

## UCA Core Council / General Education Council Minutes – January 16, 2014

### **Members Present:**

Jim Deitrick (CAR – Phil & Rel)  
Kim Eskola (CAR – KPED)  
Susan Gatto (Coll of HBS)  
Katelyn Knox (Coll of Lib Arts)  
Joe McGarrity (Coll of Bus)  
Carl Olds (CAR – Film)  
Jordan Payson (SGA)  
Patty Phelps (Coll of Ed)  
Cindy Shelton (CAR – Health Sciences)  
Carey Smitherman (Coll of FAC)  
Kenny Stice (SGA)

Mary Beth Sullivan (CAR – Poli Sci)  
Dave Welky (CAR – History)  
  
Kurt Bonecki (Ex-officio, Provost's Office)  
Joanna Castner-Post (Ex-officio, GEC Chair)

### **Members Absent:**

Charles Watson (Coll of NSM)  
Wendy Castro (Ex-officio, Dir of Assessment)  
Renee LeBeau-Ford (Ex-officio, Library)

### **AGENDA for Nov. 21 Meeting:**

1. **Curriculum Review Committee I:** Jim Deitrick (Chair), Mary Beth Sullivan, Carl Olds, and Jordan Payson. Report on Mass Communication and Theatre upper-division Core proposals.
2. **Curriculum Review Committee II:** David Welky (Chair), Kim Eskola, Cindy Shelton, and Kenny Stice. Report on Nutrition upper-division Core proposals, perhaps with a call to vote.
3. **Curriculum Review Committee III:** Joe McGarrity (Chair), Katelyn Knox, and Susan Gatto. Kinesiology upper-division Core proposals.
4. **Curriculum Review Committee IV:** Carey Smitherman (Chair), Charles Watson, and Patty Phelps. Writing upper-division Core proposals.
5. Discussion of the Proficiency Profile (Wendy Castro and Joanna Castner Post).

### **Un-numbered Item**

**MOTION** to suspend rules to allow for December minutes to be approved (Gatto) with **SECOND** (Welky)

**MOTION** unanimously approved

Minutes from Dec 3 meeting **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

### **1. Curriculum Review Committee I:**

Committee is waiting on department resubmissions

### **2. Curriculum Review Committee II:**

**FAMILY & CONSUMER SCIENCES COURSES** – ready to ask for approval after back and forth over break

**MOTION** to approve all courses as revised (Shelton) with **SECOND** (Stice)

Discussion concerned new courses that are being developed and looking at submissions with those future proposed changes in mind

**MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **3. Curriculum Review Committee III:**

**KINESIOLOGY COURSES** – ready to ask for approval

**MOTION** to approve all courses as revised (McGarrity) with **SECOND** (Deitrick)  
Discussion concerned high quality of Kinesiology submissions  
**MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **4. Curriculum Review Committee IV:**

**WRITING COURSES** – ready to ask for approval  
**MOTION** to approve all courses as revised (Smitherman) with **SECOND** (Phelps)  
Discussion concerned challenges of capturing the different writing tracks  
**MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **5. Discussion of Proficiency Profile (no intention to vote)**

Proficiency Profile is a standardized test by ETS given to students to validate Gen Ed competencies  
Council is being asked to look at using the test to get institution-comparable data on student learning in the program

During Academic Year 2011/12 the Gen Ed Council voted to pilot test using Freshmen and Seniors  
way to assess previously unassessed program  
way to demonstrate to other institutions and to outside accreditors effectiveness of program  
tested seniors during Spring 2012 with 90-minute test + essay at \$18.50 per student  
sample of students – too expensive to give to all students  
664 names submitted for sample – only 105 took it  
too small a sample size (need at least 300-350) – sample was also not very heterogeneous (not enough different courses)

Associate Provost started in Fall 12 – gave test to incoming freshmen during Welcome Week  
randomly selected 495 to take test during orientation  
needed 300+ students – it took great effort/incentives to get 220 to take it  
so test wasn't administered to seniors—waste of effort and \$ if results were unusable

new FYS and Capstone courses are ideal places to administer this – Associate Provost wants to know how council feels

Discussion about how the test would be used—  
Exam isn't relevant to the course students are taking = not fair to count in course assessment  
How much credit / incentive would you give? How do you make it uniform across multiple disciplines  
Does it show student progress in UCA Core program? measures different outcomes  
if its only use is to compare against other institutions, how valid is the data we would collect?  
problems with comparing apples to oranges—transfer students?

Many questions about its effectiveness and its practicality?

"A slippery slope problem, while hitting nails on the head," mix-aphorically speaking...  
Could this be used later by administration to force curricula changes that match the test rather than the agreed upon  
goals of the UCA Core?

Is this being pushed by the HLC? no, but we told them we would be using it  
Why wasn't this part of the Task Force deliberations?

**OUT OF TIME – DISCUSSION HALTED**  
**MOTION TO ADJOURN**