

Core Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes
November 15, 2013
SC 225

Members Present: Frances Bernat, Manuel Broncano, Pablo Camacho, Patricia Cantu, Rohitha Goonatilake, Conchita Hickey, Michael Kidd, Kevin Lindberg, Bill Manger, Mark Menaldo, Paul Niemeyer, Phil Roberson, Bernice Sanchez, Deborah Scaggs, Richard Wright

Members Absent: Carmen Bruni, Jose Carlos Lozano, Paul Madlock,

Guest: Dan Mott, Pat Abrego, Lisa Flores, Bede Leyendecker, Veronica Martinez, Mary Trevino

Approval of minutes

Kevin Lindberg requested that the minutes for November 1, 2013 be read and approved. It was moved and seconded to accept the minutes. Motion passed

Assessment Plan

Kevin Lindberg introduced the revised assessment plan.

Frances Bernat explained that the department chairs would decide what the rotation plan over a three year period would look like, determining which courses met the competencies in the fall and spring semesters. The University Core Curriculum's role will be to determine the number of samples needed. Department chairs would then decide how best to go about the random selection.

Rohitha Goonatilake indicated that the random selection should be "every N" student between 1 and N.

The reporting of the results will be handled by Frances Bernat and Veronica Martinez. The departments would archive the artifacts from which the samples would be drawn. Kevin Lindberg reiterated that he did not want the University Core Curriculum to be the body designated to make the decisions about which courses/sections would be used.

A discussion followed regarding the role of THECB. Pablo Camacho asked whether we had heard from THECB. The answer was "not yet" but that their opinion was not necessarily better than ours. We have control over how and why.

Phil Roberson shared that although the COE is not being assessed at the core level, they do have experience with large scale assessment and recommended that we look into software available, like TASK STREAM, that would handle the management of archiving efficiently and effectively. Veronica Martinez stated that TAMIU had looked into it and that it was a good software program but was too expensive to purchase and was not approved. However, she indicated that the request for that program or something similar would continue to be considered.

Conchita Hickey shared the matrix that listed the summary of all the core request approvals that identified the competencies and the artifacts to be used. Department chairs and faculty can use this to plan the semester and remind the faculty teaching the courses what they stated they would submit as evidence of assessment.

Frances Bernat and Veronica Martinez demonstrated how Survey Monkey would be used to collect the assessment judgments.

Deborah Scaggs asked how the final exam group presentations would be recorded if the OIT-AV staff could not be present in all 22 sections to record. It was determined that only a random number of sections would be selected for assessment. Pat Abrego stated that OIT would provide basic training to all faculty. She explained that ECHO 360 would capture the presentation. The faculty would have access to the server and could link to Banner. This would enable faculty to record what was necessary for assessment purposes.

With no further business to discuss, Richard Wright moved and Conchita Hickey seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 3:30 p.m.