

CCC Meeting
November 20, 2024
1:30 – 2:50 PM
Trenton Hall Room 201

Minutes

Attendees: Chris Ault, Jean Graham, June Kim, Rita King, Kevin Michels, Mary Mungroo, Kit Murphy, Nina Ringer, Andrea Salgian, Stephen Tomkiel

1. [Review of 11/6/24 Minutes](#)
 - a. Approved
2. Updates from Faculty Senate College Core discussions
 - a. Concerns about omissions of History; Literary, Visual, Performing Arts; Diversity and Inclusion
 - b. Advocacy for some form of learning outcome reflecting creative expression; artistic pursuits; critical reading
 - c. Current proposed learning outcomes appear to reflect STEM more than other disciplinary areas
 - d. Suggestion to divide outcomes into skills / perspectives
 - e. Drafted outcomes are still a work in progress, more updates to come
 - f. Pending testimony from FYE committee
 - g. Intended / ideal role of College Core in guiding students to coursework outside of their major?
 - h. When faculty senate draft of outcomes is finalized, it will be routed through CCC and other governance bodies
 - i. Appropriateness of designing outcomes before structure?
 - i. Ex. structures for building community among students

- ii. Faculty senate only looking at outcomes, CCC, other groups will be tasked with proposing structures after outcomes have been proposed
 - j. FYE committee still gathering info, no current proposals
- 3. Proposal Reviews
 - a. [MEC 263 - Mechanical Engineering Laboratory I](#)
 - i. Mid-Level Writing Intensive - Updated Materials
 - b. Approved
- 4. Discussion - Considering constraints / guidelines for utilization of AI in Writing Intensive courses
 - a. AI constraints / issues
 - i. Facilitating learning of grammar; critical thinking
 - ii. Students will lose something if they rely on AI as a crutch in their writing
 - iii. What should students know before they start utilizing AI?
 - iv. Quality of AI tools remains in question
 - 1. Pulling in inaccuracies, biases, etc. from internet sources
 - v. Rules around use of AI may not be enforceable, AI utilization may not be detectable
 - vi. Courses / disciplines may need their own AI statements
 - b. AI benefits
 - i. Time saver

- ii. It doesn't have to be human v AI
 - 1. AI can augment human work, leading to better overall results
- iii. Teach AI utilizations, show constraints in the classroom environment
 - 1. Teaching prompt engineering skills, back-end revision skills
- c. Applications / Implications for Writing-Intensive course review process
 - i. Proposal to add a Yes/No question to application form to ensure that WI courses have an AI policy. CCC would not evaluate AI policy beyond its presence on syllabus
- d. Tabled formal vote on incorporating AI statement in WI app process, will revisit during 12/4 meeting