

CC Meeting Minutes 9-20-2013

Present: Tom Dalton, Jennifer Gorsky, Cecily Heisser, Carole Huston (dean's office rep), Julia Medina, Atreyee Phukan (chair), Adam Siepielski, and David Sullivan.

Unanimously approved minutes from previous meeting.

Issue of approving courses that are already being taught.

Discussed whether or not proposals should be more general.

Discussed the need to make sure that proposals line up with the contents of the syllabus.

494's must come to the core curriculum committee

Sought some revising of the new core proposal action sheet. Specifically, to include whether or not the course is or has been previously been designated as a W or D course, and whether or not a W or D designation is being sought.

Courses discussed:

ARTH 376 – Discussed this course. 4 approve, 2 abstain, 2 not present.

COMM 483 – Materials not complete (no syllabus). We will review this proposal at the next meeting. No vote.

ENGL 420 – Discussed this course. Syllabus description did not line up with the proposal. 6 approve, no abstains.

MGMT 494 – We assigned this number as the course is currently a pilot course. Unclear if there would be iteration in the writing. A revised syllabus, provided by the instructor to Tom Dalton, now shows that there will be iteration, which the committee sees as an important facet for W courses. Additionally, a rubric will now be included in the syllabus. Learning outcomes in the proposal need to align with the syllabus. The learning outcomes do not include writing. These changed need to be met for approval. The committee will revisit this course at the next CC meeting. No vote.

MKTG 410 – Writing is very well integrated in this course; good balance between individual and group writing products. Excellent W course. 6 approve, no abstains.

PHYS 481 – Discussed the student-based development of a rubric. It was a bit unclear how this would be accomplished. Do the students develop the criteria and the proficiency levels for the criteria? Is the rubric entirely student based for each assignment? Or is one rubric developed for each assignment? Recommend that the writing standards be embedded within criteria for evaluation in the writing rubrics. How do the students come up with standards, but then in the syllabus it indicates that the standards are to be the

same for the current standards for biophysics papers. Course learning outcomes need to . We advise that Dr. Anderson contact Dr. Houston for help with creating effective rubrics to align with course outcomes.

We appreciate that the course is clearly writing intensive, but see some room for improvement (as noted above). The committee will re-visit this proposal pending revisions. No vote.

POLS374 – Seems to be writing intensive, but it is unclear how the process of writing is developed in this course. The iterative process is not clear and needs to be better developed in the syllabus. It would be helpful to see how the use of films relate to the W aspect of the outcomes. What W outcomes are associated with the use of films.

We approve this proposal pending changes.

POLI302W – No proposal was received until too late. We will revisit this proposal at our next meeting. We noted that 70% of the course is based on exams and little on writing. Little time seems to be spent developing writing. We need a proposal and also need to see a syllabus that develops the writing aspect of this course consistent with the criteria established for W course. No vote.

We will revisit this proposal at a later date.

EDUC 389/589 – Learning outcomes need revision. It is unclear how this is a D course given how diversity criteria as established is met in this course. The committee needs to see the revisions before making a decision. No vote.

EDUC 301 – Learning outcomes are unclear. Learning outcomes are not just about the course, but instead must reflect how D criteria outcomes are going to be achieved. Course as described do not meet the D criteria. These need to be better described. The committee is unclear how learning outcomes of diversity are achieved. The one outcome, appreciation, is not one that is assessable. The committee needs to see the revisions before making a decision. No vote.

EDUC 379 – No proposal. No vote. Need better alignment of course outcomes with defining of the D criteria.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Siepielski