

## **Minutes**

Core Curriculum Review Committee

14 October 2009

Present: Accord, Curran, Factor, LaBelle, Mattox, Monahan (Director), Mynlieff, Robinson, Zeps

Absent: Coan, Peterson, Dunlap, Gieser, Hudson-Mairet, Schuter, Simenz, Taylor

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:33 pm. An opening reflection was provided by Kim Factor.
2. Minutes of the 23 September meeting were reviewed and approved.
3. Jeff LaBelle shared insights into the history of the ICLO logistics. With the advent of the pilot assessment three years ago, the unfortunate brief history has been one of administering the assessment instrument always later than planned. Jeff distributed a series of handouts for review. First was the University Core of Common Studies Learning Outcomes (four key outcomes integrate the nine knowledge areas). Second was the Core Assessment Schedule developed in Fall 2008 by Chris Krueger, former CCRC Director. A list of students for the sample was activated on August 1 with a deadline for Core assessment completion by Oct. 20. Third was the UCCS Assessment Implementation Plan D submitted to the Vice Provost by the CCRC on November 5, 2008. In retrospect, the target dates for the assessment were not attained. The Committee recognized Jeff for his masterful work, not only on this history, but also as Acting Chair preceding Mike Monahan.
4. Discussion focused on improvements to the assessment process. All agreed that the timeframe for assessment should be moved up so that the student instruments could be scored by graduate students during the Spring Break. The Director indicated that he was still checking with his counterparts at other universities for assessment insights. Since it was concluded that mandatory compliance with assessment was unlikely, other options were explored. Most promising was the concept of a lottery, i.e., 25% of the typical freshman class of 1100 students. Freshmen would sign a form informing them that they could be selected by lottery to participate in an assessment project. The benefit would be several years of hard data on assessment.
5. The Director identified three task items: 1) decide on instrument content; 2) reevaluate the rubric for evaluating the instrument; and 3) identify and train scorers.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

