CCS 101 Advisory Council Minutes
Wednesday, 4/27/2022, 2:30 – 4:30p.m. on Webex

In Attendance: Jill Rushbrook (CSCC), Samantha Gonzalez (MCC), Jennifer White (NCCC) Jaime Hammond & Lou Lombard (NVCC), Maria Buchta (NCC), Rebecca Samberg (HCC), Lisa Braverman (CCC), Emily Canto (MXCC), Rose-Mary Rodrigues (GCC), Michaela Mullarkey & Amely Cross (ACC), Marguerite Yawin & Alva Hanson (TxCC), Rhonda Spaziani (TRCC)

Voting Members Absent: Laura McCarthy (NCCC), Brian Clinton & Kevin Davis (QVCC), Bridget Mullally (GCC), Julia Rosenblatt (CCC)

Ex Officio Members in Attendance: Caitlin Boger Hawkins (IR), Joe Cullen (Assessment)

Ex Officio Members Absent: Kerry Beckford (DEI), Forrest Helvie (PD)

Special Guest: Manuel Gomez, co-chair Diversity Outcomes Working Group (DOWG)

1. The minutes for 3/30/22 Council meeting were reviewed and unanimously approved. Samantha Gonzales motioned, and Michaela Mullarkey seconded.

2. A welcome was extended to new council members: Julia Rosenblatt from CCC; Jen White from NCCC; Amely Cross from ACC

3. Campus updates related to first year/college success and transitioning to CCS 101
   - ACC, Michaela Mullarkey, Amely Cross-no updates
   - CCC, Lisa Braverman, Julia Rosenblatt-no updates
   - GCC, Bridget Mullahly, Rose-Mary Rodrigues-no updates
   - HCC, Becky Samberg-they will not be piloting a business section in the fall. The business chair was concerned about enrollments and decided to table the roll out for the time being.
   - MCC, Samantha Gonzalez-no updates
   - MxCC, Emily Canto-no updates
   - NVCC, Jaime Hammond, Lou Lombard -they will be piloting a 3 credit CCS 101 in Spring 2023.
   - NCCC, Laura McCarthy, Jen White- no updates
   - NCC, Maria Buchta- no updates
   - QVCC, Brian Clinton, Kevin Davis-not in attendance
   - TRCC, Rhonda Spaziani-no updates
   - TxCC, Marguerite Yawin, Alva Hanson-no updates

4. Ex officio items
   a. Caitlin Boger Hawkins (IR)-data committee provided estimates for Fall 2022 semester CCS 101/FYE sections. The resulting recommendations are more relevant for Fall 2023 and Spring 2023 than Fall 2022. The anticipated FYE sections per campus are attached. These numbers are estimates and will need to be revisited. These projections are based on expected enrollments. There are two sets of numbers for fall and spring semesters—highs and lows by campus. Campuses may want to aim for a midpoint in the range provided. There could be an increase in overall PACT (PACT may be extending to part time options) and Guided Pathways enrollments by increasing retention rates. We may have legacy students that will also need this course.
      i. There were concerns considered about having the available rooms on campus for all of these sections.
      ii. These projections were based on enrollment of 20 students per section. The approved proposal was for a cap for 20-22 enrollees per section, but there may be some additional wiggle room.
iii. Additionally, they surveyed all degree students via a texted link in March regarding preferred instructional modality. Students without cell phones were emailed. The sample size was 5% but assessed 1,400 students, which is a decent sample.

iv. Students surveyed for preferred modality of instruction didn’t have a preference of time-of-day (see attached).

v. Anecdotal evidence shows that traditional aged students want more in person options. 75% preferring in person sections than continuing students.

vi. Can look at data in terms of traditional student vs nontraditional student modality preferences going forward.

vii. Discussion: It was noted that staffing issues will arise with all students taking the course in the first 9 credits. This course will be recommended in the first semester; however, all students won’t take it in their first semester. This may present adjunct staffing issues in the spring when there are not enough sections to offer all instructors. Each coordinator must talk with campus academic leadership to assess local staffing needs. Academic leadership has been made aware of these potential staffing issues. Ideally, CCS 101 coordinators should dialog with advisors and impress upon them that students need to take CCS 101 in the first year.

b. Joe Cullen (Assessment) drafted a rubric for an exemplar assignment and will share it to the Council for feedback

5. Manuel Gomez co-chair (DOWG) Diversity Outcome Working Group— update on Diversity Outcomes-
   a. Shared a working draft of diversity outcomes. Refined 3 outcomes and changed language (see attached). They should send recommendations to Students First Academic Affairs by next month. Working group concluded that a course must meet 2 of the 3 outcomes. The group may create rubrics for outcomes. CCS 101 proposed to meet only 1 but now we are being advised that we must meet 2 of them.
   b. The outcomes will be finalized by the end of May.
   c. Campuses have been waiting for the outcomes prior to piloting the course. The SF ASA CC will establish next steps once it reviews the recommendations from DOWG.
   d. Discussion: Concern was articulated that CCS 101 is being held to a different standard than other courses and perhaps the diversity outcome should not be met in this course. There is a movement in the National Resources of FYE to support the diversity outcome. The earlier students understand diversity issues, the better. CCS 101 instructors will need to be trained and work with the experts to develop assignments around this topic. The course proposal has already been approved with the diversity outcome, so the Council will work collaboratively to ensure it is met in the best way possible.

6. Recommendation on Contextualized Sections of CCS 101
   a. Jill shared final edits and the Council approved. Rhonda Spaziani made a motion to approve. Emily Canto seconded it.
   b. Communication plan- The form should go to the campus coordinator for review of requested added sections.

7. Use of Common Assignments and Exemplars-- Curriculum & Assessment subcommittee-developed exemplars for academic and career plans.
   a. Discussion: If we’re going to require a common assignment (Career & Academic Plan), we shouldn’t call it exemplar but “required” assignment. Maybe provide “sample” assignments rather than “exemplar” assignments. With a lot of training and evaluation, we should provide flexibility.
b. We are looking at student mastery of gen ed. It enables us to use a standard metric to evaluate the course and allows us to assess student learning outcomes specific to the course. A common rubric is critical. Each instructor can shape and scaffold it differently. Benefits of having common assignments are immense. Joe Cullen shared that common assignments in CCS 101 are critical because we are responsible for assessing three things: 1) Student mastery of course objectives, 2) Student mastery of two gen-ed learning outcomes, and 3) the success of a program (CCS 101 in not just a course, it is a BOR-mandated program with a unique mission). If we do not have some standard metrics that are embraced by all of the faculty who teach the course, then it may be very difficult to accomplish these functions.

c. We want to support instructors so they can best teach the course. Academic and career plans are very helpful. Model assignments can be developed, and if faculty want to significantly change it, as long as the rubric can accurately score it, then the data can be aggregated for all sections. It can be a backwards design practice.

d. All the Gen Ed rubrics will be evaluated during the consolidation. They’re living documents and change all the time. At some point there will be a system wide platform to upload gen ed assignments.

e. Use the FIRC Info Literacy rubric and integrate it into the career competency assignment. The Gen Ed Diversity outcomes could be handled the same way.

f. Wording of the use of “required” assignment and “samples” was tabled for next meeting

8. Course Syllabus Template for CCS 101 – Edits from training were incorporated. Council should review and provide any feedback for meeting in May.

   a. **Curriculum Development and Assessment** – present plan on use of assignments/exemplars—hasn’t met.
   b. **Professional Development/Learning** – present PD plan for Fall 2022 and Spring 2023—focused on phase III, faculty onboarding. Fall 2022, they would like to develop an asynchronous first step. It could go out to both current instructors and those interested in teaching CCS 101. The subcommittee felt that this training would be mandatory for anyone wanting to teach the course. Jill could provide a recorded introduction. The subcommittee would provide the syllabus and talk about the Council. The second step is that instructors would attend an on campus or LRON training. It was discussed that the LRON course be created by each coordinator. Coordinators could meet and review feedback. Faculty are putting in their AR requests right now, it would be a good time to incorporate these activities into proposals. It is anticipated that a series of workshops will be required to complete in Fall 2022/ Spring 2023. The timeline will need to be dialed in. Individual campuses can determine if the trainings are in person or remote.
   c. **Quality of Instruction** – presented drafts of job descriptions for CCS 101 instructor (FT and PT)— Review and provide feedback for May meeting. The CCS 101 job description will not be the generic adjunct job description as it’s not a known discipline.
   d. **Data/Student Success Measurement** – presented updated data on estimates of sections per campus and survey findings- (see Caitlin’s notes).
   e. **Policy Clarification & Implementation** – no updates

10. Future Meeting - Wednesday, May 25th – 2:30-4:30 pm Webex

   Minutes submitted by Rhonda Spaziani