

University College Advisory Board
Editorial Reconciliation Committee

Report of the Committee
March 26, 2007

Origin and Composition

At its meeting of May 11, 2006, the University College Advisory Board established an Editorial Reconciliation Committee and charged it to reconcile the student learning outcomes produced by the Core Review Task Forces during Spring semester 2006. The Committee was to establish levels of proficiency, to ensure a consistent level of generality, and to reduce overlaps among the different task force statements.

The Committee was to consist of seven members, including the chair of the Core Review Committee and members of each Task Force. A nominating committee was established to recommend these members. The nominating committee met May 15, 2006 and recommended members to the Provost. The membership of the Editorial Reconciliation Committee as approved by the Provost was as follows:

Member	Task Force
Dr. Gregory Rich (chair)	Reasoning Skills
Dr. Sonya Brown	Communication Skills
Ms. Evelyn Council	Inquiry Skills
Dr. Victor Hebert	Ethics and Civic Engagement
Ms. Socorro Hernandez-Hinek	Global Literacy
Dr. Dwight House	Reasoning Skills
Dr. Ruth Johnson	Scientific Literacy
Dr. Jon Young (ex officio)	Ethics and Civic Engagement
Dr. John Brooks (ex officio)	Global Literacy

Deliberations

The Editorial Reconciliation Committee first met December 8, 2006. It decided to meet every other week beginning January 3, 2007. It stuck to that schedule through its last meeting on March 14, 2007.

The Committee first compiled the rationales of the different Task Force Learning Outcomes Statements into a single draft rationale. The Committee next decided that defining proficiency levels for each of the learning outcomes would not be possible within the time given it. It agreed instead to recommend a single set of competencies for each outcome.

The Committee worked through the outcomes statements one by one, beginning with Communication Skills. A member of the original Task Force was paired with someone NOT from the Task Force to review each statement. Each team produced a draft that was then

reviewed by the Committee. After each statement was reviewed, the Committee voted to adopt the final wording.

In general the Committee attempted to identify a single set of competencies from among those defined by the Task Forces. In some cases, the Committee decided to make more substantial changes. For example, Scientific Literacy became considerably more general than the original Task Force report. In the case of Global Literacy, the Committee decided to recommend that study of a foreign language be one way of demonstrating global literacy rather than a requirement of all students. In making these changes, the Committee was operating within its charge, which authorized it to “make such adjustments as it deems necessary.”

The Committee decided that the assessments (embedded, University-Wide) should remain illustrative rather than definitive at this point in the Core Review process. Embedded assessments must by definition be created by the faculty who develop the syllabi in which these assessments are embedded. A number of different standardized assessments exist, and the Committee felt that more work would be needed to decide whether to retain the CBASE (the current Rising Junior Exam) or to adopt a new one (such as the CLA or the MAPP, an ETS product).

Conclusion

The Committee recommends the reconciled outcomes statements as a definition of the essential skills and knowledge that all FSU students should possess upon graduation. The Committee believes that these learning outcomes should become the basis for a review of the Core Curriculum.