

## **Baccalaureate Core Committee**

February 24, 2014

### **Minutes**

*Members Present:* Robert Brudvig, Kevin Gable, Jaga Giebultowicz, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Bob Paasch, McKenzie Pfeifer

*Ex-officio Member Present:* Stefani Dawn (Academic Affairs)

Agenda for BCC meeting

Monday, Feb. 24, 2014

1:30-3 p.m.

Gilkey 109

1. Speech (discussion continued from 2/17)

2. Fitness

3. Mathematics

1. Speech Category

- 218, in particular, rampant inconsistency of syllabus and outcomes. Kevin felt that the unit has a supervision structure in place for that course, recognizes they need consistency. Want to encourage and promote process. Come to provisional recertification, but will come back in a year to determine progress..
- Category as a whole, even though a speech skills course, no requirements for speech outcomes. Trischa is open to unit rewriting learning outcomes.
- Speech summary data –no comments

2. Fitness

- HHS 231, PAC courses and associated labs
- 231 – CSO need to be verbatim, would benefit from a common syllabus
- Pac – on-campus courses are clear and recertifiable; Ecampus courses – unclear
- Labs – need for verbatim CSLO and syllabi
- Overarching data: HHS 231 grade distribution looks normal;
- Comments: For fitness labs, CSLO assessment seems to be based on attendance. Hundreds of labs and only a few syllabi; the decision last year was to only collect a sample of the syllabi. For labs, only criteria 3 was being met. Unit has proposal to have HHS231 required within the first 45 hours; Kevin felt this was a legitimate ask. Kevin has materials that need to be distributed for review.
  - One countered that the course doesn't build on anything.
  - Stefani questioned if there is an overlap between this course and FYE courses.
- Kevin asked the unit to prepare feedback and determine from advisors if that proposed requirement would affect timing.
- Kevin will ask about Ecampus classes – how do they ensure that the student completed the lab portion.
- No other concerns expressed.
- 

3. Math Category

- All have been completed through 112.
- Will recertify 105, and the remaining courses have been provisionally recertified. Common problems: issues with syllabi – 111, in particular; poor quality; inconsistencies; and concern with high DNF rate.

- Stefanie noted there were similar comments for 111, 112, 241. Other comments: variability between sections and grades, and overall high DFW rate across the courses, in particular, Math 111 has a 29.3% DFW/I and almost 12% withdrawal rate and 211 is at 23.7% DFW.
- Flag problem with consistency of outcomes; the unit needs to determine source and fix.
- Unit is concerned about MTH 111.
- Concern was expressed with MTH 103 (pre-req for MTH 111). There is an inconsistency when switching among colleges, due to different requirements and learning environment between MTH 103 and 111.
- Kevin – Does the BCC see anywhere that an application of resources at the institutional level could make a difference?
  - Unit needs a coordinator to assist instructors when teaching a new course.
    - As an example, MTH 111 is taught in large lecture halls and has small recitations, but the grade is based on three exams; homework is not graded and there is no feedback. A coordinator could assist with this issue.
- Appears to be a high number of seniors taking Math 105(?).
- Suggesting looking at pass rate by grade level. What is the DF rate among those taking the course the first time vs. subsequent time(s)?
- Student self-evaluation – think about the way they're being taught aligned with the BCCs expectations. May result in course restructuring.
- The provisional recertifications will be reviewed again in one year.
- Need a second reviewer for Math 211 - ??

*Action: Kevin will communicate concerns to the unit.*

◦

WIC course reviews are due a week from Wed and they will begin discussing on March 7.

- Kevin previously sent assignments. Specifically look for word counts in types of writing

d

II. Orientation for review of skipped and provisional Synthesis reviews from last year

- D
- D
- D
- 

Dual degree – Kevin distributed a matrix at the last meeting; want to set up a framework for rapid approval of degree partnership programs. The challenge is to document how student have met learning outcomes.

Stefani – WIC review is quite different from category reviews. She will solicit feedback on process and asked if they feel like they want to give feedback after WIC or give feedback for first three categories and do WIC later.

- How can it be easier for the 2014-2015 group?

I. Recommendations based on category review:

-Success of CSLOs in defining course goals & outcomes -Consistency in student success in meeting CSLOs, other targets -Ability of the infrastructure to meet demand -Any other concerns