Minutes of Core Review Committee  
January 22, 2008

The Core Review Committee met January 22, 2008 in Kirby 108. Members present: Brian Whitman, Andrew Miller, Gina Morrison, Ernie Trujillo, KarenBeth Bohan, Diane Wenger, Ellen Flint and Amy Patton (ex-officio). Also present: Mary Kropiewnicki, Brian Bogert, and Provost C. Reynold Verret.

New Business: The CRC reviewed and approved a request from the Education Department to designate three courses (EDSP 225, ED 390, and ED 341) as OPO (oral performance option). Replacing COM 101 with two OPO courses would accommodate the additional three-credit Special Education course EDSP 225, which will be required of all education majors and minors by the Pennsylvania Department of Education without adding additional credits. Professor Mark Stine is willing to provide brief training sessions for teaching OPO and the CRC recommends that faculty teaching these three education/OPO courses take this training.

The CRC reviewed and approved a course description change for FYF 101. Professor Flint explained that the old description was very broad and did not reflect the current mission of FYF or the university. The revised statement was developed by the FYF faculty to more accurately reflect the current mission.

Provost Verret addressed the CRC on the urgent need to assess the current core in preparation for the Middle States review and to determine if it is effectively meeting students’ needs. Once this assessment is completed we must then determine if the current core should be revised. He emphasized that core classes are central to our students’ education—to train them for lifelong learning. The current core was in a sense done backwards; it took something from each department, but it was not constructed with the most important question in mind—what do we want our students to have?

The Provost asked if there are additional tools that the CRC needs to get the outcomes written; he explained that once the outcomes are completed, they will go to the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee will determine the artifacts that want and ask department chairs to gather them; the Assessment Committee will handle analysis of the data.

Professor Kropiewnicki recommended sharing the outcomes with the faculty and observed that the Assessment Committee will need to be larger to handle this charge. Professor Whitman suggested that the Provost could provide the necessary clout to be sure that the assessment materials are forthcoming from departments.

Professor Bohan noted that, along with looking at artifacts, the Assessment Committee will also have to determine if they want to use a standardized exam. Professor Kropiewnicki explained that, after examining a number of exams, the committee determined that the MAP exam from Educational Testing would be the best option (if a standardized exam is used at all) because it is flexible and could be customized to our needs. If a test would be used, however, it
would not be the only tool; the committee would also examine artifacts. The committee is also looking at online portfolio options.

The Provost emphasized that the outcome statements must be written clearly so they can be easily assessed. The timetable is to have data coming in by the end of this semester. Professor Bohan suggested that committees could work on the assessment over the summer, they could have some recommendations ready by fall.

Provost Verret thanked the CRC for its work on this crucial piece of Wilkes education.

Old Business: The remainder of the meeting was spent revising the proposed General Education Curriculum Outcomes. Professors Whitman and Wenger will prepare Revision III for the CRC’s review at the next meeting, February 14.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Wenger