

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 27, 2015

Minutes

Voting members present: Gerd Bobe, Robert Brudvig, Kevin Gable, Kira Hughes, David McMurray, Bob Paasch

Voting members absent: Linda Bruslind, Brad Cardinal, Susie Dunham, Kate Field, McKenzie Huber, Lori Kayes, Melinda Manore, Malgo Peszynska, Kirsi Peltomaki, Ken Winograd

Ex-officio members present: Academic Affairs (Heath Henry), DPD Director (Nana Osei-Kofi), WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)

Guests: Drew Ibarra, Erica Woekel

PAC and Fitness Requirement – Drew Ibarra, Erica Woekel

[Proposal](#) from CPHHS to adjust the PAC requirement and linkage to the Fitness requirement.

- Based on earlier conversations, the proposers provided a revised document outlining why the proposal is beneficial to students: it would link HHS and Physical Activity; would move to broader concepts; and would make HHS and PAC a first-year requirement. Initially, they would change the curriculum next fall and are looking at certification training and development (CPR, coaching, etc.).
- Discussion:
 - It's still unclear what specific changes will be made to the 231 course learning outcomes. Specific changes were made two years ago; the focus is on breadth of help, not just activity; and there will be an application component.
 - How will 231 be related to the PAC? It will be a co-requisite for HHS, and PAC will be independent. It will require a lot of training for instructors to achieve objectives and ways to assess health behaviors. The lecture provides a connection to the activity.
 - One member was concerned with the idea of linking the two areas in the first year – there is a conflict because many majors have requirements which must be finished in the first year for students to progress.
 - It was suggested to develop a pilot period and noted that there is no enforcement of first-year requirements since the Baccalaureate Core Committee decided not to assess penalties several years ago. The numbers were run after the end of the second year, and most colleges had good compliance. The proposers were asked to think of it as a roll-out period that may require adjustment.
 - Making this a requirement for a first-year class with an associated penalty would not be acceptable – no class will build on this proposal, and it may be difficult for students to schedule this course in the first year.
 - Is the large lecture offered outside of normal hours? They've thought of offering the lecture outside of normal hours, and there are five sections online each term; they've also considered an evening class.
 - Additional concerns were expressed related to the mandatory first-year requirement. When questioned whether the proposers had talked about this with advisors, they responded yes and asked advisors to suggest recommending that this be taken within the first 45 credits. The best argument for the first year is that this is in the Skills category and it's a foundational course that will apply to the students' success – it's a life skill.
 - Kevin suggested that the alignment of the material in the PAC courses and labs is likely the most important piece of the discussion. The question of making it a co-requisite with 231 is more difficult – it moves the one hour into the first 45 credits. Once there is curricular alignment, then student success can be determined.
 - Perhaps proposers could partner with other colleges, and work with advisors to persuade them of the value of the co-requisite, without being required. Erica felt that within either 45 or 90 credits is acceptable. Kevin noted that the course needs to meet the stated outcomes in the most effective way possible; the co-requisite is a logical extension, but may not be a priority.
 - CPHHS is planning to align objectives in Fall 2015 and work with other colleges to try to achieve having students take the class in the first year.

- Kevin stated that the co-requisite would require a formal curricular proposal. Erica noted the possibility of a name change, which would require a Category II proposal. A category name change would require Senate approval.

Action: Erica and Drew will update the Baccalaureate Core Committee as they move forward.

New/Revised Course Proposals

None scheduled.

DPD Category review

- LING 251- Languages of Oregon
 - Learning about cultures and approaches; felt it was too literal; it talks about formative and summative assessment; and the reviewer supports approval.
 - Regarding Learning Outcome 2, the response could include more work related to historical and contemporary examples.
 - Too many learning outcomes (14); Nana recommends 3-5 for content.
Action: Recertify, with comments related to concerns.
- ENG 220
 - Not discussed
- HST 369
 - Not discussed
- WGSS 224
 - Not discussed
- ES212 –
 - Problematic – unsure whether they wish to be recertified. They indicated that they didn't want to be recertified, but the form was completed, although it also indicates that the instructor is no longer here. Grade distribution is 67% A – seems high; question of rigor.
 - There are two different courses being taught – two different historical time periods.
 - It was noted that two new Ethnic Studies faculty have been hired who teach Latino Studies.
 - The course is not being taught on-campus this year, but unsure whether an adjunct is teaching online this year – the adjunct's syllabi has no mention of the Bacc Core.
 - Nana can advise the unit that there are no outcomes and give them a time by which to include the outcomes.

Action: Delay approval, request a plan to recertify, and come back in two years to recertify; possibly work with School head.

Kevin – I heard several options of what could occur, but I'm not certain what you're actually going to do. ~VN

- EXSS 475 – Paasch – Power and Privilege in Sport
 - Online course, no problems, high number of F grades (1/3), recommends recertification.
Action: Recertify.
- SPAN 470 - Kira
 - Very small class (8); all A's and B's; why is this a Bacc Core class (WIC and DPD); only open via instructor permission with advanced language skills; syllabus is appropriate; team taught but instructor's independently create their own syllabus (only one syllabus submitted); learning outcomes were basically the same for both instructors
Action: Kevin will determine whether there is something in the CPS related to a basis for approval and whether the question of pre-requisites was addressed. If there doesn't appear to be a basis for approval, it will be recertified.

Kevin noted that Stefani sent him a spreadsheet of the open seat analysis for a full academic year. It only includes Perspectives and DPD courses (Synthesis courses were not included), but he felt it was a representative cut. Kevin will include a summary of his analysis, forward to BCC members and asked them to review, and the summary will be discussed at the next BCC meeting.

Minutes prepared by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff