

Core Curriculum Committee Minutes
November 9, 2007
Welty Boardroom
1:30 p.m.

Members Present: Glenn Rhyne, Ross Whitwam, Amy Pardo, Joy Townsend, Sandra Jordan, Gail Gunter, Cay Lollar, Linda Mahoney (in lieu of Twila Alpe), Janice Giallourakis (in lieu of Tammie McCoy), Patricia Donat (chair)

Members Absent: Anne Balazs, Twila Alpe, Tammie McCoy and Holly Krogh (sabbatical leave)

Items Distributed: Agenda, Minutes from September 14, 2007, Rubric for Writing Exam, 2007 Commencement Survey

The minutes from the September 14, 2007, meeting were approved by Committee members after Dr. Donat noted an edit in the discussion of the General Education IER: "One committee member recommended changing the wording of the question to 'art, music, OR drama' as students may have marked the question 'disagree' because they had only had coursework in one of the three areas."

The Writing Assessment Committee is approaching the implementation phase of the process. This implementation committee has broad representation across the campus. The rubric for the writing exam was reduced to three levels – 0=Failing; 1=Average; and 2=Excellent. It was noted that we have only one category for failing versus two categories for passing. It was suggested that the category labels be taken off the rubric. There will be a pilot training program for the assessment committee. If this rubric proves successful, it could be distributed to students and faculty and could be used as a criterion across disciplines for writing assignments to clarify university expectations for competency.

The 2007 Commencement Survey was disseminated so that Committee members could review and suggest revisions. We may need to get more accurate descriptions of what we're trying to ascertain from the survey. Committee members were asked take the current survey back to their colleges and solicit ideas for changes. It was noted that a few questions need to be rephrased for accuracy. Any revision to the Commencement Survey must go before the PIE Council for approval.

A report of the fall 2007 CAAP test administration was given. This session had a projected attendance of 177. There were 113 students in attendance on Friday and 18 on Saturday for a total of 131 or 74% (26% no-show). In the spring of

2007, our no-show rate was at 27%. In the fall of 2006, we had a no-show rate of 21%. We have seen no positive effect yet of the rescheduling fee that will be assessed for the first time this fall. Our no-show goal is 10%. It was noted that we may not see any improvement in attendance until the fee structure has been in place more than one semester. Dr. Donat said that we will begin distributing to department heads our no-show list as well as the number of times students fail to show.

Committee members who served as proctors for the fall CAAP reported that those conducting the administration of the test did a great job. They also noted that when proctors observe students who are obviously not taking the test seriously, those students' tests can be flagged and not included in our analyses. It was reported that when sub-tests are paired for distribution the proctor will avoid these combinations: reading with writing and math with critical thinking.

Data for the spring 2008 CAAP administration were reported. The report total does not include students with a grade for UN001L; students with test scores for CAAP; Tupelo nursing students; students that have earned a degree; and non-degree seeking students. The report generated 657 student names. We will pare the list down by hours earned (78-80) in order to get near our target headcount of 250. The dates for the spring administration are Friday, March 28th, and Saturday, March 29th. The final listing of students for the spring will be circulated to deans and department chairs for their information. We are considering a CAAP administration date in the summer for students enrolled for summer school and/or graduating in August.

Dr. Donat will order examination copies of the CAAP test for departmental reviews. It was requested that departments contact her with preferred dates for review. She is hoping to make test available in departmental "secured areas" in order to make review more convenient.

Dr. Whitwam gave the Committee a report of the ad hoc Core Review Committee. He stated that the committee is working from the top down, establishing a vision, mission statement, guiding principles, etc. These are posted on the Core Review WebCT site. Next the committee will go to the learning objectives and then on to core categories. Dr. Jordan suggested that the Core Review Committee plan to hold an open forum for faculty members.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 8, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. in the Welty Boardroom.