Minutes of Core Review Committee  
September 13, 2007

The Core Review Committee met Sept. 13, 2007 in Kirby 108. In attendance were committee members Brian Whitman, Andrew Miller, Ernie Trujillo, Gina Morrison, Diane Wenger, and KarenBeth Bohan, ex officio members Sue Hritzak, Ellen Flint and Amy Patton, student representative Carl Santana, and Mary Kropiewnicki, chair of the University Assessment Committee. The meeting was called to order at 11:07 a.m.

Minutes: The minutes of April 24 were approved as written.

Old Business:

Assessment Committee Update. Dr. Kropiewnicki distributed an informational packet, including the draft document, Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Based on the comments that she receives from faculty the committee will do another rendition of the outcomes. She noted that, the Middle States Review is the big task that the Assessment Committee faces, and in light of that the committee will be reviewing its charge and its membership. She pointed out that to prepare for Middle States, the CRC needs to develop institutional learning outcomes and these must be linked to the Mission, Vision, and Values statement. She advised the CRC that, rather than awaiting for assessment reports from departments that have not yet done assessment of the core (and may not know what they are supposed to assess) it would be better to get the outcomes written and look at the core and see if they fit.

Dr. Whitman asked if the Assessment Committee has looked at the Core 2001 statement of outcomes and if that could serve as a template. Dr. Kropiewnicki responded that the Assessment Committee has not done this because they did not know if CRC was going to change the core. She explained that when the Middle States group does our review they will look at the core to see if it is aligned to the mission, and they will want evidence or proof that students are attaining the outcomes expected from the core. Middle States will be happy to see that we have a plan about how we will assess the outcomes, even if we have not completed those assessments; they want to see progress and growth, not stagnation. She urged CRC to think about what we want from the current core; some areas are now content specific, while others (WAC, for example) are integrated.

Dr. Flint pointed out that we have not yet accessed the current core, so we don’t know what is working. Dr. Whitman asked if the Assessment committee could examine the objectives of the current core and see if they align with outcomes and the Mission/Vision/Values. There is a complied document that contains the current objectives; Dr. Whitman will have copies made and distribute it to the committee. Dr. Kropiewnicki agreed that the Assessment Committee will look at wording issues in the proposed outcomes to be see if they can be assessed.

Multicultural & Global Awareness. Dr. Whitman reminded the group that last May the term “human awareness” was discussed rather than multiculturalism and global awareness. The
current core requirements are broken down in “fiefdoms”; global awareness crosses many of the areas.

   Dr. Flint pointed out that what we have is a general education requirement, not a core; a “core” is more a philosophical requirement, relating to a core of common knowledge that might we achieved in a number of ways, while general education requirements involve a list of specific courses students must take. The group then discussed various innovative models (“abilities,” portfolios, group projects) that some institutions are using in their core curriculum.

   The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Diane Wenger