The Core Review Committee (CRC) met Wednesday, October 12, 2005, in Weckesser Hall Board Room. Present were: Susan Hritzak, Art Kibbe, Maravene Loeschke, Andrew Miller, Gina Morrison, Marianne Rexter, Diane Wenger, and Brian Whitman. Chairman Whitman called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

On motion by Wenger, seconded by Miller, the minutes of the September 29th meeting were approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

Additional Members: Whitman reported that the faculty approved adding four ex-officio members to the committee: Amy Patton (Office of Admissions), Susan Hritzak (Registrar), Ellen Flint (Office of Provost), and a student member. (Whitman will ask Student Government to name the student committee member.)

Terms: Since this is a new standing committee, members drew numbers for term lengths with the following results: Rexter and Whitman will serve 1 year terms; Morrison and the committee member elected to represent Area IV (to replace Ellen Flint) will serve 2 years; Miller and Wenger will serve 3 years.

Writing Across Curriculum: The group discussed the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) proposal; Rexter volunteered to put it into the proper format for review by the Curriculum Committee.

NEW BUSINESS:

Subcommittees: The group discussed forming subcommittees on assessment and WAC, but decided to table this until we get more information about has already been done on these issues as well as CI and OPO designations. Provost Loeschke explained that assessment of the core resides with this committee and suggested that the committee invite Barbara Loftus to a future meeting to explain what other committees and departments have done so far on assessment.

Web Page: Whitman suggested that the Committee may want a web page at some point; the group agreed that we will need this in the future, but that we are not yet ready. Loeschke offered to provide assistance by compensating a student or other web design expert to design the page.

Core Assessment: Loeschke recommended that the committee consider inviting Joan McDonald to a future meeting to talk about the four standardized tests that are available to measure core outcomes; ideally these might be administered to freshmen and juniors to assess the effectiveness of the core. Using standard tests would relieve departments of much of the burden of assessing themselves.

Whitman suggested that it might also be a good idea to invite Doug Lynch, Mark Stine, and Barbara Bracken to a committee meeting to discuss First Year Foundation, OPO offerings, and CI designation.

There was a general discussion about the philosophical approach to the core revision. Kibbe emphasized that we should look at the University vision and match the new core to the vision’s expressed values (i.e., citizenship, ethics, openness, sensitivity). Rexter proposed that once we have the WAC proposal
(which is a priority) and process organized, that will serve as a model for other areas. Morrison urged meaningful discussion of what is missing from the core, and proposed we seek input from the Wilkes community. Hritzak noted that, as a member of the Academic Standards Committee, she receives numerous waiver requests because students cannot complete the specific courses required in the present core; Writing Intensive courses are the biggest problem. Kibbe noted that the old process of forming the core (for economy and efficiency) was not a good approach. We need to decide if we want specific courses or common experiences. Miller added that we need to be able to offer what we require in the core.

Loeschke suggested, after hearing this discussion that she sees three major initiatives for the committee:

1. **CORE REVISION**—hold open forums for faculty to discuss what is wrong with present core and to suggest the values we want in the core; determine if the six UGE values identified by task forces last year work for core values; examine models of cores in place at other institutions and determine revision process.

2. **ASSESSMENT**: Short term, meet with Barbara Loftus to pull together what has already been done; long term, meet with Joan McDonald on core assessment tests.

3. **MOVE ON WAC NOW**: Don’t wait on Writing Across Curriculum; this can be acted on now and serve as a model (as Rexer proposed) for other areas.

The group returned to the discussion of what the core needs to be (Kibbe asked if we want skills or values from the vision). Wenger suggested that some of the vision values could be incorporated in First Year Foundation (FrF) courses. Loeschke commented on the tremendous improvement in FrF courses this year, thanks to work of the FrF task force and the faculty in-service in August.

Morrison offered to prepare a breakdown of information from other institutions’ cores; Kibbe again argued for an integrated core, in which inter-disciplinary courses deliver same offerings to all students.

There was some discussion about the urgency of WAC because WI courses are set to expire at the end of next year, departments need time to respond to the new proposal, and the Curriculum Committee needs two weeks notice to put a proposal on the agenda. (The next Curriculum Committee meetings are 11/1 and 11/15). Whitman will ask Rexer to circulate the WAC proposal electronically to CRC members as soon as possible.

The group agreed to hold a **special meeting October 27** at 11 a.m. to approve the WAC proposal.

The next regular meeting will be held **November 10**; Morrison will present a summary of other core curricula, and Barbara Loftus will be invited to discuss assessment.

The meeting adjourned by common consent at 3:10 p.m

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Wenger