Present: Kristina Allende, Stacy Bacigalupi, Glenda Bro, Teresa DeLaby, Mike Dowdle, Marlene Gallarde, Solene Halabi, Hal Hoffman, Luisa Howell, Jim Jenkins, Carolyn Kuykendall, Elizabeth Lobb, Bob Stuard, Jeanne Marie Velickovic, John Vitullo

Item	Comments/Discussion/Outcome
Minutes	Minutes for November were approved as submitted
Announcements/Reminders	<ul> <li>Division Winter Retreat will be held 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on January 24<sup>th</sup></li> <li>Division ranking of faculty RTFs will be done at our first meeting of the Fall Semester, and the Chairs were asked to make sure their departments vet those requests by their last department meetings of the Spring Semester</li> <li>By mid-Spring, the Chairs will be given a set of criteria to be used in ranking faculty RTFs, and it will be a blind process without discussion</li> <li>Chairs were asked to think about technology and instructional equipment needs, as we will also be ranking those sometime in Fall</li> <li>Instruction is now looking at technology and instructional equipment needs based on last year's PIE; this is the starting point – not our requests – and the Chairs were reminded of the importance of those needs being reflected in PIE</li> <li>The College is probably behind on FTES this year, and we should find out what we need to add to the Spring schedule by sometime in early Winter</li> <li>Classroom computers in 26A, 26B, and 26D are being reimaged for Windows 7, as XP will no longer be supported by Microsoft</li> <li>For the last 2½ years, the HSS Division PIE has included a replacement priority system for classroom lab computers (Psychology, American Language, The Writing Center); based on IT's assessment of which computers are likely to fail first, the AmLa lab is at the top of our list</li> <li>Over the next year, IT will begin replacing faculty computers that are determined to be unsalvageable</li> <li>The Chairs were thanked for their hard work on Curriculum, and hardly anything from our division</li> </ul>
Honors Task Force Update	Jim asked Carolyn Kuykendall to report on the results of the initial Honors Task Force meeting that was commissioned to look at honors rigor. The task force tried to define rigor and concluded that rigor, enrichment, and harder are independent terms with different meanings. They then came up with examples of what constitutes rigor, with the understanding that not all suggestions will work for every discipline (see attached notes). Jim has asked the task force to meet again to talk about specific ways we might build academic skills, to further explore what would make interdisciplinary coursework and linked classes successful, and maybe come up with some ideas for best practices.

Respectfully Submitted,

Teresa DeLaby Administrative Secretary Notes from Humanities and Social Science Task Force on Rigor in Honors Classes Members: Andrea Diem, Gary Enke, Misty Kolchakian, Charis Louie, Carolyn Kuykendall

## 1. Definition of rigor

- a. The task force agreed that rigor, enrichment, and harder are independent terms with different meanings
  - i. Harder is not necessarily rigor—it might be represented by a longer paper assignment
  - ii. Rigor reflects such ideas as using primary texts, providing assignments that involve critical thinking and analysis
- b. Stacked classes can be enriching for both honors and non-honors students, however the preference is for pure honors courses. Honors students generally read the homework assigned, talk in class. This is not always the case in a general classroom.
- c. The course outline of record should reflect the rigor of an honors course. It might also be a good idea to check on the pre-req for honors courses.

## 2. What constitutes rigor?

- a. Primary research, conducted by students if applicable
- b. Use of primary texts, sources, again if applicable to the discipline
- c. Use of Bloom's taxonomy verbs—higher levels
  - i. Exams should require more synthesizing, evaluation, compare/contrast, explanation
  - ii. Define/give an example are not appropriate for an honors assignment
    - 1. Caveat: instructors do need to include scaffolding, to explain and define concepts, but have students build on those concepts
- d. Presentation of research—student's own and/or that of others
- e. In the classroom—give students more responsibility
  - i. Ask for student examples of concepts
  - ii. Have small group discussion that promote critical thinking
  - iii. Use a more Socratic method rather than pure lecture: explain, analyze, apply
- f. If applicable, use theme based courses
- g. Can grade for participation (suggested 10-15% of course grade)
- h. Students should not just receive, regurgitate information; they should create something
  - i. Students should be active versus passive consumers of information
  - ii. They should be cultivating curiosity and creativity
  - iii. They should be given choices of how to create—film, debates, etc.
- 3. Interdisciplinary coursework/stand alone, linked classes/online courses
  - a. Offer a first year honors seminar
    - i. Course content is basis for writing and discussion

- ii. Each discipline might be focus for one week
- iii. Might look at a model of a learning community class, located in Area E, Life Long learning
- iv. Look into a library course for honors
- v. Follow the Humanities model
  - 1. Two teachers teach a course for 2 semester, each gets paid for one semester, each might grade a specific cohort all the way through the semester; one might lecture, the other might lead discussion (1.5 LHE each semester for the shared class)
- b. Note: Team teaching linked classes "kills schedules" and students don't seem to like this model—they get tired.

## 4. Concerns:

- a. Filling classes—but stacked classes are not a bad experience. Often students who are not in honors feel that they can be honors students.
- b. Longer paper assignments do not constitute an honors experience unless there is sufficient reason for the added length
- c. How do we create interdisciplinary courses in our current curriculum environment