

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
October 7, 1997**

Present: Barnett, Bruce, R. Fields, Fikes, Goleeke, Kline (Chair), Lupher, Mehlhaff, Proehl, Ralls, Bartanen, Washburn, Tomhave (for Morgan)
Absent: Hooper
Visitor: Yuko Tanaka

Kline opened the meeting at 4:06 p.m. and acknowledged Brad Tomhave, attending for Morgan.

Minutes. Fields M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 30 September 1997.

Core Curriculum assessment. Kline, along with Washburn and Bartanen, met with Associate Academic Dean John Finney and talked about assessment as a long-term overall process. The chief outcome of the meeting was the realization that the committee's effort to determine a process of assessment for a "pilot" implementation this year as part of the University's reaccreditation study can focus on only part of the core, perhaps two areas, as a basis for future extension of the process.

Washburn added that as an institution we need to design a University-wide system of assessment at all levels, and this system should be "eased into." We do not need masses of data in the short run. Kline stated that involving ourselves in "the process of inquiry," having a "plan," and being in a position to do a "trial" would be acceptable.

In discussion Goleeke asked if the committee's efforts would duplicate those of departments, schools, or programs with core courses and up for five-year curricular review this year. Bartanen responded that only the Curriculum Committee judges a core course for its "core-ness"; a department would judge a course on its role in the departmental curriculum.

Mehlhaff launched conversation about the basis for measuring the core and suggested a focus on information published in the University *Bulletin*, which includes the eight educational goals (p. 3), the four goals of the core curriculum (p. 6), and an encapsulation of each core rubric (pp. 7-9). Responding to Bartanen's suggestion, the committee's attention turned particularly to the four goals of the core.

Fikes mentioned the evaluation form for Science in Context courses and also a report by Jim Evans done last year. Washburn will arrange for committee members to receive copies of the report, which includes a copy of the form.

"WORK GROUP" SESSION. For the remainder of the meeting the committee functioned as a "work group" to set a course of action. With Kline presiding at the blackboard, the committee came up with working labels ("useful categories") for groups of core courses and chose a core rubric in each for our assessment project. The committee achieved a consensus as follows: "**Processes,**" COMMUNICATION I; "**Perspectives,**" FINE ARTS; "**Perplexities,**" SCIENCE IN CONTEXT.

With reminders to read pp. 1-9 of the *Bulletin* and the last reaccreditation report (on the web), and with distribution of a document resulting from John Finney's research through the Office of Institutional Research, the committee ended the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne W. Barnett
8 October 1997