**Agenda for UCA Core Council Meeting:**

**October 1, X period, Library 202**

**To:** Jim Deitrick, Mary Beth Sullivan, Carl Olds, David Welky, Kim Eskola, Cindy

Shelton, Joe McGarrity, Susan Gatto, Carey Smitherman, Charles Watson, Patty Phelps, Katelyn Knox, Renee LeBeau-Ford, Wendy Castro, Kurt Boniecki

**From:** Joanna Castner Post

**Date:** September 27, 2013

**Subject:** UCA Core Council Agenda for October 1 meeting (Library 202, X period)

1. Approve the minutes from the last meeting
2. Core Curriculum Review procedures (see Appendix A & B)
3. Parliamentarian
4. Working definitions of the four Core competencies
5. FYS Committee Report to Share Pilot Assessment Rubric (see FYS Committee Charge below)
6. Report from Special Committee for the Development of an Assessment Report Template (see charge below)

Note: The next meeting is November 5 at X period in Library 202. We won’t have the third Thursday meeting in Oct. because it is the beginning of Fall Break.

**FYS Committee Charge:** Review the suggestions (to be supplied by jcp) from FYS instructors about the shape and content of an assessment rubric for teaching students about general education and the UCA Core, and create a draft of an assessment rubric to pilot this semester. Work with the three volunteer FYS instructors: Benjamin Rider (philosophy), Joe Horton (EFIRM), Horst Lange (World Languages). FYS Committee Members: Cindy Shelton, Carl Olds, Kim Eskola. Due date for pilot rubric: October 1. We’ll review the pilot at the UCA Core Council meeting Oct. 1.

**Special Committee for the Development of an Assessment Report Template:** Create a report template for professors reporting data from the assessment of their Core courses. The template should call for the information the UCA Core Council will want to review. Committee members: Patty Phelps, Susan Gatto, Katelyn Knox. Due date: October 1. We’ll review the template at the UCA Core Council meeting Oct. 1.

**Appendix A: Rationale for Keeping Curriculum Review**

**Committee Structure as Outlined in Appendix B**

Upon review of the logistics of implementing a specialized Curriculum Review Committee structure wherein each committee reads for only one of the Core designations, it is the judgment of the UCA Core Director that the Core Council will work more efficiently with the previously outlined set-up. Problems with a specialized structure are as follows:

* Core Council members must understand all of the Core competencies and rubrics to represent their constituencies as effectively as possible. Departments across the disciplines will teach all four of the Core competencies.
* Specializing will result in multiple (up to 6) presenters for each proposal. We will have to meet more often to get through the upper-division Core proposals as a result.
* Specializing will result in multiple (up to 6) points of contact with each department chair, which would be inefficient and frustrating for everyone involved.

**Appendix B:** **Curriculum Review Committees**

One of the main goals of the UCA Core Council this year will be to review the expedited proposals for programmatic Core designations for upper-division and capstone courses. Become reacquainted with this process by going to the UCA Core Council web site ([www.uca.edu/gened](http://www.uca.edu/gened)) and scrolling down on the homepage to see the UCA Core structure graphic—it looks like a Grecian temple. Last year the General Education Council worked with programs to put the lower-division Core in place—that is the 38 hour foundation you see at the bottom of the Grecian temple.

This year, we will be working with programs to implement the upper-division and capstone component of the UCA Core. Students must take 3 hours in each Core competency at the upper-level (critical inquiry, diversity, effective communication, and responsible living). Then they must take a capstone course (from 1-6 hours) that will be assessed for effective communication and critical inquiry. Each upper-division course can be designated with up to two Core competencies. Programs will likely want to designate courses in the Core to help their majors graduate within the state-mandated 120 hour time frame. However, some programs will not be able to design courses with particular designations due to their disciplinary focus. In that case, students will take those hours from another program, likely in the course of completing their minor.

As a result, the UCA Core Council will be reviewing a great deal of curriculum this year. Please review the expedited form for upper-division and capstone courses for more details (click on Forms from the UCA Core web site). We are working with a tight time line. Those programs that are not creating new curriculum will be able to use the expedited process outlined on the form described above. These areas are encouraged to fill out the forms for their entire program and submit in one packet, so the Council can review the programmatic designations as a whole. The ideal time line for submitting this paperwork to the UCA Core Council would be early October, so there might be a chance that the Council could work through the many proposals in time for them to be implemented in the Spring of 2014. Changes to the Undergraduate Bulletin are due in early January, and curriculum would have to be ready to post then to be implemented this spring. Those programs creating new courses will not likely be able to meet this deadline because they will have to go through the entire curriculum review process, but they should plan to have their new curriculum through their college by the end of this semester to meet the hard deadline of curriculum implementation: Fall 2015.

In an effort to facilitate our workload, we will follow the curriculum review process instituted by Undergraduate Council. The UCA Core Director will gather programmatic proposals and assign them to one of the Curriculum Committees at least seven business days before each Council meeting. **Due to the workload and tight time line, the UCA Core Director will send proposals as she receives them, so be prepared to receive proposals before and up to the deadline.** **She will make an effort not to overload the committees.** The designated Chair of the committee will lead committee discussion via email or face-to-face about whether or not the elements of the proposal are correct and fitting for the definitions of each Core competency. If there are questions only the Chair of the proposing department can answer, the Chair of the Curriculum Committee will solicit the appropriate information and convey it to the committee. **The goal will be to solve problems with the proposals before they reach a vote in the larger Council.** Please be prepared to work with department chairs to make proposals ready for the vote. Once all information has been gathered, and the Curriculum Committee has discussed the issues related to a proposal, the Chair of the Curriculum Committee should take a vote of the Committee members. This can take place via email.

Chairs of Curriculum Committees should then be prepared to make a short presentation to the rest of the Council to explain the designations and issues discussed amongst the Curriculum Committee members as well as the result of the Committee’s vote**. Please be as detailed as possible, so the entire Council can understand the issues clearly.** The Chair of the Curriculum Committee will explain whether or not his/her committee recommends approval. Ideally, department chairs will also be present at the meeting to answer other questions that may arise from Council members on other committees.

**Curriculum Review Committee I:** Jim Deitrick (Chair), Mary Beth Sullivan, and Carl Olds.

**Curriculum Review Committee II:** David Welky (Chair), Kim Eskola, and Cindy Shelton.

**Curriculum Review Committee III:** Joe McGarrity (Chair), Katelyn Knox, and Susan Gatto.

**Curriculum Review Committee IV:** Carey Smitherman (Chair), Charles Watson, and Patty Phelps.