

CCC Meeting Notes
October 7th, 3:00–4:30pm

Present: Jim, Jennifer, Alice, Elena, Michael, Chris, Greg, Sharon, Zach, Richard

1. Updates

(a) Long-Semester Course Proposals

There are 75-ish proposals for new long-semester Core courses. We should plan on both December 15th and 16th for CCC meetings to review them.

(b) Ranked Teaching in Jan Term and Seminar

The proposal from the CCC, Jan Term and Collegiate Seminar about ranked teaching in those programs was well received by the UEPC and is before the Academic Senate on October 8th.

(c) Language requirement and the Core Curriculum

Jim met with the Department of Modern Languages at their department meeting September 24th. At their August departmental retreat DoML discussed ways to move the language requirement into one of the areas of the Core. Based on the 9/24 discussion Jim believes DoML will apply to the CCC that languages become one of the Pathways to Knowledge. He asked that they provide Learning Goal language, learning outcomes, and rationale. He indicated that the CCC would consider it, and, if in favor, would send the proposal on to the UEPC and Senate. Finally, we talked how this involved no graduation requirement change – the level 3 proficiency would continue.

Update: The proposal from DoML arrived in Jim's mailbox during the CCC meeting, and will likely be on our agenda for 10/21.

(d) LEAP & BALOS

While we await the final BALOS/Core proposal (most of which we have tentatively approved), on October 8th the Academic Senate will consider a proposal to continue, for one year, the current situation in which BALOS students satisfy their religion requirement via their second Seminar course.

Cathy Davlos is now the faculty chair of LEAP. She and Jim have met to discuss the status of that program wrt the Core. Students who entered the LEAP program this year will also need a waiver from certain Core requirements. Jim believes Cathy is preparing to submit such a proposal to the GPSEPC.

(e) Integral

The Provost has rejected the Academic Senate's recommendation that the students in the Integral Program not be bound by the Core Curriculum. Jim believes that the Senate is currently trying to determine its next action.

(f) Completion Information

Gregg Thompson, Director of Institutional Research, is studying the progress of students through the Core. Based on about 20% of those starting at SMC in fall 2012:

	The Common Good	Community Engagement
Fall 2012	28%	0%
Jan 2013	8%	2%
Spring 2013	8%	6%
Fall 2013	24%	4%
Jan 2014	4%	2%
Spring 2014	10%	16%
Total Completed	82%	30%

Gregg expects to have numbers for the other EtW goals, and for the class beginning 2013 soon.

The critical question is what happened to those entering 2013? The college made substantial efforts to increase the CE offerings – did this have an effect? The HUB for CE and TCG is actively discussing this.

(g) Jan Term 2015 Update

After the 9/23 CCC meeting and subsequent posting of Jan Term 2015 designations, several instructors asked that their courses also be considered and/or reconsidered. This is complete. All Jan Term 2015 courses are now settled. They are posted at <http://stmarys-ca.edu/core-curriculum/> page.

(h) Course Listings

All core Designations can now be found at <http://stmarys-ca.edu/core-curriculum>. The lists include the semesters (and instructors, if appropriate) that a course or experience satisfies a core requirement. Please refer those with questions to these lists

(i) Splitting Learning Outcomes

We received a proposal that a course satisfy only some of the learning outcomes for a particular learning goal. Jim responded to the proposer that the CCC would not consider such a proposal. This was discussed and the CCC remains actively opposed to splitting LO's across courses.

2. Action Items

(a) Global Perspective petitions

Jim received a petition that a student receive GP for a particular long-semester upper division course. Based on the syllabus it seems to him the course is a strong contender for a designation. However, the instructor has not applied.

After discussion, Jim to contact the department chair (and instructor) about submitting a proposal, but not to grant individual students credit.

(b) Designation Renewal

At its 10/1 meeting the UEPC considered our proposal for Designation Renewals, rejecting it by a vote of 4-5-0. Among the concerns were

- The renewal process involved too much work for the department
- Some courses are taught every semester, and/or have numerous sections. Others consist of only one section taught occasionally. A universal 'every four years' rule seems wrong.

- The request of such submissions implies a lack of trust in our colleagues - if a department indicates no change has occurred in the course, then no renewal should be needed.

After discussion, it was determined that the CCC is still confident that some sort of Designation Renewal procedure is necessary, but that we are not wedded to the particular details in the one we forwarded. Jim is to reach out to the UEPC informally to indicate this, as our sense that we welcome the UEPC's input on particular details of the proposal. (Possible revisions could include (1) Putting the form online – which is believed to reduce work, (2) Indicating that the frequency of teaching would impact the frequency of renewals, and (3) Leading with the “explain the changes in this course” question.)

(c) .5 Credit Pathways to Knowledge Courses

We have received a proposal that a particular .5 credit course satisfy Artistic Analysis. Jim indicated to the proposer that the “2 course requirement” for AA clearly implied a “2 full credits of work in” requirement. This Registrar could implement this. Is the CCC interested?

The CCC discussed both the practical (if there are several .5 credit courses satisfying the various goals, haven't we just made the Core twice as complicated?) and the theoretical (can a course meeting only “half the time” really teach the types of thinking skills demanded by the Core?).

There was no support within the CCC for designating half-credit course for PtK. Jim is to inform the proposer.

3. Assessment Updates

A discussion of Working Group work on assessment occurred. WG Chairs were asked to think about ways the administration could provide appropriate support.

4. Google Docs and fall 2014 Working Group considerations

1) Proposal documents are all online, via Google Docs. Jim has made all WG Chairs co-editors of the appropriate folders. He has invited all WG members, as well.

2) Discussion of Working Group consideration process.

Collegial advice was shared. The Working Groups are asked to see themselves as the advocate for the proposals – meaning their role is to help the proposers put together the strongest proposal possible for eventual CCC consideration. LO's are a necessary part of the syllabus. WG Chairs are to be clear that the WGs make recommendations, the CCC makes the final determination. These recommendations come to the CCC only and don't go to the proposer. There are sufficient funds to support sustenance for the WG members and perhaps, with reasonable lead time, support through the Vice Provost's office for arranging such.