

C&I FCC meeting, 1/18/08 3:30-5
Walsh Administration & Finance Conference Room

In attendance were Phyllis Brown, John Hawley, Teresia Hinga, Lisa Kealhofer, Scott LaBarge, Arthur Liebscher, Barbara Molony, and Andrea Pappas.

1. The committee discussed and accepted Scott LaBarge's recommendation (email 14 January 2008; text reproduced below) and Andrea Pappas recommendation (reproduced below) for changes in wording in the Bulletin description, the Guidelines for Honoraria, the Guidelines for Approval of C & I Courses, and the Goals, Objectives, and Guidelines documents. [Phyllis sent copies of the revised documents to Diane Jonte-Pace.]
2. The committee discussed the request from Diane Jonte-Pace and Carol Gittens that the objectives for C & I courses be revised to reflect the differences between the two courses in the sequences. The topic resurfaced in connection with discussion of individual honorarium proposals. The committee agreed to look for patterns that might emerge from the honorarium proposals that can be reflected in revised student learning objectives. Concern was expressed that assessment needs should not restrict pedagogical decisions because learning (and teaching) opportunities might be occluded by insistence on uniformity in learning objectives and assessment plans.

Ideas for differentiation of learning objectives for the two courses included wording such as "through various assignments (to be determined by the instructors) students will demonstrate deepened insights or capacity for deeper analysis of issues related to the course themes."

3. Barbara and Phyllis reported very briefly on plans for a C & I summer workshop 25-27 June 2008 (date changed to avoid overlap with the Civic Engagement summer workshop).
4. The committee cursorily reviewed the 15 proposals for C & I honoraria. There was agreement that all have merit. The committee agreed to read the proposals more carefully before the next FCC meeting.
5. Review of the WASC rubric was deferred to the next meeting, Friday February 8, 3:30-5, same place.

Respectfully submitted,
Phyllis Brown

LaBarge recommendation:

I still would like to revisit the description of model B sequences in the "criteria" document. I don't think the present description does enough to distinguish model B from model A. Why not "construction of western culture in its global context" rather than "Western integrations with global culture"? I think the former is more inclusive of different strategies for building a model B sequence and better captures the connection to the old Western Culture sequences that some faculty will be retooling. Both bits of language come from the Core document.

Cultures & Ideas FCC

[from Andrea Pappas]

RE: Changes in wording of info requested for Course Descriptions/Proposal for Honoraria from 12/19/07 to 1/14/08.

Two issues;

1) Old: Item #5 (bullets 3&4) ask

- What global context(s) will be central to the courses?
- What Western contexts(s) will be central to the courses?

New: Course Approval Process (bullets 4&5) ask

- What are the global contexts (at least two), and how will they be made explicit?
- What are the connections to Western culture, and how will they be elucidated?

I think this language in the second bullet in the new document should be parallel to the first—right now it sounds like a question for Series A courses.

I suggest:

If this is a Series A sequence:

- What are the global contexts (at least two), central to the courses and how will they be made explicit?
- What are the appropriate connections to Western culture, and how will they be elucidated?

If this is a Series B sequence:

- What Western contexts (at least two) will be central to the courses and how will they be made explicit?
- What are the appropriate connections to the global context and how will they be made explicit?

2) Bulletin description:

- Current bulletin language for C&I courses says, regarding Sequence B, “emphasizes integration with world cultures.” I think this is potentially confusing to faculty trained as historians because of the word “emphasize.” (To someone not privy to all our discussion I think it sounds like the course is supposed to concern *only* those connections.) I like Scott’s suggestion, “construction of Western Culture in its global context” –I think it is clearer and more user-friendly.