CBL Working Group Meeting (CBLWG)
Wednesday, January 13, 2011 // Mattin 161, 12:00 pm

In Attendance: Gia Grier McGinnis, Linda DeLibero, Mindi Levin, Claude Guillemand, Tristan Davies, Jim Goodyear, Kimmy Puccetti, Amy Bachman, Susan Chase

I. Tristan reported on meeting w/Steven David
   1. Prepare to present a proposal to Curriculum Committee in February (or whichever meeting occurs after proposal is finished)
   2. Generally in favor of CBL, Dean David suggested forming this into an academic program; felt it would be easy to do

II. General Challenges/ Things to Consider for CBL
   1. What are we trying to achieve?
   2. What kind of support would faculty need?
   3. Seen as a program, discipline or under broader umbrella?
   4. Expansion of CBL courses would be much more resource-intensive
   5. Much more one-on-one or small group attention needed for CBL classes
   6. More TA’s would be needed/a possibility to require CBL students to TA?
   7. More JHU staff and/or faculty interfacing with community partners
   8. Outside funding might be needed—perhaps from alumni/development’s efforts?
   9. Preparing students to go into the community would require resources, too
   10. Funding often goes to graduate programs—need to demonstrate benefits to undergrads and encourage undergraduate program gifting

III. The Proposal: Selling CBL
   1. Need to convey that experiential education is an relevant academic exercise (“practice matters”) and that CBL is a pedagogical model very different from traditional classroom instruction
   2. Define CBL as measurable and competency-building and as benefiting the learning experience of JHU students as seen in medicine, public health and social work
   3. Common thread: classes choose to partner outside of campus; strong reflection to link community work to learning objectives
   4. CBL fits under many programs (“beyond discipline”); a way to promote cross-disciplinary work
   5. Can site research (Furco and Kolb) to distance CBL from non-CBL internships (which are not valued as academic activities on this campus)
   6. Baltimore is a city with many NGO’s, government agencies—should take advantage of the potential opportunities for applied work and collaboration

Discuss two program models that could be proposed...

IV. Option I: CBL as an Academic Program
   1. It would be something that dean’s and faculty/students can conceptualize administratively (course designation, quality control for classes).
   2. Gateway to inspire and motivate faculty to expand to CBL—perhaps monetary incentives
   3. Vehicle to develop new courses designed for CBL or incorporate CBL into existing classes
   4. Would need to grapple with accreditation issues
   5. Have existing courses that could serve as core courses for a minor
6. Program name to include growth to overseas, rural vs. urban, etc (ex. community studies/urban studies)
7. Could require 1 CBL course for practical learning in grassroots setting and 1 CBL within government agency
8. Student leadership can be developed through TA opportunities/training

V. Option II: Academic Center
1. Center could be under CSC’s wing- CSC move from purely Student Life to also have academic reporting (how easy would that be?); model similar to other institutions
2. Center could also be stand alone but would you be creating another silo? Harder for community to navigate?
3. Center would provide administrative support for faculty (trainings, faculty fellow programs etc.)
4. Staff support for course development (mentoring for faculty, additional support for placement management)
5. Structural example: Bloomberg Center for Global Health-a clearinghouse of programs
6. Could do some of the things a program could do, but would need outside funding to sustain it

VI. What next?
1. Working Group is ready to make something happen while administrative climate is favorable!
2. Look into models of other institutions
3. Call to work on proposal (call time/date TBD; look for e-mail from Gia)
4. Smaller group meet again with Steven David before taking it to committee