

Minutes

Core Curriculum Meeting

January 24, 2014

SC 225

Members Present: Frances Bernat, Carmen Bruni, Pablo Camacho, Patricia Cantu, Rohitha Goonatilake, Conchita Hickey, Michael Kidd, Kevin Lindberg, Mark Menaldo, Paul Niemeyer, Deborah Scaggs, Richard Wright

Members Absent: Manuel Broncano, Jose Carlos Lozano, Paul Madlock, William Manger, Phil Roberson, Bernice Sanchez

Guests: Brian Gaskins, Dan Mott, Veronica Martinez, Mary Trevino

Kevin Lindberg called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes: Membership reviewed minutes and noted that Dr. Frances Bernat was listed twice in the attendance list. The guest listing was an error. Dr. Goonatilake noted that the footer was incorrectly dated. Frances Bernat moved and Mary Trevino, seconded to approve minutes as amended.

Proposal for the Rotation Assessment Cycle: Deborah Scaggs presented an electronic spreadsheet that explained one option for two 4 year rotations of competencies and corresponding courses. The fifth year would be for assessing those competencies and courses that should be revisited. On the sixth year the rotation would begin again. At the end of the tenth year, each core curriculum course would have been assessed for the respective competency at least twice.

K. Lindberg indicated that this proposal or something similar was the most efficient way to assess so no competency or course would be missed. He also proposed that the Departments take ownership of this and be responsible for assuring that all courses in the core were assessed.

F. Bernat noted that some courses had only a three year cycle, e.g. math and science courses in the Empirical and Quantitative Skills. K. Lindberg indicated that it would be up to the department to determine how to proceed with the cycle, but that they could easily choose some courses to assess third year and others fourth year.

P. Camacho stated that some of the proposed assessments measured more than one competency and asked whether it was not more efficient to do several at once. K. Lindberg responded that each department could proceed as they saw fit as long as, at the university level, we had something coherent to report to the Coordinating Board that would help us determine student performance and make us stronger as an institution.

Fall 2013 Pilot Assessment: P. Camacho asked whether we were piloting the courses. D. Scaggs, C. Hickey, and R. Wright reported that they had participated in the pilot; Communication was done in ENGL

1301, and Critical Thinking was done in UNIV 1101 and ARTS 1303. The pilot allowed the testing of the rubrics and the storing of scores on the Survey Monkey database that F. Bernat and V. Martinez set up.

Rubrics: R. Wright stated that learning to use the rubrics took a little time, noting that after some time he realized not all descriptors in the rubric needed to apply in all cases to the artifact at hand. He also stated that the overall the artifacts assessed for creative thinking were mediocre.

K. Lindberg reminded the committee that we are tracking at the core level, from the beginning to the completion of it and that the data should be useful to the departments. The rubrics could also be used at the senior level for to assess student performance in the majors.

Survey Monkey: F. Bernat reviewed the process of entering scores and the viewable results on Survey Monkey. She mentioned that we could use the data to set our benchmarks. In response to a question about parsing out information by student ID, she indicated there was cross tab control by semester, student ID, and course. ECHS were not included in this sample. After some discussion, F. Bernat suggested that we include an additional question on the student survey and ask if the students if they were core complete, almost done, or just starting.

The rubric scores for ENGL 1301's final group presentation were high. D. Scaggs stated that perhaps it was an indicator that the wording on the rubric for oral presentations needed some refinement. The results for Critical Thinking in UNIV were also shared, with most students scoring at the lower levels.

M. Trevino mentioned that the committee did not yet have the timeline for departments to turn in the data for fall 2014-spring 2015. K. Lindberg stated that department chairs have to lay this out and that all assessment data would be due two weeks after final grades due.

P. Camacho indicated that Business faculty would pilot their assessment of all competencies at once to make sure they understand the competencies and rubrics using 10 or 15 student samples. K. Lindberg stated that was exactly what we needed, departments willing to test out the assessment process and get a sense of it. Random size should be meaningful, perhaps 30%. Departments who volunteered to pilot the rubrics were asked to provide feedback if any issues needed to be addressed.

The university will need to have an institutional rotation plan, but the departments can have their own assessment schedule beyond what they submit at the university level if they want to do more.

K. Lindberg reported on the Chief Academic Officers meeting. University of Texas is using the CLA and only including 250 freshmen and 250 seniors. Corpus Christi is using a portfolio which they believe is a better assessment tool. Commissioner Paredes is very much in favor of the CLA.

M. Trevino reported that we did the CLA Fall 2013 with approximately 400 students and that it was not an easy process as students complained about the length of it.

M. Menaldo raised the issue that the department chairs were not discussing assessment and that perhaps it would be a good idea to get on the agenda, with K. Lindberg and C. Hickey sharing the assessment cycle, pilot, Survey Monkey, etc. C. Hickey will send out the two matrices to the committee

members and the department chairs. With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.