

**CCC/CCIC Meeting Notes, by Jim  
September 22nd, 2011, 3:00-5:00pm  
Founder's Dining Room**

Present: Jim, Vidya, Kara, Ed, Rebecca, Paul, Rebecca, Cynthia, Sam, Jane, Russ, Lisa, Sharon, Michael.

1. Reminders of on-going work.

- CCIC: Members: liaisons to dept/programs. Present on 10/13 Drop-in
- CCC: Finalize Feedback Forms. Encouraging WGs to be present on 10/13. Plan for Dec/Jan meetings.

2. All members are encouraged to attend Senate meeting 9/29, when the Seminar model vote, and models, are to be discussed, and hopefully determined. (The HoM WG cannot do much more toward integrating Composition and Seminar until the Seminar Model is determined.)

3. Preventing the Crunch of 2016

Last spring the CCIC determined that the 'designation' stamp would last for 5 years. Since we are considering 80-ish courses this year, we are setting ourselves up for another huge crunch 5 years hence. We should fix this. Options include:

- a. Ask for volunteers from departments to be 'nice' about this and go early,
- b. Set up some criteria to distinguish between those getting bonus points (=5 years) vs. regular points (=3 or 4 years), possibly if courses meet multiple outcomes,
- c. Declare that a department's first course will receive a 5-year stamp, the second will have 4 years, and any more are for 3 years. Year-long sequences will be considered one course for the purposes of timing.

After brief discussion option c, viewed as the fairest and easiest, was adopted. We will make this clear in the 'course interest' statement.

4. Feedback and Feedback Forms.

Zach and Jim met with the TUG chairs on 9/28. They are concerned about 'sufficient'. We assured them we will be as clear as we can about 'how much' of each outcome (while admitting that we don't really know what this means until we see actual proposals.). Having the Feedback Forms and a couple of sample proposals available will also help. CCC members: Jim's working assumption remains a 10/1 deadline for the completion of Feedback Forms.

Outside of the HoM, all other working groups have completed a solid draft form. Several were distributed and discussed. The 'how much' question was discussed. Suggestion is to use terms like *central to course* or *secondary*.

SHC is making a guideline sheet: what do we mean by terms like 'period and place' and 'human activities?' We reviewed the SU rationale, which indicates that, with the limited exception of Physics 1/2, Physics 10/11 and Chemistry 8/9, all SU courses must do LO #3.

We will also discuss Zach's comments/proposal (attached below) on the authority of the WGs to decide 'what kind of' and 'how much'. This led to the following agreements (some of which overlap).

- 1) The *primary* and *integral to the course* language should be put into each PtK and EtW Feedback Form. I.e., "Is American Diversity *integral* (but not necessarily primary) to the

courses?”.

2) WG's should read the LO's in a minimally intrusive way (while remembering that for PtK course the LG must be primary).

3) If the WG doesn't define 'how often' then it must be open to the interpretation of the proposer. In particular, when the WG hasn't provided specific 'sufficiency' demands, then they cannot veto application based solely on this aspect of the application. (Of course, the demands given the LO's themselves are non-negotiable.)

4) Further, the LO's should be viewed as a package, so, unless the WG has specified otherwise, it is to be expected, and allowed, that in any particular application some LO's will be met lesser and some more extensively. So, for example, in a PtK course, the LG (= cluster of LO's) must be primary, in the absence of language otherwise, however no particular LO must be primary.

## 5. Upper Division Core Courses

Continuing the conversation from last week, Jim's proposed: "To be considered for the core, an upper division course must have Seminar 1 and Composition 1 as formal prerequisites."

A number of objections were raised. Concern about transfer students – they will not have taken Sem 1 and Comm 1. Further, upper division is a departmental decision, not a core decision. There are 'core courses', and their 'upper division courses', but (outside of UD Writing) there is no 'upper division core course'. Finally, advisors should do the gatekeeping – keeping students out of non-first year courses.

In favor it was pointed out that the purpose of proposal is that HoM is central to the core. Students who have passed through the first year should be expected to use these skills in other courses. And that the proposal would prevent first-year students from taking core courses, a good thing.

The overwhelming sense was the proposal was appropriate for HoM (where it is unneeded), but inappropriate for the other goals, and so it was withdrawn.

Note that there will be an incentive for first-year students to take core courses, and departments will need to be aware of the potential danger if they have upper-division core courses that appear to be available to first-year students.

## 6. Composition 2 Placement

Intro: Discussions in the Habits of Mind WG has led HoM to speculate on the possibility of moving Composition 2 back to the spring of the first year as a way to better meet the developmental LO's we are responsible for. Pros include:

(1) The traditional topics of Composition 2 match well the IE&RP LG. These learning outcomes should be taught sooner, not later.

(2) Many Humanities departments will have their UD writing course (how to write and to IE&R in the major) in the sophomore year. Comp 2 is excellent preparation, and so should occur beforehand. Conversely, it would be odd and perhaps even problematic to have a more general 'writing research papers' course occur later.

(3) Continuation of writing development wouldn't be broken by 12 months,

(4) Having Comp 2 in spring 2013 eliminates a severe source of staffing disruption.

Cons include: (1) Model 1 says In most cases, English 4 will be taken in fall of the student's first year and English 5 in the spring of the student's second year. So we would need to ask the Senate to change Model 1, and it may appear we are doing to sate a 'special interest'.

We've tried very hard to stay away from that can of worms.

(2) Spring Soph students will be taking a 'useful' course (as they will often have started writing research papers) rather than yet another 'preparatory course' and so may be more motivated.

(3) Greater demands on us to clarify areas of confusion regarding movement of Seminar and Composition.

(4) Perhaps slightly harder route to 'developmental' goals.

Before the HoM WG meets again (on 9/28) Zach and Jim need feedback from the CCI/C on how to proceed. In particular, is the CCI/C likely to look kindly upon, and perhaps endorse, a proposal to modify Model 1 to move Comp 2 back to the first year?

Why did Model 1 put Composition 2 so late? Summary: Comp 1 should be before Sem 1. For staffing problems, Sem 2 and Comp 2 then in sophomore year in opposite semesters from their first-year locations. Further, this leads to 2 year developmental cycle.

The discussion of the issue was very strongly in favor of moving Composition 2 (back) to spring of the first year. Points raised included

- Frosh Composition 2 will be more helpful to majors that teach writing in the major in sophomore year.
- Is the move better pedagogically? Is it better enough to ask the Senate to make this change?
- Can we put some of IE&RP into Comp 1? No, this course is already too full. It must concentrate on basic writing skills.
- We would not be supporting special interest, but have found an 'error' in Model 1 and trying to fix it.
- We should talk to CCTF members about this.
- The move is really about student learning, about best preparing them for success in sophomore year.
- LO#4 in W&OC. especially (plagiarism) needs to appear in the frosh year. Students are confused about what paraphrasing is allowed.
- Comp 1&2 will be more integrated and developmental this way.
- Comp 2 will need to be standardized, scaffolded to support UD Writing. Rosemary, Ellen and Lisa working to make sure there are very clear connections between Seminar and Composition.
- A downside. Are there other issues we will bring to the Senate? We can only ask them to change so many things before political troubles.
- We should survey of chairs – how many expect UD writing in sophomore year. Get real info, not ad hoc data.
- The Library is likely to support this move.
- We need to more explicitly elicit Seminar's view.

The strong consensus was the the CCI/C is interested in pursuing this. Steps to take include

- (a) Sending Paul reasons as to why this is pedagogically appropriate. He will colate and summarize
- (b) The HoM should sift the arguments. If in favor, formally propose to the CCC/IC on 10/6. If approved by CCI/C, the committees would jointly sent it to the Senate.
- (c) We (Jim) would send outline of issues to the Senate plenty ahead.
- (d) We contact members of the CCTF for their reaction. Roy-Jim. Mary T-Rebecca J, Ted-Jim. Robert B-Cynthia. Ellen-Lisa.
- (e) Liaisons should contact their chairs: When to you plan to teach the UD writing? (Implicitly, what is the impact on your department of move Eng 5 to sophomore spring?)

#### 7. Sam: Lumina's Degree Qualifications Profile

Distributed. Likely to be adopted in some form by WASC. How is this relevant to the CCC? Not clear yet. Someone at the college will need to deal with this. WASC will be asking colleges to enter 'learning communities', likely schools that have vaguely similar LG's assessed in vaguely similar ways. (Not clear if this will be mandatory.) This leads to benchmarking. WASC may be looking for schools to pilot by 2014?

Attached below is an email from CCIC Chair Zach Flanagan, September 17th, 2011. It was discussed during the 9/22 meeting, and its points generally endorsed.

*I have been trying to figure out a better way to express the point that I was trying to make about WG creation of designation standards. Here is a draft set of ideas / principles for all of your consideration. Since the Theological Understanding rubric has been on my mind in a special way, I follow them with an attempt to apply these principles to this goal. What do you think?*

*What it means for the WG to set standards for determining 'sufficiency'(in general):*

*1. The 'what' is already established by Senate-approved language (i.e., the outcomes and rationales). Therefore, WGs cannot add or subtract requirements to/from the outcomes.*

*2. The WGs do have the authority to determine 'what kind of' particular items legitimately meet the Senate-approved outcomes. For example, in the SHC outcome (#3) that requires 'social science or historical methodology', the WG has the authority to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate methods by which one might try to do social science or history. If there is any worry that departments writing proposals would not be clear on the distinction, the WG may choose to make up an exemplary list of the kinds of methods that would meet this outcome (and possibly some examples of the kinds of methods that would not). However, the WG does not have the authority to demand a particular legitimate method (if it is not part of the Senate language) or more than one method (since the Senate language is in the singular).*

*3. The WGs also have the authority to determine 'how much' each particular outcome must be learned, i.e., the depth of learning expected for it. Using the example above, the WG may determine that students should meet SHC outcome #3 deeply, and thus the teaching of that outcome would likely need to be integrated throughout the course, and student evidence for learning it would likely need to be a substantive project in which they showed their skill in the SHC methodology. Conversely, the WG could decide that this outcome is secondary. Thus, while students would still have to meet it, the level of proficiency expected would be much lower, and the integration of this outcome into course and assignment design could be significantly less.*

*An attempt to apply these principles to Theological Understanding, Christian Foundations:*

*1. Re: outcome #1 The TU WG has the authority to define what sorts texts and themes in the Bible qualify as 'major' and what theological and interpretive principles qualify as 'central to the Catholic*

*tradition'. Since texts, themes, and principles are in the plural, the WG can require at least two of each be present and assessed. But the WG cannot require any more than two, because neither the outcome nor the rationale require it. The WG also cannot require which of the list of 'major' or 'central' items be covered, only that they be 'major' or 'central.' It can, however, require at what depth these major/central items be learned by students. Finally, the WG needs to decide if the 'implications' at the end of the outcome have to match each of these texts, themes, and principles or if 'implications' simply need to be raised in some of these topics. I.e., what does the 'their' refer to?*

*2. The same framework would apply to their determination about outcomes #2 and #3. I.e., what sorts of things would 'count' for basic scholarly methods and tools in biblical interpretation and relevant contextual readings? What sorts of methods, tools, and contexts would not count? Finally, how deeply must these outcomes be met? Once again, since these terms are in the plural, then two of each could be required, but no more.*