2 Mar 2012 Minutes of the College Undergraduate (UG) Curriculum Committee

Members Present: Terry Adler, Dennis Clason, Michelle Jasso, Justine Adkisson, Michael Loera, Kathy Brook, Greg Roth and Kevin McNelis

Meeting Called to Order at 1130.

First Order of Business:

We reviewed a BUSA 111 Course Action Form (CAF) from the Dean’s office. Kathy Brook asked that there be no course prerequisites for BUSA 111. Currently, BCIS 110 (or CS 110) are listed as a prerequisite for BUSA 111. The issues are that students do not need to take this course before they take BUSA 111 and students are not being held accountable for this prerequisite to get into BUSA 111. Kevin McNelis moved and Dennis Clason seconded a motion to accept the proposal to eliminate this prerequisite for BUSA 111. The results of the discussion were as follows:

Motion passed with a 5-0 vote

Second Order of Business:

Terry confirmed that Michelle Jasso and Dennis Clason received supporting materials for the upcoming Finley Graves visit on 5 March 2012. Both did and the agenda for the visit was discussed.

Third Order of Business:

The committee began to review the performance components for each COB goal per the request of Sherry Mills. It has been three years since the UG Curriculum committee established goals for the college which ultimately led to the rubrics now used in assessment, so this is a timely and needed review. The results of this review are as follows:

1. **Goal 4: Ethics.**

A proposal was made to change the format of two of the “Components” in the *New Product Release* rubric. There are currently three “Components” in the left-hand margin of the rubric: Describe, Identify and Identify/Explain. We suggest deleting the word “Identify” in the last component so that it just says “Explain.” In conjunction with this change, we suggest moving the first statement in the current “Identify/explain” component that states “Identify alternative solutions to the ethical issue” to the second component labeled “Identify.” Finally, we suggest eliminating the bullets in front of “Identify alternative solutions to the ethical issue” and “Explain each alternative using the appropriate ethical perspectives.” While these changes are cosmetic, we believe that this will improve clarity in using the rubric in the assessment process. Dennis Clason moved and Michelle Jasso seconded a motion to accept these proposed changes. The results of the discussion were as follows:

Motion passed with a 5-0 vote
2. **Goal 3: Critical Thinking**

A proposal was made to delete the word “weakly” in the “Demonstrates an ability to form a clear comprehensive recommendation” component in the Critical Thinking rubric under the “Meets Expectations” category. The committee believes that this is too low a standard in meeting expectations to provide a conclusion with weakly supported evidence. Dennis Clasen moved and Greg Roth seconded a motion to accept these proposed changes. In discussion, a question was raised as to whether the fourth component is even necessary in assessment since it may be at too comprehensive a level of learning (i.e., the first three seem to do fine). Assessment data indicates that student learning is acceptable for the first three components of this rubric yet data for the fourth capability shows a consistent drop-off from the first three (67% this past fall for “Demonstrates an ability to form a clear comprehensive recommendation”). The committee reaffirmed that this is a valued skill to have upon graduation for our students but the committee **would like further context from the AOL committee as to why the drop-off in student learning**. The results of the discussion were as follows:

Motion passed with a 5-0 vote to delete the word “weakly.”

3. **Goal 2: Diversity**

As stated in previous minutes, the committee would like to see the performance components in the Diversity rubric changed to better align with the intent of a more general definition of diversity. Currently, we believe that there is too much emphasis placed on “stereotypes” in the assessment process. For instance, two of the three components deal with stereotypes while one assesses social perception issues. The committee reaffirmed the social perception component as necessary for this goal but would like the Management Department to expand our assessment of diversity. **Thus, we are asking Grace Ann Rosile to come to our next meeting on 30 March 2012 to provide context on this issue in how best to proceed in revising diversity as it is currently assessed.** Michael Loera also provided the committee with a copy of the current AACSB International BizEd which discusses the teaching of diversity. Thanks to Michael.

4. **Goal 1: Written Communication**

The committee recognizes that the rubric used to assess written communication needs revision. There are overlapping areas in the descriptions of these components for one. We are asking the opinions of experts in written communication on their thoughts about our rubric and will be getting electronic templates more applicable for what we are trying assess from said experts. We should have these templates made available to us by Dennis Clasen in time for review at our next meeting on 30 March 2012.

Meeting Adjourned at 1224.

Next meeting is scheduled at 1130 on 30 Mar 2012.

Submitted by: Terry Adler, Chair