

Minutes of the Liberal Studies Committee (LSC)

October 30, 2014

UC Dogwood

Members Present: Brent Kinser (Chair), Carol Burton, Chris Tuten, Elizabeth McRae, Heather Pack, James Deconinck, Jeanne Dulworth, Martin Tanaka, Niall Michelsen, Steve Baxley, Baldwin Sanders

Members Absent: Michelle Scifers, Paromita Biswas, Travis Bennett

Recorder: Deidre Hopkins

Ex-Officio Members/Guests: Erin McNelis, Larry Hammer, Kim Winter

1. Introductions around the table for our new committee members and our guests.
2. Liberal Studies Assessment Rubrics
 - Brent sent out the Rubrics again with the revisions that were discussed at our last meeting.
 - Would be willing to preliminarily approve the rubrics as a starting point because the next two things that need to happen are:
 1. Getting the survey for Phase I, which is to go to all 101 or 202 instructors.
 2. Prepare the same survey for Phase II to get the sample.
 3. Are there any comments, suggestions, etc of the revised rubrics? Minor changes include:
 1. Pulling out all info about assignments, because they are irrelevant.
 2. Tweaked the rubrics by doing the further separations that were discussed.
 3. Recollection was that we would present the instructors with the outcomes and ask in Phase I which of these outcomes do you address in your course, then we'll have a map of that.
 4. In terms of assessing student work, we are going to ask the instructors who are selected to turn in their student's work and select the rubric that best fits that assignment.
 5. Changed the love of learning rubric, either is excited to learn or loves to learn but not both.
 - Motion to preliminary approve the rubrics and move forward with the plan for assessment. The motion was seconded by Martin Tanaka. No further discussion. All was in favor and motion was carried.
3. Curriculog Presentation (Kim Winter)
 - Dr. Burton introduced Kim Winter and her team, Larry Hammer is present as part of that team.
 - Dr. Burton gave a quick overview of the Curriculog at last week's meeting. She asks that as Kim goes through the presentation, that we keep in mind that although we are looking at it from the Liberal Studies Committee today, you may be required to look at it as general faculty/staff in your home departments.
 - A little background: January 2014 the committee began to talk to the Provost about how the curriculum process worked, mostly paper based and semi-electronic as there were a few emails here

and there. Large amounts of printing. A team was put together from people across the entire campus and began meeting in May 2014.

- Where you can find Curriculog:
University website > Provost Office > Resources for Faculty and Staff > Curriculum Items
<http://www.wcu.edu/about-wcu/leadership/office-of-the-provost/resources-for-faculty-and-staff/index.asp>
- The most important things to note is the Curriculog Email (curriculog@wcu.edu). For questions, concerns, help, etc. you can send an email and one of the Curriculog administrators (Kim Winter, Ann Green, Sara Speed) will respond to your email.
 1. The administrators also act as liaisons to the company, if you find a bug, glitch or anything wonky – let them know so that
- First proposal is to have one of the administrators sit down and walk through the proposal together.
- Brent Kinser is the LSC Chair and Agenda Administrator.
 1. Agenda Administrator is the person who pulls together the proposals that you are going to review.
 2. Also, the agenda administrator records the vote on behalf of the committee.
- WCU Curriculog website: <https://wcu.curriculog.com/>
 1. Logging in: Use WCU username and password
- For the sake of repetition, the WCU Curriculog User Guide can be found in today's meeting folder.
- Dashboard:
 1. There's a calendar where the approval dates have already been added. You can change the view. It will tell you when things happen that are related to you. It will give you big picture updates.
 2. When there is something is ready for the LSC to review, you will receive a daily digest email that will be sent out to you notifying you that you have an item that is at the level of LSC and needs to be acted on.
- Settings – feel free to change your settings.
- Proposals: (vocab word - Launch)
 1. Can be edited throughout the process; mainly typos, grammar errors, or small things that need to be changed for clarification.
 2. The point is not to change the intent of a proposal, but to be able to have the flexibility to make those small changes here and there. (Changes are tracked throughout the process.)
 3. Circles below proposals will show where in the process that the proposal is currently.
 4. In the full proposal, you can see comments on the right-hand side.
 5. New proposals must seek a library consultation.
 6. Watch List – if you click watch on any items, then you will get notifications in daily digest but you can also look at your watch list and see the things you are interested in.
 7. Advance Filter – if you want to filter for your program, **filter for the department** (don't write in the college name; you'll get a much bigger list that may not be as helpful for you.)
 8. Encouraging course and program changes as a package...if they are going hand in hand.
 9. Very important to read the **"READ BEFORE YOU BEGIN"** section when you start a proposal.
 10. Track changes are recorded through the process. It will tell you who/when the changes are made.
 11. Question: can you do multiple degree types? For instance, in History we have a B.A. and a B.S.

1. Per Larry Hammer – these are technically different programs and if you do them together, then it will cause problems in the integration back to Acculog and Banner.
2. If the programs do not look exactly alike, the import will be off causing problems.
12. Importing a program change will take longer than if you are importing a course change.
13. Anything with an (*) is required before you can launch the proposal.
- 14. If there is a rejection to a proposal, it will go back one step.**

- Agendas: (vocab word - Publish)
 1. Name the agenda, once an agenda is published it becomes public. (Maybe name the agenda by using the committee name and/or date.)
 2. View agenda summary, view full agenda, lots of different options.
 - Accounts:
 1. You can see the roles that each faculty/staff member, etc has within the system.
 - Reports:
 1. Impact Reports – to see if any other programs are going to be effected by the changes you make. This will generate a list of the programs that are impacted, if there are any.
 2. Human element – it's your responsibility to get those consultations from the departments' that are impacted. It can be emailed and the email consultations can be pasted/uploaded to the proposal.
 3. There are numbers of other options for Reports that you can view for more specific information.
 - Catalogs (Larry Hammer):
 1. When we implemented Curriculog we decided not to publish the proposed catalog in this list. It has been hidden.
 2. The things that get edited with regard to curriculum will happen in Curriculog. As a proposal comes through, you'll get your descriptions, etc from the current catalog and make whatever edits. Then as it comes to the approval process, it will write back into the proposed catalog.
 3. Acculog does our online catalog and Curriculog is owned by Acculog and that's why those two systems talk to each other.
4. Do we want to establish a time for when we want to get proposals in by before we discuss at a meeting. Since we are scheduled to meet weekly, we will play it by ear. If we have a task to approve that comes in too soon to meeting time, we will postpone it until the following week.

Time of Meeting Adjournment: 4:42pm

Email Update from Brent on 11/04/14

Here is an update on the assessment, with a question for David O at the end.

1. I have begun consulting with Laura Cruz to see how the survey might work. She is going to have a conversation with David Onder, and will be happy to help once we figure a good and non-onerous way to do this survey.
2. It has become clear that we need to alter the plan a bit. Although the first phase can stand basically as is, the second phase needs to be altered.
3. **Phase I:** send a survey to all instructors of 101 and 202 and ask them to select all of the outcomes expected in their class. That will allow us to understand what the map of outcomes delivery looks like in Engl 101 and 202. **Change:** Prepopulating the survey would require manual entry of the data – this will not work. So, instead of prepopulating the survey I have proposed that we simply send it to the instructors with something generic along the lines of
 - a. “You have been identified as a current instructor of English 202. In order to assess the C1 category of the Liberal Studies Program, we need your help. From the list below, please select all of the outcomes that you address in your English 202 classes. The information will be kept confidential and used only in the context of assessing the entire Liberal Studies Program.”
4. I think another change here is possibly to separate email/survey into 101 and 202, simply to know if there any differences in the self-selected outcomes being delivered in the two courses. Something to discuss in terms of whether we want/need to do this.
5. **Phase II:** We were going to ask instructors to select a rubric. But, it will be just as difficult to attach a self-selected rubric to sample as it would be to attach an assignment to a sample (all identifying info will be stripped, so we can't tell which assignment belongs to which person, assignment, or rubric), so we need a plan B, or C.
6. **Plan B:** One possibility is that what we could do is to first do phase one, take a look at the map of outcomes selected outcomes, and then have the LSC choose which rubric the assessment team will use to assess student work during this cycle of assessment. This will work well if the English instructors all choose the same outcome (not likely).

7. **Plan C:** Another possibility might be to set up David's tool so that we have multiple folders for submissions. If possible, the folders would be attached to different rubrics. It would work like this: If I think my student sample should be assessed by the locate and analyze information rubric, I submit it to folder A. If I think the sample should be assessed by the Effective written communication rubric, I submit to folder B; etc.
8. We could, if this approach is possible, set up folders for the entire range of outcomes selected by the 202 instructors. The information would be stripped from the file, so the assessment teams would not know who is submitting the material, but they would know which rubric to use on the samples in the folder.
9. So, **a question for David O:** Would this kind of multiple submission folder approach be possible within the tool you are developing for Nate?

Please consider the issue, and we can discuss it at next week's meeting.

Email Update from Brent on 11/13/14

David Onder has offered a suggestion for the rubrics (refining the meaning of the word refined) and caught a couple of errors—so I will fix the rubrics and send out for everyone to review. Stand by.

I will be meeting with David Onder and Nate Kreuter on Monday to finalize the processes for the WRCS (C1) assessment. Which means that by next week (20 Nov.) we should be able to make a presentation to LSC for a final sign-off before I roll it out to the WRCS faculty on 21 Nov.