Present: Caitlin Boger-Hawkins, Maria Buchta, Emily Canto, Joseph Cullen, Jaime Hammond, Alva Hanson, Forrest Helvie, Lou Lombard, Bridget Mullally, Michaela Mularkey, Rose-Mary Rodrigues, Jill Rushbrook, Becky Samberg, Rhonda Spaziani, Marguerite Yawin.

1. Welcome & Approval of Minutes:
   a. Minutes from 2/23/2022 were unanimously approved

2. Volunteer for minutes – Rhonda leaving early:
   a. Joe Cullen volunteered to take minutes

3. Campus updates related to first year/college success and transitioning to CCS 101:
   a. Louis Lombard from NVCC reported that his campus would be offering an honors FYE class this fall. NVCC is also exploring discipline specific FYE classes.
   b. Emily Canto from MxCC reported that her campus is considering developing an honors FYE class.
   c. Marguerite Yawin from TxCC reported that her campus will task guided pathways advisors with advising students into sections of CCS 101 that are specific to their career paths. TxCC is also hiring a full time FYE Instructor. They are currently reviewing 95 applications.

4. Ex officio items:
   a. Caitlin Boger Hawkins (IR) shared that a system-wide course modality preference survey has been completed. There were over 1400 responses. She will be sharing the results with the Advisory Council in the near future.

5. Timeline Talk – Jill R. reaffirmed the following:
   a. Discipline Coordinators should be confirmed in positions no later than early Fall 2022
   b. Sections need to be planned/scheduled per campus in Fall 2022 and finalized by early Spring 2023
   c. Recruiting, hiring, and staffing in Fall 2022 and Spring 2023
   d. Information session training (for those interested) in Fall 2022 along with other outcome-based training – hopefully with Christine Harrington
   e. Required training for new (hired) instructors no later than Spring 2023

6. Designated/Contextualized Section of CCS 101 Recommendation:
   a. The committee reviewed the newly updated draft policy on designated/contextualized sections of CCS 101.
   b. The policy now includes a form that asks for key information such as the credentials of the instructor(s), projected enrollment data, rationale for dedicated section, how it will benefit students, and how it will be contextualized.
   c. Emphasis is placed on the key provision that the course be designed so that student meet essential course outcomes even if they do not continue to pursue the discipline to which the course has been aligned.
   d. Members of the Advisory Council offered several suggestions for wording and formatting, including edits to how the questions are phrased on the “designated section request form”.
   e. Jill shared that with the current crosswalk work, faculty are now starting to recognize that CCS 101 will be a permanent part of their program. This has prompted interest in developing designated sections that can be used to reinforce PLOs.
   f. One issue noted by several members of the committee is that CCS 101 is not listed as a Gen-Ed core course. This is because programs have the option to include it as either a Gen-Ed course or a program requirement.
g. In any event, emphasis initially should be on the development of general sections. Academic Deans have been advised to be cautious about encouraging or approving contextualized sections.

h. A second draft of the policy will be presented at the next meeting to review and, hopefully, approve.

7. Student Exemption Guidelines for CCS 101 – Time Sensitive
   a. Jill R. presented the student exemption policy and guidelines in detail, including how they apply to students who start but do not finish their degrees in legacy programs, transfer students; and students who enter after July 1, 2023.
   b. For transfer and legacy students, the threshold for waiving the requirements is 24 credits. Some felt that it should be 30 credits.
   c. Concern was expressed about having liberal waiver/substitution requirements because they may undermine enrollment in the course and create extensive paperwork.
   d. If a student is granted a waiver or substitution, then it is necessary to assure that (s)he will complete coursework that addresses all Gen-Ed Learning Outcomes, including the Information Literacy and Diversity outcomes that are embedded in CCS 101.
   e. The requirement that students take it within their first 9 credits was also discussed. Since this requirement will not be built into Banner in terms of a registration hold, it will be difficult to enforce.
   f. A general rule was proposed that exceptions apply primarily to legacy and transfer students. New students admitted after July 1, 2022, should be expected to take it in within the first nine credits (ideally in either their first or second semester).
   g. A suggestion was made to create an option for a student to submit a proposal to substitute another course for CCS 101. These proposals would be reviewed by academic deans and either approved or denied. It was pointed out that this may not be necessary as this option already exists. Encouraging individuals to seek a waiver may not help with adhering to policy and having as many students take this course as possible to help them be successful.
   h. A vote on raising the threshold from 24 to 30 credits was inconclusive. Members of the Advisory Council voted on and approved the proposed Student Exemption Policy with recognition that it will need to be reviewed for effectiveness.

8. CCS 101 Common Assignments and Exemplar Options– Discussion:
   a. Members of the Advisory Council reported being unable to view Joe Cullen’s presentation The Case for Common Assessments 3.10.22.mp4. To correct this problem, Joe agreed to repost the video in the Council’s MS Teams folder.
   b. Some members of the Council expressed opposition to common assignments. In response, Joe C. reviewed the reasons for using common assignments and assured the Council that instructors would have the ability to scaffold them as they saw fit. The key elements of common assignments are that they address the same learning outcomes, have a similar design and set of deliverables, and can be scored with a common rubric.
   c. An analogy was made with ENG 101, which requires that students across all sections complete an expository essay. While this is common assignment, it is scaffolded differently by different instructors, each according to his/her professional judgement. However, all instructors are expected to use a common grading rubric to grade the assignment. This assures that the results can be compared across sections.
   d. It is was agreed that the subcommittee for Curriculum and Assessment will come up with language on how to use any developed exemplars or common assignments. The council will review this recommendation next meeting and vote.

9. Repository Submissions:
   a. Jill R. reiterated that she is building repositories of instructional materials that will be made available to all CCS 101 instructors. Members of the Advisory Council were encouraged to submit activities and assignments that can be added to these repositories. Jill will be sending out communication for the rest of the semester to prompt submissions aligned with each outcome of CCS 101.
10. Members of the Council were reminded of the 2-hour professional development session: Developing a Master Course Syllabus for CCS 101 scheduled for Friday, 4/22 from 2-4 pm.

11. Subcommittee reports were deferred until the next meeting. In the meantime, subcommittees can share any updates on Teams and via Email.

12. Next council meeting is Wednesday, April 27th.

Submitted by Joe Cullen.