

CCI/C Agenda
Thursday September 22nd 2011
3-5pm, Founder's Dining Room

1. Reminders of on-going work. (5 minutes)

- 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. The Crunch of 2016 (5 minutes)

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.

Jim and Zach's Proposal: Option c. It is fairest and easiest.

3. Feedback and Feedback Forms (30 minutes)

Zach and Jim met with the TUG chairs yesterday. 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.

We will also discuss Zach's comments/proposal (attached below) on the authority of the WGs to decide "what kind of" and "how much."

4. Upper Division Core Courses (20 minutes)

Continuing the conversation from last week.

Jim's Proposal: "To be considered for the core, an upper division course must have Seminar 1 and Composition 1 as formal prerequisites".

5. Composition 2 Placement (60 minutes)

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.
- NB: These are Jim's pro/con's. Zach and Lisa (as Director of Composition) didn't endorse them, and may not necessarily agree.

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?

Upcoming in 2 weeks: Assessment and Assessment Rubrics.

Zach Flanagin, September 17th, 2011

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 (with no more barnyard metaphors). 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.