

**Core Curriculum Review Committee**  
**Approved Minutes**  
**November 11, 2009 – 3:30-5:00PM, Raynor 301**

**Present:** Michael Monahan (Chair), John Curran, Richard Taylor, Kim Factor, Michelle Mynlieff, Jane Peterson, Mickey Mattox, Richard Robinson, Jeff LaBelle, Chris Foley, Christopher Geiser, Cheryl Coan, Lea Acord, Michael Zeps, Melissa Condon.

**Absent:** Stephen Hudson-Mairet, Robert Shuter.

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:30PM. An opening reflection was offered by Curran
2. Minutes from 10/28/09 were amended and approved.

**Old Business**

Monahan has spoken to the writing center and they are willing to use their instructors to help with the grading of the ICLO assessment instrument.

3. Kim Factor presented a new activity C designed by the CCRC mathematical reasoning subcommittee to replace the previous activity on the assessment because it was thought to test software knowledge more than math skills. Students will be asked to determine if a graph depicting the oil consumption by China over time accurately represents what is written in the essay about oil consumption in China. Discussion ensued over a grading rubric to accompany this activity. A rubric was discussed. Would correct use of mathematical terms be required for outstanding or will we allow outstanding on an intuitive analysis of the graph? Is this a reasonable task to expect of a graduating senior? It was concluded that if we use it for assessment in the 2009/10 school year, we will get information on the validity of this as an assessment tool. The graph was discussed and changes were proposed. The Activity will be modified as proposed, removing numbers from the Y axis and fixing typos. Curran recommended that it be accepted as amended, seconded by Coan. It passed unanimously.

**New Business**

4. The rubric for the ICLO assessment developed two years ago was discussed. It was proposed that a single rubric for Activity A and B would be used with a separate rubric for C. The task in Activity C was changed to writing a response to the employee who constructed the graph about whether the graph is suitable for publication and represents the prediction correctly. The rubric designed 2 years ago needs to be filled in with more detail. A suggestion was made that we might be able to translate rubrics designed in English for the scholarship exam or the masters exam. The points on the rubric work well but we need to give more detail to clarify what constitutes “outstanding”, “proficient”, and “developing”. Monahan will collect a number of rubrics and send out the best of the best by email for the members to look over.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:41PM. The next meeting will be December 9, 2009.

Respectively submitted,  
Michelle Mynlieff