and Common Good Working Group, during their May 2013 retreat, considered the question of pedagogical development for instructors of Community Engagement courses, and recommended to the CCC that it require all CE instructors to have received training or have a background in CE. Briefly, the WG views the Community Engagment goal as being fundamentally different from the other Engaging the World goals, in the following way. Each of the other three (American Diversity, Global Perspective, Common Good) can be considered to be a lens through which traditional material can be approached by making certain selections in readings and discussion topics. And so there is no need for faculty to have additional particular background or training to teach courses designated for these goals. The Community Engagement goal is different, and in order for an instructor to well incorporate student involvement in the community into the course in a way that meets the three CE

Learning Outcomes that instructor needs some knowledge and training in best practices regarding CE. The CE/CG WG is also concerned about the potential dangers of community engagement, dangers both to the student (when they venture off campus into locations in which they may be unaware of the cultural and societal norms) and to the community (from well-meaning but possibly unaware students). To help mitigate this, again they argue that SMC must have instructors familiar enough with the details of the community engagement process. Finally, both the Vice Provost and the Director of CILSA have argued that over the past twenty years Community Engagement has become established as a discipline, with standards of practice, and it is incumbent upon us to provide at least an initial background to faculty from outside this discipline who will be expected to use these practices in their classrooms.

In the past CILSA has provided such training to the campus. The material used during the spring 2013 training sessions (for “Modules #2 & #3: Course Implementation Part I, Part II”) was made available for CCC members on the CCC website.

The discussion was extensive. Eventually the CCC decided “Yes”, and the following summary is written with that in mind.

- CE is a pedagogy. We expect faculty to have received training in their discipline in graduate school – that Biologists have been trained in biology. We can’t expect faculty to have been trained in other disciplines, and so must offer them that training.
- Is the CCC requiring the CILSA-provided workshops? No: Instructors who have extensive experience in CE, or who have received training off-campus, are considered to have met this. Likewise, future training, perhaps at a disciplinary conference, is welcomed. It is the responsibility of the CE/CG WG to determine the sufficiency of such experiences.
- Are we requiring that faculty use the specific materials provided in the CILSA handouts? These particular rubrics, for example? Or the particular modes of engagement highlighted in the CILSA workshops? No: As in all disciplines we expect that faculty have been sufficiently trained and given sufficient background to teach their courses. The specific details of how they do so are their responsibility (within the usual structures of SMC).
- How much training are we talking? The current training is two two-hour sessions, stipended at \$100 per hour. (Faculty who wish to take a refresher course will not receive the stipend). It was agreed the CCC is responsible to see that there is no time-creep.
- What is the purpose of the CILSA workshops? CILSA is our on-campus experts in this pedagogy, and will introduce faculty to the methods of instruction CILSA has found most effective in assisting students to achieve the Community Engagement Learning Outcomes.

- The CCC agreed it will be worthwhile to assess these workshops, both to learn faculty's opinion of the training immediately after receiving it, and then again after they have taught the CE course.

A formal vote was held, and the CCC now requires instructors of CE courses to have a background in, or have received training in, the pedagogy of Community Engagement instruction in order to teach a Core-designated CE course

It was agreed that this pedagogical threshold would be in place beginning with Jan Term 2014.

How to do verification, that faculty have actually received this training? (This important issue of implementation came up early in the discussion, but it was set aside until the principle had been decided.) The Chair of the CCC and the Chair of the CE/CG WG, working with the Vice Provost, would be responsible for the details of implementation, and they were to consult with the CCC as appropriate.

The Vice Provost expressed concerns about cost, and indicated that either contingent faculty cannot be allowed to teach CE, or contingent faculty must complete the workshops without being paid for their time. It was agreed that he and the Chair of the CCC would discuss this, and report back.

4. Designation Documents 2013–14

The Designation Procedures and Course Proposal Form were discussed and agreed upon. They are posted at

<http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/core-curriculum-committee/designation-information>

5. Jan Term 2014 CE Working Group recommendations

The CE/CG Working Group made recommendations on eleven Jan Term course that had applied for a CE designation. In closed session the CCC reviewed these recommendations, and formally voted to adopt each.