

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 7, 2014 ~ 3:30-4:30 PM

109 Gilkey Hall

Agenda

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable, Jaga Giebultowicz, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Malgo Peszynska, Kirsi Peltomaki, McKenzie Pfeifer, Ken Winograd

Voting Members Absent: Trischa Goodnow, Lori Kayes, Bob Paasch

Ex-Officio Members Present: Stefani Dawn (Academic Affairs), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

Guest: Valerie Rosenberg, International Admissions

Next meeting: March 17, 1:30-3:00 PM

Dual degree Partner Programs: BCC matrix (distributed 2/17) Valerie Rosenberg, International Programs

- Need a consistent way in which to deal with dual degree partner programs. There are a certain number of Bacc Core elements that are unique to OSU and a student could only take these courses through OSU courses (DPD, Synthesis Courses [Contemporary Global Issues and Science, Technology and Society and WIC]. Learning outcomes need to be met and documented in some way.
- Discussion –
 - VTB – didn't hear first presentation; asked KG to say who will decide?
 - BCC would still review proposals, but units would know they have guidelines to satisfy, i.e., document learning outcomes, would not allow articulation of some courses, etc.
 - Unit would be required to validate to BCC if they feel that an articulated course would satisfy more than one courses.
 - BCC will look at programs, not case-by-case students.
 - Would students still need to satisfy the 48 SCH required for Bacc Core. Would separate out learning outcomes vs. credit requirements. Stefani felt that this would need to be discussed with Rebecca Mathern.
 - Vicki felt that Writing I and II would not be able to be articulated if the student had equivalencies in another language – it must be done in English. Stefani suggested there be something on the guidelines stating that English is the only language that will satisfy the WR I and II requirements.
 - How many students will be impacted? Currently 5-6 per year. Hope is that interested units will engage in this program.
 - Stefani stated that a review of the agreements would occur every three years. The new agreements state that any substantial revisions must be identified to APAA and three year time period will begin at the time the revisions are reviewed. She will discuss this with the Curriculum Council.
 - Kevin noted reticence related to WR I and II must be in English; total SCH mapping has to fit.; Speech outcomes may need to be met in English
 - Re: the overall concept of mapping by learning outcomes vs. credit, several felt it was positive change.
 - Valerie will draft what she heard and will forward that to Kevin

WIC Category Review

a. Business (BA 353)

- Rebecca felt that additional information was needed. Concerns – two syllabuses included, but none had a schedule – difficult to determine course content. 2) wasn't clear if there were audiences other than potential

employers. Wasn't clear whether drafts were required or submitted to instructor. Neither syllabi requires revision, which should be required. Re: assessment, for the first outcome they talk with employers; not all assessment questions were answered. Does a class devoted to getting a job, satisfy the expectation of a WIC outcome? It may be problematic that there is only one audience. Issue of proposers unable to provide each syllabus from every instructor.

- What type of writing was done for the discipline? One syllabus had a greater range of writing.
- Vickie noted that WIC outcomes are not labeled, nor are they stand alone and verbatim, which is required. Students need feedback on their writing.
- Kevin – they would have the Learning Outcomes somewhat verbatim, but would specify the discipline.
- Vicki noted that the assessment question needs to be revised because most feel that this correlates to grading.
- Rebecca recommended a provisional approval.

Action: Kevin will approve provisionally with a one-year review. He recapped the deficiencies that he will address with the proposers: must state required revision of the long paper on the syllabus and on the schedule; deficiency of assessment of learning outcomes (must indicate WIC outcomes) and address grading in lieu of assessment; and submit complete syllabi for all instructors.

b. DHE 370 – Graphic Design

- Ken felt this was an exemplary class. However, the class size was consistently high (50ish) and always taught by a GTA.
- Vicki couldn't tell whether students are getting adequate feedback on their writing. National standard for writing courses, with feedback and revisions, is 20-25. It was noted that the form indicates 30 students per course; there are no red flags if enrollment is under 30. Suggested revising form to state role of faculty member.
- McKenzie felt the unit needs to be advised of the class limit.
- Consensus was to have the unit address issues in one year: class size is substantially larger than rec for WIC courses and that the bulk of instruction is falling to a GTA, would appear to be better to have more inst and above participation in the course even if a GTA is utilized to spread the workload. Observe there is high rate of success related to grades, but unclear of the amount of feedback, particularly with 2,000 word paper

•

DHE 481 0 professional practices in Interior Design

- Malga? Felt that this course meets the letter of the law. Cap for course is 48, but enrollment is 32. Learning outcomes are insufficient presence of WIC in syllabus, no statement that explains WIC rationale. Assignment sheet was very minimal – students need more guidance. Overall information provided was so little.
- Vicki also felt it met the letter of the law and that WIC is low profile, and there are no WIC outcomes indicated.
- Apply provisionally with a one-year review and harp on learning outcomes.

GD 412 – Contemporary Issues in Design

- Ken – caps out at 20-21 students; taught by associate professor rank; assessment of student writing indicates that the instructor really cares;

syllabus was good – peer revision, instructor revisions and Writing Center revision; need to make assignments and tests explicit.

- Kevin- WIC outcomes are not identified.
-

Action: Approve provisionally - indicate that this is a strong course, but address the syllabus deficiency.

ART 310 resubmission

Ken noted the issues have been addressed

Action: Kevin will approve.

ES353

- Rebecca noted that 30% is for participation and 10% for attendance – is this percentage appropriate? She felt it was structured.
- Rebecca – doesn't appear to be a textbook, rather Blackboard is used and felt that university may not want all of the materials on Blackboard. It cannot be a copyright violation.

Kevin will indicate approval, because it meets Bacc Core criteria, however, there were concerns about participation.

b. Agricultural Sciences (AG 421, ANS 420, AREC 434, AREC 461, BOT 323, CSS 325, FST 425, FW 435, FW454, HORT 318)

- Postpone to Spring term

c. Public Health & Human Sciences (DHE 370, DHE 481, EXSS 375, EXSS 381, EXSS 455, GD 412, H 434, H476, HDFS 430, HDFS 461, NUTR 416, NUTR 439)

- Will review on 3/17.
- d

d. Issues about the implementation of the requirement that each program have a unique WIC course.

- D
- D

New Course Proposals Ready for Action:

- 86759 (ES 353)
 - d
- 88677 (SOIL 102)
 -
- Others?
 -

Other Business?

-

Spring term – need to address Synthesis courses that have not been taught or need to be reviewed. Kevin suggested scheduling weekly meetings during Spring term to ensure that all of the business is finalized.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 PM.