

CCC Brief Notes
April 1st, 2014 3:00–4:30 FAH 205

Present: Zach, Jim, Michael, Paul, Greg, Tracy, Jennifer, Chris, Sharon

Next meeting: April 22nd: Filippi Academic Hall 205 3:00–4:30pm.

1. January Term proposals and designations

Paul, Zach and Jim made a first pass through the travel course proposals. These will eventually come to the CCC.

2. Senate CCC language

Still at the Senate.

3. LEAP & BALOS waivers

Apparently at the Senate.

4. Designation Renewal Process

Knowing that the UEPC would be unable to fully consider this even were we to adopt a process, this item was put off until fall.

It was suggested that the CCC consider using some of the ‘provisionally’ designated courses as practice for the renewal process. The benefits of testing the renewal process and/or keeping the transition from provisional to full designation fairly easy were discussed, but nothing was decided.

5. Transfer courses

No progress has been made. This is being put off until summer.

6. Perfa 184: Asian Dance for Global Perspectives

This course was designated.

7. Language LO's

Knowing that the UEPC would be unable to consider this, this item was put off until fall.

8. CE Reimbursement Limits

The CCC carefully reviewed the document provided by CILSA and the recommendations of the CE WG.

- 30 mile round trip and 30 hours reimbursement cap.

(Note: 30 miles and 30 hours leads to max of 15 trips.) This hour count is apparently typical in the field, the this distance covers nearly all partners. The CE WG is very much in favor of such a cap. The CCC supports these limits.

- Course fee for extra costs?

What when costs go over, how to pay? The CCC recognized that the student ELF's are opposed to a course fee. The CE WG argument that such fees are payable by scholarships, should in practice be rare, and should be known to the students in advance of registration held sway. The CCC supports the use course fees when classes go over the reimbursement cap.

- Should ‘capstone’ courses be split from other types of CE?

The CE WG thinks that a CE course is a CE course. The CCC discussed this, and being unable to see the concrete difficulty, declined to take any action that would lead toward a ‘splitting’.

9. Risk Assessment Documents

Zach summarized the history and development of the Online Rich Assessment form, as developed by an ad hoc group of faculty and administrators. This is to provide a way to be flexible (potentially allow CE interactions with a wider definition of ‘partner’) while still doing our due diligence wrt risk.

The CCC considered the document, and agreed we are willing to use such a document as part of the CE proposal process. The CCC thanks the CE WG for carefully vetting the document, and endorses its work. We are pleased to work to mitigate risk and yet provide opportunities for non-traditional CE courses.

The CCC noted that the “Signature of statement of risk waiver” (page 7) and “General Principles” (page 8) are items worth considering adopting/employing, but that the conversation about them goes beyond the CCC. We are willing to be part of that larger discussion.

10. Learning Goal Assessment

This item was not discussed.

11. Integral Response

Jim summarized the background, and the email exchange. A careful discussion occurred, and Jim was directed in how to continue the conversation.

12. Definition of ‘undergraduate’ faculty (From the AARC)

The CCC didn’t think its work would be affected in any way. It was confused, however, by the need to eliminate the categories of ‘undergraduate’ and ‘graduate’ faculty only the immediately reinstitute them under a different guise. Jim is to relay the response to the AARC.