

Kevin's goal is to have the first round of reviews completed in 2 weeks; hope to have all reviews in queue now to be dealt with by the end of Fall term.

SD – there will be clear distinction between requested start date and actual start date due to some proposals that are highly ambitious and lack of understanding of what needs to occur prior to approval

KG has initial set of assignments and will share tonight; plan on having the initial discussion of those assignments two weeks from today. Priorities- anything in queue prior to end of classes Spring 2014; most appear to be changes to courses rather than new courses.

Category Review – DPD – has some important details associated – wants to do some training sessions; initial thoughts is to co-opt Oct and November meetings to ensure that members are available to attend. WIC courses – all from Engineering.

Policy issues to deal with – need to come to conclusion on them.

KG – distributed Bacc Core Review Tools – APAA – he will distribute electronically and they will be posted online from the BCC site. Members can fill out and save reviews online. Kevin showed online how the online review system works. He noted that the links are not secure; but the information that members enter will not be accessible to others.

Stefani noted that the current CPS sometimes almost shuts down daily after 4:00.

Kevin explained that the alternating meeting schedule Thursday PM and Monday AM – with one exception all members can attend at least one time. If unable to attend a meeting and have comments or concerns to share, send to KG. Need to discuss at two meetings before a final decision is made on proposal so all have an opportunity to discuss.

Stefani stated that forms will be submitted via Qualtrics, then APAA staff will move to SharePoint; Stefani will provide instructions. Stefani – trick with SP is when you login, indicate ONID\login name

Kevin noted that members should review proposals that will be discussed at the next meeting so they're ready to discuss.

Training for Category Reviews – Kevin suggested beginning 27 October, then 6 November would be the first two meetings to discuss reviews or to train.

Kevin – last year observed during Category Reviews, when done, make observations among mismatches re: student learning outcomes and what is accomplished by including a particular category. i.e. need to revise expectations that speech competency is an outcome of the Speech category. KG offered the unit head the opportunity to rewrite things; she offered to rewrite, and it now includes reference to oral communication, but it now includes written

communication and conflicts with Writing I and II and WIC. Rationale is currently three points; nothing precludes adding a fourth point. Kevin – concern with adding a fourth is that if there is a Student Learning Outcome, must assess the outcome which would add an additional step for courses that

Suggested rewriting the first Outcome to include ‘oral communication in English’

How would one in ALS satisfy this competency? Kevin – failure to execute on any of the LO’s is not structurally tied to any necessary sanction for the student – accommodation would be made. DAS would provide an interpreter. Kevin – need to accommodate those who are visually impaired.

Could return to speech unit and offer them a chance to respond or come before BCC to discuss. A change to the outcome or rationale would need to be approved by the FS.

Category Minimum Credit Levels – Stefani distributed handout. Kevin – discovered that re: # of courses and enrollment from 2012-13 – challenge is that a number of areas are shifting from 3 to 4 (typically). Stefani – APAA will pull together data for distribution of credits across all categories by next meeting. Kevin – concerned that we’re at a point where we’re saying the Bacc Core is  $48 + 3 \text{ WIC} = 51$ . IF reality is that only 4-credit courses are viable in a 3-credit ...the reality is that the BC may be over 60 credits. Some programs can handle additional credits, but COE is tightly packed and carefully scheduled; lack of 3-credit courses may allow student to not satisfy in a timely manner and complicate scheduled. As plateau ends, students will pay more for the extra hour(s). Do we build in an incentive to drive course away from? All are not satisfactory. Recognize that some courses legitimately need more depth, but need to build in incentive that don’t exist for units to build in acceptable courses. Simplest way is to once a category has 50% or more above minimum credits level, moratorium to adding 4-credit courses until percentage is reduced.

Stefani – could be what Kevin described, or a new or changed course proposal could be denied unless unit agrees to decrease comparable course in the same category. This would provide flexibility in administering categories.

Kevin – last year’s BCC considered: look at # of seats at different levels – administrative process is daunting on a term-by-term or week-by-week basis. Perhaps make distinction between upper and lower division courses – BCC did not respond favorably.

Stefani – statement = action to accommodate a new or changed ‘over credit’ course cannot result in an increase in the percentage of ‘over credit courses in a full category. This may provide an incentive for units to review courses in the category and eliminate courses that are not taught.

Kate