

## Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » 2010 Minutes

**Please note that some links go to websites not managed by the Faculty Senate. As such, some links may no longer be functional or may lead to pages that have since been changed or updated.**

### 2010 Minutes

Minutes for Faculty Senate meetings can be accessed by clicking on the desired year. Minutes are distributed to Senators for approval each month. Contact the [Faculty Senate Office](#) via email or phone at 541-737-4344 for more information.

- [June 10](#)

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Minutes](#) » [2010 Minutes](#) » June 10, 2010

## Faculty Senate Minutes

2010 No. 650

June 10, 2010

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Leslie Burns on June 10, 2010 at 3:00 PM in the LaSells Stewart Center.

### Meeting Summary

- Action Items: Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee Elections; Consideration of Degree Candidates; Consideration of Degree Candidates – K. Kuo; Category I Proposals – C. Brown: Rename the BS in Wood Science & Technology to the BS in Renewable Materials, Energy Engineering Management, Undergraduate Certificate in Medical Humanities, Change the Name and Requirements for Bachelor of Science Degree in Environmental Economics, Policy and Management; Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee Report – J. Bailey, B. Bogley: motions to adopt the learning goals for graduates and to adopt other recommendations in the report; Bylaws Revisions – L. Ciuffetti – motions re: Create a Cascades apportionment group, Absenteeism/vacancies, Housekeeping items, Apportionment determination
- Special Reports: Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting Recap – R. Reuter
- New Business: None

### ACTION ITEMS

#### Faculty Panels for Hearing Committee

Balloting by Senators for Faculty Panels for Hearing Committees resulted in the following faculty being elected to serve through June 30, 2014:

##### Primary Members

Eric Skyllingstad  
Neil Davison  
Andrea Wirth  
Paul Biwan  
Joanne Sorte  
Virginia Lesser  
Jeanne Brandt  
Christian Matheis  
Kendra Sharp  
Beth Valentine

##### Alternate Members

Andrew Plantinga  
Darrell Ross  
Matthew Ito  
Chris Coffin  
Dahong Zhang  
Mamta Accapadi  
Neil Browne  
Rosemary Garagnani  
Sabry Elias  
Beth Siddons  
Kay Stephens

#### Consideration of Degree Candidates

Kent Kuo, Registrar, recommended for approval the proposed lists of degree candidates and honors subject to final confirmation of all degree requirements. There were 4,496 students who were candidates for 4,695 degrees which included: 3,733 Bachelors, 656 Masters, 174 Doctors and 131 Professional Doctor degrees. There were 189 students who were candidates for 2 degrees and 5 students were candidates for 3 degrees.

The Class of 2010, OSU's 141st graduating class, had 1,208 seniors who qualified for Academic Distinction and included 466 'cum laude' (gpa 3.50-3.69), 294 'magna cum laude' (gpa 3.70-3.84), and 268 'summa cum laude' (gpa 3.85 and above).

*Motion 10-650-01 to approve the proposed list of degree candidates and honors passed by voice vote with no*

*dissenting votes.*

### **Category I Proposals**

Carol Brown, Curriculum Council co-chair, presented the following Category I proposals for approval:

[Rename the BS in Wood Science & Technology to the BS in Renewable Materials](#) - Reason for change:

- Employer needs are changing and enrollment is low – proposed curriculum changes in major will make the program more relevant to the current generation; attempt to remove barriers to allow students to graduate in a timely manner; broadened curriculum to include more materials in renewable materials.

There was no discussion. *Motion 10-650-02 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.*

[Energy Engineering Management](#) - Background

- The program will be offered only at OSU-Cascades where demand is high for graduates and among current students. The reason why it will only be offered at OSU-Cascades is because it requires new hires and Cascades has money to hire
- It will be accredited as a professional engineering program; 4 of 7 members of College of Education Curriculum Committee didn't feel that Faculty Senate approval was necessary, but the Executive Committee asked for approval, which was provided
- Discussion – if the program is successful at Cascades will it be integrated? Brown indicated that integration may eventually be possible depending on funding.
- *Motion 10-650-03 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.*

[Undergraduate Certificate in Medical Humanities](#) - Brown's comments:

- This is an integrated cross-departmental certificate consisting of 27 credits with 15 core credits.
- The Curriculum Council was concerned that the certificate is accessible to pre-med students and determined there is sufficient overlap with Baccalaureate Core courses without adding too many additional courses to their degree.
- The Executive Committee questioned the rigor of the program – Brown determined that the selected courses were done so by consulting with medical educators and doctors; coursework is comparable to other minors and majors at other universities.

Discussion:

- Senator Bird, Vet Med questioned why a certificate rather than a degree. Brown responded that a certificate makes it accessible to more students who may decide to broaden to a minor or major; however, if it's a second major, additional credits are needed. A certificate is also transcript visible.
- In response to Senator Brubaker-Cole, Associated Faculty, Brown acknowledged that the certificate is available to post-bacc students.

*Motion 10-650-04 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.*

[Change the Name and Requirements for Bachelor of Science Degree in Environmental Economics, Policy and Management](#) - Brown's comments included:

- The proposal creates three options, changes name, is geared toward distance learning, there are approximately 70 SCH of free electives, and is very quantitative but flexible.
- Issues all addressed to satisfaction of both the Curriculum Council and Executive Committee – most of the seven new classes are one-credit classes offered in alternate years matched with research interests of instructors. Regarding development of distance ed courses, five of the eight are already being offered via distance. Whether growth projections of 25-33% is realistic, the enrollment doubled last year and there will be an enrollment push with a redesigned program to be attractive to other institutions.

*Motion 10-650-04 to approve the proposal passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.*

### **Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee Report**

John Bailey and Bill Bogley, Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee co-chairs, presented for adoption the committee's final report titled, [Vitalization of General Education at Oregon State University](#). Also attached was an [appendix](#) from the Executive Committee outlining the recommendations. The report was accepted by the Executive Committee and was presented to the Faculty Senate for adoption. Bogley thanked all individuals, councils and bodies for sharing input, insight and reservations with the task force.

The two motions related to the report were to:

1. adopt the learning goals for graduates
2. adopt other recommendations in the report.

Background - The Executive Committee (EC) created and charged the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee (BCR) to recommend potential changes to the Baccalaureate Core; the report proposes the structure for the Bacc Core.

The BCR launched a four-month listening period resulting in a final report that includes: learning goals for graduates, implementing a shared vision, and experiential learning. The EC asked that the following Faculty Senate committees/council provide input regarding the report; a synopsis of their comments appears below.

Academic Advising Council (AAC) - voted to endorse with one abstention. Their input included – given access issues, they questioned whether it was realistic to have consequences for students failing to complete Bacc Core courses in the first year; because AAC doesn't control curriculum, it's difficult for advisors to ensure that students' schedules can accommodate first-year Bacc Core courses in the first year; and re: learning goals, they noted that student support may not be the same in all areas (Corvallis, Cascades, E-campus).

Baccalaureate Core Committee - The Committee did not provide input because they did not have adequate time to meet to discuss the proposal.

Curriculum Council - The Council voted to endorse final BCR report but noted that the report did not address the number of credits required, overlap of categories, double-dipping or counting allowed, and restriction of undergraduate courses, lack of cohesiveness among Bacc Core classes, lack of coordinated, ongoing assessment of effectiveness of Bacc Core classes, and lack of specific learning outcomes for each category, uniformly applied for all courses within each category.

Joint Task Force on Shared Governance - The majority of members endorsed report. They noted concern re: shifting responsibility and authority from the BCC to administrative positions, but felt that adequate safeguards were proposed.

The first motion related to adoption of learning goals for graduates which would serve as the overarching framework; the learning goals originated in 2002 as part of OSU 2007; the Curriculum Council will be charged with reviewing learning goals periodically; and refinement will occur over time.

Senator Tate, Science, questioned to what extent would learning goals be reflected in individual courses. Burns responded that the learning goals do not apply to individual courses.

*Motion 10-650-05 to adopt learning goals for graduates passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.*

The second motion related to adoptions of other recommendations in the report.

There are four overarching initiatives – 1) learning goals for graduates (LGGs) was approved above; 2) implementing a shared vision; 3) Baccalaureate Core first-year experience; and 4) student engagement with experiential learning.

The recommendations included:

- The EC shall charge the following committees:
  - Curriculum Council to periodically review the LGGs, coordinate with Academic Affairs alignment of LGGs as a criterion in Undergraduate Academic Program Reviews, coordinate with Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to incorporate LGGs in all aspects of the student experience
  - Baccalaureate Core Committee to align specific LGGs with each category of the Bacc Core, and revise course approval processes to incorporate the LGGs alignments
  - Committee on Committees, Bacc Core Committee, Bylaws Committee, to rename the Baccalaureate Core Committee to the Baccalaureate Core Leadership Team (BCLT) and to determine the new role of the BCLT.
  - Bacc Core/BCLT to implement a "three college-level skills" requirement for the first year
    - Bacc Core/BCLT to revise the current Skills requirements such that oral communication is a first-year Bacc Core requirement;
    - Academic Advising Council to coordinate with major programs of study to ensure that students' schedules have room for first-year Bacc Core courses in the first year; and
    - Bacc Core/BCLT and Academic Standing Committee to create policies for consequences for

students if a first-year student fails to complete the first-year Bacc Core courses during their first year.

- Curriculum Council and Bacc Core/BCLT to develop criteria and create an "EL" or other designation for courses that have an experiential learning component
- The EC shall recommend to:
  - Academic Affairs the creation of the Baccalaureate Core Implementation Team with a focus on the shared vision of the Bacc Core, faculty development, assessment, and resource allocation
    - Faculty review of Bacc Core writing requirements and outcomes
    - Faculty review of Bacc Core mathematics requirements and outcomes
    - Faculty Senate (BCLT and Faculty Senate President) participation in the selection and annual reviews of the Director of the Baccalaureate Core Implementation Team
  - Academic Affairs to improve course access/availability, dedicate resources to support learning communities infrastructure, and recruit faculty and teaching assistants to teach within the learning communities
  - Academic Affairs and UCSEE to coordinate and fund learning community pilot projects
  - Registrar and UCSEE to design new registration management strategies to plan and manage enrollment across the three college-level skills areas and provide linked registration to support learning communities

Senators were encouraged to think about implementation as incremental – implementation is forever. Adoption of the recommendations comes to the Faculty Senate as recommended from the Executive Committee. Senators are asked to vote on the EC having the authority to work through the recommendations and implementation while working with Senate committees and through Senate processes and giving the EC authority to work collaboratively with Academic Affairs to ensure infrastructure and processes are in place.

#### Discussion:

- Paul Doescher, Executive Committee, thanked Bogley, Bailey and BCR and noted all have done a tremendous amount of work.
- Senator Selker, Agricultural Sciences, questioned how a continuous improvement process would handle concerns related to the Bacc Core. Bailey provided an example related to category overlap – map out things and determine redundancies and the number of classes contributing to desired outcomes. The two bodies – faculty and administration – are looking for efficiencies, and will begin generating recommendations. BCR felt it was important to set up the framework. Bogley responded that some see the Bacc Core as a disjointed process; some speak highly of some of the courses; the final resolution pieces are designed to communicate across courses and categories; and the goal is for students to experience an integrated experience. Bailey noted there is currently not an easy mechanism to add a new category. Selker expressed concern about further stretching resources and people and how this would be practicable. Bailey felt that elevating the BCC will assist in addressing this concern. Bogley responded that, on the investment side, there is an appetite for faculty to improve education
- Senator Mallory-Smith, Agricultural Sciences, asked when changes resulting from this initiative will be measured and will results be seen. Bailey responded that, ultimately, measurement comes in recruitment and retention numbers; currently students view the core as 'getting it out of the way.' Bogley noted that the proposal is designed to assist with graduation and retention rates; OSU was criticized during the last accreditation in relation to Bacc Core issues; and Phase I survey results indicated that 2500 students think very little about the bacc core.

*Motion 10-650-06 to adopt recommendations as outlined in BCR committee report passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.*

Burns thanked the members of the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee for their efforts during the last two years.

#### **Bylaws Revisions**

Lynda Ciuffetti and Walt Loveland, Bylaws and Nominations Committee members, presented for approval [proposed revisions](#) to the Faculty Senate Bylaws. An accompanying [document](#) contained information related to proposed apportionment issues and creation of a Cascades apportionment group. Ciuffetti thanked the Bylaws and Nominations Committee for their work during the year. She proceeded to outline each of the proposed revisions, followed by discussion and voting.

#### **Creation of a Cascades Apportionment Group**

- OSU-Cascades requested a separate apportionment group due to their unique situation; this has been in the works for several years.
- If approved, Cascades faculty would not be eligible to represent their current apportionment groups.
- A survey among Cascades faculty resulted in 20 votes which were all in favor of the separate apportionment group
- Senator Gable, Science, questioned what the reduction in representation of existing apportionment units would be. Ciuffetti responded that, based on their current FTE and SCH, they would have only one Senator.

#### Absenteeism/Vacancies

The proposed verbiage to be added is bolded and proposed deletions are shown as strike-throughs:

#### Article V – Member Nominations and Elections – Sec. 7. Vacancies

~~;~~ or (5) ~~(moved from Article X, Sec. 2, paragraph 4)~~ In the event of a Senator's absence, without providing a substitute, for three meetings during ~~one year~~ **the session (October-June)** ~~the position will be declared vacant by the apportionment unit and~~ **the Faculty Senate President will contact the individual and indicate that if they miss a fourth meeting, the position will be vacated.** Any vacated position will be filled by the nominee with the next highest number of votes at the most recent election.

#### Article VII: Executive Committee – Sec. 4. Term of Office and Vacancies

~~;~~ or (5) **non-participation due to non-attendance of meetings. A member missing three meetings during the term, unless deemed an excused absence by vote of the Executive Committee.**

#### Article VIII: Interinstitutional Faculty Senate – Sec 5. Vacancies

~~;~~ or (5) **Non-participation due to non-attendance of meetings, at the discretion of the Executive Committee.**

~~A vacancy shall be filled by appointment of the Executive Committee with approval from the Senate.~~

**Vacancies in elected positions shall be filled for the period to complete the term at the discretion of the Executive Committee by the candidate who, in descending order, received the next highest number of votes in the most recent election.**

#### Article X: Meetings – Sec. 2

In the event of a Senator's absence, without providing a substitute, for three meetings during one year ~~the position will be declared vacant by the apportionment unit and filled by the nominee with the next highest number of votes at the most recent election~~ **see Article V, Section 7.**

- Senate Bylaws call for the apportionment unit to declare Senator vacancies due to non-attendance, but this doesn't occur. Selker questioned the fraction of Senators who would be affected. Ciuffetti responded that the number of absences during a two-year period was shocking.
- Senator Angima, Extension, noted that financial restrictions limit off-campus Extension from attending. Ciuffetti acknowledged that this is an issue and would be handled individually.
- Ciuffetti responded to an inquiry of how Senators would be advised if a Senator was removed by indicating that the Faculty Senate president will contact the individual and the apportionment group will be notified.
- Theo Dreher, Executive Committee, felt it was appropriate for a letter to go to the chair or head since service is a P&T issue.

#### Housekeeping Items

- Ciuffetti noted that some are proposed to allow flexibility and some are due to practices being changed, such as paper ballots vs. electronic.

#### Apportionment Determination

The proposed verbiage to be added in Article V, Sec. 1. is bolded:

Official current University personnel statistics will be the basis for determining the FTE for each Faculty member and for determining whether a Faculty member holds academic rank in more than one apportionment group. Official university student credit hour reports for the most recent academic year will be the basis for determining the total SCH of each apportionment group. **To simplify the calculation of the apportionment, factors relating FTE to the number of Senators in each apportionment unit will be determined by examining the 2005-2008 academic years. These factors will be used for estimating the number of Senators per apportionment group in future years. These factors will be revised at the completion of any University reorganization process, or upon creation or abolishment of apportionment groups, and every five years thereafter.**



- Apportionment is currently determined by 75% FTE and 25% SCH; the number of Senators with apportionment groups vary little from year to year
- Loveland compiled FTE data and created the proposal based on historic trends over a four-year period.
- Senator Wilcox, Health & Human Sciences, distributed the following proposed amendment to Article V, Sec.1.:
  - Official current University personnel statistics will be the basis for determining the FTE for each Faculty member and for determining whether a Faculty member holds academic rank in more than one apportionment group. **The most recently published Official University Institutional Research Student Credit Hour reports for the most recent an academic year will be the basis for determining the total SCH of each apportionment group. SCH data taken from the report and used for apportionment will be that which is specifically identified with an apportionment group (e.g., college, ROTC) or a department or program that is assigned to one apportionment group.**
  - Wilcox noted that SCH is important because it reflects teaching, but don't count SCH for Extension, Library, Associated, Student Affairs.
  - Wilcox also noted that SCH were factored in when the professional faculty were added to the Faculty Senate and recommended tracking SCH by unit rather than faculty because IR does not track SCH by faculty.
  - Wilcox moved to amend the motion to include above verbiage; motion seconded.
    - Senator Gross, Liberal Arts, asked Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff, for her opinion of the proposed amendment. Nunnemaker responded that she was concerned that the amendment marginalizes faculty in non-college apportionment units who generate SCH. She noted that currently SCH follows the faculty member and the SCH allocation would look very differently if SCH followed the unit and, in turn, the apportionment could look very different.
    - Senator Gregory, Agricultural Sciences, recommended that Bylaws options address all units in a quantitative system.
    - Senator Snyder, Student Affairs, acknowledged that Student Affairs faculty may not generate as much SCH as academic faculty, but expressed hurt that SCH is being dismissed for faculty in her apportionment group. Ciuffetti agreed with Snyder and noted that some colleges have fewer SCH than Associated Faculty. Ciuffetti also noted that faculty in interdisciplinary programs will not be apportioned correctly in the proposed amendment.
    - Wilcox understood it may be emotional philosophically, but there is a need to eliminate the onerous task of determining SCH and there are trade-offs. He noted that the SCH generated by Associated Faculty results in only one Senator.
    - Doescher called the question.
    - *Motion 10-650-08 to end debate on the amendment passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.*
    - *Motion 10-650-07 to approve the amendment proposed by Senator Wilcox was defeated by voice vote with some in favor.*

Senators were asked to vote via written ballot at the conclusion of discussion related to each of the four proposals; the results appear below:

- Proposed revisions to create a Cascades apportionment group – 58 in favor, 4 in opposition
- Proposed revisions related to absenteeism/vacancies – 55 in favor, 4 in opposition
- Proposed housekeeping revisions – 58 in favor, 0 in opposition
- Proposed revisions related to apportionment determination – 55 in favor, 4 in opposition

## **SPECIAL REPORT**

### Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Recap

Ron Reuter, OSU Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Senior Senator, provided a [written recap](#) of the May IFS meeting.

## **REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE PROVOST**

Provost Randhawa invited faculty to step back and look at what has been accomplished this year given the challenges we've faced, and hoped for a wonderful summer for all.

## **REPORT FROM AND DIALOG WITH THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

President Leslie Burns report included the following:

- Congratulated Lynda Ciuffetti for being appointed as a faculty representative to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.
- Informed Senators that Joe Hoff is departing OSU for the University of Richmond and has been replaced on the Executive Committee by Mario Magana in the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no New Business

### **Roll Call**

#### *Members Present:*

Agricultural Sciences: Arp, Borman, Capalbo, Curtis, Dreher, Field, Goddick, Gregory, Mallory-Smith, Perry, Putnum, Selker

Associated Faculty: Brubaker-Cole, M. Bierly v. Calvery, Dennis Bennett v. Dempsey, Gillies, Halischak, Holdren, Leslie, Nishihara, Pierson-Charlton Business: Lykins, Moore, Swift, Yang

Business: Lykins, Moore, Swift, Yang

Education: O'Malley

Engineering: Bailey, Hunter-Zaworski, Koretsky, Magana, Pence, Porter

Extension: Angima, Bub

Forestry: Bailey, Leavengood, Vandetta, Wright

Health & Human Sciences: Champeau, Mahana, Porter, Wilcox

Liberal Arts: Chappell, Gross, S. Meyers v. Helle, L. Cramer v. Orosco, Plaza, Shaw, R. Hammer v. Steel

Library: Chadwell

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Lerczak, Spitz, Ungerer

Pharmacy: McPhail, Proteau, Suchy

ROTC: Campbell

Science: Bogley, Bruslind, Dilles, Flahive, Fowler, Gable, Jansen, Karplus, Lesser, Parks, Tate, Thomann, Trempy

Student Affairs: Accapadi, Davis-White Eyes, Snyder, Stroup

Veterinary Medicine: Bird

#### *Members Absent:*

Agricultural Sciences: Auyong, Bolte, Braunworth, Cassidy, Herring, Hino, Sears, Thompson

Associated Faculty: Babcock, Barr, Bruce, Eklund, Gomez, Hemmer, Hoff, Ott, Perrone, Rogers, Ross, Simmons

Business: Simpson

Education: Winograd

Engineering: Bay, McFarlane, Paul, Plant

Extension: Bondi, Deboodt, Tuck

Forestry: Rosenberger

Health & Human Sciences: Bernell, Eversole, Gunter, Hooker, McAlexander

Liberal Arts: Bernell, Cardenas, Clough, Cytrynbaum, Daugherty, Hale, Henderson, Tilt, Trujillo

Library: none

Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences: Davis, Duncan

Pharmacy: None

ROTC: None

Science: Haggerty, Hsu, McIntyre, Rajagopal, Remcho, Taylor

Student Affairs: Alexander, Vina

Veterinary Medicine: Heidel, Sisson

*Guests Present:* C. Campbell, L. Ciuffetti, M. Fisk, D. Hatlen, K. Kuo, W. Loveland, M. McCambridge, T. Simmons

#### *Faculty Senate Officers, Ex-officios and Staff:*

Officers: L. Burns, President; J. Higginbotham, President-Elect; P. Doescher, Immediate Past President

Ex-officio Voting Members: S. Gregory, J. Sorte

Ex-officio Non-voting Members: M. Beachley, Parliamentarian

Staff: V. Nunnemaker

*Ex-officio Voting Members:* S. Randhawa, E. Ray, R. Reuter

*Ex-officio Non-voting Members:* M. Beachley, Parliamentarian



*Respectfully submitted:*  
*Vickie Nunnemaker*  
*Faculty Senate Staff*

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).



College of Business

College of Business

Oregon State University, 200 Bexell Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331-2603

Phone 541-737-2551 | FAX 541-737-4890 | www.bus.oregonstate.edu

June 9, 2010

Dear Leslie Burns – Faculty Senate President:

On June 9, 2010 the Academic Advising Council voted (with one abstention) to endorse (with concerns noted below) both the adoption of the Learning Goals for Graduates and the Other Recommendations in the Bac Core Review Committee report. Our discussion on the topic resulted in the following concerns and recommendations which we would like noted:

**Regarding....**

*“Bac Core/BCLT and Academic Standing Committee to create policies for consequences for student if a first-year student fails to complete the first-year Bac Core Courses during their first-year.”—pg 2 of Appendix*

- A general concern that creating consequences for students who do not complete the first-year courses on time seemed punitive.
- We wondered how realistic being able to provide access to these classes for all first-year students is. We understand that we are working toward this goal, but not sure we are ready to have consequences for something we cannot guarantee. Perhaps when we know more about access to courses and classrooms, we can revisit the consequences part if needed.
- If this remains a requirement, who will monitor when students do and do not comply, notify them, and administer the chosen consequence? This would take some resources we may not have now or in the next couple of years.
- Recommend the Implementation Team consider when and if it is feasible to require this part as opposed to leave as part of the culture change to “all first year students take these classes”.

*“...Academic Advising Council to coordinate with major programs of study to ensure that students’ schedules have room for first-year Bac Core courses in the first-year.”—pg 2 of Appendix*

- Note that AAC members cannot control curriculum. That being said, we will work with faculty when needed toward this end; however, we didn’t think there were many (if any) programs out there that wouldn’t be able to fit these first-year courses into the first year.
- Recommend that the Implementation Team work with the AAC and advisors more than the *Recommendations* area of the document indicates ( AAC appears only once.)

*“...University personnel and advisors whose work is in this informal educational system will support student’s accomplishment of the LGGs. The Curriculum Council will work with the Office*



**College of Business**

Oregon State University, 200 Bexell Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331-2603

Phone 541-737-2551 | FAX 541-737-4890 | www.bus.oregonstate.edu

*College of Business of Academic Affairs and the Student Affairs Team to coordinate this work.”—pg 12 of report under Initiative for Adoption: Learning Goals for Graduates (LGGs)*

- A note that support for students may not look the same or even be able to be replicated amongst all our campuses: Corvallis, Cascades, E-campus (e.g. can a student obtain the same services online or in Bend from the EOP or CAMP programs?)

The AAC does look forward to working with the Faculty Senate and Implementation Team in the future regarding these issues.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brenda R. Sallee". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Brenda R. Sallee,  
Academic Advising Council Chair 2009-10  
Head Advisor, College of Business



College of Business

**College of Business**

Oregon State University, 200 Bexell Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331-2603

**Phone** 541-737-2551 | **FAX** 541-737-4890 | [www.bus.oregonstate.edu](http://www.bus.oregonstate.edu)

cc:

Vickie Nunnemaker

John Bailey

Bill Bogley

Kim McAlexander

Leslie,

The BCC is not able to endorse the Ad Hoc Review Committee's recommendations at this time. This does not imply a lack of endorsement, it just means that given the short notice, we were not able to meet to discuss the proposal. As you know, we only meet together as a full committee twice a year and we had just met for the second time when we received your request to endorse the recommendations. Had the request been made a couple days earlier, we could have accommodated it. We tried to piggy-back onto one of the subcommittee meetings last week but with the short notice and some confusion, on my part, there was not a quorum. We would like the opportunity to collectively comment on the recommendations but will not be able to do that before the FS meeting on Thursday. If the FS were to delay their decisions until the fall, the BCC would have sufficient time to respond to your request.

With apologies,

Roger Hammer

***Materials linked from the June 10, 2010 Faculty Senate Agenda.***

### **Curriculum Council Comments on the Final Report of the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee**

The Curriculum Council has voted to endorse the Final Report of the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee, with the following comments and/or reservations. We would like our comments to be read into the minutes at the Faculty Senate meeting when the report is discussed.

We approve of most of what is contained in the report, and agree with many of the specific recommendations, such as adoption of Learning Goals for Graduates, a First Year Experience, and more Experiential Learning. However, we are concerned that the report does not address several issues of pressing concern for the Bacc Core structure and implementation. These concerns, touched on in the report or discussed at least since 2002, include:

- a) the number of credits required for Bacc Core requirements;
- b) possible overlap of Bacc Core categories;
- c) differences in how Bacc Core requirements are applied among different colleges and programs (e.g., whether "double dipping" or "double counting" are allowed);
- d) restriction of some categories of Bacc Core courses to lower-division courses, requiring many students to take less challenging classes than appropriate;
- e) lack of cohesiveness or integration among Bacc Core courses (the "smorgasbord" approach);
- f) lack of coordinated, ongoing assessment of effectiveness of Bacc Core classes;
- g) lack of specific learning outcomes for each category, uniformly applied for all courses within each category.

When the Bacc Core was first established, educators used a content-driven approach; as a result, the Bacc Core largely consists of distribution requirements, which, it was hoped, would deliver the desired content. Now, higher education has shifted to a model based on measurable outcomes, allowing assessment. The system of "Learning Outcomes" currently followed by OSU and required by current accreditation standards reflects this change. The Curriculum Council has been instrumental in helping to apply the "Learning Outcomes" model to individual classes and programs, but the change has not yet affected the Bacc Core.

It is important to establish measurable learning outcomes for the categories within the Bacc Core, and to require that all courses that are certified as Bacc Core classes have these explicit learning outcomes, along with whatever other specific learning outcomes are appropriate for the particular class. These actions would address several outstanding problems with the Bacc Core. Requiring students to achieve the Bacc Core outcomes, rather than take a specified number of classes, would obviate problems with "double counting", credit requirements, and course level. This would also allow some departments to provide some of the Bacc Core Learning Outcomes within their own majors, if desired (although not the breadth-type outcomes). Students would be able to take upper-division classes to fulfill their Bacc Core, as



long as the classes they chose provide the required Learning Outcomes. Individual students, departments, or programs would be able to put together integrated series of classes to achieve their Bacc Core Learning Outcomes. In addition, adding the ability to do assessment fits very well into OSU's accreditation process.

We note that the Learning Goals for Graduates are not the same as Learning Outcomes (Learning Outcomes refer to measurable results). Whatever Bacc Core oversight structure is established must have as an immediate task to establish and implement specific, required Learning Outcomes for each Bacc Core category.

Reviewing and revising the Bacc Core should be a priority, and should be addressed before new initiatives, such as the Learning Goals for Graduates, First Year Experience, and Experiential Learning, are put into place. Two important shortcomings we see with the Ad Hoc Committee's report are: first, it is not clear who is responsible for reviewing and revising the Bacc Core; and second, there is no timeline for this process. We would like to suggest, as an addendum to the report, that such a timeline be established. The Curriculum Council, as the group within OSU's faculty senate most immediately concerned with, and responsible for, curriculum, is looking forward to seeing the results the Bacc Core revision, and offers to assist in this process in whatever way we can.

Dear Leslie,

The SGTF considered your request and felt it appropriate that the committee provide input on the BCRC report as it relates to shared governance only.

From a shared governance perspective, the majority of the SGTF endorsed the report. However, there was not a consensus among the committee. There were some concerns regarding a shift of responsibility and authority over the BC to administrative positions. However, it was noted that there appears to be adequate safeguards proposed in the report. These are specifically noted on Pg. 16 of the report:

"To codify and promote the collaborative nature of this expectation, to further provisions ensure direct faculty involvement in the administrative component of Baccalaureate Core leadership:

- The Baccalaureate Core Implementation Team will include direct and ongoing involvement of tenured OSU faculty members in fixed-term, partial-FTE administrative appointments overseeing specific aspects of the Baccalaureate Core; and
- Annual review of the BCIT director's performance should include direct input from the Baccalaureate Core Leadership team and the Faculty Senate President.

These two provisions should help to ensure that the effort remains collaborative and that the FS has input to the review of the BCIT director. Also, it was suggested that the administrator appointed come from within the faculty with specific requirements (e.g. Ph.D. in one of the academic disciplines represented in the core and with experience teaching BC courses).

From a shared governance perspective, the SGTF felt that due process was given in the development of this report and that a fair and open process was implemented throughout the various phases.

We thank the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee for all their hard work and we thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

*Lynda (on behalf of the Shared Governance Task force)*