

**Core Curriculum Review Committee**  
**September 12, 2012**  
**Raynor 301**  
**Minutes**

**In Attendance:** Ball, Barrington, Belknap, Dabney, Karkheck, Kim, Knox [sub for Paxton], McAvoy, Sanders, Schultz, Shuter, Su, Wadsworth

Meeting called to order at 3:32 PM by Su. Reflection offered by Su.

Approval of minutes: none.

**Updates:**

1. Core assessment development grants.
  - a. 15 grants awarded.
  - b. Rubrics currently being developed. CCRC will vote whether or not to approve later this semester.
  - c. AY 2011-12 knowledge area assessment: Rhetoric, Mathematical Reasoning
  - d. AY 2012-13 knowledge area assessment: Histories of Cultures and Societies (Contact: Meissner), Human Nature and Ethics (Contact: Franco)

**Ongoing Business:** [Response to UBUS recommendations for the UCCS: tabled until next time]

**New Business:**

1. Members introduced.
  - Sabbatical absence: rep from the College of Business.
  - Roster and meeting schedule reviewed. Additional absences and conflicts were noted and corrected.

2. Overview of the University Core of Common Studies (UCCS) and Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC).

Su reviewed and responded to questions concerning the Core and the charge of the CCRC. Members were referred to the Core website and Statutes of the University Academic Senate. Reaccreditation process will begin Sept. 2013. The Core has been identified as a particular concern.

Broad discussion of assessment process, including how and where to assess Integrated Core Learning Outcomes (ICLO's), and aims of the CCRC for the next three years.

Su presented an overview of the two-tier, four-year cycle of Core assessment.

3. Su presented the 2012 annual report, requesting that members review it for the next meeting, identifying any points they would like to pursue.

4. Drafts of policy documents introduced:

- UCCS Knowledge Area Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
- UCCS Integrated Core Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

These drafts have been reviewed by Sharon Ronnco, Gary Meier, and Sarah Feldner. CCRC to review and discuss these at the next meeting with the aim of recommending revisions.

5. Subcommittees assigned. Subcommittees to report findings at next meeting.

- Rhetoric Knowledge Area assessment report: Wadsworth (point person), Kim, McAvoy
- Mathematical Reasoning area assessment report: Sanders (point person), Karkheck, Ball

Motion to adjourn by Karkheck, seconded by McAvoy. Meeting adjourned at 5:00.

Minutes respectfully submitted by

Sarah Wadsworth

**Core Curriculum Review Committee**  
**September 26, 2012**  
**Raynor 301**  
**Minutes**

**In Attendance:** Ball, Barrington, Feldner, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, Kranz, Mc Avoy, Paxton, Sanders, Scanlan, Schultz, Su, Wadsworth

Meeting called to order at 3:35 PM by Su. Reflection offered by Sanders.

Minutes approved.

**Updates:** Simpson-Scarborough survey circulating among different stakeholders. Of special interest to the CCRC is that 5 groups reviewing 6 topics identified the Core of Common Studies as a defining aspect of an MU education. BUT in the next 5-10 years the same 5 groups identified innovation and potential instead of the CORE as important aspects of a MU education. However, innovation and potential were not defined or operationalized.

**Ongoing Business:** Response to UBUS recommendations for the UCCS.

**New Business:** Su moved review of Math reasoning & assessment agenda item to the beginning as Math Chair Gary Kranz was present.

**Robust discussion regarding math reasoning and assessment report:**

- Sample size
- Incorrect calculation of the developing met, exceeded categories on the rubric is an average of the percentages rather than cumulative percentages
- Identification of faculty names and courses connected to percent of students who are developing, meeting, or exceeding on the rubric could lead to evaluation of faculty performance instead of focusing on student learning
- Difficulty deciphering what is being measured i.e.
  - Are we measuring what students learn after taking the course?
  - Missing are pre-posttests, integration across courses, budget, personnel, and/or mechanisms to do pre-post...so we catch a snapshot of where the student is in a moment in time.
- Are students proficient in math when they graduate?
- These are course-based assessments & a major criticism by the Higher Ed. Commission last time was that our assessments were course-based
- Higher Ed. Accreditation wants quantitative analysis
- Suggestion: Engineering suggests selecting a few courses for assessment and construct problems for students to solve to determine if they possess enough knowledge in a particular area. Further, suggestion is to separate non-science from science majors to do math assessment accurately and with validity.

After many members questioned what we are hoping to measure the Chair of Math Dept. thinks Higher Ed. Commission will put the question back to us: "What do we want to be measuring & how will we measure that? Furthermore, after their last visit the Accreditation committee was displeased with MU's course-based assessment, no assessments in general and that it was too self-congratulatory.

**Major Questions:** Is our primary focus measuring improvement or end-point proficiency? What is our continuous improvement plan?

**Concluding Recommendations:**

1. Remove names, course sections, recalculate statistics to get cumulative percentages, and add sociology course. Use Moyers matrix in his syllabus in all math courses.
2. The assessment instrument should be designed to improve instruction and increase student learning.
3. There should be coherence of assessment questions across courses and ideally the same number of questions/answers assessed by instructors.

4. Operationalize outcomes so they can be connected to specific skills learned from a specific course.

**Motion to accept Math Reasoning Report SU:** 12 yea, 1 nay, 0 abstained.

**Discussion of Su's response to the Academic Senate' Recommendations:**

**Recommendation 1:** Learning outcomes need to be reconsidered, re-evaluated, sharpened to more easily measure.

If we are charged with developing a process to directly measure student learning then we need to directly measure learning not performance with multiple, time-sequenced measures, based on what UBUS wants. There was agreement that learning could be measured by measuring performance at different points. The process must match outcomes. There is confusion about terms i.e. student learning, learning outcomes. Core is meant to be a measure of minimum literacy. In that vein, MU does a very good job increasing humanities knowledge for science/math majors but MU does a poor job increasing science/math knowledge for humanities majors.

**Recommendation 2:** A budget and new structuring is necessary to fulfill the charge given to CCRC.

**Discussion:** Can we do away with knowledge outcomes & focus on integration? Core courses are 'bricks' for integration. Core Learning Outcomes should not be based on courses. Team teach to achieve structured integration i.e. i.e. create a module to integrate course content across units i.e. theology and ethics. Faculty should be compensated for constructing assessment tools. Could we do an exit survey with the students? Right now there are so many stakeholders with questions on this survey that it has turned into a huge task and very time-consuming to complete.

**Recommendation 3:** Keep the Diverse Culture requirement but assess Diverse Cultures courses so there is no incidental meeting of this requirement by accidentally taking another course.

**Motion to approve these recommendations:** Barrington seconded by Foster.

**Rhetoric Knowledge Area assessment report:** Because of limited time a summary of the completed by Wadsworth (point person), Kim, & McAvoy will be emailed to all CCRC members prior to the next meeting.

**Motion to adjourn:** Su seconded by McAvoy.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.**

Minutes respectfully submitted by Maureen Mc Avoy

**Next Meeting:** 10/10/12 in Raynor 301

**Core Curriculum Review Committee**  
**October 10, 2012**  
**Raynor 301**  
**Minutes**

In Attendance: Ball, Barrington, Dabney, Feldner, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, McAvoy, Paxton, Sanders, Scanlan, Schultz, Shuter, Su.

Meeting called to order at 3:30 PM by John Su. Reflection offered by Ruth Ann Belknap.

Minutes approved.

Updates:

- Regarding the 10/3 UBUS meeting to discuss the CCRC's response to their recommendations: The UBUS members seemed comfortable with the CCRC's response. They appear to be looking to the CCRC for guidance going forward. They seem more interested in measuring competency/performance at the end of a period of study than in measuring the amount of improvement that may have taken place during that period.

Ongoing business:

- Discussion of knowledge area learning outcome assessment reports:
  - mathematical reasoning subcommittee: Su met with Math Chair Gary Krenz, and Krenz felt that the data did not provide the math department a great deal to go on. Krenz also suggested that the questions could be redrafted to lead to more uniformity in the procedure. More revisions will be made, and they will be discussed with Krenz.
  - rhetoric subcommittee: The report was discussed, and reaction was very favorable. It would be desirable in the long run to be able to break down the data by college, though no one expected that this would be possible in the near future.

By a unanimous voice-call vote, the report was accepted.

- Discussion of knowledge area learning outcome and integrated core learning outcome policy documents
  - knowledge area learning outcome policy document: Discussion included questions regarding the possibility of moving back dates on the timeline. In particular, can deadlines be changed so that faculty are not required to work on these matters when they are not under contract? A motion was made that the 8/1 deadline be replaced with a 9/15 deadline—and that subsequent deadlines be pushed back as necessary. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

With this revision, the document was approved by a unanimous show of hands.

- integrated core learning outcome policy document: Discussion featured opinions on the following questions. Is it a problem that by no means all departments have capstone courses? How troubled should we be by the fact that our current data do not come from a representative sample of the student population? The prevailing view in the committee appeared to be that, with all its drawbacks, the current

procedure represents an advance over the methods used in the past—though the need for further improvement was clear to all. Discussion then turned to the issue of how a capstone course in one department could incorporate knowledge from other departments, and how an individual professor could assess this knowledge.

A motion was made to change the time period in which to invite feedback from the faculty who participated in the assessment process during a given academic year. Specifically, the motion called for moving the initial date of this invitation from 5/15 to 4/15 (with the end date of the period remaining 5/30). The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

With this revision, the document was approved by a show of hands: all in favor except for one abstention.

New business:

- Examination of draft rubrics for integrated core learning outcomes 1, 2, 4. Su asked committee members to look over this material and email to him any comments that might occur to them.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Alan Ball.

Next Meeting: 10/24/12 in Raynor 301.

**Core Curriculum Review Committee**  
**October 24, 2012**  
**Raynor 301**  
**Minutes**

In Attendance: Ball, Barrington, Feldner, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, McAvoy, Paxton, Sanders, Scanlan, Schultz, Shuter, Su, Wadsworth.

Meeting called to order at 3:30 PM by John Su. Reflection offered by John Karkheck.  
Previous meeting minutes approved.

Updates:

- The annual assessment report for the Integrated Core Learning Outcomes was submitted to the University Assessment Committee.
- The annual assessment report for knowledge areas (rhetoric and mathematical reasoning) is ready for submission; however, the on-line submission system is not ready for these knowledge areas.

Ongoing business:

- None

New business:

- The committee broke up into three groups to examine a draft of rubrics for the Integrated Core Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Homework for 11/14 Meeting

- “Integration signpost.” What modules/unit/assignments in the core courses in your area might connect with/build upon/anticipate elements of other core courses?
- Advising. How does undergraduate major advising work in your unit/department/college?
  - Who is responsible for ensuring that students select appropriate courses?
  - Are there curriculum maps for your undergraduates? Do students follow them?

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Kyle Kim.

Next Meeting: 11/14/12 in Raynor 301.

**Core Curriculum Review Committee**

Wednesday, 11/14/12

3:30-5:00 PM

**Raynor 301**

---

**Minutes**

Minutes: Scanlan

Reflection:

In Attendance: **Ball, Barrington, Feldner, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, Paxton, Sanders, Scanlan, Schultz, Shuter, Su.**  
Meeting called to order at 3:30 PM by John Su. Reflection offered by Barrington.

Previous meeting minutes unanimously approved.

Updates:

- **UBUS**
  - We discussed a possible charge to revise ICLOs (integrated core learner outcomes) which may be forthcoming.
  - This may involve an "external scan" of core curricula of peer/aspirational institutions.
  - In the coming months the CCRC will be laying the groundwork for this, perhaps generating 2-3 proposals.
  
- Su reported that the CCRC recommendations for revisions and suggestions for the knowledge area learning outcome assessment outcomes have been passed on to the respective departments.
- Schultz reported that a survey on the Core was conducted amongst students by MUSG. Lots of implications for advising are coming from this. The survey was general and the sample size was small, but if there are matters that seem pertinent to CCRC, Schultz will bring these forward.

Ongoing business:

- Discussed and voted on two University Core of Common Studies course proposals:
  1. to REMOVE from LPA requirement: COMM 2100 (visual communication)
    - Passed unanimously
  2. to MODIFY existing course for fulfilling Diverse Cultures requirement: renaming ADPR 4700 to COMM 4650 (attachment 3).
    - Passed unanimously

New business:

- Discussed homework (from last CCRC meeting, 10/24):
  - "Integration signposts." what modules/units/assignments in the core courses in your area might connect with/build upon/anticipate elements of other core courses?



- Engineering:
  - Courses: 1 course in civil engineering. Noted that at a previous university, there was an incentive for faculty to create core courses, while here there isn't.
  - Connections: none noted
- Human nature / ethics:
  - Courses: Human nature
  - Connections: This builds – on English
- Nursing
  - Courses: There is a diverse cultures course that is required. It serves primarily sophmores, but ranges. Lots of non-nursing students take this.
  - Connections: This could link with ethics (e.g., health disparities).
- Mathematical reasoning
  - Courses: Calc 1 & 2 build on each other
  - Connections: Connect to Physics in the core. Not to anything else in the core. Note: Mathematically reasoning courses are assumed to be foundational in the core.
- Health Sciences
  - Courses: Two classes in diverse cultures: cultural diversity and health (doesn't accept outside students) and a Physical Therapy course (also primarily just serves PT students). Anatomy (BISC 1010 and 1015)
  - Connections: some connections in classes designed for non-health science people (e.g., ethics).
- Education
  - Courses: Two courses – one introductory, one upper level.
  - Connections: Both would have some overlap with many other areas (e.g., ethics, history, theology)
- Science and Nature
  - Courses: Wide range of courses that vary.
  - Connections: Calculus-based physics works well with math. Typically these are taken concurrently. Highly variable for non-science majors taking core courses (freshmen through seniors). Some occasional overlaps with other topics (e.g. ethics) arise.
- Histories of cultures in societies
  - Courses: Typically history 1 – 2 are Freshmen and sophomores
  - Connections: Content modestly connects to other areas, but it varies by instructor how much this is made. For instance, many might connect to literature or philosophy, but not all. It's idiosyncratic.
- Communications
  - Courses: Everyone takes Comm 1200 in communications department. Most take it freshmen; all take it by sophomore year.
  - Connections: Not huge array. Comm 1100. This connects a lot with English 1. This anticipates ethics and ethical issues – how you present issues, use evidence, communicate. Comm 1200 is media and society. This *could* connect to build off mathematical reasoning and statistics. A

diverse cultures course that serves as an elective for upper level students builds on this media class.

- ISP
  - Courses: Many different examples of classes
  - Connections: There are connections between different courses. Making these connections is easier than sequencing. Connections between an introductory politics with ethics, diverse cultures, economics, etc. Finding the different connections is often not difficult, both within ISP and beyond.
- Advising. Discussed how undergraduate major advising works across unit/department/college?
  - General conversation about the role of faculty as advisors, and the limitations of faculty being expected to advise on courses. When the course sequencing is prescribed, this creates space for more substantive advising.
  - Su will be consulting via e-mail members of the CCRC

Homework for 11/28 Meeting:

- We have been asked to talk about what is distinctive about Marquette's Core. Su will draft this and invite us to respond.
- Look at the list of our leaders, competitors, and peers. Su will assign each CCRC member two to look at, and we will bring information about their core curricula back:
  - choose two institutions+ one you know and admire
  - identify 2-3 salient differences from Marquette
  - what can Marquette learn from these other institutions?

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Martin Scanlan.

Next meeting: Wednesday, 11/28, 3:30-5:00 PM in Raynor 301

## Core Curriculum Review Committee

Wednesday, 11/28/2012

3:30-5:00 PM

**Raynor 301**

---

### Minutes

Minutes: Feldner

Reflection: Dabney

In Attendance: Ball, Barrington, Dabney, Feldner, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, McAvoy Paxton, Sanders, Scanlan, Schultz, Shuter, Su, Wadsworth.

Meeting called to order at 3:30 PM by John Su. Reflection offered by Dabney.

Previous meeting minutes unanimously approved with one minor correction

#### Updates:

- UBUS will be submitting a charge for the CCRC

#### Ongoing business:

- Su updated us on what our purposes are relative to core -- to get models that might meet college needs

#### New business:

- We have been asked to talk about what is distinctive about Marquette's Core. –
  - John Su created a document that puts all the key aspects in place
  - Group discussion - on format of document
  - Key points from discussion:
    - distinctive may not be the same as other universities

- how would we address integration – proposal to add a section on the sequencing/differentiation issues that are being discussed
- our core structure remains largely driven by college curriculum
- proposal to add/clarify what we have been doing relative to assessment as an opportunity
- question raised of how document acknowledges our focus on cultural context of education
- what makes us distinctive is that we try to do both what liberal arts do and what we do as RI institution
  - John Su will update report and circulate to the rest of us
- Small group discussion of what we learned from our review of peer institutions core curricula; summary of discussions will be sent to John
- No CCRC meeting during finals week
- John Su outlined tasks to completed prior to January meeting
  - codifying the process by which we approve courses (will sent to committee vets)
  - everyone finish research on benchmarks
  - review the course proposals as they become available

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Sarah Feldner

Next meeting: January ??, 3:30-5:00 PM in Raynor 301

## Core Curriculum Review Committee

Wednesday, 1/23/13

3:30 - 5:00 pm

Raynor 301

### Minutes

In attendance: Ball, Bansal, Barrington, Belknap, Chattopadhyah, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, Mc Avoy, Pennington-Cross, Scanlan, Su, Schultz, Wadsworth

Meeting called to order at 3:30 pm by John Su. Reflection by Scanlan.

Minutes of the 11/28/12 meeting were unanimously approved.

**New business** was taken up first to accommodate those who had to leave early:



Discussion of course proposals submitted for inclusion in the UCCS

A. The committee was broken into subgroups, each of which addressed the points on the Form for Subcommittee Evaluation of Core Course Template Submissions for its assigned proposal.

B. The subgroup findings:

1. HEAL 1001 by Barrington - does not meet core expectations, lack of fit, practical focus, stands alone

2. SPAN 3300 by Ball - lacks a syllabus, no rubric for assessment

3. BIOL 1410 by Karkheck - syllabus learning objectives lack detail, objectives lack substance, staffing is a concern

4. THEO 2230 by Foster - concern about the number of faculty, outcome # 1 not addressed, reach on the outcomes is overstated, concern about depth in comparison to other THEO courses





5. THEO 2250 by Scanlan - concern about the number of faculty, addresses outcomes 2 and 3 but not 1

C. John Su will report these findings to the proposers with a request for a timely response

D. Proposer response will be distributed to the assigned subcommittee which will meet/interact to form recommendations and vote on the assigned proposal before

the next meeting, 2/13/13.

### **Updates:**


-  Assessment: The Higher Learning Commission will be visiting beginning September 29  
Assessment of the core is a major concern  
Researching annual assessment reports in ARMS
-  Knowledge area assessment AY 2012-2013 for Human Cultures and Societies; Human Nature and Ethics
-  Knowledge area assessment AY 2013-2014 for Science and Nature; Individual and Social Behavior; Theology
-  Integrated Core Learning Outcomes assessment is underway and continuing  
There were 15 participants in the initial effort, begun in summer 2012, covering all colleges except for Education and Health Sciences, based on the Fall 2012 capstone/senior experience courses. Reports are in progress.

The second round will begin in summer 2013, aiming to attract more senior experience/capstone teachers, and to build upon the foundation set last year with higher expectations. Outcomes 3 and 4 need heavier coverage.

### **Ongoing business:**

-  None

### **New business:**

-  Response to the 12/12 charge from UBUS

The CCRC goal is to produce 5 frameworks by March 25 that offer alternatives to addressing the core and the integrated core learning outcomes

The committee was again broken up into subgroups to do some brainstorming

Ideas/strategies suggested: provide a gateway to the core; provide stages within the core - the courses sharing a common thread such as reflection; rework the ICLOs; each unit offers a capstone course that pulls the core together; build upon Ignatian pedagogy



Committee members are asked to pass along who is doing capstone/senior experience courses in their areas and to promote participation in this second round.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Karkheck

Next meeting: February 13, 2013 at 3:30 pm, Raynor 301

Core Curriculum Review Committee  
Wednesday, 2/13/13  
3:30 - 5:00 pm  
Raynor 301

Minutes

In attendance: Ball, Bansal, Barrington, Belknap, Chattopadhyah, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, Mc Avoy, Pennington-Cross, Scanlan, Su, Schultz, Wadsworth

Meeting called to order at 3:30 pm by John Su. Reflection by Kim.

Minutes of the 1/23/13 meeting were unanimously approved.

New business was taken up first to accommodate those who had to leave early:

A. Continuation of the discussion of course proposals submitted for inclusion in the UCCS and votes on those proposals.

1. HEAL 1001 (Personal Health and Fitness) Subcommittee: Barrington (point person), Wadsworth, Belknap The motion to accept HEAL 1001 into the core was NOT approved 0 in favor, 0 abstentions, 15 opposed.
2. SPAN 3300 (People and Cultures of Spain) Subcommittee: Ball (point person), Kim, McAvoy The motion to accept SPAN 3300 into the core was approved 15 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 opposed.
3. BIOL 1410 (The Biology of Human Disease) Subcommittee: Karkheck (point person), Paxton, Pennington-Cross The motion to accept BIOL 1410 into the core was approved 14 in favor, 1 abstentions, 0 opposed.
4. THEO 2230 (Theology in the Writings of C. S. Lewis) Subcommittee: Dabney (point person), Foster, Scanlan. The motion to accept THEO 2230 into the core conditional on THEO 1001 covering outcome 1 was approved 9 in favor, 2 abstentions, 0 opposed.
5. THEO 2250 (Ignatian Spirituality). Subcommittee: Dabney (point person), Foster, Scanlan The motion to accept THEO 2250 into the core conditional on THEO 1001 covering outcome 1, was approved 14 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0

B. In response to a request from Vice Provost Gary Meyer, members of the CCRC were asked to examine the draft self-study document, paying particular attention to subcomponent 3B. Members were tasked with e-mailing Su suggestions for revision.



Meeting adjourned at 448 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Foster

Core Curriculum Review Committee  
Wednesday, 3/27/13  
3:30 - 5:00 pm  
Raynor 301

Minutes

In attendance: Ball, Bansal, Barrington, Belknap, Chattopadhyah, Foster, Kim, McAvoy, Paxton, Pennington-Cross, Su, Wadsworth

Meeting called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Su. Reflection by Ball.

Minutes of the 2/13/13 meeting were unanimously approved.

Updates:

Kim gave an update on the Course Transfer Policy Task Force and possible implications for core course transfer credit.

Ongoing business:

The committee discussed the report to the UBUS on integration of the UCCS (“Models for Increasing Integration among Courses in the University Core of Common Studies”).

Comments included:

- \*Models of integration should be linked to the likelihood that the UCCS will be restructured.
- \*Better clarification of the two types of core learning outcomes (area and integrated) was needed.
- \*Partly because of the difficulties with the A&S “senior experience,” moving forward with the idea of a core capstone seminar will require careful consideration.
- \*It is crucial that changes to the core focus on the goal of improving student learning rather than on a goal of making assessment of student learning easier.
- \*The cost of assessment, including in terms of faculty time, and the comparative lack of compensation to date should be highlighted.
- \*Creating incentives to participate in activities to improve the core or assessment of it is key.
- \*Look for opportunities to unify related but slightly differently worded learning outcomes, while respecting the need not to have a small set of outcomes forced into a wide range of courses.
- \*The portfolio approach to assessment of core integration is intriguing but requires careful thought about how feasible this would be in practice.
- \*Above all, changes to the core and assessment of it must be based on our commitment to Jesuit ideals of reflection, critical thinking, and the search for truth.

New business

CCRC members were asked to let Su know about plans for offering senior experience/capstone courses

Su asked CCRC members to encourage their colleagues to participate in core assessment activities.

- \*Assessment of areas of the core should not be performed solely by instructors of those courses.

- \*The CCRC will also need to look at examples of core course assignments used in the knowledge area learning reports.

- \*This will take place at the next CCRC meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Next meeting: April 10, 2013.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Barrington.

Core Curriculum Review Committee  
Wednesday, 4/10/13  
3:30 - 5:00 pm  
Raynor 301

Minutes

In attendance: Ball, Belknap, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, McAvoy, Paxton, Pennington-Cross, Scanlan, Su, Schultz, Wadsworth

Meeting called to order at 3:30 pm by John Su. Reflection by McAvoy.

Minutes of the 3/27/13 meeting were unanimously approved.

Outstanding Issues

The annual report will need to be written a little early this year to support accreditation. The task of assessing the core will be done using subcommittees. Each subcommittee will report to the whole committee at the next meeting.

Update

The deadline for the capstone course grants is approaching and email requests will be sent out next week as a reminder.

New Business – The Calibration Tests

Most committee members submitted their scores. As a second stage, three groups were created and they discussed the artifacts (papers submitted by students). The aim was to see if each group could come to some form of an agreement on categorizing the outcomes and to identify any sticking points.

Group 1 found that they had good “correlation” and that the assessment process really became a relative ranking. It was difficult to link the integrated core learning outcomes to the outcomes and objectives of the assignment and course. Group 2 also found good “correlation” – agreement across the group members. Group 3, while of good spirits, found less “correlation”. They also stated that it was difficult to assess an area where they had no knowledge of the subject. However, the discussions did lead to a reduction in the range of scores for individual artifacts. They also noted that the quality of work seemed to reflect a lack of effort. This was discussed and the question was raised about how well prepared the student were a writing assignment.

Next, a discussion ensued on what we could infer. This led to a discussion of the ability to assess the core outcomes – especially core outcome 3. There was a discussion about the difficulty of transferring skills across disciplines such as writing about Plato versus a lab report or nurse patient evaluation.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Pennington-Cross

Core Curriculum Review Committee  
Wednesday, 4/24/13  
3:30 - 5:00PM  
Raynor 301

Minutes

In attendance: Ball, Bansal, Barrington, Belknap, Chattopadhyay, Dabney, Foster, Karkheck, Kim, McAvoy, Paxton, Pennington-Cross, Su, Schultz, Wadsworth

Meeting called to order at 3:30PM by John Su. Reflection was offered by Wadsworth.

Minutes of the 4/10/13 meeting were unanimously approved.

Update

-Data for the annual report is pending. The report is due 5/21/13. This report will be emailed to committee members for review.

-Core curriculum assessment grants are due. All MU colleges are currently represented in this process.

New Business

-Committee members were divided into 4 groups to evaluate various capstone projects. Prior to discussion there was debate regarding feasibility of assessing ILCO #1 regarding interdisciplinary fields within a disciplinary capstone. Questions were also raised regarding assessment of individual vs. group projects / data as well as professional development of faculty who participate in this process. Most groups felt that overall assessment of ILCO #1, 3, & 4 was more difficult with the current round of projects.

-Subcommittee members submitted their scores to their point person prior to the meeting. Further discussion of the projects occurred in order to attempt calibration among group members.

-Group 1 evaluated PURE 4997 which was a group project. Compromise was reached within the group for evaluating the projects using the rubrics. There were significant questions regarding the overall writing of the projects.

-Group 2 evaluated FINA 4931 which was also a group project. Compromise was reached within the group for evaluating the projects using the rubrics. There were significant questions regarding the overall writing of the projects. There was also a question of overall effort.

-Group 3 evaluated CMS 4600 which was also a group project. There was good agreement across the group for evaluating the projects using the rubrics. There were significant questions regarding the overall writing of the projects. There was also a question of overall professionalism.

-Group 4 evaluated HIST 4955 which was an individual writing assignment. There was good correlation across the group for evaluating the projects using the rubrics. The lowest assessments were in the writing evaluation.

Next, a discussion ensued on what we could infer. It was recommended that ongoing evaluations of these capstones should include a multidisciplinary group for improved consistency. There was also a lengthy discussion of the quality of writing for these assignments. It was felt that in order to assess larger cohorts of assignments a paid “staff” should be developed.

The meeting wrapped up by considering all that has been accomplished this year and what we should be doing next year. Many comments reflected on the direction the “Core” will be taking and awaiting further input from University leadership.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Paxton