Minutes of
Core Review Committee
September 11, 2008

The CRC met September 11, 2008 in Kirby 108. Members present when meeting called to order: Phil Simon, co-chairperson; Karen Beth Bohan; Andrew Miller, Ernie Trujillo, Gina Morrison, and Diane Wenger. Brian Whitman came in mid-way through the meeting. Guests present: Bridgette Zielinski and Lori Drozdis.

Dr. Simon called the meeting to order at 11:05. The minutes of September 2, 2008 were approved (motion by Morrison, second by Miller).

**New Business:** Professors Zielinski and Drozdis were presented the Nursing Program’s WAC proposal. A motion by Trujillo, seconded by Wenger, to accept/accept with revisions was passed.

CRC members commended the program on the blind read policy (whereby a second reader evaluates any papers graded above 95 or below 75). Members also noted some areas that are not addressed in the proposal: It does not specifically mention assessment, nor does it mention a plan to address the student writing deficiencies identified as a problem. Some of the terminology used is not clear to those outside the nursing program; perhaps a lexicon of terms might be provided? The proposal mentions the six principles of good writing, but does not specifically explain what these principles are. Finally, the proposal does not say whether there are outside evaluations of student writing from clinical supervisors.

Professor Zielinski explained that the department does self-assess for accreditation purposes, but does not gather artifacts to determine individual students/general assessments. She noted that all eight-credit courses have writing components, that the “topic” paper referenced in the proposal is a scholarly paper done in drafts, and that the department plans to have students who are deficient in writing take additional courses. (She noted their frustration that students are not learning to write at the high school level.) Students who fail the writing component of the clinical experience fail the course. The department is currently revising its grading criteria for writing; there is a need for more specific guidelines to help adjuncts who teach in the program. She emphasized that clinical supervisors do comment extensively on the students’ writing and that these items could be explained more fully in a revised proposal.

The CRC approved the motion to accept the Nursing Program’s WAC proposal provided it is revised and re-submitted to include the points mentioned above.

**Old Business:**

A question was raised: how will WAC be assessed? Professor Whitman explained it is supposed to be part of program reviews. WAC will not be specifically addressed, but CRC will extract the information it needs; or a question on WAC could be added to the form. A discussion of the nature and timing of program reviews followed.

1
Professor Morrison urged the CRC to look at *Task Stream* as a method of online assessment. Professor Simon noted that nothing takes the place of faculty in the classroom; evaluation needs to be a total package.

Dr. Whitman announced that he had attended a meeting on how to gather the assessment information; we need to start now, focusing on oral presentation (COM101 and OPO), quantitative reasoning and computer literacy (focusing on CS115). He is planning to meet with the faculty in math and computer science to ask them what courses should be assessed for quantitative reasoning. He will also meet with the Dean’s Council.

Dr. Whitman further stressed the need to divide into subcommittees and to distribute some of the work load.

Each member of CRC will be the liaison for his/her distribution area.

The FYF assessment plan is in good shape. Dr. Wenger offered to work with Dr. Mark Stine to obtain assignments from about two sections of students and to determine what rubrics will be used to assess outcomes for oral communication.

Dr. Morrison, a member-at-large, agreed to look into MAPP testing.

The meeting adjourned as 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Wenger