Westfield State University
Curriculum Committee Minutes for 10-20-11

In attendance: Enrique Morales-Diaz, Emily Todd, Christin Cleaton-Ruiz, Gabriel Aquino, Volker Ecke, Nicholas Newsome, Emily Tobin, Sarah Hegarty, Joe Camilleri, Eric Bressler, Diane Prusank, Tom Raffensperger, Marsha Marotta, Brian Conz, Jennifer DiGrazia, Mary Brown-Bonacci, David Shapleigh

- Meeting convened at 3:45 by Chair Morales-Diaz
- Minutes of October 6, 2011 meeting were approved
- Because there was no report from subcommittees, Chair Morales-Diaz proposed that we discuss ROCCC, specifically the issue of our large CORE.
  1. He began by asking if there was another approach that would work to assess our CORE. We discussed NEASC assessment identified that we need a process by which we might assess the effectiveness of our CORE, which hasn’t been assessed since the current outcomes were implemented. He suggested that ROCCC indicates that we need to take action, but explained that in our previous discussions, we have been stymied in our attempts because we had identified that the process that led to the ROCCC report may have been lacking some important information.
  2. One member suggested that we as a committee clarify what we are assessing: process, outcomes, our current CORE. We discussed how we might assess the CORE in a way that complemented the work done by ROCCC. One proposal was that we look at syllabuses since they are submitted electronically.
  3. We focused on the questions: How are we communicating the CORE to instructors and students?, How do we mandate change?, Do we ask departments if they have adopted the current CORE outcomes, or if they use another set?
  4. Discussion then moved to the role of IAC (Institutional Assessment Committee) in our discussion/process. Many Curriculum Committee members suggested that perhaps a review of the CORE was the purview of IAC. We discussed possible models: IAC collects and we review; does IAC recommend a tool for review? Overall, the point is that we don’t have a system or tool in place that enables review of our common CORE, aside from the ROCCC report’s data.
  5. One possible way to view the problem: ROCCC did a needs-based assessment. We are in the process of trying to determine what to do about it.
  6. Problems we identified/questions we raised: Do we invite IAC to come to a CC meeting? We need to know what is already happening in departments so we don’t repeat efforts. Have individual instructors informally revised their outcomes to reflect what courses do? What is the chain of command for implementing assessment? What is the chain of command for submitting requests for changes to the common CORE? What information does IAC currently have that might be useful to us? We determined that CurrComm should be in a position to articulate the questions that drive any sort of assessment process and that CurrComm should be in a position to implement any change to the CORE.
  7. We determined that we needed the exact language that articulates Curr Comm’s responsibilities regarding assessment of and possible changes to the common CORE.
  8. We voted to adjourn at 5:00.