Present: Jim, Vidya, Kara, Ed, Rebecca, Paul, Rebecca, Bob, Julia, Cynthia, Sam, Jane, Russ, Lisa, Richard.

1. Reminder of revised October 13th schedule.

   (a) Drop-in assistance for course designation proposers: 9:00-12:00. Available CCIC members.

   (b) Assessment 101 for WG members: 9:30-11:00. Cynthia
   Assessment Rubric construction: 11:00-1:00. WG's.

2. Update on template assessment rubric development.

   Zach and Cynthia and Jim met to think about assessment rubrics. It would be good if the (eventual) assessment rubrics have similar forms. They will continue working on this.

   A CCI/C meeting will need to spend significant time on assessment rubrics in preparation for the 10/13 meeting.

3. Review and approve the augmented designation procedures

   Comments, corrections to be directed to Jim. He will be meeting with UEPC on 10/17 to discuss to receive their feedback on our procedures. He assumes the current lack of feedback to be implicit approval.

4. Review and discussion of the draft designation rubrics.

   A considerable time was spend on this. Comments and areas of discussion included

   - Format of Common Good form is good, as is it clear on how top (teaching) and bottom (learning) of form differ in purpose.

   - The Artistic Understanding forms description of 'insuffficient' and 'sufficient' is likely very helpful.

   - "Artifact" is probably a bad word, it seems to confuse working group members. 'Evidence' is maybe better

   - The Math/Science working group struggled to articulate 'insufficient'.

   - Remember that proposers (departments and programs) have the responsibility to make the case for their courses. It is not our job to search and guess our way through their applications. On the other hand, we've been clear that working groups are to assist departments/programs when they are making honest attempts but have weaknesses or misunderstandings in their proposals.

   - Concern that the Theological Understanding draft is too specific. It appears that each of the laundry list of items must be part of the course, which is an over-reading of the Senate learning outcome and rationale language. Instead, give exemplary things. What is primary (crucial), and what is secondary? A long check list is not good.

   - Sometimes a working group will need to break out single learning outcomes into several pieces, othertimes not.

- Several CCI/C members agreed to draft sample applications, to provide examples for departments and programs.

- Some suggested that working groups should define sufficient and insufficient. Indicate 'how many of these' to do. Use words like primary, integral, secondary, interwoven.

  Others felt this was difficult, that the terms should be thought of as intuitively clear, and that the feedback the working group will give the proposer will in effect define them.

- It was pointed out that we face the difficulty of creating 'formal law' since we have a complete lack of 'case law'. We will be operating in good faith, but won't really know how we did until we did it. This is a work in progress, and all will have to understand this.

- The designation rubric provides a method for communicating with proposer.

- Having a "comments" box valuable.

- Jim considers the following recommendations to have been adopted by consensus:
  - We will use the term *Feedback Form* and not 'designation rubric'. This is not about grading, but is a method for shaping the communication between proposer and WG.
  - WG's have the option of defining sufficient and insufficient, as well as the option to leave these terms as primitives.
  - Each Feedback Form should have a 'comments' box for each learning outcome segment, to be used by the WG to communicate with the proposer.

5. Discussion of related designation concerns

- Which courses should be in core? It was agreed that we should welcome all EtW courses, whether lower or upper division. For PtK, when are upper division courses ok? It seems that frosh and sophomore courses should be eligible for core, less so jr/sr.

- Discussion about pre-reqs. Should core courses have them? Or be prevented from doing so?

- Suggestion that putting frosh into upper division core courses leads to attrition. That it is better for frosh to be courses that are intended for frosh.

- Suggestion that 'courses that are designed for first year students' (not the current 'routinely taken by') is the proper descriptive language. We want frosh in courses that are at a level appropriate. Jim will make the necessary changes in the documents.

- Keep in mind advising – faculty need to know how to help students choose classes.

- Need to support small departments, which often draw area req fulfillers into upper division courses.

- Could 'eng 5 or instructors consent" be allowed as pre-req for upper division core courses? For some.

- Could courses be listed at *FC* and *OC*, meaning Frosh Core (courses appropriate for first year students) and Other Core?

- Continued concern about disciplinary expertise. Should this be in feedback form? The sense was that the statement 'the chair affirms that department has sufficient academically qualified personel to teach the learning outcomes' would need to be accepted. Note

that the dean will also need to sign off on the proposal, and that the WG will not consider proposal until the dean does so.

Jim notes that in extraordinary cases, the CCC has the authority to reject proposals. Further, just as we expect the faculty to assume our work will be done in good faith, so too should we make this assumption of them.

- While the ideal is for *all* students to achieve *all* lo's, this is not a realistic expectation. Instead we will be building targets, e.g. 70% of students should meet ....

6. Presentations

- Core Curriculum and Junior Faculty. 9/14. Jim, Rebecca J, Cynthia.
  Seemed to go well, about 15 faculty present. Lots of good questions afterwards.
- Zach and/or Jim to give brief updates to the Tug Chairs, SoS Chairs, SEBA Chairs, and SoLA Chairs in the coming weeks.
- Core Curriculum for Department Chairs.
  Community time presentations by Jim (and others?) on 9/21 and 9/28 during community time. Open to all faculty.

7. From which students will assessment artifacts be gathered?

Note: we assume we will have assistance for copying, scanning and uploading paper. Faculty shouldn't have to do this.

Note: WASC is moving toward 'learning communities' - schools with similar goals, which will expect (and help) with benchmarking.

After discussion it was agreed that our current language ('faculty should expect') which indicates faculty agree to upload, if requested, is satisfactory for now.

8. Additional representatives.

Jane, Vidya and Rebecca J interviewed 3 potential student representatives. One seems a stand out. Jane will recommend the student to ASSMC for their approval.

Sam Agronow (as temporary representative of the potentially soon to exist assessment office) and Sharon Walter (library representative) are joining the CCC. Welcome!