January 8, 2016

Tuesday, January 05, 2016 9:21 AM

Date: 1/8/2016, 2-3:30 pm
Location: Hurley 204A

Attendance:

1. ✓ Admin Co-Chair: Jeanne Tunks
2. ✓ Group I: Kathryn Raign (L&TC)
3. ✓ Faculty Co-Chair: Group II: Karen Harker (LIBR)
4. ✗ Group III: Robert Renka (CSCE)
5. ✗ ✓ Group IV: Steven Forde (PSCI)
6. ✗ Group V: Robert Insley (MGMT)
7. ✗ Group VI: VACANT
8. ☐ ! Group VII: Gabe Ignatow (SOCI)
9. ✓ Group VIII: Teresa Cooper (DANC)
10. ✗ Group A-L 1: Lou Pelton (MKTG)
11. ✓ Group A-L 2: Daniel Alemneh (LIBR)
12. ✗ Group A-L 3: Phil Sweany (CSCE)

Agenda

- Review Provost's decision regarding capstones. Jeanne Tunks
- If necessary, review the SOWK 2361 course in Curriculog. Karen Harker
- Decide on scope, content and flow of Website about the Core Curriculum. Karen & Jeanne
  - Primary audience: Faculty and departmental course committees desiring info about getting a course through the core.
    - What information is needed?
      - Checklists of the process
      - Structured around the documents that need to be assembled
      - Rubrics for assessment
      - User's guide to getting a course by steps
      - Length of time needed to approve
      - Examples of proposals and assessment plans that were approved - with explanations of what was good about them.
      - Explanation of the difference b/w assessment methods
      - About the communal assessment process
      - Link to the OCCC page on the Faculty Senate site
      - More info:
        - Some state documents
        - AACU VALUE rubrics
    - What is not needed?
  - Secondary audiences:
    - Core curriculum admins/faculty from other institutions
      - Processes
    - Students seeking info about transferring core courses
      - Links to the TCCNS course comparison list (http://www.tccns.org/search/year/)
- Review the Empirical & Quantitative Skills rubric in light of the assignments that were actually submitted for communal assessment. Karen & Jeanne.
  - We compared the current UNT E&QS to the VALUE QL rubric, as well as one of the

assignments that was submitted and recognized that the current rubric would not apply to the assignments.

- The main concern is that the dimensions were good, but the levels were worded to apply only to assignments with a specific number of "targeted questions", whereas most of the assignments submitted were from the social sciences & business that were based on reviewing data and writing reports.
- Jeanne & Barbara will provide an assessment of the assignments that were submitted for us to review at the February meeting in order to revise the E&QS rubric to match them.