AGENDA

1. Call to order  
   Professor Morris Levy

2. Approval of Minutes of 23 January 2012

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the President  
   President France A. Córdova

5. Remarks of the Chairperson  
   Professor Morris Levy

6. Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees  
   For Information  
   Professor Timothy Folta

7. Question Time

8. Legislative Update  
   For Information  
   Vice President for Public Affairs Julie Griffith

9. University Senate Document 11-7 Undergraduate Core Curriculum  
   For Action  
   Professor Teri Reed-Rhoads

10. University Senate Document 11-8 Nominees for Vice-Chair of the Senate  
    For Discussion  
    Professor Natalie Carroll

11. Honors College Update  
    For Information  
    Interim Dean Dennis Savaiano

12. Academic Program Assessment Update  
    For Information  
    Provost Timothy Sands

13. New Business

14. Memorial Resolutions

15. Adjournment
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Fifth Meeting, Monday, 20 February 2012, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: President France A. Córdova; Morris Levy, (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding,


1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson Morris Levy.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 23 January 2012 were approved as distributed by unanimous voice vote.
3. The agenda was accepted as distributed by unanimous voice vote.
4. President France A. Córdova presented remarks to the Senate.
5. Professor Levy presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix A).
6. Professor Timothy Folta, Chair of the Steering Committee, presented, for information, the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix B). Professor David Williams, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), mentioned that the FAC is forming a subcommittee to review the online system that is currently used by students to evaluate faculty members. This subcommittee will be chaired by Professor Charlene Sullivan. The formation of this subcommittee is in response to numerous concerns about the system that have been expressed by Purdue University faculty members. Professor Williams also said that the FAC has received the proposal from Professor Levy concerning adding a faculty member to the Board of Trustees. He invited comments on this matter from the Senators.

7. At “Question Time” Professor Louis Sherman stated that the Senate needs a public relations committee to enable it to act quickly in response to legislative issues that affect the university. Professor Folta noted this request and it will be considered by the Steering Committee.

8. Vice President Julie Griffith presented, for Information, a legislative update (see Appendix C). Following her presentation she entertained questions from the floor. These questions primarily dealt with issues being considered during the current legislative session. She emphasized that her office is following issues closely and in touch with legislators to ensure that they know the Purdue University positions on various issues. Her office is working diligently to keep develop relationships with new legislators and while maintaining existing relationships with longer-term legislators. She will be happy to come back to the Senate and present a post-legislative session summary. In addition, she emphasized that her door is always open and she is quite willing to answer questions from any of the university community members.

9. The next item on the agenda was Senate Document 11-7, Endorsement of the Proposed University Core Curriculum. This document was an action item. Prior to the motion to approve the document Professor Teri Reed-Rhoads, chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) introduced Professor Teresa Doughty Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee. Professor Doughty presented an update on the changes that were made in the document since its first reading (for Discussion) at the January Senate meeting (see Appendix D). Following Professor Doughty’s presentation, Professor Reed-Rhoads stated that she was willing to accept the revised document by consent of the assembly (a friendly amendment). In order for its acceptance by consent, no objections to its acceptance or amendments could be made from the floor of the Senate. Professor Levy asked if there were objections to accepting the document by consent or if there were amendments to be proposed. It was noted that several amendments were to be proposed so the motion to accept the document by consent failed. Professor Reed-Rhoads made a motion to accept Senate Document 11-7 and her motion was seconded. During the ensuing discussion period, several amendments and amendments to the amendments were proposed and voted on.

- Professor Paul Schwab introduced and made a motion to accept an amendment that would limit the issues that could be addressed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Council (UCC). His motion was seconded. There was no objection to his amendment and it was accepted by consent of the assembly. The change in wording will be on page 4 of the document in the third sentence of the first paragraph under “2. Undergraduate Curriculum Council: Administration and Oversight Structure.” The Current and Proposed wordings are listed below:

  o Current Wording: “Among the range of issues to be addressed by the UCC is the approval of foundational courses, establishment of guiding
rules, regulating and monitoring approved courses, and resolution of issues related to transfer students.

- Proposed Wording: “The issues to be addressed by the UCC are limited to: the approval of foundational courses, establishment of guiding rules for meeting the foundational outcomes, regulating and monitoring approved courses that satisfy the foundational outcomes, review of the list of foundational and embedded outcomes, and resolution of issues related to transfer students satisfying foundational requirements.”

Professor William Crossley proposed a second amendment to change the wording associated with the UCC structure. His motion was seconded. The wording change is located on page 4, the fifth sentence in the first paragraph under “2. Undergraduate Curriculum Council: Administration and Oversight Structure.” The Current and Proposed wordings are below:

- Current Wording: “The UCC will report directly to the University Senate.”
- Proposed Wording: “The University Senate shall define and limit the UCC’s duties, responsibilities and powers; the UCC shall be directly responsible to the Senate.”

Two amendments to the amendment were made and passed. The amended amendment was then approved and the final wording of the amendment is as follows:

- Final Proposed Wording: “The University Senate shall define and limit the UCC’s duties, responsibilities and powers, and hear appeals to the UCC decisions; the UCC shall be directly responsible to the Senate via the Educational Policy Committee.”

Professor Schwab presented the third amendment concerning substantial changes that are proposed by the UCC in the future. The changed wording will be on page 5, first bullet point as follows:

- Current Wording: “All substantial changes to the framework or outcomes require a majority vote of the Undergraduate Curriculum Council and approval of the University Senate.”
- Proposed Wording: “Substantial changes to the framework or outcomes that are originated by the Undergraduate Curriculum Council require a majority vote of the UCC and subsequent approval by the University Senate. Substantial changes to the framework or outcomes may also be made by action of the University Senate following the established bylaws for new proposals.”

An amendment to the amendment was accepted by consent. The amended amendment was then approved and the final wording of the amendment is as follows:

- Final Proposed Wording: “Substantial changes to the framework, outcomes, or procedures that are originated by the Undergraduate Curriculum Council require a majority vote of the UCC and subsequent approval by the University Senate. Substantial changes to the framework, outcomes, or procedures may also be made by action of the University Senate following the established bylaws for new proposals.”

Professor Barrett Caldwell presented the fourth amendment concerning embedded outcomes. The changes are on page 5, the bullet point describing reviewing of embedded outcomes as follows:

- Current Wording: “It is recommend that reporting procedures be outlined/streamlined to coordinate with accreditation approvals for programs whose national accreditation standards already align with the
embedded outcomes and they achieve national accreditation to avoid duplicative efforts. For example, scheduling extensive reports on assessment of core outcomes should be scheduled to coincide with ABET, NCATE, AACSB and other accrediting agency visits. Also, for outcomes that are also accreditation outcomes, the program area accreditation report be acceptable to the Undergraduate Council review procedures for ongoing embedded learning outcomes alignment.”

**Proposed Wording:** “Reporting procedures shall be coordinated with accreditation approvals for programs whose national accreditation standards already align with the embedded outcomes and whose programs achieve national accreditation to avoid duplicative efforts. For example, reporting on assessment of embedded outcomes shall coincide with ABET, NCATE, AACSB and other accrediting agency visits. Also, the program area report provided to the accrediting agency shall be acceptable to the Undergraduate Curriculum Council for ongoing embedded learning outcomes alignment, if that program area deems that receiving the national outcomes based accreditation is part of that program area’s determination of where and at what level the embedded outcomes are met.”

Professor Reed-Rhoads expressed her willingness to accept this amendment by consent, but Professor Patrick Kain raised an objection. A motion was then made to approve the amendment and it was seconded. Discussion ensued and an amendment to the amendment was proposed as follows:

**Revised Proposed Wording:** “Reporting procedures shall be coordinated with accreditation approvals for programs whose national accreditation standards already align with the embedded outcomes and whose programs achieve national accreditation to avoid duplicative efforts. For example, reporting on assessment of embedded outcomes shall coincide with ABET, NCATE, AACSB and other accrediting agency visits. Also, the program area report provided to the accrediting agency shall be acceptable to the Undergraduate Curriculum Council for ongoing embedded learning outcomes alignment, if that program area deems that receiving the national outcomes based accreditation is part of that program area’s determination of where and at what level the embedded outcomes are met.”

This amendment to the amendment failed.

A second amendment to the amendment was proposed by Professor Schwab. His amendment to the amendment was accepted and approved. The amended amendment was then approved by unanimous voice vote and the wording of the amended amendment is as follows:

**Final Proposed Wording:** “Reporting procedures shall be coordinated with accreditation approvals for programs whose national accreditation standards already align with the embedded outcomes and whose programs achieve national accreditation to avoid duplicative efforts. For example, reporting on assessment of embedded outcomes shall coincide with ABET, NCATE, AACSB and other accrediting agency visits. Also, the program area report provided to the accrediting agency shall be acceptable to the Undergraduate Curriculum Council for ongoing embedded learning outcomes alignment, if that program area deems that receiving the national outcomes based accreditation is part of that program area’s determination of where and at what level the embedded outcomes are met. Embedded outcomes that do not align, shall be reported to the UCC.”
• Professor Sandra Rossie introduced a fifth amendment to change the wording describing Change of Degree Objective (CODO) on page 5 where the single bulleted item will be changed to two separate bullet points.
  o **Current Wording:** “Recommends that once a student meets an outcome (whether foundational or embedded), the student receives credit for meeting that outcome. If a student CODOs to another program or college, the previously met outcomes will still be considered to have been met for that student.”
  o **Proposed Wording (two bullets):**
    ▪ “Recommends that once a student meets an outcome (whether foundational or embedded), the student receives credit for meeting that outcome.”
    ▪ “If a student CODOs to another program or college, the previously met foundational outcomes will still be considered to have been met for that student.”
  o Professor Rossie’s amendment was accepted by consent of the assembly.

• Professor Patricia Bauman made a motion to amend the wording in Table 1 by adding the words “…or a higher level Mathematics course…” after “MA 153.” Her motion was seconded. Following a brief discussion, her motion was defeated by a majority voice vote. Professor Gabriele Giuliani made a motion to add “e.g.” before “MA 153.” His motion was seconded. Professor William McInerney spoke in opposition to the motion. The vote was taken and the motion passed with a majority of hands raised in favor.

• Professor Natalie Carroll made a motion to approve wording changes to the Council Membership at the bottom of page 4.
  o **Current Wording:** “The membership of the Undergraduate Curriculum Council is comprised of at least one faculty representative from each College, the Krannert School of Management, and Libraries as voting members. In addition, members will be added to represent regional campuses, a member of the PWL Registrar’s office, PWL Student Government, a head academic advisor, and a representative from the Provost’s Office. Faculty members will serve a 3-year term. A faculty representative may serve no more than two consecutive terms before new faculty representatives are appointed. The faculty in each College/School will select its representative to the UCC.”
  o **Proposed Wording:** “The membership of the Undergraduate Curriculum Council is comprised of one faculty representative from each College, the Krannert School of Management, and Libraries as voting members. In addition, non-voting members will be added to represent the University Senate, regional campuses, a member of the PWL Registrar’s office, PWL Student Government, a head academic advisor, and a representative from the Provost’s Office. Faculty members will serve a 3-year term. A faculty representative may serve no more than two consecutive terms before new faculty representatives are appointed. The faculty in each College/School will select its representative to the UCC.”
  o Professor Carroll’s amendment was intended to prevent colleges from having more than one voting member on the UCC. Some Senators expressed the opinion that the regional campus members should have a vote. However, the current document is a PWL initiative. Hence, the
regional campus members should be non-voting, for now. This might change in the future. The question was called and the motion passed by majority voice vote.

- The next amendment was to change the wording of the first bullet on page 4 from “The curriculum will be faculty governed” to “The curriculum is faculty governed.” This amendment was accepted by consent of the assembly.

A motion was made and seconded to approve Senate Document 11-7. Several Senators spoke in support of the amended document. In addition, Professor Shelley MacDermid Wadsworth spoke in favor of the document (see Appendix E). Two additional amendments were proposed and defeated. The first was to add a voting member from the regional campuses on the UCC and the second was to change the “Core Curriculum” wording in the document in two places. Finally, Professor Kain made a motion to add the word “Core” to the title of the document. His amendment was accepted by consent with no objections. The discussion of Senate Document 11-7 came to an end. Professor Janusz Duzinkiewicz requested a vote by secret ballot. Such a request cannot be debated and was honored immediately. The vote was taken and the amended document passed by a vote of 63 in favor to 9 opposed. The document will now serve as the template for the administration and oversight of the Outcomes-Based Core Curriculum of Purdue University. The faculty, administration, staff and student representatives will work in concert to bring the Core Curriculum to fruition.

10. Professor Robert Barrett made a motion to recess the meeting so that the Senators and invited guests could go to Hillenbrand Hall for dinner prior resuming the meeting. His motion was approved.

11. Following dinner, the meeting was called back to order. Professor Natalie Carroll presented Senate Document 11-8, Nominees for Vice-Chair of the Senate, for Discussion. Professor Timothy Folta officially removed his name from consideration; Professor David J. Williams was the sole nominee. Professor Carroll called for additional nominations from the floor or volunteers who can contact her prior to the March Senate meeting at which the vote will occur.

12. Interim Dean Dennis Savaiano presented, for Information, an update on the Honors College (see Appendix F). Following the presentation he answered questions from the floor.

13. Provost Sands presented, for Information, an update on the Academic Program Assessment process (see Appendix G). Provost Sands entertained questions from the floor following the update.

14. Under New Business Professor Levy mentioned two items. Professor Levy first mentioned the creation of an ad hoc committee that will focus on advancing the University’s research agenda. The committee will include members from the Senate, Provost’s Office and the Office of the Vice President for Research. The second item was the proposed creation of a committee or task force to study the University’s trimester plan. This committee will be a joint effort between the Senate and the Provost’s Office and will consider the plans for next summer’s session as well as examine the faculty workload issue.
15. A Memorial Resolution had been received for Professor Emeritus of Comparative Pathobiology John Van Vleet. The Senate members stood for a moment of silence to honor their departed colleague.

16. The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.
Chair Remarks
University Senate

Feb. 20, 2012

Professor Morris Levy
Chair, University Senate

Business Leaders See Higher Education as Hampering Economic Growth

HIRING AND HIGHER EDUCATION: Excerpts

- Interviewees point to serious weaknesses in the country’s system of higher education. One of the most often voiced concerns is the out-of-control price of higher education, particularly a 4-year degree.
- ...there’s a serious talent shortage – especially in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM).
- ...business executives complained about the character, interpersonal skills and comportment of the young people they encounter... persistent criticisms of the motivation and work ethic of new workers, a view that they come in with a sense of entitlement. Even such basic skills as writing a clear memo were called into question.
Nebraska Univ.: Regents approve reducing number of credit required for most programs to 120., an important element of making higher education affordable for families and students. (9/9/11)

Some recent IN Legislative/ICHE initiatives:
- Reducing or “capping” the number of credits required for graduation (pending)
- Increasing advanced standing from pre-college AP credits
- Reduce calendar time as undergraduates via Core Curriculum portability among IN institutions; Indiana Senate Bill (SB) 0182 “requires state educational institutions to create a statewide transfer general education core to be implemented by May 15, 2013.”

Request to Board of Trustees 2/12/12:
“Do not permit the quality of a Purdue education to be influenced by encroaching political pressure.”

- The Faculty’s professional responsibility is to maintain the high quality of our degrees.
- We do pay attention to affordability.
- But our curriculum is too important to be determined by transient economics or political agendas
- We request your insight and influence to allow the Purdue academy to continue to do its job of deciding the curriculum, as mandated by Purdue’s University Code.
- Response: “Morry, the word is speed.. We need speed (in our decisions.)

The Senate’s 2nd phase of adopting a “Core Curriculum” is up for Action today. I expect us to do our due diligence to this process so that we make a wise decision as per our regional campus colleagues for their Gen. Ed. Requirements.
2/20/12 Extended Meeting Schedule

• General session-STEW 302 2:30 pm
• 4:30 pm Entertain motion to recess until 6:00 pm at Sautter Atrium
• 5:00 pm dine at Hillenbrand Dining Court - announce yourself as “Senator” to cashier at Dining Court entrance; coat rack in Atrium; obtain dinner and beverages; eat in Atrium; please return your dishes to station at rear of Atrium
• 6:00 pm Senate session reconvenes until adjournment, est. by 8:30 pm.

• Jill Irvin (Director of Dining Services)
TO: University Senate
FROM: Timothy Folta, Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE
Timothy Folta, Chairperson
foltat@purdue.edu

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee is the organization and distribution of the agenda for each meeting of the University Senate. This committee also receives communications from any faculty member or group of members and directs such communications to appropriate committees or officers for attention.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Morris Levy, Chairperson of the Senate
levy0@purdue.edu

The responsibility of the University Senate Advisory Committee is to advise the President and/or Board of Trustees on any matter of concern to the faculty.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Natalie J. Carroll, Chairperson
ncarroll@purdue.edu

The Nominating Committee is responsible for presenting nominations for the University Senate and University committees. In filling committee vacancies the Nominating Committee seeks to have all interested Senators serve on at least one committee.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Terri Reed-Rhoads, Chairperson
trhoads@purdue.edu

1. Student access and success
2. Review of GPA requirements in early years
3. GPA requirements after readmission
4. Transfer credit
5. Evening Exams
6. Honors College
7. Core Curriculum

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
David J. Williams, Chairperson
djw@purdue.edu

1. On-line Course Evaluation System
2. Request for a Faculty Member on the Board of Trustees

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Thomas J. Templin, Co-Chairperson
Sally Hastings, Co-Chairperson
ttemplin@purdue.edu
sahnohte@purdue.edu

1. Student Conduct

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
A. Paul Schwab, Chairperson
pschwab@purdue.edu

1. Changes in the Business Operation Model for Purdue Employee Travel
2. Student resolution concerning Comprehensive Energy Master Plan

Chair of the Senate, Morris Levy, levy0@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, J. Paul Robinson, jpr@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/faculty
### BILL DIGEST

**HB 1003 – State Agency Issues**

**Digest:** Allows a member of the governing body of any public agency of the state to participate in a meeting of the governing body by electronic communication only if: (1) the meeting meets all other requirements of the open door law; and (2) a majority of the governing body adopts a policy regarding the use of meetings by electronic communication. Provides that if a meeting by electronic communication is conducted, the governing body is required to: (1) have the greater of two members or one-third of the governing body physically present at the meeting place; and (2) take only roll call votes. Provides that unless a policy adopted by the governing body provides otherwise, a member who participates in a meeting by electronic communication: (1) is considered to be present at the meeting; (2) must be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum; and (3) may vote at the meeting. Requires each member of the governing body to physically attend at least one meeting annually. Specifies that a governing body may adopt a policy that allows the public to attend meetings conducted by electronic communication at a public place and where a member is physically present and participates by electronic communication, excluding executive sessions. Requires a governing body to post the governing body's electronic meeting policy on the Internet web site of the governing body or public agency. Specifies that the electronic meeting law does not affect a governing body's right to exclude the public from an executive session conducted by electronic communication. Repeals the individual statutory authorizations for the following state entities to have meetings by electronic communication: (1) State ethics commission. (2) Indiana bond bank board of directors. (3) Indiana public retirement system board of trustees. (4) Board for depositories. (5) Education savings authority board of directors. (6) State board of trustees or a committee of the state board of trustees of Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana, Vincennes University, Ball State University, Indiana State University, Indiana University, Purdue University, and University of Southern Indiana. (7) Commission for higher education. (8) State workforce innovation council. (9) Boards, committees, or commissions administered by the professional licensing agency. (10) Department of financial institutions governing board. (11) Regional services council. Changes the number of annual meetings the following state entities are required to conduct: (1) The state budget committee. (2) The state employees appeals commission. (3) The board for depositories. (4) The commission for a drug free Indiana. Adds electronic media to the definition of "record" for purposes of the public records law. Eliminates a requirement that the public works division of the department of administration solicit sealed bids for public works projects by sending notices by mail and posting notices on a bulletin board in the agency's office. Requires the state police department to publish the following on the state police Internet web site: (1) The forms to be used by valuable metal dealers when purchasing valuable metal. (2) A list that describes valuable metal products that are particularly susceptible to theft. (3) The statutes and rules adopted by the superintendent of the state police department concerning the regulation of valuable metal dealers.

### STATUS

The bill was amended to include language that would allow University BoT committee meetings to be conducted electronically if necessary.
**HB 1116 – Military Education and Training**

**Digest:** Requires a state educational institution to adopt a policy to award educational credit to an individual who is enrolled in a state educational institution and successfully completes courses that: (1) are part of the individual's military service; (2) meet the standards of the American Council on Education for awarding academic credit; and (3) meet the state educational institution's role, scope, and mission. Requires that the commission for higher education must adopt rules that establish uniform guidelines for state educational institutions to follow when implementing the requirements. Provides that an occupational or professional licensure board shall issue a license, certificate, registration, or permit to a military service applicant or military spouse who meets certain requirements. Allows a board to issue a temporary practice permit or provisional license while the military service applicant or military spouse is satisfying certain requirements as determined by the board.

Hearing is slated for 2/22

Purdue is supportive of this bill as currently written

**HB 1220 – Commission for Higher Education**

**Digest:** Allows the commission for higher education to approve or disapprove existing or new associate, baccalaureate, or graduate degrees, or programs leading to a certificate or other indication of accomplishment. Requires each state educational institution to review its undergraduate degree programs to determine the number of credit hours required for the degree and to report the results of the review to the commission, including a justification for any associate degree program of more than 60 hours or baccalaureate degree program of more than 120 hours.

Passed out of Senate Education Committee. It was amended based upon language that we developed jointly with CHE, the other universities and the Office of the Governor

**HB 1270 – Commission for Higher Education**

**Digest:** Abolishes the state student assistance commission (SSAC). Abolishes the commission on proprietary education (COPE). Requires the commission for higher education (commission) to administer the functions formerly administered by SSAC. Establishes the commission on postsecondary proprietary education. Provides that the commission on postsecondary proprietary education is responsible for accrediting a postsecondary credit bearing proprietary educational institution. Provides that the commission is responsible for providing staff and office space for the commission on postsecondary proprietary education. Provides that the state workforce innovation council is responsible for accrediting postsecondary proprietary educational institutions that are non-credit bearing. Provides that, on or before July 1, 2014, the commission on postsecondary proprietary education may make a report to the legislative council regarding the transition of responsibilities from the Indiana commission of proprietary education to the commission on postsecondary proprietary education and may make recommendations. Provides that the market research of a postsecondary credit bearing proprietary educational institution may not be considered or required by the commission on postsecondary proprietary education as a condition for accrediting or renewing the accreditation of or for approval of the programs of a postsecondary credit bearing proprietary educational institution. Repeals: (1) provisions relating to establishment and administration of SSAC; (2) provisions relating to establishment and administration of COPE; (3) certain

Passed out of Senate Education Committee. Purdue has no issues with this bill as currently written.
provisions requiring the commission for higher education to provide SSAC information to implement the minority teacher or nursing scholarship program; and (4) definitions relating to SSAC or COPE. Adds transitional provisions. Makes conforming and technical amendments.

**HB 1093 = Public Access Issues**

**Digest:** Requires a public agency to: (1) allow inspection or copying; or (2) make copies; of a public record within a reasonable time after the request is received by the agency. Provides that a court may impose a civil penalty against: (1) an officer of a public agency or an individual employed in a management level position with a public agency; or (2) the public agency; for violating the open door law with specific intent to violate the law if the plaintiff obtained an advisory opinion from the public access counselor before filing an action. Provides that a court may impose a civil penalty against an officer, management level employee, or the public agency for violating the public records law if the officer, management level employee, or agency: (1) continues to deny a request for a public record after the public access counselor has issued an advisory opinion that instructs the agency to allow access to the public record; and (2) denies the request with the specific intent to unlawfully withhold a public record that is subject to disclosure. Provides that an individual or agency could be subject to a civil penalty if the individual intentionally charges a copying fee that the individual knows exceeds the amount set by statute, fee schedule, ordinance, or court order. Provides that a court may not impose a civil penalty unless the public access counselor has issued an advisory opinion that instructs the public agency to allow access to the public record before the lawsuit is filed. Provides that it is a defense to the imposition of a civil penalty under this section for a violation of the open door law or public records law if the individual acted in reliance on an opinion of the public agency's legal counsel or an opinion of the attorney general. Provides that a court may impose a civil penalty of: (1) not more than $100 for the first violation; and (2) not more than $500 for any additional violations. Provides that a court may: (1) impose only one civil penalty against an individual in an action even if the court finds that the individual committed multiple violations; and (2) impose another civil penalty against the individual in a separate action. Provides that if an officer of a state or local government agency orders a management level employee to: (1) not give proper notice of a public meeting or executive session; or (2) deny or interfere with a person's request to inspect or copy a public document; the employee is not subject to a civil penalty for violating the statute. Provides that if a local government agency has the capacity to send electronic mail, the agency shall provide notice to anyone (other than news media) that makes an annual request for notice by: (1) transmitting the notice by electronic mail; or (2) posting the notice on the agency's Internet web site (if the agency has an Internet web site). Provides that a court may not declare a governmental action void for failure to give notice by electronic mail or posting on the local government agency's web site if the agency made a good faith effort to comply with the statute. Provides that a public agency may withhold personal information from public disclosure regarding an individual less than 18 years of age who participates in an activity conducted or supervised by a state educational institution, including personal information regarding the individual's parent or guardian. Requires (rather than allows) a court to review public records in camera to determine whether redaction of the records violates the public records act. Creates an education fund for a program administered by the public access counselor to train public officials and educate the public on the rights of the public and the responsibilities of public agencies under the public access laws. Provides that a public

---

This bill has not been heard in the Senate. Sticking point is that there is concern as to how this might apply to the legislature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>agency has discretion as to whether to disclose a public record requested by an offender containing personal information relating to a judge, law enforcement officer, or family member of a judge or law enforcement officer.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HB 1201 – State Provision and Use of Communications Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digest:</strong> Provides that after March 31, 2012, the I-Light communications network may be used not to offer or provide, directly or indirectly, communications service to the public or to any private or governmental entity. Provides exceptions to this prohibition to allow for the following: (1) The provision of communications service for 911 services or emergency or law enforcement purposes. (2) The provision of communications service to institutions of higher education for the direct benefit of students, faculty, and staff. Provides that after March 31, 2012, a person that is not: (1) a state educational institution; or (2) a private postsecondary educational institution; may not become a member of the I-Light network or otherwise connect to or use the I-Light network or any services made available through I-Light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This bill passed out of the Senate Utilities Committee and was amended so that it preserves our ability to continue to use I-Light as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 54 – State University Use of Eminent Domain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digest:</strong> Provides that before a state supported college or university may acquire property that contains an operating business through the use of eminent domain, the college or university must pay to the owner of the property: (1) the fair market value of the real property and all improvements pertaining to the real property; and (2) compensation for the loss of the value of the business as a going concern, unless the college or university establishes that the loss of the value of the business as a going concern is not caused by the taking of the property or by injury to the owner's remaining property, or that the loss of the value of the business as a going concern can be reasonably prevented or mitigated by relocating the business or trade in the same or a similar and reasonably suitable location. Specifies that the compensation required does not include any compensation for a loss to the value of the business as a going concern that: (1) is mitigated by relocating the business or trade in the same or a similar and reasonably suitable location; or (2) could be prevented if the owner of the property takes the actions and adopts the policies that a reasonable prudent person of a similar age and under similar conditions as the owner would take and adopt in preserving the value of the business as a going concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This bill has not yet been scheduled for a hearing in the House of Representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 56 – Ball State Board of Trustees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digest:</strong> Adds definition of a &quot;research intensive campus&quot;. Removes a requirement that all members of the Ball State University board of trustees be residents of Indiana. Removes a requirement that at least one member of the Ball State board of trustees be a resident of Delaware County. Modifies the manner in which alumni members of the Indiana University board of trustees are elected. Allows the board of trustees of Indiana University to hold meetings at the dates, times, and places the board of trustees agrees upon. Repeals a provision concerning emergency appointments to the board of trustees of Indiana University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill was amended to include language that would set in statute the definition of a “Research Campus” as defined by Carnegie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 155 – Higher Education Employment Age Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 179 – Virtual Instruction Course Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 182 – State Education Institutions; Credit Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 392 – State Educational Institution Grading Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 9 – Study Committee on Indiana Law Requiring Undocumented Students to Pay Out-of-State tuition rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Steering Committee of the University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Undergraduate Outcomes-Based Core Curriculum and Administration & Oversight Structure
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Approval

The Educational Policy Committee hereby forwards to the University Senate the attached report and proposal about the proposed Outcomes-Based Curriculum and Administration & Oversight Structure. This report provides the background information and confirms there has been active faculty involvement in the discussion and planning for the creation and implementation of the core curriculum and oversight structure.

Motion: To approve the Purdue-West Lafayette (PWL) undergraduate curriculum framework with identified essential learning outcomes and guidelines for rubrics AND to appoint an Undergraduate Curriculum Council with the responsibility for the ongoing governance of the undergraduate outcomes-based curriculum, with rotating faculty representation from each College, the Krannert School of Management, and Libraries.

Approving: Danita M. Brown
James R. Daniel
Frank J. Dooley
Peggy A. Ertmer
Joan R. Fulton
Chong Gu
Katherine Horton
Christine A. Hrycyna
Harold P. Kirkwood
Robert A. Kubat
Martin A. Lopez-de-Bertodano
Craig Miller
Lindsey Payne
Teri Reed-Rhoads
Glenn G. Sparks
Matthew Swiontek
A. Dale Whittaker

Disapproving: Peggy A. Ertmer

Absent: Thomas H. Siegmund
Background for the PWL Undergraduate Outcomes-Based Curriculum

In January 2011, Joan Fulton, Chair of the University Senate, discussing changes at the state legislative level that affect academic issues, reported

One of the driving forces behind these changes stems from the need for the Indiana economy to change from its traditional manufacturing base and the ensuing need to increase the education level of Hoosiers. The issues of student access to higher education, transferability of credits across institutions, and flexibility for the students have been identified as important for student success (at the state level) in completing degrees in a timely manner. We are working to be proactive in this area, while at the same time emphasizing the quality of a Purdue degree and the need to not diminish that quality. In that light, we are moving forward with the implementation of a Core Curriculum at Purdue, as recommended by the committee that reported this past April. The Steering Committee, at its January meeting, voted to establish the Core Curriculum Committee to implement the core.3

That action was based on recommendations of the initial Core Curriculum Committee, which met during the academic year 2009-2010 and issued its report at the April 2010 University Senate Meeting.2 The 2009-10 Core Curriculum Committee provided a draft list of core outcomes, a vision statement for the core, and the rationale for the core. This report provided the foundation for the work of the current Core Curriculum committee, and called for an outcomes-based core curriculum.

Our report concurs with the April 2010 finding that a key motivation for a core curriculum is to better prepare all PWL students for future employment success. Recent studies indicate employers are seeking employees able to use a broader set of skills beyond their discipline-specific abilities and necessary for success for the individual and employer (Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, 2010; Hart Research Association, 2010).

Two additional factors bolster the call for a core curriculum, new accreditation requirements and legislative initiatives of the 2012 legislature. First, the Higher Learning Commission (a commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools) recently updated accreditation requirements that mandate institutions maintain a minimum requirement for general education.

“through a traditional practice of distributed curricula (15 semester credits for AAS degrees, 24 for AS or AA degrees, and 30 for bachelor’s degrees) or through integrated, embedded, interdisciplinary, or other accepted models that demonstrate a minimum requirement equivalent to the distributed model. Any variation is explained and justified” (HLC, Criteria Revision Initiative - Gamma Version - November 9, 2011, p. 11-12).

Second, members of the 2012 Indiana General Assembly have introduced higher education initiatives focused on a general education and core curriculum. Indiana Senate Bill (SB) 0182 “requires state educational institutions to create a statewide transfer general education core to be implemented by May 15, 2013.”3 SB 0182 passed the Senate by a 50-0 vote on January 31, 2012, and has moved to the House for further consideration.

In conclusion, new accreditation standards and legislative action are consistent with the recommendations of the University Senate Report 09-3. Thus, by developing and adopting an undergraduate outcomes-based curriculum, the Purdue-West Lafayette faculty will benefit its undergraduate students while concomitantly addressing the concerns of external entities.
1. Proposed PWL Undergraduate Outcomes-Based Curriculum

The core curriculum consists of two levels of outcomes, foundational and embedded (see Appendix A). All Purdue students are expected to meet the foundational learning outcomes from 25 to 30 credits hours of coursework that is portable across the campus. In contrast, the embedded learning outcomes are addressed within courses typically taught within a specific discipline or major. Faculty within each program area will be responsible for determining where and at what level embedded outcomes will be met within their programs. In addition, program area faculty will be solely responsible for assessing student learning on embedded outcomes within their courses.

Thus, the foundational learning outcomes can be viewed as the academic structure that assures a general education, while the embedded learning outcomes define the expectations of particular degrees or plans of study. In some cases, entering freshman will have met foundational levels (e.g., via credit by exam, Advanced Placement (AP) test scores, or CLEP tests). Some foundational courses may be part of a curriculum plan for a particular major.

Foundational and embedded learning outcomes differ in two key ways, 1) the areas of learning and 2) the depth of learning. Rubrics developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) are adapted for use at Purdue. The AACU rubrics indicate levels of knowledge and skill development increasing from “developing” (Level 1) to “emerging” (Level 2) to a “proficient” (Level 3) level (see Appendix B).

The foundational outcomes focus on a developing level of knowledge (Level 1) in five areas: 1) written communication, 2) information literacy, 3) oral communication, 4) science, technology, and mathematics, and 5) human cultures (Table 1). More than one learning outcome may be satisfied in an individual course if that course is approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Council as fulfilling the requirements of each learning outcome rubric.

Higher levels learning (rubric levels 2 and 3) should be a focus for three outcomes at the embedded level: written communication, information literacy, and oral communication. For the remaining embedded outcomes, (creative thinking, critical thinking, ethical reasoning, global citizenship and social awareness, intercultural knowledge, leadership and teamwork, quantitative reasoning, integrative learning, and critical thinking, writing, research, and representation), faculty within each academic unit will determine the appropriate level of knowledge (rubric levels 1-3) with which students will meet outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Foundational and Embedded Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How students might fulfill this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Communication • One course (e.g., ENGL 106 or 108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information Literacy • One course (e.g., GS 175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oral Communications • One course (e.g., COM 114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Science, Technology, and Mathematics • Two courses TBD in science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One course in Science, Technology, and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College Algebra (e.g., MA 153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Human Cultures • One course TBD in humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One course TBD in behavioral/social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundational outcomes are portable across all academic units. Specific courses may or may not fulfill all student degree requirements.

Embedded Learning Outcomes
2. Undergraduate Curriculum Council: Administration and Oversight Structure

The Undergraduate Curriculum Council (UCC) is charged with the administration and oversight of the core curriculum. As a faculty-led structure, the UCC determines and oversees the operational guidelines associated with implementation elements of the core curriculum. The issues to be addressed by the UCC are limited to: the approval of foundational courses, establishment of guiding rules for meeting the foundational outcomes, regulating and monitoring approved courses that satisfy the foundational outcomes, review of the list of foundational and embedded outcomes, and resolution of issues related to transfer students satisfying foundational requirements. It is recommended that the UCC be established no later than the Spring 2012 semester. The University Senate shall define and limit the UCC’s duties, responsibilities and powers, and hear appeals to the UCC decisions; the UCC shall be directly responsible to the Senate via the Educational Policy Committee. Four principles guide the working of the Undergraduate Curriculum Council.

- The curriculum is faculty-governed.
- Learning outcomes within the outcomes-based curriculum are designed to prepare students for continuous learning and expertise within disciplines. The PWL curriculum will be one that is outcomes-based.
- The curriculum maintains high academic standards within the disciplines.
- The goal of the curriculum is to design mechanisms to permit flexibility for both academic programs and students in meeting learning outcomes.

Recommended Procedures:

- **Council Membership:** The membership of the Undergraduate Curriculum Council is comprised of one faculty representative from each College, the Krannert School of Management, and Libraries as voting members. In addition, non-voting members will be added to represent the University Senate, regional campuses, a member of the PWL Registrar’s office, PWL Student Government, a head academic advisor, and a representative from the Provost’s Office. Faculty members will serve a 3-year term. A faculty representative may serve no more than two consecutive terms before new faculty representatives are appointed. The faculty in each College/School will select its representative to the UCC.

- All decisions of the Undergraduate Council can be appealed (by any affected unit) directly to the University Senate.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Creative Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ethical Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Global Citizenship and Social Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Intercultural Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Leadership and Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Integrative Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Written Communication (levels 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Information Literacy (levels 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Oral Communication (levels 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcome rubrics (adapted from the AACU Core Value Rubrics) should be used as a guideline (not literally) by programs as they determine at which level they are addressing embedded learning outcomes within their programs. Each program faculty defines the appropriate level of proficiency. Faculty within each program area will be responsible for determining where and at what level embedded outcomes will be met within their programs. In addition, program area faculty will be solely responsible for assessing student learning on embedded outcomes within their courses.
• Substantial changes to the framework, outcomes, or procedures that are originated by the Undergraduate Curriculum Council require a majority vote of the UCC and subsequent approval by the University Senate. Substantial changes to the framework, outcomes, or procedures may also be made by action of the University Senate following the established bylaws for new proposals.

• **Learning Outcomes:** As the need arises for introducing new learning outcomes or eliminating those that are no longer relevant for PWL graduates, it will be the responsibility of this committee to identify and vet those through a regular (at least every 5 years) reevaluation process. The introduction or elimination of a learning outcome will equate to a substantial change to the framework and will require a majority vote of the Undergraduate Council and approval by the University Senate.

• **Foundational Courses:** Any course accepted for PWL’s undergraduate outcomes-based curriculum (foundational level) must be approved by a majority vote of faculty members on this committee.

• All courses (or non-courses) used to fulfill PWL’s undergraduate outcomes-based curriculum are limited to those or equivalencies approved by this committee.

• **Nominating Foundational Courses:** recommends using an adapted Registrar’s Form 40 for nominating courses for meeting the foundational outcomes (specific content to be included in this document TBD).
  • Course nominations may be submitted by faculty in any College/School or program area on the PWL campus to the Undergraduate Curriculum Council

• Nominations must identify the course, course description, and foundational learning outcome(s) addressed within the course

• **Reviewing of Embedded Outcomes:** Reporting procedures shall be coordinated with accreditation approvals for programs whose national accreditation standards already align with the embedded outcomes and whose programs achieve national accreditation to avoid duplicative efforts. For example, reporting on assessment of embedded outcomes shall coincide with ABET, NCATE, AACSB and other accrediting agency visits. Also, the program area report provided to the accrediting agency shall be acceptable to the Undergraduate Curriculum Council for ongoing embedded learning outcomes alignment, if that program area deems that receiving the national outcomes based accreditation is part of that program area’s determination of where and at what level the embedded outcomes are met. Embedded outcomes that do not align shall be reported to the UCC.

• **Change of Degree Objective (CODOs):**
  • Recommends that once a student meets an outcome (whether foundational or embedded), the student receives credit for meeting that outcome.
  • If a student CODOs to another program or college, the previously met foundational outcomes will still be considered to have been met for that student.
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NOTES

1 See Report To The University Senate - Professor Joan R. Fulton, http://www.purdue.edu/faculty/download.cfm?file=96310AAD-D7DD-B12C-377DCC1A36DCC1A0.pdf&name=minutes.pdf.


3 http://www.in.gov/apps/lsa/session/billwatch/billinfo?year=2012&session=1&request=getBill&docno=0182&doctype=SB.

4 Depending upon the outcome of SB 182, it may be necessary to expand this to 30 hours.
TO:    Steering Committee of the University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Undergraduate Outcomes-Based Curriculum and Administration & Oversight Structure
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Approval

The Educational Policy Committee hereby forwards to the University Senate the attached report and proposal about the proposed new Undergraduate Outcomes-Based Curriculum and Administration & Oversight Structure. This report provides the background information and confirms that there has been active faculty involvement in the discussion and planning for the creation and implementation of the new undergraduate outcomes-based curriculum and oversight structure.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Learning Outcomes

Foundational Learning Outcomes

1. Written Communication* -- Clear expression of ideas in writing; includes grammar, organization, and structure. Varying levels and types of writing skills are required for different jobs. The ability to convey ideas concisely and coherently is important.
   Key Skills:
   - Demonstrates understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses on all elements of the work.
   - Uses appropriate and relevant content to explore ideas and/or demonstrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer’s understanding, and shaping the work.
   - Demonstrates attention to and successful execution of organization, content, presentation, format and stylistic choices in writing.
   - Demonstrates use of credible, relevant resources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of writing.
   - Uses language that effectively communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency.

2. Information Literacy*—Information literacy is the ability to recognize the extent and nature of information need, then to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information. It involves designing, evaluating and implementing a strategy to answer questions or achieve a desired goal.
   Key skills
   - Determine the extent of information needed (define the research question, determine key concepts and types of information needed)
   - Access information using effective, well-designed search strategies and relevant information sources.
   - Evaluate information and its sources critically (analyzes assumptions and evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position)
   - Communicate, organize and synthesize information from several sources.
   - Access and use information ethically and legally (citations and references; paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution)
   - Propose a solution/hypothesis that indicates comprehension of the problem and is sensitive to contextual factors as well as the ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions of the problem.
   - Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

3. Oral Communication* – activity of conveying meaningful information verbally; communication by word of mouth typically relies on words, visual aids and non-verbal elements to support the conveyance of the meaning. Oral communication is designed to increase knowledge, foster understanding, or to promote change in the listener’s attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.
   Key Skills:
• Uses appropriate organizational patterns (introduction, conclusion, sequenced material, transitions) that is clearly and consistently observable when making presentations
• Uses language that is thoughtful and generally supports the effectiveness of the presentation (and is appropriate to the audience).
• Uses appropriate delivery techniques when making a presentation (posture, gesture, eye contact, vocal expression)
• Effectively uses supporting materials in presentations (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations)
• Clearly communicates a central message with the supporting materials

4. **Science, Technology and Mathematics** -- the ability to understand and apply basic scientific, quantitative, and technological content knowledge.

Key skills:
• **Science**: think and function as a scientist by using critical thinking and analytical inquiry; apply basic scientific, quantitative, and technological methods and knowledge of nature to the solution of scientific problems; use the scientific method and theories to analyze questions in the physical and natural world; provide scientific explanations of the nature of the universe, the earth, and/or life forms and be able to distinguish these explanations from non-scientific explanations.
• **College Algebra**: Students must pass this content area or earn a minimum ALEKs score or higher (minimum score TBD during Phase II of planning).
• **Science, Technology and Society**: Understand and reflect upon the complex issues raised by technological and scientific changes and its effects on society and the global world by making sense of, evaluating, and responding to present and future changes that shape individuals' work, public, and personal lives. Courses meeting this content area may focus on issues such as global warming; biotechnology; GMO foods; and computing and information science as it relates to security, privacy, and the proliferation of global information. Consideration should be given to scientific and technological changes from fields such as agriculture, computer science, engineering, education, health sciences, etc.

5. **Human Cultures** -- the ability to recognize one’s own cultural traditions and to understand and appreciate other cultural traditions and languages.

Key skills:
• Discuss history and the basic principles and operation of government with a view to being a responsible citizen; discuss economic, social, and cultural diversity within a global context; describe the cultural, social and historical dynamics that influence individuals and groups; explain the perspective of the culture of another country through the study of world languages, arts, spiritual traditions, mythology/literature, and/or through study abroad
• **Humanities**: Includes content in classics, history, languages, the law, literature, the performing arts, philosophy (including ethics), religion, and visual arts.
• **Behavioral/Social Sciences**: Includes content in anthropology, psychology, cognitive science, organization theory, sociology, economics, history, counseling, political science.
* Foundational outcomes also should be embedded within disciplinary areas and students should demonstrate higher levels of learning in each area as determined by program area faculty and suggested within rubrics.

**Embedded Learning Outcomes**

1. **Creative Thinking** – the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by innovation and divergent thinking.
   
   **Key Skills:**
   - Acquires strategies and skills within a particular domain: adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications; creates an entirely new object, solution or idea appropriate to the domain; evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria
   - Takes risks: considers new directions or approaches; incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment; actively seeks out and follows through on untested directions or approaches to the assignment
   - Solves problems logically and using a plan; considers consequences and alternatives
   - Includes, incorporates, and integrates alternative or divergent perspectives or ideas.
   - Experiments with, creates, and extends a novel or unique idea, question, format or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.

2. **Critical Thinking** -- Critical thinking is "purposeful, self-regulatory judgment which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference, as well as explanation of the evidential, conceptual, methodological, criteriological, or contextual considerations upon which that judgment is based...The ideal critical thinker is habitually inquisitive, well-informed, trustful of reason, open-minded, flexible, fair-minded in evaluation, honest in facing personal biases, prudent in making judgments, willing to reconsider, clear about issues, orderly in complex matters, diligent in seeking relevant information, reasonable in the selection of criteria, focused in inquiry, and persistent in seeking results, which areas precise as the subject and circumstances of inquiry permit." (Facione, P. A., ED 315 423.
   
   
   **Key Skills:**
   - Examines explanation of issues: Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively delivering relevant information necessary for understanding
   - Evaluates evidence: Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop an analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.
   - Questions assumptions: Analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.
   - Assumes/takes a position on a topic: Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.
   - Identifies conclusions: Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.
3. **Intercultural Knowledge and Effectiveness** -- Defined as a set of behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together to enable systems, agencies, or professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations. Culturally effective systems integrate and transform knowledge about individuals and groups of people into specific standards, policies, practices, and attitudes used in appropriate cultural settings to increase the quality of services; thereby producing better outcomes. Culturally effective services are respectful of and responsive to the beliefs and practices, and cultural and linguistic needs of diverse populations. Cultural competence is a developmental process that evolves over an extended period. Both individuals and organizations are at various levels of awareness, knowledge and skills along a cultural competence continuum.

**Key Skills:**
- Identifies, recognizes new perspectives, and articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases
- Demonstrates understanding of other cultures in relation to history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
- Identifies, recognizes, and interprets intercultural experiences from the perspectives of one and more than one worldview
- Identifies, recognizes, and articulates understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication
- Asks questions about other cultures, seeks out information about other cultures.
- Interacts with culturally different others.

4. **Ethical Reasoning** – is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students’ ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

**Key Skills:**
- Articulate one’s ethical beliefs and approach to ethical decisions;
- Identifies major theories supporting ethical perspectives and concepts
- Recognize ethical issues in personal, professional and civic life;
- Identify competing values in ethical dilemmas; Understand different ethical perspectives and ethical concepts;
- Defend a position with good reasoning and consideration of opposing views.

5. **Global Citizenship and Social Awareness** -- Civil discourse on complex issues, Ability to appreciate and critique multiple perspectives including one’s own, Self-reflective examination of values, Self-reflective awareness of oneself as a global citizen, Ethical citizenship and leadership in a global civil society, Commitment to community service.

**Key Skills:**
- Understanding of a citizen's responsibilities to others, to society and to the environment:
- Examine the meaning of democracy and citizenship from differing points of view including non-dominant, non-western perspectives.
- Explore the rights and obligations that citizens have in their communities, nations and in the world.
- Discuss or write about their lives, careers, and interests in relation to participatory democracy and the general welfare of the global society.
• Explore the relationship of global citizenship and responsibility to the environment.
• Understand how governmental laws, policies, and regulations affect their careers and personal economic and social lives

6. **Integrative Learning** -- Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

   Key Skills:
   • Connects relevant experience with academic knowledge
   • Makes connections across disciplines, perspectives
   • Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations
   • Demonstrates a developing sense of self as a learner, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts (may be evident in self-assessment, reflective, or creative work).

7. **Quantitative Reasoning** -- Quantitative literacy is knowledge of and confidence with basic mathematical/analytical concepts and operations required for problem solving, decision-making, economic productivity and real-world applications.

   Key Skills:
   • Explains information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)
   • Converts relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)
   • Competently performs basic computational/arithmetic operations
   • Makes judgments and draws appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data while recognizing the limits of this analysis
   • Makes and evaluates important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis
   • Expresses quantitative evidence in support of the argument or purpose of the work

8. **Leadership and Teamwork** – Leadership and Teamwork are interpersonal skills and behaviors under the control of individuals and team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to organizational and team discussions). The leader is one who practices management as a trainable skill with technical and administrative aspects which serve to direct people for the good of the enterprise. Leadership is the art and science of getting the job done through the willing efforts of others.

   Key Skills
   • Facilitates change for the good of the organization
   • Contributes to team meetings, discussions, and work products
   • Facilitates the contributions of team members
   • Individual contributions outside of team meetings
   • Fosters constructive team climate
   • Responds to conflict
Appendix B

Learning Outcome Rubrics

Faculty within each program area will be responsible for determining where and at what level embedded outcomes will be met within their programs. In addition, program area faculty will be solely responsible for assessing student learning on embedded outcomes within their courses.
## Creative Thinking Rubric

### Definition

The capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by innovation and divergent thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquiring Competencies</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This step refers to acquiring strategies and skills within a particular domain.</strong></td>
<td>Reflect: Evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria.</td>
<td>Create: Creates an entirely new object, solution or idea that is appropriate to the domain.</td>
<td>Adapt: Successfully adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taking Risks</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>May include personal risk (fear of embarrassment or rejection) or risk of failure in successfully completing assignment, i.e. going beyond original parameters of assignment, introducing new materials and forms, tackling controversial topics, advocating unpopular ideas or solutions.</strong></td>
<td>Actively seeks out and follows through on untested and potentially risky directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</td>
<td>Incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</td>
<td>Considers new directions or approaches without going beyond the guidelines of the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solving Problems</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.</strong></td>
<td>Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.</td>
<td>Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embracing Contradictions</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.</strong></td>
<td>Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in an exploratory way.</td>
<td>Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative Thinking</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novelty or uniqueness (of idea, claim, question, form, etc.)</strong></td>
<td>Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.</td>
<td>Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td>Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms.</strong></td>
<td>Synthesizes ideas or solutions into a coherent whole.</td>
<td>Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics*
**CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC**

**Definition**
“...mode of thinking about any subject, content, or problem in which the thinker improves the quality of his or her thinking by skillfully taking charge of the structures inherent in thinking and imposing intellectual standards upon them.” It is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of issues</strong></td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence of context and assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others’ assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Identifies own and others’ assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</strong></td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</strong></td>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics
**Ethical Reasoning Rubric**

**Definition**

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students’ ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Self-Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.</td>
<td>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
<td>Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</strong></td>
<td>Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.</td>
<td>Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.</td>
<td>Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Issue Recognition</strong></td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</strong></td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.</td>
<td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</strong></td>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.</td>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.</td>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics*
# Global Citizenship/Social Awareness Rubric

**Definition**

Global citizenship and social awareness is civil discourse on complex issues, Ability to appreciate and critique multiple perspectives including one’s own, Self-reflective examination of values, Self-reflective awareness of oneself as a global citizen, Ethical citizenship and leadership in a global civil society, Commitment to community service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others’ engagement with diversity.</td>
<td>Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.</td>
<td>Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to global engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.</td>
<td>Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to global engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.</td>
<td>Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to global engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity and Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.</td>
<td>Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.</td>
<td>Evidence suggests involvement in civic-engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action.</td>
<td>Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.</td>
<td>Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do more than one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action and Reflection</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.</td>
<td>Demonstrates independent experience and team leadership of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.</td>
<td>Has clearly participated in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics*
# INFORMATION LITERACY RUBRIC

**Definition**

Information literacy is the ability to recognize the extent and nature of information need, then to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information. It involves designing, evaluating and implementing a strategy to answer questions or achieve a desired goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determine the Extent of Information Needed</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.). Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Access the Needed Information | Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources. | Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search. | Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources. |

| Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). |

| Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth. | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved. | Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved. |

| Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally | Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. |

- Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics
# Integrative Learning Rubric

**Definition**
Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and cocurriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections to Experience</strong>&lt;br&gt;Note: Connects relevant experience and academic knowledge</td>
<td>Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view.</td>
<td>Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks of fields of study.</td>
<td>Compares life experiences and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledge perspectives other than own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections to Discipline</strong>&lt;br&gt;Note: Sees (makes) connections across disciplines, perspectives</td>
<td>Independently creates wholes out of multiple parts (synthesizes) or draws conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
<td>Independently connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
<td>When prompted, connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer</strong>&lt;br&gt;Note: Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations</td>
<td>Adapts and applies, independently, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways.</td>
<td>Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues.</td>
<td>Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation to contribute to understanding of problems or issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Communication</strong></td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) in ways that enhance meaning, making clear the interdependence of language and meaning, thought, and expression.</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) to explicitly connect content and form, demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience.</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) that connects in a basic way what is being communicated (content) with how it is said (form).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection and Self-Assessment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Note: Demonstrates a developing sense of self as a learner, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts (may be evident in self-assessment, reflective, or creative work)</td>
<td>Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts).</td>
<td>Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).</td>
<td>Articulates strengths and challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics*
# Intercultural Knowledge and Effectiveness Rubric

## Definition

A set of behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together to enable systems, agencies, or professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g., seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)</td>
<td>Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)</td>
<td>Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g., with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks</td>
<td>Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.</td>
<td>Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.</td>
<td>Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal and nonverbal communication</td>
<td>Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.</td>
<td>Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.</td>
<td>Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.</td>
<td>Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.</td>
<td>Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others. Suspends judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Begins to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others. Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of her own judgment and expresses a willingness to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics*
**Leadership and Teamwork Rubric**

**Definition**
Leadership and Teamwork are interpersonal skills and behaviors under the control of individuals and team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to organizational and team discussions). The leader is one who practices management as a trainable skill with technical and administrative aspects which serve to direct people for the good of the enterprise. Leadership is the art and science of getting the job done through the willing efforts of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributes to Team Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.</td>
<td>Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.</td>
<td>Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members</strong></td>
<td>Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage.</td>
<td>Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others.</td>
<td>Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fosters Constructive Team Climate</strong></td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following:  • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.  • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.  • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.  • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following:  • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.  • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.  • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.  • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following:  • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.  • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.  • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.  • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responds to Conflict</strong></td>
<td>Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.</td>
<td>Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.</td>
<td>Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics*
# Oral Communication Rubric

**Definition**

Activity of conveying meaningful information verbally; communication by word of mouth typically relies on words, visual aids and non-verbal elements to support the conveyance of the meaning. Oral communication is designed to increase knowledge, foster understanding, or to promote change in the listener’s attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Material</strong></td>
<td>A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Message</strong></td>
<td>Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)</td>
<td>Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.</td>
<td>Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics
**Quantitative Reasoning Rubric**

**Definition**
Quantitative Reasoning is knowledge of and confidence with basic mathematical/analytical concepts and operations required for problem-solving, decision-making, economic productivity and real-world applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information. For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph.</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation</strong></td>
<td>Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.</td>
<td>Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.</td>
<td>Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculation</strong></td>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.)</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application / Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for workmanlike (without inspiration or nuance, ordinary) judgments, drawing plausible conclusions from this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, presents it in an effective format, and explicates it with consistently high quality.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubrics*
**WRITTEN COMMUNICATION RUBRIC**

**Definition**

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context of and Purpose for Writing</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).</td>
<td>Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Development</strong></td>
<td>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.</td>
<td>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.</td>
<td>Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices</td>
<td>Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources and Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.</td>
<td>Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.</td>
<td>Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from AAC&U Core Value Rubric*
Undergraduate Outcomes-Based Curriculum
Presentation to Faculty Senate
February 20, 2012

11-7 Revisions

- Background for current proposal
  - Initial core curriculum committee recommendations
  - Research findings
- Higher Learning Commission accreditation requirements
- Indiana Senate Bill 0182
Overall Updates in 11-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Changed to: Purdue-West Lafayette (PWL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Core Curriculum”</td>
<td>Changed to “Undergraduate Outcomes-Based Curriculum”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundational Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removed “Technology and Computer Science”</td>
<td>Added “Science” to Science, Technology and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Science “clusters”</td>
<td>Broadened description in appendices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Sciences</td>
<td>Two Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified baseline criteria in appendices</td>
<td>Specified baseline criteria in appendices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered sample courses and credit hours for meeting outcomes</td>
<td>Offered sample courses and credit hours for meeting outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foundational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Communication</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information Literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oral Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Science, Technology, and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology, and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two courses TBD in science</td>
<td>12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course in Science, Technology, and Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Algebra (e.g., MA 153)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Human Cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course TBD in humanities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course TBD in behavioral/social sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundational outcomes are portable across all academic units. Specific courses may or may not fulfill all student degree requirements.

Embedded Outcomes

**Previous**
- “Global Citizenship & Social Responsibility"

**Current**
- “Global Citizenship and Social Awareness”
  - Expanded description in appendices

- Clarified embedded outcomes
  - Faculty within units will determine how and where outcomes are met
  - Faculty within units determine at what level outcomes are met
Embedded Learning Outcomes

1. Creative Thinking
2. Critical Thinking
3. Ethical Reasoning
4. Global Citizenship and Social Awareness
5. Intercultural Knowledge
6. Leadership and Teamwork
7. Quantitative Reasoning
8. Integrative Knowledge
9. Written Communication (levels 2 and 3)
10. Information Literacy (levels 2 and 3)
11. Oral Communication (levels 2 and 3)

The learning outcome rubrics (adapted from the AACU Core Value Rubrics) should be used as a guideline (not literally) by programs as they determine at which level they are addressing embedded learning outcomes within their programs. Each program faculty defines the appropriate level of proficiency. Faculty within each program area will be responsible for determining where and at what level embedded outcomes will be met within their programs. In addition, program area faculty will be solely responsible for assessing student learning on embedded outcomes within their courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Engineering</th>
<th>Major: Chemical Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement Tests</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Chemistry I</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Chemistry II</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR 13100:</td>
<td>Transforming Ideas to Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR 13200:</td>
<td>Transforming Ideas to Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 17200:</td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 10600: English Composition</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 11400: Fund of Speech</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE 20000: Chem Engr Sem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE 20500: Chem Engr Calculations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 26100: Organic Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 26300: Organic Chemistry II lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA 26100: Multivariate Calculus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 24200: Electricity &amp; Optics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN-ED Elective</td>
<td>(e.g., Behavior/Social Sciences choice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN-ED Elective</td>
<td>(e.g., Humanities choice) V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Curriculum Council

- Changed name from “Oversight and Administration Committee” to “Undergraduate Curriculum Council (UCC)”

- Defined council membership
  - Faculty within each College/School will select its representative to the UCC

- Updated membership terms from 2 years to 3 years

- Outlined procedural recommendations
  - Nominating foundational courses
  - Reviewing embedded outcomes
  - Revisiting learning outcomes every 5 years
### Progression of 11-7

**September 12 – November 7, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to University Senate</td>
<td>Monday, September 12, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open forum presentation to faculty</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 21, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Purdue Academic Leadership Forum</td>
<td>Thursday, October 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with EPC of University Senate</td>
<td>Monday, October 31, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPC approves document and sends to Senate Steering Committee</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 11-7 posted on Senate website</td>
<td>Monday, November 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November 15, 2011 – February 17, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Dean's meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 11-7 mentioned in Charapin Larry's comments</td>
<td>Monday, November 21, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU undergraduate committee meeting presentation</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Student Government presentation</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 30, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Liberal Arts系 and mathematics track</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 30, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to College of Education faculty</td>
<td>Monday, December 5, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to College of Science and Engineering Heads</td>
<td>Monday, December 11, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Local Arts Faculty</td>
<td>Thursday, December 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture Brown Bag presentation</td>
<td>Saturday, January 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPC undergraduate committee meeting presentation</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 17, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Student Services Office</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to College of Engineering Leadership team</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 19, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to IUPUI faculty</td>
<td>January 20, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 11-7 First read in the Senate</td>
<td>Monday, January 23, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU EPC cut timeline to provide as much time as possible for faculty feedback</td>
<td>Monday, February 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPC discussion of document progress</td>
<td>Monday, January 30, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Technology curriculum committee meeting discussion</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Math department faculty to discuss mathematics at the foundational level</td>
<td>Thursday, February 2, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Brown Bag discussion</td>
<td>Friday, February 3, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with faculty in science department to discuss science at the foundational level</td>
<td>Monday, February 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due date of comments for revision</td>
<td>Monday, February 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions sent from Core Curriculum Committee to EPC</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates provided at Associate Dean's meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Session of EPC to discuss document update</td>
<td>Thursday, February 9, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Session of Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Friday, February 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Document 11-7 posted on Senate website</td>
<td>Friday, February 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to College Science faculty</td>
<td>Monday, February 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates to Material Radio</td>
<td>Monday, February 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to nursing faculty</td>
<td>Friday, February 17, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks by Shelley MacDermid Wadsworth  
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs  
College of Health and Human Sciences  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Purdue University  
February 20, 2012

Thank you for the invitation to speak briefly at today’s meeting. I am grateful for this opportunity because I would like to share the perspective of someone who simultaneously serves as a faculty member and as an administrator charged with working closely with faculty to ensure that undergraduates in our college and at Purdue receive an education that is of the best possible quality and value. In my brief remarks I would like to explain why I hope that the Faculty Senate will vote today to approve the proposed core curriculum framework. In so doing, I hope I can dispel some possible misconceptions and underscore some key strengths of the proposal.

The first and perhaps most selfish reason for hoping for an affirmative vote today is that my college has been on hold, waiting for this vote. As you know, we were born just over a year ago, and we have delayed trying to construct our own core curriculum or general education requirements. I have been hoping to avoid the necessity of our faculty going through the process twice in quick succession, but we cannot wait any longer. If the faculty senate fails to act, we will need to proceed in our own direction.

The most important reason for Purdue to consider a core curriculum is to better serve our students. I have heard many arguments about why the proposal currently under review will not achieve this goal, ranging from concerns that students will need to complete more not fewer credits, that the quality of students’ educations will be eroded by reduced control of their unit’s faculty over their curriculum, that the core courses will not be fully and completely transferable, and that long lists of courses satisfying foundational outcomes will be no different than what we currently have.

What we have today is a situation where every unit or -- more commonly -- most colleges impose requirements for core competencies, core curricula, or general education. These requirements vary considerably from college to college, not always for reasons that are clearly apparent. Some of these requirements are quite substantial, totaling more than 50 credits. Faculty constructing such requirements often do so based on reviewing course titles and descriptions, and then must rely on student word of mouth and conversations with advisors to determine whether or not the courses meet students’ needs. Faculty have little or no leverage to ensure that courses are accomplishing the goals students were sent there to achieve, particularly when the courses are offered in another department or college. When students change majors, as substantial proportions of our students do, they either must add courses to fulfill the requirements of the list in the new college, or advisors or others implement very liberal course exchange policies to minimize students’ delays. Such delays are a key part of the reason that our four-year graduation rates are well behind those of our peers.

I suggest to you that what we have today is not working well for students because they can be slowed down by variations in requirements for general education courses that may not be
essential to the quality of their education. What we have today is not working well for faculty because they have no ability to know in advance what they can count on a particular course to do, and no systematic way to know if it is doing so.

I believe that the proposed framework for the first-ever core curriculum at Purdue University improves upon our current situation in several ways. First, through the campus committee, faculty for the first time will have the ability to more thoroughly examine the courses that will fulfill foundational outcomes. Because that committee will be overseen by the senate, its process will be necessarily be transparent and systematic, which will allow faculty all across the campus and not just on the committee, to understand what students will be experiencing. Even though many courses may be approved as meeting foundational outcomes, all units across campus will be working from one list, not many lists. This will necessarily reduce confusion and arbitrary delays students experience when changing their degree objective. The proposed core curriculum comprises fewer credits than some existing general ed or core curricula, thus increasing students’ flexibility. The only students that could experience credit increases are those in majors with few elective credits, high credit requirements, and a small core or no core today. Few majors on this campus meet all three of those characteristics.

I know that every senator must vote according to his or her own best judgment and that of the faculty members they represent. With all due respect, however, I believe the current proposal includes several key strengths, and I hope you will vote to approve it.
February 2, 2012

To: Teresa Doughty, Chair, University Core Curriculum Committee  
    Teri Reed-Rhoads, Chair, Educational Policy Committee, University Senate

From: Barbara L. Golden  
    Chair, Curriculum and Student Relations Committee  
    College of Agriculture

Re: Core Curriculum Proposal

Please accept this communication on behalf of the Curriculum and Student Relations Committee (CSRC) of the College of Agriculture. Our committee has carefully reviewed the Core Curriculum Proposal and sought input from faculty in developing the following suggestions and requested revisions. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss or provide more information about any of the following items. Thank you for your consideration.

Core Curriculum Timeline

CSRC previously requested a delay in Senate action on the Core Curriculum Proposal. The request to delay action was not intended to impede progress on the Core Curriculum Proposal, but to allow ample time for faculty discussion and participation in this process. Because this is a major curricular revision that will affect every degree program at Purdue University, we continue to feel that additional time is needed for faculty to thoroughly review this document, consider how it will be implemented and to make suggestions for its improvement. An open process such as this has strong potential to increase faculty awareness and support of the document, and to ease its implementation in the coming months. We appreciate EPC's consideration of this request.

Core Curriculum Proposal

CSRC requests consideration of the following revisions to the Core Curriculum Proposal. They are listed in order of priority (highest priority listed first). In the attached documents, we have suggested explicit changes and rephrasing.

1. Mapping and assessment of embedded outcomes should occur at the College level. Decisions regarding the rubric level at which embedded outcomes are measured should be made at the degree program level.

2. ‘Technology and Computer Science’ should be removed as a foundational outcome. These applications are best addressed within the disciplines. Disciplines that do not currently incorporate Technologies and Computer Sciences may be better served by the ‘Technology and Society’ outcome.

3. Each College should have the authority to select its representatives to the University Core Curriculum Administration and Oversight Committee. While we believe this is the intent, it is not clearly stated in the proposal or its appendices.
4. The College of Agriculture has a deep respect for the efforts and accomplishments of our colleagues at the Purdue University regional campuses. We request that representatives from branch campuses should have full voting privileges on the University Core Administration and Oversight Committee, once established.

5. The Technology and Society outcome should be rephrased and broadened to include any of the entire range of STEM disciplines, including Science and Agriculture. This change better reflects the diversity of academic programs across the campus.

6. The College of Agriculture strongly recommends that some outcomes should be rolled out gradually. Foundational and embedded outcomes should be mapped onto plans of study for each major. Where coursework does not exist on campus, it should be developed and assessed prior to implementation of the outcome. Likewise, if capacity does not currently exist on campus, time will be needed to develop and build capacity. This is critical both to ensure quality coursework for our students and because faculty are near their maximum bandwidth.
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate
REFERENCES: Bylaws, Section 3.20b, c
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slate to serve as vice chairperson of the University Senate for the academic year 2012-2013. The nominee for chairperson is:

David Williams  Veterinary Administration

Candidate résumé is attached.

Approving, via e-mail:
Patricia Bauman
Natalie Carroll
Michael Fosmire
Joan Fulton
William McInerney
Suzanne Parker
J. Paul Robinson
Sam Wagstaff
David J. Williams

David J. Williams is a professor of medical illustration. He joined the Purdue University faculty in 1973, coming to West Lafayette from the College of Human Medicine at Michigan State University. Professor Williams’ original award winning medical illustrations can be found in journal articles, books, and various other forms of media publications. His scholarly interest in the history of art in science and medicine led to Professor Williams being named a Visiting Scholar in History and Philosophy of Science at the University of Cambridge in 2009. At Cambridge, he was a Visiting Fellow at Clare Hall and Clare’s Governing Body elected Professor Williams a Life Member of the College. He has won Literary Awards for his scholarly publications, and is co-author of *Veterinary Medicine: An Illustrated History*, the only work of its kind in English.

Professor Williams has a longstanding interest in faculty partnering with administration in University governance. He has served on the Advisory Committee for two Purdue Presidents. He chaired the Student Affairs Committee and is in his fifth year as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee in the Purdue University Senate. He recently served on the Steering Committee for the HLC/NCA Re-Accreditation of Purdue University, the Blue Ribbon Healthcare Committee, and the Steering Committee for Purdue's Decadal Funding Plan. He is currently a member of the University’s Human Resources Governance Council and is vice chair of the Special Advisory Committee to the Presidential Search Committee of the Board of Trustees.

David, and his wife, Andrea, a continuing lecturer in the Academic Success Center, raised four children in West Lafayette. Two daughters graduated from Purdue, a third graduated from DePauw and then earned an MBA from Indiana University, and their son graduated from Michigan State University. Their second daughter is currently in the MPH program at Johns Hopkins University.
AN UPDATE TO THE FACULTY SENATE ON THE HONORS COLLEGE AND THE REPORT OF THE HONORS COLLEGE TASK FORCE

Dennis Savaiano
Interim Dean and Professor of Nutrition Science
February 20, 2012

HONORS COLLEGE TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Fall 2011

Faculty:
51 from all academic colleges and libraries

Staff:
28 from 18 different units

Students:
13 from 5 colleges
HONORS COLLEGE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Complement the academic colleges
2. Be diverse
3. Build student leadership, scholarship and engagement
4. Integrate residential, co-curricular and curricular learning opportunities
5. Promote innovative learning approaches
6. Enhance student profile

TASK FORCE WORKING GROUPS

• Curricula
  Jeff Karpicke, Psychological Sciences
• Faculty appointment/involvement
  John Cushman, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences
• Post-graduate opportunities
  Riall Nolan, Anthropology
• Recruitment and admissions
  Rosalee Clawson, Political Science
• Residential and co-curricular activities
  Vicki Simpson, Nursing
• Undergraduate scholarships
  Barbara Dixon, CLA
HC TASK FORCE KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Holistic admissions review coupled with college presidential scholarship review
- Supplemental student award for scholarship, leadership, citizenship activities
- Common curricular framework with discipline-based and interdisciplinary honors courses/options
- First year seminar/common course
- Significant capstone/thesis requirement
- Residential co-curricular model
- Faculty governance

HOLISTIC ADMISSIONS REVIEW

- Students first admitted to discipline and then considered for Honors College admission.
- Coupled with college presidential scholarship review.
- Recruit high-ability students who have leadership potential and an interest in social responsibility.
- Academic colleges will play a central role in the recruitment and admissions.
- Robust outreach and recruitment activities to cultivate a diverse set of high-ability prospective students.
- Trustee and Presidential scholarships should not be connected to acceptance into, or continuation in, the Honors College.
- Students who have completed no more than 4 semesters may apply for transfer admission to the Honors College.
**CURRICULA**

- First year Honors College introductory seminar/course common to all Honors students
- Minimum of one advanced 3 credit HC course
- Minimum of nine credits of honors coursework in the department or college
- Minimum of ‘B’ in all honors coursework
- Three ‘points’ of leadership activities
- Three ‘points’ of engagement activities
- Significant thesis/public scholarly activity
- Thirty credits/points total

**EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AWARD FUNDS**

- Travel to research seminars
- Study abroad
- Thesis/capstone project work
- Experiential learning opportunities
- $3000 per student recommended
- Contingent upon remaining in Honors College
RESIDENTIAL CO-CURRICULAR MODEL

• Build community
• Co-curricular programming
• Using the residence halls to enhance student academic success
• Physical space that integrates learning
• Faculty and staff on site
• Leadership and engagement programming
• Experiential learning

POST GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

• We are behind our peers
• Needs
  • A culture of encouragement
  • Faculty involvement
  • Readily available information
  • Information sessions
  • Individual counseling
  • Workshops on application and writing
• Focus on success with a single opportunity—Fulbright
PROPOSED HC FACULTY GOVERNANCE

• One faculty member elected/appointed from each Academic College.

• A maximum of six at-large faculty members elected/appointed by Educational Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate to constitute broad and inclusive representation from nominations obtained by the Honors College.

• Three year rotating terms with one third turnover each year. No more than two consecutive terms allowed.

• The HC Faculty Governance Committee will advise the Dean, act as a Curriculum Committee and be a communication interface between the HC, the Faculty Senate and the Academic Colleges.

HONORS COLLEGE TASK FORCE REPORT

http://www.purdue.edu/provost/honors/info/HonorsCollegeUpdate.shtml
Develop a space management strategy for a residential college model

Recommendations due March, 2012

HONORS RESIDENTIAL SPACE TASK FORCE

Co-chairs:
Barb Frazee, Executive Director, University Residences
Catharine Patrone, Assistant Director, Honors College

Members:
• Emily Allen, Liberal Arts Honors Director, Associate Professor, English
• Leigh Anderson, Undergraduate student, psychology
• Amy Boyle, Human Resources Manager, Housing and Food Services
• Jessica Carducci, Undergraduate student, computer graphics technology
• Mae Christiansen, Undergraduate student, education
• Tim Gennett, Director of Physical Facilities, Housing and Food Services
• Sherry Hardebeck, Assistant to the Dean, Honors College
• Mark Harlan, Undergraduate student, engineering

Ex-Officio:
• Lynn Horngren, Director of Undergraduate Education and Advising, Science
• Elizabeth Hudson, Undergraduate student, Professional writing
• PK Imbrie, Engineering Honors Director, Associate Professor, Engineering Education
• Sean McDowell, Undergraduate student, engineering
• Luke Poole, Undergraduate student, psychology
• Jonathan Pfluger, Undergraduate student, engineering
• Julie Talz, Director of Residential Life
• Elizabeth Williams, Undergraduate student, speech language and hearing sciences
• Merri Anne Wright, Housing Assignments Coordinator
FACILITIES CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE HC

• Connect curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities.
• Beginning in Fall 2013, house 500-600 students with the goal of housing up to 1,000 students by Fall 2017.
• A variety of room types, allowing for move-up options for sophomores through seniors.
• A facility (or facilities) that provides a sense of presence for the Honors College.
• Space for Honors Offices.
• Classroom/Programming space.
• Space to support a Faculty in Residence program.
NEXT STEPS IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

• Share report with College leadership
• Solicit input campus-wide
• Establish a faculty governance committee
• Governance committee to accept or modify recommendations of the Task Force
• For non-curricular issues, the governance committee will make recommendations to the Dean who will consult with the Provost
SCOPE & PURPOSE

• First assessment of all 330+ degree, minor and certificate programs on the Main Campus
• Intended to...
  – guide future resource allocations at the department, college and university levels
  – Identify specific weaknesses in programs for targeted remediation
• Parallel process for assessing general-fund supported research centers (OVPR)
WHAT THE APA IS NOT:

• A replacement for the periodic in-depth external reviews of academic units
• A Blue Ribbon committee show for external stakeholders
• A mechanism for skirting established processes for academic reorganization

SURVEY QUESTIONS

• History and trajectory?
• Student success (retention, graduation rates, placement)? Disparities by race/ethnicity, first generation?
• Relative position in state, nation, world?
• Role in land-grant mission?
• Role in the academic fabric of Purdue?
• Redundancy or overlap within Purdue?
• Challenges?
• Opportunities?
• May-Sept. 2011: Purpose, scope, tools, timeline developed
• Oct.-Dec. 2011: deans and Senate EPC engaged; OIR data assembled; regional campuses engaged (PUC, PNC)
• Jan.-Feb. 2012: APA validation committee appointed; OIR program data shared with deans; deans distribute surveys: deans collect and review survey input; deliver to APAVC

• March-April 2012: APAVC validates survey data; interviews deans and program leads as needed; returns draft report to deans and provost; finalizes report
• May 2012: deans develop action plans with stakeholders; submit plans to provost; provost develops action plan
• Summer 2012: provost presents action plan to campus stakeholders and Board of Trustees
• Fall 2012: action plans involving academic reorganization vetted by University Senate
APAVC COMPOSITION

- Co-chairs Rab Mukerjea and Nancy Bulger
- One representative from each college
- Director of Assessment
- Office of Institutional Research representatives
- Undergraduate student representative
- Graduate student representative
- Graduate School representative
- University Senate representative
- Diversity advocate
- Regional campus liaisons

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

- 33 programs without students terminated
- 25 programs with zero or sparse and declining enrollment identified for retirement

Since July 2010:

- 21 programs merged into 8
- 25 majors and minors added
- 24 programs revised
- 28 programs under review to reduce credit hour requirements
EXPECTED OUTCOMES

• More and stronger “pillars of excellence”
• Less program redundancy; greater clarity of options for students
• Clear program-specific plans for enhancing student success
• Rich and actionable program-level data moving forward
• Refined process for biennial APA

Thank you
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
JOHN F. VAN VLEET, DVM, PH.D.
March 23, 1938 – January 5, 2012

Dr. John F. Van Vleet, professor emeritus of comparative pathobiology and former associate dean for academic affairs in the Purdue University College of Veterinary Medicine, died January 5 at the age of 73. Dr. Van Vleet’s Purdue University career spanned 43 years, and included 22 years as associate dean. Even after his official retirement in 2010, he continued to actively serve the college and the profession in a variety of capacities. Dr. Van Vleet was a very dear friend, colleague and mentor, who touched countless lives during his Purdue Veterinary Medicine career. He will be missed tremendously not only in the Purdue Veterinary Medicine family, the Purdue University and Lafayette – West Lafayette communities, but across the veterinary medical profession as well.

A native of Lodi, New York, Dr. Van Vleet earned his DVM degree from Cornell University in 1962, and then went to graduate school at the University of Illinois, where he earned his Masters and Ph.D. degrees in Veterinary Pathology. He became board certified by the American College of Veterinary Pathologists in 1967, the same year when he joined the Purdue Veterinary Medicine faculty.

Dr. Van Vleet received numerous honors and awards during his tenure as a veterinary educator and administrator, and he was selected to be included in the Purdue University Book of Great Teachers. He was a member of several professional societies including the International Academy of Pathology and the American College of Veterinary Pathologists. Dr. Van Vleet also was highly regarded in his own specialty field of cardiovascular pathology and was published in various pathology journals and textbooks. Since 2001, he also served as a visiting professor at St. George’s University in Grenada, West Indies.

Upon his retirement from Purdue University, Dr. Van Vleet was honored with a Symposium on Cardiovascular Pathology that was held at Lynn Hall, as well as with a recognition dinner that included tributes from selected colleagues and alumni, a veterinary student, and AVMA Executive Vice President Ron DeHaven. Dr. Van Vleet was commended for his qualities of loyalty to the college, dedication, commitment, caring, and excellence, as well as his great attention to detail, his skills in planning and organization, his dependability and trustworthiness, and his steadfast support of the students.

Dr. Van Vleet’s legacy of excellence and dedication is reflected in a total of four different funds established to honor him or his family. In recognition of Dr. Van Vleet’s tireless efforts to support and ensure the success of the College’s annual Fall Auction, the Van Vleet Auction Scholarship Endowment was established with auction proceeds to support veterinary student financial aid. Dr. Van Vleet and his wife Nancy also created the Van Vleet / Coon Family Veterinary Scholarship Endowment as a tribute to their own parents. Upon Dr Van Vleet’s retirement, the College created the Van Vleet Summer Research Program Fund, in recognition of Dr. Van Vleet’s vision for providing veterinary students opportunities to experience the world...
of scientific discovery through a summer research program that partners them with faculty scholars. Additionally, a duplex in Lafayette that was gifted to the College for use in hosting international visitors was named the Dr. John F. Van Vleet International House.

Dr. Van Vleet also was very involved with his family, his faith, and his community. He was a member of Covenant Church, where he sang in the choir. He also served on the board of the Bach Chorale Singers and was a member of the Kiwanis Club. His other interests included traveling, Purdue athletics, music, and spending time at his cottage on Lake Freeman with friends and family. He is survived by his wife, Nancy, two daughters and their spouses, four granddaughters, two sisters and two brothers and their spouses. Additionally, he is remembered, respected and revered by a host of colleagues, students, staff and alumni who cherish the memory of his tireless dedication in the pursuit of excellence; his care and concern for the students; his sense of humor and friendly smile; and his faithfulness in fulfilling his varied roles of administrator, teacher, scholar, husband, father, colleague and friend.

Willie M. Reed, DVM, Ph.D.
Dean
Purdue University College of Veterinary Medicine
## CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE DOCUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-14*</td>
<td>Medical Amnesty or PurdueCares</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Approved 12 September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2*</td>
<td>Endorsement of COACHE Survey Purdue Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Approved 24 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4*</td>
<td>Undergraduate Admissions Policy</td>
<td>Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>Approved 21 November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-6*</td>
<td>Senate Reapportionment</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Approved 21 November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1*</td>
<td>Revised Research Faculty Policy</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Approved 23 January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-3*</td>
<td>University Open Access Policy</td>
<td>University Resources Policy Committee</td>
<td>Approved 23 January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-7</td>
<td>Undergraduate Core Curriculum</td>
<td>Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>Approved 20 February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-8</td>
<td>Nominees for Vice-Chair of the Senate</td>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approved