

Minutes of the LPWG

Wednesday February 11, 2009 – 3 p.m.

Pioneer

In attendance: Sharon Wilkinson, Sal Meyers, Jennifer Nostrala, Jack Gittinger, Del Shepard, Steve Griffith, John Pauley, Cyd Dyer, Amy Doling, Murphy Waggoner, Kedron Bardwell, Walter Pearson, and Jim Hayes.

The Academic Dean Steve Griffith called the meeting to order to discuss the document being prepared to send to the full faculty.

A discussion was held regarding when to present to EPCC.

The Dean noted that Nancy St. Clair is still working on the breadth issue to include as a response in the document.

Walter Pearson presented a document that addressed the transfer issues raised. Included within this document are the following: everyone would take a Simpson seminar upon entry to the academy including all transfers, there would be core to core transfer approval with the exception of the global perspective, and the embedded skills (called Intellectual Practices at Arcadia) are assumed to be met in a student's major.

A great deal of the information presented in the document on transfers by Walter was lifted from the ideas and programs at Arcadia. It was noted that to create a system that would look at each course and syllabus would be nightmarish, thus the idea of a core to core acceptance proves workable. The global perspective is the exception as many community colleges do not have this as part of their core program and so it would need to be met at Simpson.

A discussion ensued about the amount of credits that would exempt a student from having to track the embedded skills here at Simpson College. 16 credits were proposed. Some persons favored upping the amount to 30 or 32 credits.

Kedron Bardwell brought forth the question of assessment. How would we see if the program as a whole is achieving a competency/proficiency? How would we measure growth?

Steve Griffith said that we would not assess the individual student. Jack Gittinger and Sal Meyers concurred explaining that rather than assessing individual students the program as a whole would be assessed.

Jennifer Nostrala commented that it might be useful to know how many credits the incoming freshman class brings in.

Sal suggested that Simpson should approach this issue in one of two ways: either change #5 to 32 credits or require incoming transfers complete 1 stamp in each embedded skill.

Several persons present voiced favor for the 1 stamp of each embedded skill idea.

John Pauley related that he had a student in class now who has gone to DMAAC and Iowa State. It's likely that she's taken three critical thinking courses – should she be required to take more here at Simpson to meet the 1 stamp each requirement?

Jennifer Nostrala said, “You have to imagine the Admissions office explaining this...”

Jennifer also noted that maybe we need to distinguish between AP credit or core courses from another institution of higher ed.

Walter replied that Simpson College has a large and thoughtful base of experience well established to discern incoming credits. He said that the OCW (the new proposed core) transfers nicely. The embedded skills process is the issue we face because it's not a course by course transfer.

The sentiment of the group is to raise the incoming transfer credits to 30 credits to reduce required number of embedded skills. Therefore students coming in with 30 or more credits would be required to only meet 1 each of the embedded skills. Students with 29 or less credits would be expected to meet all required embedded skills.

Walter will provide data to see what kinds of credit students are bringing in currently and he will begin redrafting the transfer document.

Walter Pearson then talked about the core to core transfer portion of the document. His committee looked at the community colleges that Simpson tends to draw from. The committee decided that the general ed curriculum is at a higher level of consistency and that the AA degree meets core to core with Simpson with the exception of global perspectives.

Next on the table the timeline was reviewed.

The group decided that it will not endorse the swift interim curriculum adjustment proposal and wanted it taken out of the publicized timeline.

They felt that should this overall proposal fail that the same process would be followed and we'd go back to looking at criteria for the cornerstones.

Murphy said that the faculty has expressed wanting a change and that is what the group is proposing. She will redraft the timeline and take out all of the “if, yes” and “if, no” language. The committee agreed and would like to propose a timeline that expresses confidence that the new curriculum is being proposed to be voted and passed.

Cyd noted that what the committee is asking at this point as far as a vote is a vote for the framework of a new curriculum.

Steve Griffith also said that on day one we wouldn't have to begin the project in total – we could bring this in in pieces.

Murphy brought up the curriculum assessment needs which will be present for the old or the new curriculum. A call for volunteers for a committee to study such will include Sal Meyers, Nancy St. Clair and Amy Doling.

The meeting was adjourned. Next meeting – Wednesday February 18, 2009 – 3 p.m. – Pioneer, McNeill Hall

Respectfully submitted,

Shelly Priebe