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Standing Rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate student attainment of category learning outcomes. This work depends on the availability of data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members. Additionally, the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs shall appoint one ex-officio, non-voting representative from Academic Affairs.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC may solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

2. All existing, modified and new courses proposed by individual faculty, groups of faculty, or departments for inclusion in general education must be approved by an appropriate faculty curriculum committee within the college of origin prior to BCC submission.

3. All submissions shall be routed for additional curriculum review at the discretion of the BCC. Request for such reviews, and selection of the reviewing unit, will be made by the BCC. The criteria used to select the reviewing unit will be based upon that unit's ability to assess the specific general education objectives proposed.

4. All submissions that deal with WRI and WRII must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

5. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses which are deemed by the BCC to meet these criteria and address the category learning outcomes can be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to approval by the Curriculum Council.

6. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

B. Category Reviews

1. The BCC will periodically request and review institutional data in order to evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:

   a. adequate access to courses within the category;
b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning;

c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes;

and

d. continued satisfaction of category criteria by individual courses.

2. The BCC has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses.

3. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

C. Changes in Core or Criteria or Process

1. Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

Scheduled Meetings

Spring 2014 ~ All meetings are in 109 Gilkey, unless otherwise noted.

- April 2 – 2:00-3:30 pm
- April 7 – 1:00-2:30 pm
- April 16 – 2:00-3:30 pm
- April 21 – 1:00-2:30 pm
- April 30 – 2:00-3:30 pm ~ 128 Kidder Hall
- May 5 – 1:00-2:30 pm ~ CANCELED
- May 14 – 2:00-3:30 pm ~ 128 Kidder Hall
- May 19 – 1:00-2:30 pm ~ 128 Kidder Hall
- May 28 – 2:00-3:30 pm ~ 128 Kidder Hall
- June 2 – 1:00-2:30 pm ~ 128 Kidder Hall

Winter 2014

- January 17 – 3:30-5:00 pm ~ 109 Gilkey
- January 27 – 1:30-3:00 pm ~ 109 Gilkey
- February 17 – 1:30-3:00 pm ~ 109 Gilkey
- February 24 – 1:30-3:00 pm ~ 109 Gilkey

Fall 2013

- November 13 – 3:00-4:00 pm ~ 109 Gilkey
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Minutes
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

- 2012-2013
- 2011-2012
- 2010-2011
- 2008-2009
- 2006-2007
- 2005-2006
- 2004-2005
- 2003-2004
- 2002-2003
- 2001-2002
- 1999-2000
- 1998-1999
- 1997-1998
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Resource Materials

- Baccalaureate Core Course Review
- Reports
- Baccalaureate Core Course Review by Year
- 2007 Baccalaureate Core Review Materials
- Review/Relevance of the Baccalaureate Core Program
- OSU Bacc Core Comparison with AAOT Requirements
- The Baccalaureate Core: Approved and Pending Courses
- Baccalaureate Core Course Articulation Table for Oregon Community Colleges
- Course Equivalencies/Articulation Tables for Oregon Institutions and Community Colleges
- Baccalaureate Core Courses Approved
- Baccalaureate Core Courses Scheduled
- Schedule of classes
- Baccalaureate Core Courses
- Scheduled Baccalaureate Core Courses
- 2011-2012 Curriculum Review Process
- OSU Curricular Policies and Procedures
- BCC Template Syllabus
- OSU General Education Assessment Road Map – Outcomes, Evidence, Reflection, Improvement
CPS Proposal Search

To access course proposals via the CPS (Curriculum Proposal System) site:

- go to [https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals](https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals)
- select ‘BCC Committee’ in the ‘Review Group’ box
- scroll down and click on the ‘Search’ box
- the pending proposals will appear below the ‘Search’ box
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Membership -- 2013-2014

Kevin Gable '16
McKenzie Pfeifer '14
Jaga Giebultowicz '14
Trischa Goodnow (v. Sherwood) '14
Rebecca Olson '14
Linda Bruslin '15
Lori Kayes '15
Melinda Manore '15
Ken Winograd '15
Kirsi Peltomaki '15
Bob Paasch '16
Robert Brudvig '16
Malgo Peszynska '16
TBA '16

Chemistry
School of Design and Human Environment
Zoology
School of Arts & Communication
English
Microbiology
Biology
School of Biological and Population Health Sciences
College of Education
Art
Mechanical, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering
Music
Mathematics

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD Director (Nana Osei-Kofi)
Academic Affairs (Stefani Dawn)

Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison – Bernadine Strik
Membership -- 2012-2013

Kerry Kincanon, Co-chair '13
Marion Rossi, Co-chair '15
TBA (v. Bogley) '14
Uta Hussong-Christian '13
Michael Lerner '13
TBA (v. Peltomaki) '13
Joe Zaworski '13
Jaga Giebultowicz '14
Trischa Goodnow (v. Sherwood) '14
Rebecca Olson '14
Lori Kayes '15
Linda Bruslind '15
Melinda Manore '15
Ken Winograd '15

Academic Success Center
University Theatre
OSU Libraries
Chemistry
Mechanical, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering
Zoology
School of Arts & Communication
English
Biology
Microbiology
School of Biological and Population Health Sciences
College of Education

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD Director (Michelle Bothwell)

Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Bob Mason
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Membership -- 2011-2012

Bill Bogley, Co-chair '14
Kerry Kincanon, Co-chair '13
Penny Diebel '12
Victor Hsu '12
David McMurray '12
Marv Pyles '12
Marion Rossi (v. Yu) '12
Uta Hussong-Christian '13
Michael Lerner '13
Kirsi Peltomaki '13
Joe Zaworski '13
Jaga Giebultowicz '14
Rebecca Olson '14
Dawn Sherwood '14

Mathematics (COS)
Academic Success Center
Agricultural and Resource Economics (CAS)
Biochemistry (COS)
Anthropology (CLA)
Forest Engineering Resources and Management (FOR)
University Theatre (CLA)
OSU Libraries
Chemistry (COS)
Art (CLA)
Mechanical, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering (COE)
Zoology (COS)
English (CLA)
Animal Sciences (CAS)

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD director (Michelle Bothwell)

Student Members-
- Brian Powell
- Karli Olsen

Executive Committee Liaison - Joan Gross
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Membership -- 2010-2011

Mary Cluskey, Co-chair '11  Nutrition & Exercise Science (HHS)
Victor Hsu, Co-chair '12  Biochemistry (COS)
Mina Carson (v. Hammer) '11  History (CLA)
Nick Drapela '11  Chemistry (COS)
Kirsi Peltomaki '11  Art (CLA)
Hal Parks '11  Mathematics (COS)
Penny Diebel '12  Agricultural & Resource Economics (CAS)
David McMurray '12  Anthropology (CLA)
Marv Pyles '12  Forest Engineering Resources & Management (FOR)
Marion Rossi (v. Yu) '12  University Theatre (CLA)
Uta Hussong-Christian '13  OSU Libraries
Kerry Kincanon '13  Academic Success Center
Michael Lerner '13  Chemistry (COS)
Joe Zaworski '13  Mechanical, Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD director (Michelle Bothwell)

Student Members-
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Theo Dreher
Baccalaureate Core Committee

**Membership 2009-2010**

Margie Haak '10, Co-chair  
Roger Hammer ’11, Co-chair  
Barbara Edwards '10  
Cary Green '10  
John Lambrinos '10  
Anne Marie Deitering '10  
TBA (v. Reuter) '10  
Mary Cluskey '11  
Nick Drapela '11  
Chris Anderson ’11  
David McMurray ’12  
Victor Hsu '12  
Marv Pyles ’12  
Marion Rossi (v. Yu) '12

Chemistry  
Sociology  
Mathematics  
Agricultural Sciences  
Horticulture  
University Libraries  
Nutrition & Exercise Science  
Chemistry  
English  
Anthropology  
Biochemistry  
Forest Engineering, Resources & Management  
University Theatre

Ex-Officios:  
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)  
DPD director (Susan Shaw)

Student Members-  
- Brittany Duffy-Goche  
- Melissa Stone

*Executive Committee Liaison - Theo Dreher*
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Membership 2008-2009

Margie Haak '10, Co-chair
Denise Lach '09, Co-chair
John D. Bailey '09
David Bernell '09
Victor Hsu '09
Barbara Edwards '10
Cary Green '10
John Lambrinos '10
Anne Marie Deitering '10
Kate Hunter-Zaworski (v. Reuter) '10
Mary Cluskey '11
Nick Drapela '11
Roger Hammer '11
Chris Anderson '11

Chemistry
Sociology
Forest Resources
Political Science
Biochemistry
Mathematics
Agricultural Sciences
Horticulture
Library
Civil & Construction Engineering
Nutrition & Exercise Sciences
Chemistry
Sociology
English

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Lisa Ede)
DPD director (Susan Shaw)

Student Members-
- Jill Ferris
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Carol Mallory-Smith
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Membership 2007-2008

Jay Noller '08, Co-chair
Cheryl Middleton '08, co-chair
George Caldwell '08
Margie Haak '08
John D. Bailey '09
David Bernell '09
Victor Hsu '09
Denise Lach '09

Crop and Soil Science
Valley Library
Speech Communication
Chemistry
Forest Resources
Political Science
Biochemistry
Sociology

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD director (Susan Shaw)

Student Members-
- Alejandra Bornowski
- Sarah Farmer

Executive Committee Liaison - Carol Mallory-Smith
Faculty Senate

Facultly Senate » Committees/Councils » Baccalaureate Core Committee » Membership » 2006-2007
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Membership 2006-2007

Pat Muir '07, Co-chair
Jay Noller '08, Co-chair
Cheryl Middleton '07
George Caldwell '08
Margie Haak '08
John D. Bailey '09
David Bernell '09
Denise Lach '09

Botany & Plant Pathology
Crop and Soil Science
Valley Library
Speech Communication
Chemistry
Forest Resources
Political Science
Sociology

Ad Hoc Members:
Manolete Gonzalez '07
Liz Gray '07
Deb Pence '07
Ken Winograd '07

Business
Health & Human Sciences
Mechanical Engineering
Education

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD director (Susan Shaw)

Student Members-
- Annette McFarland
- Mike Olson

Executive Committee Liaison - Moira Dempsey
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Membership 2005-2006

Milo Koretsky '06 Chair
David Bernell '06
Patti Watkins '06
Cheryl Middleton (v. Ahern) '07
Pat Muir '07
Margie Haak '08
Jay Noller '08
George Caldwell '08

Chemical Engineering
Political Science
Women Studies
Valley Library
Botany & Plant Pathology
Chemistry
Crop and Soil Science
Speech Communication

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD director (Jun Xing)

Student Members--
-- TBA
-- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Lynda Ciuffetti
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Membership 2004-2005

Joanne Sorte '05, Chair
Ruth Vondracek '05
David McMurray (v. Kekvliet) '05
Milo Koretsky '06
Patti Watkins '06
Pat Muir '07
Kevin Ahern '07

Child Development Lab
Consulting/Lab Services
Anthropology
Chemical Engineering
Women Studies
Botany & Plant Pathology
Biochemistry/Biophysics

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD director (Jun Xing)

Student Members--
-- TBA
-- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Lynda Ciuffetti
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**Membership 2003-2004**

Ruth Vondracek '05, Chair  
Ed Jensen '04  
TBA (A. VanDerZanden '04)  
David McMurray (v. Kekvliet) '05  
Joanne Sorte '05  
Milo Koretsky '06  
Patti Watkins '06

Consulting/Lab Services  
Forest Resources

Anthropology  
Child Development Lab  
Chemical Engineering  
Psychology

Ex-Officios:  
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)  
DPD director (Jun Xing)

Student Members--  
-- TBA  
-- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Maggie Niess
### Baccalaureate Core Committee

**Membership 2002-2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair and Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Burke (v. Dilles) '03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Lee '03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Jensen '04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Marie VanDerZanden '04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Kerkvliet '05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Sorte '05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Vondracek '05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex-Officios:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference, Power and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director (Susan Shaw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive Curriculum Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vicki Tolar Burton)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Members**
- Tom Headley
- TBA

**Executive Committee Liaison** - Maggie Niess
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Membership 2001-2002

John Lee (v. Reddy) '02, Chair
Bonnie Avery '02
Kurt Peters '02
Mary Burke (v. Dilles) '03
Janet Lee '03
Ed Jensen '04
Ann Marie VanDerZanden '04

Mathematics
Valley Library
Ethnic Studies
Microbiology
Women Studies
Forest Resources
Horticulture

Ex-Officios:
Difference, Power and Discrimination Director (Susan Shaw)
Writing Intensive Curriculum Director (Lisa Ede)

Student Members--
-- Darlene Vranas
-- Stephany Peebler

Executive Committee Liaison - Paul Doescher
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Membership 2000-2001

John Lee (v. Reddy) '02, Chair
Bob Jarvis '01
Christine Snow '01
Bonnie Avery '02
Kurt Peters '02
John Dilles '03
Janet Lee '03

Mathematics
Fisheries & Wildlife
Exercise & Sport Science
Valley Library
Ethnic Studies
Geosciences
Women Studies

Ex-Officio: DPD Director (Susan Shaw)

Student Members--
-- TBA
-- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Paul Doescher
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Membership 1999-2000

Michael Scanlan '00 Chair Philosophy
John Lee '00 Mathematics
Bob Jarvis '01 Fisheries & Wildlife
Christine Snow '01 Exercise & Sport Science
Bonnie Avery '02 Valley Library
Kurt Peters '02 Ethnic Studies
Satish Reddy '02 Mathematics

Ex-Officio: DPD Director (Susan Shaw)

Student Members

• -- TBA
• -- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Robert Burton
2013-2014 Agendas

Baccalaureate Core Committee

2013-2014 Agendas

- November 13, 2013
- November 27, 2013
- January 17, 2014
- January 27, 2014
- February 17, 2014
- April 2, 2014
- April 7, 2014
- April 16, 2014
- April 21, 2014
- April 30, 2014
- May 14, 2014
- May 19, 2014
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2012-2013 Agendas

- October 18, 2012
- February 13, 2013
- March 18, 2013
- April 10, 2013
- April 24, 2013
- May 7th, 2013
- May 21, 2013
- June 5, 2013
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2011-2012 Agendas

- September 27, 2011
- October 7, 2011
- October 11, 2011
- October 21, 2011
- November 4, 2011
- November 18, 2011
- November 29, 2011
- December 8, 2011
- January 26, 2012
- February 16, 2012
- March 9, 2012
- April 13, 2012
- April 23, 2012
- May 8, 2012
- June 6, 2012
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2010-2011 Agendas

- November 29, 2010
- February 4, 2011
- April 22, 2011
- May 20, 2011
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2009-2010 Agendas

- May 14, 2010
- November 6, 2009
2008-2009 Agendas, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University
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Faculty Senate » Committees/Councils » Baccalaureate Core Committee » Agendas » 2008-2009 Agendas

Baccalaureate Core Committee

2008-2009 Agendas

- June 8, 2009
- December 5, 2008
- October 24, 2008
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2007-2008 Agendas

- June 11, 2008
- March 11, 2008
- January 7, 2008
- December 3, 2007
- October 1, 2007
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2006-2007 Agendas

- June 1, 2007
- May 4, 2007
- April 20, 2007
- April 13, 2007
- February 28, 2007
- February 14, 2007
- January 31, 2007
- November 9, 2006
- October 12, 2006
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2006-2007 Agendas

- February 28, 2007
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2004-2005 Agendas

- April 14, 2005
- February 23, 2005
- February 9, 2005
- January 26, 2005
- January 12, 2005
- December 7, 2004
- November 15, 2004
- October 18, 2004
2003-2004 Agendas, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate » Committees/Councils » Baccalaureate Core Committee » Agendas » 2003-2004 Agendas
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2003-2004 Agendas

- May 24, 2004
- May 10, 2004
- April 26, 2004
- April 12, 2004
- February 23, 2004
- February 9, 2004
- January 26, 2004
- January 12, 2004
- December 8, 2003
- November 24, 2003
- November 10, 2003
- October 27, 2003
- October 13, 2003
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2002-2003 Agendas

- June 2, 2003
- March 17, 2003
- March 10, 2003
- February 24, 2003
- February 10, 2003
- September 30, 2002
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2001-2002 Agendas

- May 13, 2002
- April 15, 2002
- April 01, 2002
- March 04, 2002
- February 18, 2002
- February 04, 2002
- November 26, 2001
- November 12, 2001
- October 29, 2001
- October 01, 2001
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2000-2001 Agendas

- June 5, 2001
- May 29, 2001
- May 15, 2001
- May 1, 2001
- April 17, 2001
- April 5, 2001
- March 19, 2001
- February 19, 2001
- February 12, 2001
- January 29, 2001
Baccalaureate Core Committee

1999-2000 Agendas

- November 20, 2000
- November 6, 2000
- October 23, 2000
- October 9, 2000
- June 8, 2000
- May 25, 2000
- May 11, 2000
- April 29, 2000
- April 13, 2000
- March 30, 2000
- March 6, 2000
- February 28, 2000
- February 21, 2000
- February 7, 2000
- January 10, 2000
Baccalaureate Core Committee

1998-1999 Agendas

- December 12, 1999
- November 29, 1999
- November 1, 1999
- October 18, 1999
- October 15, 1999
- October 4, 1999
- May 26, 1999
- May 5, 1999
- April 28, 1999
- April 6, 1999
- March 17, 1999
- March 10, 1999
Baccalaureate Core Committee

1997-1998 Agendas

- November 12, 1998
- October 15, 1998
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2013 - 2014 Minutes

- November 13
- January 17
- January 27
- February 17
- March 17
- April 7
- April 16
- April 21
- April 30
- May 14
- May 19
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2012 - 2013 Minutes

- October 18, 2012
- February 13, 2013
- March 18, 2013
- April 10, 2013
- April 24, 2013
- May 7, 2013
- May 21, 2013
- June 5, 2013
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2011 - 2012 Minutes

- October 7, 2011
- October 11, 2011
- October 21, 2011
- November 4, 2011
- November 18, 2011
- November 29, 2011
- January 26, 2012
- February 16, 2012
- March 9, 2012
- April 13, 2012
- April 23, 2012
- May 8, 2012
- May 21, 2012
- June 6, 2012
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2010 - 2011 Minutes

- November 29, 2010
- January 24, 2011
- April 22, 2011
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2008-2009 Minutes

- April 9, 2009
- March 10, 2009
- February 24, 2009
- January 27, 2009
- December 12, 2008
- November 19, 2008
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2007-2008 Minutes

- March 4, 2008
- February 19, 2008
- February 5, 2008
- January 22, 2008
- December 3, 2007
- November 12, 2007
- October 1, 2007
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2006-2007 Minutes

- May 18, 2007
- May 4, 2007
- March 14, 2007
- February 28, 2007
- January 31, 2007
- January 17, 2007
- November 9, 2006
- October 12, 2006
- September 26, 2006
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2005-2006 Minutes

- December 2, 2005
- November 11, 2005
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2004-2005 Minutes

- October 18, 2004
- November 2, 2004
- November 15, 2004
- December 7, 2004
- January 12, 2005
- January 26, 2005
- February 9, 2005
- March 3, 2005
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2003-2004
Minutes

- April 26, 2004
- April 12, 2004
- February 23, 2004
- February 9, 2004
- January 26, 2004
- January 12, 2004
- December 8, 2003
- November 24, 2003
- November 10, 2003
- October 27, 2003
- October 13, 2003
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2002-2003 Minutes

- June 2, 2003
- May 12, 2003
- March 31, 2003
- March 10, 2003
- January 27, 2003
- January 13, 2003
- December 09, 2002
- November 25, 2002
- November 11, 2002
- October 28, 2002
- October 14, 2002
- September 30, 2002
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2001-2002 Minutes

- April 01, 2002
- March 04, 2002
- February 18, 2002
- February 04, 2002
- January 07, 2002
- November 26, 2001
- November 12, 2001
- October 29, 2001
- October 15, 2001
- October 1, 2001
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2000-2001 Minutes

- June 5, 2001
- May 29, 2001
- May 15, 2001
- May 1, 2001
- April 17, 2001
- April 5, 2001
- March 19, 2001
- March 5, 2001
- February 19, 2001
- February 12, 2001
- January 29, 2001
- January 21, 2001
- November 20, 2000
- November 6, 2000
- October 23, 2000
- October 9, 2000
Baccalaureate Core Committee

1999-2000 Minutes

- June 8, 2000
- May 25, 2000
- May 11, 2000
- April 27, 2000
- April 13, 2000
- March 30, 2000
- March 15, 2000
- March 6, 2000
- February 28, 2000
- February 21, 2000
- February 7, 2000
- January 24, 2000
- January 10, 2000
- December 6, 1999
- November 29, 1999
- November 15, 1999
- November 1, 1999
- October 18, 1999
- October 4, 1999
Baccalaureate Core Committee

1998-1999 Minutes

- May 19, 1999
- May 5, 1999
- April 28, 1999
- April 21, 1999
- April 7, 1999
- March 31, 1999
- March 17, 1999
- March 10, 1999
- February 10, 1999
- February 3, 1999
- January 20, 1999
- December 9, 1998
- November 19, 1998
- November 12, 1998
- October 22, 1998
- October 15, 1998
- October 8, 1998
To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
From: Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi, Baccalaureate Core Committee Co-Chairs  
Date: July 15, 2013  
Re: 2012-2013 Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) Annual Report

**Membership**  
The BCC membership for 2012-2013 included twelve faculty members from a cross-section of OSU’s colleges and academic programs and ex-officio members representing WIC and DPD. Two available slots on the committee went unfilled, and we did not have any student members this year. A complete and accurate membership list appears below:

- **Kerry Kincanon**, Co-chair ‘13
- **Marion Rossi**, Co-chair ‘15
- **TBA (v. Bogley)** ‘14
- **Uta Hussong-Christian** ‘13
- **Michael Lerner** ‘13
- **TBA (v. Peltomaki)** ‘13
- **Joe Zaworski** ‘13
- **Jaga Giebultowicz** ‘14
- **Trischa Goodnow (v. Sherwood)** ‘14
- **Rebecca Olson** ‘14
- **Lori Kayes** ‘15
- **Linda Bruslind** ‘15
- **Melinda Manore** ‘15
- **Ken Winograd** ‘15
- **Academic Success Center**
- **University Theatre**
- **OSU Libraries**
- **Chemistry**
- **School of Arts & Communication**
- **English**
- **Biology**
- **Microbiology**
- **School of Biological and Population Health Sciences**
- **College of Education**

**Ex-Officios:**
- **WIC Director** (Vicki Tolar Burton)
- **DPD Director** (Michelle Bothwell)

**Student Members** -  
- TBA
- TBA

**Executive Committee Liaison** – Bob Mason

**Meetings**  
The BCC maintained an active meeting schedule in 2012-13. Our workload for the year was heavily defined by Synthesis Category Review activities. We limited our fall term meeting schedule, so members could focus on completing their assigned Synthesis Category Reviews.

- **Fall Term 2012** – One Meeting and Two Category Review Training Sessions (BCC members were asked to attend one training session)
- **Winter Term 2013** – Two Category Review Debrief Sessions (BCC members were asked to attend one debrief session) and Two Meetings
- **Spring Term 2013** – Five Meetings
Minutes for all meetings can be found at http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/min/2012-2013/. No minutes were taken at the Category Review Training Sessions in early November 2012 as it was simply a demonstration of how to use our Category Review template and how to access the Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) SharePoint site where documents for Synthesis were securely stored. Also, no minutes were taken at the Category Review Debrief sessions in late January 2013. Rather, the notes and ideas from those meetings are reflected in our final report on the Synthesis Category Review (See Appendix A).

Course Approvals
The BCC approved 37 courses for addition to the Baccalaureate Core in AY 2012-2013 (see Table 1). We followed the course review process that was established by the 2011-2012 BCC and is included as an appendix in the 2011-2012 annual report. To date, 32 of these courses have been added to the catalog as part of the Bacc Core, and 5 of the courses are still pending Curriculum Council approval. Additionally, the co-chairs are working this summer with a proposer from the School of Language, Culture, and Society to see through a proposal for ANTH 473 that came in just prior to our final meeting. The proposer was seeking addition of the course to Cultural Diversity, but we think it would fit better in Contemporary Global Issues. The originator is in the process of adjusting the proposal. There is one other course proposal that came to committee after our final meeting. Review of this course will be held until the BCC reconvenes in the fall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing II</td>
<td>WR 240*</td>
<td>*Pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>PAC 121, PAC 304, PAC 320, PAC 321, PAC 325</td>
<td>Physical Activity Courses (PAC) can be used to meet the lab portion of the Fitness Category so, starting this year, all new PAC classes were routed through the BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Culture</td>
<td>GER 321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>PHL 214, PS 343, ES 231*, WGSS 280**</td>
<td>*ES 231 is an existing course in this category that went through a Change Course CAT II to add an additional credit. **WGSS 280 is also a Change Course CAT II that is pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and the Arts</td>
<td>ENG 107, FILM 255, FILM 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>WGSS 496, HST/PHL 210/210H, QS/WGSS 262, QS/WGSS 364, QS/WGSS/ES 431, QS/WGSS 462*</td>
<td>*Pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Global Issues</td>
<td>FOR 476, WGSS 463, HST 488, AREC 352*</td>
<td>*AREC 352 was an existing course approved for Science, Technology, and Society (STS). The unit submitted a Change Course CAT II to shift it from STS to Contemporary Global Issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology, &amp; Society</td>
<td>ATS 320, SUS 304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>PS 300, HDFS 461, PHL 474*, BEE 469, QS/WGSS 472*, WSE 453, MB/BI 385, FW 439, EXSS 455, FE 460*</td>
<td>*Pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AY 2012-2013 BCC Activities
1. The College of Public Health and Human Sciences (PHHS) contacted Vicki Tolar Burton, the Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation, and Kerry Kincanon, BCC co-chair, in the summer of 2012 with a request for the BCC to consider adding a third outcome to the Fitness Category Learning Outcomes. While considering the two existing Fitness outcomes through the lens of impending assessment, PHHS realized that something was missing and that the outcomes did not sufficiently
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address the activity component inherent in the criteria of the Fitness category. A delegation from PHHS worked with Vicki to draft a third outcome which reads:

- Through regular and sustained engagement, demonstrate the knowledge, skill, and ability to participate in a selected physical activity for health, fitness, sport, or recreation.

This addition was presented to the BCC in September and the outcome was officially added on September 17, 2012. The addition is reflected in the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes, Criteria and Rationale statement.

2. At the final 2011-2012 BCC meeting, the committee voted to put forward changes to the Category Criteria language for the Perspectives Category. The recommendation was to strike the "Be lower division and at least three credits" statement from the criteria of non-science Perspectives Categories and "Be lower division, at least four credits, and contain a laboratory" from all Science Perspectives categories and to add the following statements to the criteria for all Perspectives categories:

- For the non-science categories:
  Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least three credits and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

- and for the science categories:
  Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least four credits, contain a lab, and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

The co-chairs took these proposed changes before the full senate on October 11, 2012, and they were approved. The changes are reflected in the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes, Criteria and Rationale statement.

3. In September 2012, the Baccalaureate Core Web Site was officially launched. It includes targeted information for various OSU constituents (current students, prospective transfer students, faculty and advisors, etc.) and serves informational and archival purposes relative to the Bacc Core. The site also houses the "Bacc Core Playlists," an innovative tool that provides optional thematic pathways that students can follow as they navigate their way through Bacc Core requirements. Vicki Tolar Burton coordinated the development of the site with Central Web Services, but the BCC played an instrumental role in vetting content last year. This year's BCC agreed that our committee should review content yearly and make recommendations to Academic Affairs on revisions and adjustments to the site.

4. The BCC conducted Category Review for the Synthesis categories. Information relative to Category Review for Synthesis courses was collected at the end of spring 2012. This information was collated and organized over the summer by Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment in the Office of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) and presented to the BCC at the beginning of the fall 2012. Appendix A is the final report of the Synthesis Category review, including a full description of the process, results, and conclusions. Ultimately all courses were either fully or provisionally recertified for continued inclusion in their respective Synthesis categories. The only exceptions were the handful of courses whose offering units specifically requested that they be removed from the core. Provisionally certified courses will be subject to an extensive follow-up in Category Review cycle year 3 (2015/2016). A list of provisionally certified Synthesis courses can be found in Appendix B.

5. The BCC engaged in communication and activities related to the next Category Review. In the fall of 2013, the BCC will engage in Category Review for the following Skills Categories: Mathematics, Speech, and Fitness, and the WIC courses from the following colleges: Agricultural Sciences, Business, and Public Health and Human Sciences. Appendix C presents the memo we sent in the fall to these participating units regarding upcoming Category Review. Early in spring term, Stefani Dawn coordinated with these units to establish access to the reporting form that they would use to submit materials for the following year. In winter and spring, Stefani and Vicki Tolar Burton offered several workshops to support these units in preparing for Category Review. DPD and College of Engineering WIC faculty were informed of these workshops as well. These two categories will be up for review in the fall of 2014.

6. Given the strong working relationship that has been established with the Office of APAA around matters related to the Bacc Core, the BCC put forward a standing rules change to the Committee on Committees to add an ex-officio from Academic Affairs to be appointed by the Senior Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs. Ideally, this appointee will be the individual in the Office of APAA designated to

support Bacc Core assessment (currently Stefani Dawn). The standing rules change was approved at the June 13, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting.

7. During winter and spring terms, the BCC engaged in a lengthy process to prioritize recommendations from the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report that was completed in 2011-12 by a special review committee convened by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Appendix D is the memo outlining the BCC’s suggestions for where the institution should start in the implementation of report recommendations.

8. A concern identified in the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report was the varying degrees to which students in Synthesis courses were asked to complete evidence-based writing, a key component of the Synthesis category criteria and learning outcomes. This concern was reinforced by what the BCC learned during Category Review. Some of the courses reviewed have successfully integrated evidence-based writing and others not so much. The BCC sought the assistance of the Writing Advisory Board to help create explanatory matter that units could use to guide the creation of writing-based assignments in Synthesis courses. This explanatory matter has been added to the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes, Criteria and Rationale statement. (Both Appendix A and Appendix D also include references to and examples of this explanatory language as the decision to add it emanated from these respective processes).

9. The addition of this explanatory matter prompted the BCC to work with colleagues in the Office of APAA to revise the Bacc Core question sets for the Synthesis categories in the Curricular Proposal System. We also worked with them to revise the final question in all Bacc Core question sets. This question asked proposers to discuss unit level assessment plans for the course. We found proposers were really struggling with the question as written, so we made adjustments that we think will help proposal writers better understand the question.

10. During spring term, the BCC reviewed compliance numbers for the First-Year Skills Requirement, which mandates that students complete their Writing I, Speech, and Mathematics Bacc Core categories within their first 45 credits. This requirement has been in place now for two academic years, and the BCC agreed to review compliance numbers after two years to determine if an enforcement mechanism was needed. The BCC was content with compliance rates. We decided not to create an enforcement mechanism and to continue to rely on advisors to promote and advocate for completion of these three categories in the first year. A table comparing compliance rates by college for the 2010-2011 cohort (the year before the requirement was implemented) and the 2012-13 cohort can be found in the June 5, 2013 meeting minutes.

11. Inspired in no small part by the pivotal role that Vicki Tolar Burton has played for OSU in her three-year tenure as Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation, the BCC drafted a memo at the end of the academic year advocating for the creation of a permanent Director of Baccalaureate Core (See Appendix E). Such a position would provide stability in oversight of the Bacc Core and an individual well-positioned to shepherd long-term projects related to OSU’s General Education efforts.

On the Horizon for the BCC in AY 2013-14

- In addition to recommending explanatory matter to help with writing in Synthesis, the Writing Advisory Board suggested that the BCC also develop a "rationale statement" that would govern the larger "parent category" of Synthesis. The BCC favored this suggestion, but we simply ran out of time this year to complete this task. While each category of the Bacc Core has a rationale statement, the larger parent categories (Skills, Perspectives, and Synthesis) do not (DPD does because it is a stand-alone category). Drafting rationale statements for Skills, Perspectives, and Synthesis would be good undertaking for the BCC in 2013-14.

- Per a request from Sunil Khanna, Associate Provost for International Programs, and Valerie Rosenberg, INTO Director of Student Experience and Director of International Admissions, the BCC should consider having representation on a task force that is exploring Dual Degree Programs with international institutions. (see meeting minutes from June 5, 2013).


- Fall Term: Co-chairs should work with Stefani Dawn in the Office of APAA to initiate communication to units offering DPD and College of Engineering WIC classes regarding gathering data to submit at the spring term 2014 for Category Review in the fall of 2014. Stefani may also need support in offering workshops and/or consultations in winter and spring term to these units, as well as those who offer Western Culture, Cultural Diversity, and WIC classes in the School of Writing, Literature, and Film, the School of Psychological Science, and the School of Arts and Communication from the College of Liberal...
Arts.

- **Winter Term:** Have the BCC or a subcommittee of the BCC review the Baccalaureate Core Web Site for accuracy and make suggestions or changes for updates (Per the recommendation of 2012-2013 BCC, this should be an annual task). Changes, for the time being, can be relayed to Dr. Susie Brubaker-Cole, Associate Provost for Academic Success and Engagement.

- **Spring Term:** The BCC should work with Academic Affairs and/or the Registrar’s Office to get compliance data on the 2nd Year Skills Requirement (i.e., students who started in fall 2011 or after must have completed their Writing II requirement by the time they’ve finished 90 credits).
To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
From: Bill Bogley and Kerry Kincanon, Baccalaureate Core Committee Co-Chairs  
Date: July 15, 2012  
Re: 2011-2012 Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) Annual Report

**Membership**
The BCC membership list included fourteen faculty members from a cross-section of OSU’s campus, ex-officio members from WIC and DPD, and two student members. A complete and accurate membership list can be found at [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/member/2011-2012.html](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/member/2011-2012.html).

**Meetings**
The BCC maintained an active meeting schedule.  
- **Fall Term**  
  - Eight meetings (includes a Finals Week retreat)  
- **Winter Term**  
  - Three meetings  
- **Spring Term**  
  - Five meetings

Minutes for all meetings can be found at [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/min/2011-2012/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/min/2011-2012/), except for the fall term Finals Week retreat on December 8, 2011. At the retreat, we worked on idea generation relative to the revised Category Review Process and Baccalaureate Core Assessment (see **Activities** section). No minutes were taken at the retreat.

**Course Approvals**
The BCC reviewed and approved thirty-three courses during the course of AY 2011-2012. At our first two meetings, the BCC established a **Course Review Process** ([Appendix A](#)) that outlined our approach to course reviews. Thirty-one of these courses have been officially added to the core. Two courses are still pending Curriculum Council approval. There were three courses that were submitted prior to the end of AY 2011-12 that are pending BCC review. The following table illustrates the distribution of course approvals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>MTH 241*</td>
<td>*The Math department changed this course to add an enforced MTH 111 or appropriate placement prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>CH 231, 232, 233, 261, 262, 263, 271, 272, 273</td>
<td>The Chemistry department reconfigured its CH 221, 222, 223 General Chemistry sequence and separated out the lab into a separate credit-bearing course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>SOIL 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>SPAN 237, HST 391, 392, 396, 397, ART 208*, FR 329, HEBR 231</td>
<td>The History courses were pre-existing in the BC; the unit updated submitted &quot;Change Course&quot; requests to update titles and description to better represent the current tenor and focus of these courses. *Also approved for Literature and the Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Literature and the Arts | ENG 320, 321, 322, 330, ART 208* | *Also approved for Cultural Diversity

Social Processes & Institutions | WSE 266* | *Pending Curriculum Council Approval

DPD | WS 462, PSY 426 |

Contemporary Global Issues | WS 495, PHL 432, AMS 350* | *Cascades Campus course

Science, Technology, & Society | ENGR 363, NMC 427* | *Pending Curriculum Council Approval

WIC* | MB 385, H 476 | *The BCC co-chairs and WIC director learned recently that there were anomalies with WIC course approvals that made it through the system without review by the WIC director and the BCC. We are working with the Office of Academic Programs to remedy this situation.

AY 2011-2012 BCC Activities

1. Per recommendations from the Committee on Committees, the BCC spent fall term revising our Standing Rules to reflect more accurately the function and composition of the committee. The revised standing rules, which provide a clearer delineation of committee membership and its stewardship of OSU's Baccalaureate Core via its two primary functions, course proposal review and category review, were approved by the Faculty Senate on April 12, 2012.

2. One of the recommendations of the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee (2008-2010) in its final report, Vitalization of General Education at Oregon State University, was a review of Writing in the core. The Executive Committee convened a committee to engage in the review during AY 2011-2012. Dr. Susan Meyers, the Director of the Writing Program at OSU, chaired this group, and she presented findings and recommendations to the BCC on May 21, 2012. The report was subsequently submitted to the Executive Committee with BCC endorsement.

3. Baccalaureate Core Implementation Director Vicki Tolar Burton implemented new minimum syllabus requirements as devised by the 2010-2011 BCC. Syllabi for Core courses must now include the Category Learning Outcomes, and those outcomes must be assessed. This requirement in now included in the OSU Curricular Policies and Procedures. At the BCC's recommendation, Dr. Tolar Burton contacted BC faculty before each term to remind them to include and assess the new category outcomes for their BC courses. A Core syllabus template suggested by the 2010-11 BCC should be offered as a tool, but the 2011-12 BCC was hesitant to be overly prescriptive.

4. The Executive Committee (EC) charged the BCC with resuming the category review process that was temporarily suspended during the Ad Hoc Review, and incorporating evidence of student learning into that process. The charge dovetailed with institutional concern regarding assessment of student learning in the core curriculum. The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation visit in the spring of 2011 yielded a recommendation to further develop assessment efforts in the Baccalaureate Core. It made sense for the Baccalaureate Core category review to be the site from which to launch a strategic campus-wide effort to improve assessment of learning in Baccalaureate Core classes – an effort that addressed both the charge of the EC and the accreditation recommendation. The BCC worked all fall and winter with Vicki Tolar Burton and, upon her arrival in February, Assistant Director of Assessment Stefani Dawn to create a new category review process, which was vetted through several channels (Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Education Council, University Assessment Council, Provost’s Council, and correspondents from several colleges) and ultimately launched spring term with the "Synthesis pilot." The Synthesis categories were chosen to be the first reviewed under the new process. Here are some salient motivating factors, principles, and documents relative to the new process:

- From the start, the principle of shared governance has guided decisions. Using the BCC process to aid the institution in responding to accreditation recommendations means that the BCC would work closely with Academic Affairs and the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and
Accreditation. Leaders from those areas helped to create an Assessment Roadmap (Appendix B) to ensure comprehensive attention to the Baccalaureate Core Assessment Process.

- This was the first year of having defined Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes. The BCC recognized that institutionalizing those outcomes and the process of assessing them will take time, but piloting the process with Synthesis categories in spring would reignite category review and provide a baseline of assessment data for the accreditation follow-up visit in the fall of 2012.
- The BCC created a Baccalaureate Core Category Review Course Webform to collect feedback from units on how BC Category Learning Outcomes are being realized in their core classes. The Office of Assessment houses the webform on its website, and Stefani Dawn will help collate information to be presented to the BCC in Fall 2012. The Office of Institutional Research has agreed to gather course demographic info, so the burden for providing that portion of important Category Review data has been shifted from the unit.
- Stefani Dawn and Vicki Tolar Burton coordinated multiple faculty development workshops on strategies for Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes assessment. The BCC co-chairs attended most of these workshops, and several BCC members attended as participants.
- The pilot allows the BCC to shift the category review calendar. Traditionally, category review data was collected in the fall and the review was conducted in the winter and the spring. Now data will be collected throughout the year with a spring deadline, collated in the summer, and the review will be conducted in the fall. Institutional leaders asked the BCC for assistance in creating a timetable for Baccalaureate Core assessment. This was initially posed to the BCC as a Five-Year plan but, after putting that time on paper, the committee unanimously agreed that timeframe was unrealistic. The BCC ultimately landed on a Seven-Year plan. See Appendix C for Assessment Activity by Cycle Year and Appendix D for BCC Category Review Task by Year.

5. The BCC quickly realized that the Baccalaureate Core question sets in the Curricular Proposal System were inadequate now that the BCC is viewing courses through the lens of student learning and the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes. Several proposals were sent back for revisions, in part, because expectations for BCC approval were not being communicated through the questions. The BCC revised these question sets over the course of winter and spring terms and presented the new sets to the Office of Academic Programs at the end of spring term. These new sets are now in the Curricular Proposal System.

6. Vicki Tolar Burton worked with Central Web Services to develop a comprehensive website dedicated to the Baccalaureate Core. Selected BCC members participated in a web architecture session to develop the design and content framework of the site. This site should be ready for launch in the summer of 2012.

7. In coordination with the Office of Assessment, the BCC created a voluntary pilot in spring where faculty teaching courses in the Synthesis categories could add questions to the ESET to gather student perceptions of Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes achievement in the course. Pending review of the pilot, the BCC should work with the Advancement of Teaching Committee and the EC to examine the merits of expanding this voluntary program to a mandatory program of indirect assessment of student learning in the core. Some faculty voices oppose using eSET for assessment but, if eSET is deemed unsuitable for this purpose, the BCC recommends that an alternative means must be identified for incorporating student input into the assessment data stream.

8. The BCC had several conversations regarding the presence of upper division coursework in Perspectives Categories being at odds with category criteria. At our June 6, 2012 meeting, the BCC voted unanimously to strike the “Be lower division and at least three credits” statement from the criteria of all Perspectives categories and to add the following statement to the criteria for all Perspectives categories: Courses in the Perspectives categories should be accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for student seeking to fulfill these categories. The BCC co-chairs subsequently sent a memo to the Executive Committee asking for Senate consideration of this change.

On the Horizon for the BCC in AY 2012-13

- Potential senate action on proposed change in language to Perspectives Category Criteria.
- Assist with prioritizing and implementing recommendations from the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report.
- Fall Term: Review compliance on First-Year Skills Requirement for 2011-2012 cohort
- Fall Term: Conduct Category Review of Synthesis
- Winter/Spring: Outreach related to Synthesis Category Review
- Coordinate with the Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation and the Office of Academic
Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation on communication surrounding upcoming Category Reviews.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Annual Report of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) of the Faculty Senate 2010-2011

Membership:
- Mary Cluskey, Co-chair '11, Nutrition & Exercise Sciences
- Victor Hsu, Co-chair '12, Biochemistry
- Mina Carson '11, History
- Nick Drapela '11, Chemistry
- Hal Parks '11, Mathematics
- Kirsi Peltomaki '11, Art
- Penny Diebel '12, Agricultural & Resource Economics
- David McMurray '12, Anthropology
- Marvin Pyles '12, Forest Engineering Resources & Management
- Marion Rossi '12, University Theatre
- Uta Hussong-Christian '13, OSU Libraries
- Kerry Kincanon '13, Academic Success Center
- Michael Lerner '13, Chemistry
- Joe Zaworski '13, Mechanical, Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering

Ex-officio, non-voting members:
- Vicki Tolar Burton, WIC Director
- Michelle Bothwell, DPD Interim Director

The Committee met eight times during the year, excluding meetings to share and get feedback from faculty regarding learning outcomes for the BC courses.

The Committee addressed the task of implementing the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee's recommendations approved June, 2010 by the Faculty Senate relative to the review of the Baccalaureate Core. These and other activities included:

1. developed a policy and catalog description for implementation of a new sequence requirement for the Skills courses of the Baccalaureate Core. The implementation of this requirement was left undefined, as there was no certainty about how it could be monitored. The suggestion would be that after a 2-5 year period, an audit might reveal the extent to which the "requirement" was being adhered to. The BCC leaves this decision with others in academic administration.
2. developed learning outcomes for categories of the Baccalaureate Core,
3. created connections linking how the BC outcomes link to the Learning Goals for Graduates;
4. revamped the process for BC review and approval as follows:
   a. Use of student employee to screen BC proposals and syllabus for non-subjective aspects of review (e.g., course name, credit hours, syllabus contains statement that course is a BC course, etc.) using a check list developed by the BCC, missing elements are identified.
   b. The packet (electronic version) consisting of the check list, syllabus, and proposal form is sent to the BCC Co-Chair who subsequently assigns the course review to a BCC member. Course proposers are sent requests for corrections or additions to the proposals.
   c. If subsequent materials are approved, the BCC reviewer approves the course. When questions or uncertainty exists as to whether the course meets Bacc Core criteria, the whole BCC will review the course.
5. developed a syllabus template to be used for proposing BC courses
6. reviewed 20 BC courses; 2 are unfinished; 1 was not finalized;
7. co-hosted 5 meetings/events to share and vet the category outcomes
8. developed and submitted a letter to all faculty describing the incorporation of the learning outcome requirements to the BC course requirements and process
9. developed a web page at http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for the BCC to provide current information and processes relative to the Baccalaureate Core.

In response to the Faculty Senate June, 2010, approval of the report of the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee, Academic Affairs funded a one-year position at .5 FTE for the Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation. Vicki Tolar Burton, Professor of English and Director of the Writing Intensive Curriculum, was appointed to this position. The Transitional Director collaborated with the Baccalaureate Core Committee on implementing the above changes, with particular attention to the Outcomes Development events.
After a change in bylaws last year, the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) membership was increased to 14 faculty and two student members (along with ex officio members representing the WIC and DPD programs). Members were assigned to one of two subcommittees (as noted on the membership list below) to undertake regular BCC business and category reviews, which are described below. The entire committee met together for the fall term to review Category II proposals for changed and/or new Bacc Core courses, but worked separately as two subcommittees on Category Reviews during winter and spring terms. We were unable to identify two students who would work consistently with the BCC during the school year, although we did have ASOSU representation at important meetings.

### Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College/Unit</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
<th>Sub-committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Chris</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, John</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernell, Dave</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluskey, Mary</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapela, Nick</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Barbara</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deitering, Anne Marie</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Cary</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haak, Margie, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer, Roger</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter-Zaworski, Kate (replaced Reuter)</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsu, Victor</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lach, Denise, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambrinos, John</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuter, Ron (dropped out mid-year)</td>
<td>Cascades, Forestry</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Shayna</td>
<td>ASOSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris, Jill</td>
<td>ASOSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ede, Lisa (ex officio)</td>
<td>WIC Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Susan (ex officio)</td>
<td>DPD Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory-Smith, Carol</td>
<td>EC Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Science, Technology and Society Category Review**

The review of the History of Science courses within the Science, Technology and Society category (originally scheduled for review in 2007-08) was postponed to 2010-2011. The postponement request (which appears in the November 19, 2008 minutes) cited faculty retirements and will provide an opportunity for new faculty to teach and/or revise the courses prior to the review. The specific courses are: HSTS 411, HSTS 412, HSTS 412 (ecampus), HSTS 413, HSTS 414, HSTS 415, HSTS 417, HSTS 417 (ecampus), HSTS 418, HSTS 418 (ecampus), HSTS 419, HSTS 421, HSTS 421 (ecampus), HSTS 423, and HSTS 425.
Physical Sciences Subcommittee

The Physical Sciences subcommittee met seven times during the 2008-2009 academic year with Margie Haak as the Co-Chair of the Subcommittee. The responsibility of this subcommittee was to conduct the Category Review for the Physical Sciences with Laboratory Category.

Physical Science with Laboratory Category Review

The subcommittee completed the reviews of all the courses in the Physical Science with Laboratory category. All but two of the courses were recommended for continuation in the Baccalaureate Core. The ecampus versions of CH 122 and CH 123 will be removed from the Physical Sciences with Laboratory category as soon as possible, most likely as of Winter 2010. The committee felt that the virtual lab used by the ecampus versions of these courses did not fulfill the mission of the category which is to provide a laboratory experience in a physical science discipline.

Category II Proposals

The Physical Sciences subcommittee also reviewed Category II proposals for CH 231, CH 232, CH 233, CH 261, CH 262, and CH 263. These courses are the ecampus equivalent of CH 221, CH 222, and CH 223, which are already part of the Physical Sciences with Laboratory category. CH 231 (lecture course) + CH 261 (laboratory course) is equivalent to CH 221, CH 232 (lecture) + CH 262 (laboratory) is equivalent to CH 222, and CH 233 (lecture) + CH 263 (laboratory) is equivalent to CH 223. Because these courses have adopted a hybrid model, with the lecture as web-based course and the laboratory held on campus in the OSU chemistry teaching labs, the committee felt that the students would receive a physical science laboratory experience, and so approved these courses as part of the Physical Science with Laboratory category, effective Fall 2009. Because the laboratory will be offered as an intensive three-day course, rather than once a week for the full 10 weeks of a term, the BCC will review these courses in two years to ensure that the condensed format is fulfilling the mission of the Physical Sciences with Laboratory category. Students will need to complete both the paired lecture and lab course to be awarded Baccalaureate Core credit.

Fitness Subcommittee

The Fitness Subcommittee met eight times during the 2008-2009 academic year with Denise Lach as the Co-Chair of the Subcommittee. Responsibilities of this subcommittee included conducting the Category Review for the Fitness Category and evaluating Category II proposals regarding Bacc Core courses including changes to WIC and DPD curriculum. The Physical Sciences subcommittee was asked to review a few Category II proposals that were closely related to their topic. These activities are described below.

Fitness Category Review

Due to financial considerations, the College of Health and Human Sciences proposed to eliminate all one-credit HHS Lab courses and allow students to substitute a PAC course to fulfill the activity portion of the Fitness Category. After review and discussion with the Department Chair and Fitness Course Coordinator, critical thinking elements of the Lab Courses were moved to the lecture component (HHS 231), interactive pedagogical elements were integrated into the course, and plans were made to provide GRAs to help grade assignments. After these changes were made to HHS 231, the BCC approved a proposal from HHS to allow students to take either an HHS Lab Course or a PAC course to fulfill the activity element of the Fitness Category. Students who have taken a PAC course in the past can retroactively use that course to fulfill this requirement. All students must still meet the requirements of HHS 231. The recommendation was passed to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which subsequently approved the recommendation. The new requirements for the Fitness Category will be in place starting fall term 2009. Because the Category Review was not completed this year due to the changes described above, we recommend that the Fitness Category be reviewed within the next three years.

Category II Proposals

We reviewed 29 proposals to create, modify, or eliminate Bacc Core, WIC, and/or DPD Courses. We approved the removal of HSTS designators on Bacc Core Courses to recognize the removal of HSTS designators in the History Department. These courses were NOT reviewed for meeting Bacc Core, WIC and/or DPA requirements and will be reviewed in depth during the appropriate Category Review. There are two courses with outstanding requests for modification (MUS 104 and BI 201). All proposals submitted by the end of spring term 2009 were acted on.

2009-2010

After consultation with the larger OSU community in regards to potential consequences of budget decisions and/or the findings from the Bacc Core review committee, the BCC proposed to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that no Category II proposals for new Bacc Core courses be accepted next year (2009-2010)
except for WIC and DPD courses. The BCC will review proposals for revisions/changes to existing Bacc Core courses and conduct the scheduled Category reviews. This proposal was accepted and forwarded to the OSU community at the end of spring term 2010. We recommend that this decision be reviewed at the end of the 2009-2010 academic year to determine if/when Category II proposals for new Bacc Core courses will be accepted.

Margie Haak and Roger Hammer have agreed to be Co-Chairs of the BCC for the academic year.

Category Reviews will be conducted next year for Social Processes and Institutions, Biological Science with Laboratory, and Math.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Annual Report 2006 - 2007

The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) met 15 times during the 2006-07 academic year. Membership and major activities are described below.

Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
<th>College/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Muir</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>COS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Middleton</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Haak</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>COS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bernell</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Noller</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Caldwell</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Lach</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bailey</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette McFarland</td>
<td>(2007)</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ex-officio:*

- Vicki Tolar Burton   | WIC       |
- Susan Shaw           | DPD       |

Jay Noller and Pat Muir served as Co-chairs during this academic year; Jay Noller and Cheryl Middleton will be Co-chairs during the upcoming year.

A new member from COS is needed for 2007-08, as BCC standing rules indicate that two members should be from that College. In addition, two students should be on the BCC; this year, Annette McFarland joined us for several meetings, but she will be unable to participate during 2007-08; student members should be sought.

General Category II Bacc Core Course Reviews

We reviewed and approved 27 Category II proposals for changes in existing or for new Bacc Core courses. All proposals that were submitted by the end of spring term 2007 were acted on.

Category Review

We completed reviews of all Synthesis, Contemporary Global Issues, courses whose review from 2005-06 had been delayed or deferred. All were approved, with two exceptions.

ANTH 487 – instructor filed a request to remove its Bacc Core status.
H 312 – the BCC’s concerns about evenness of course quality across offered sections, degree of oversight of graduate students who teach the course, and an appearance of grade inflation remain. Noller and Muir met with the course organizer, Donna Champeau, and the Chair of Public Health, Marie Harvey, and were assured that changes to improve the course are being made. It was agreed that the course will be reviewed again at the end of winter term 2008. In the meantime, it continues to be offered as a Contemporary Global Issues synthesis course.

Review of courses in the other Synthesis category, Science, Technology, and Society (STS), which was to be reviewed during the 2006-07 academic year was initiated. A list of courses in this category that have not been reviewed in at least 5 yrs, along with enrollments over recent years, was created and BCC members...
were assigned courses to review. The category review web site was updated and began accepting review materials. However, the review was delayed until the 2007-08 academic year, as the BCC became heavily involved in issues that arose from potential credit increases in certain Bacc Core courses (see below). This activity took priority over the category review; STS courses will be reviewed during the 2007-08 year.

Standing Rules and Operating Procedures

One formal change in Standing Rules was requested, which allows the BCC to remove Bacc Core status from courses that no longer meet criteria (see text in Appendix 1). This change was approved by vote of the Faculty Senate on June 14, 2007.

We discussed whether the BCC needs to be more explicit about some of the rationale that we use to make decisions (e.g., that courses with disproportionately large enrollment and multiple sections receive closer scrutiny than do smaller, single-section courses; that, when reviewing course change proposals, we will consider impact of changes in course credits on access; and others – see list in the Agenda for the May 18, 2007 meeting). **Decision:** It is important for the BCC to be transparent about operating procedures, but flexibility is needed for dealing with new or unanticipated situations. As new situations are encountered, procedures to address them will be recorded in BCC minutes. Be it here noted that (in addition to items listed in operating procedures, on the Cat II proposal web site, and on the annual category review web site) the outcome of the BCC’s review of proposed changes to existing Bacc Core courses and of proposed new Bacc Core courses can be affected by:

- impact of proposed change on access to courses in the relevant category and
- considerations of consistency in course quality across multiple sections or offerings.

Furthermore, courses that do not appear to meet one or more criteria can be re-reviewed at a set date in the future, pursuant to notice to appropriate department Chair and faculty.

In addition, we **recommend** that the BCC continue to send beginning-of-term notice to Chairs/Heads and Office Managers of Departments that will offer Bacc Core courses that term, asking them to remind the appropriate faculty to make the role of the course in the Bacc Core clear to students early in the term.

Overall Baccalaureate Core Purpose Statement

Students and faculty often do not understand the role of the Bacc Core curriculum. To help redress this, we created an overall purpose statement, which is now found in the OSU Schedule of Classes information on Bacc Core categories, criteria, rationale, and courses. See Appendix 2.

Baccalaureate Core Outcomes

In response to a request from OSU’s Academic Programs, driven by standards established by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, we crafted outcomes for the Bacc Core. The effort was spearheaded by Co-chair, Jay Noller. The outcomes are hierarchical, being derived at the levels of the Bacc Core overall, highest levels within that (e.g., Skills, Perspectives, Synthesis, WIC), and levels within each of those (e.g., Biological Science, Physical Science, Fitness, Mathematics, Writing, Western Culture, etc.). The outcomes were approved by the BCC on April 20, 2007, and forwarded to Academic Programs, Curriculum Council, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for comment. No comments were received; we assume that the outcomes met the needs of Academic Programs. The Learning Outcomes of OSU Baccalaureate Core Curriculum and Report of OSU Baccalaureate Core Committee on Baccalaureate Core Learning Outcomes are both available online.

Implications for the Bacc Core Curriculum of course credit increases from 3 to 4

The latter part of winter and most of spring term were occupied with considering potential implications for the Bacc Core models if many Departments increased credits for Bacc Core courses from 3 to 4. Serious discussion of the issue was incited by discussions with English, which contemplated increasing all of its current 3-cr classes to 4-cr, with obvious implications for WR I, II and III, as well as for Western Culture and Literature and the Arts categories. Departments including History were also considering such a change. Further, we were charged by Faculty Senate President Mike Quinn to develop a preferred alternative Bacc Core model that could accommodate such credit increases without increasing (at all or substantially) the number of credits that the Bacc Core comprises. This model would then be presented to faculty and students at forums late in spring term. To ensure representation of all colleges during this discussion, the following **ad hoc** members were added to the committee: Liz Gray (HHS), Kenneth Winograd (ED), Manolete Gonzalez...
(COB), and Deb Pence (ENGR); their participation during this time is gratefully acknowledged. A moratorium on all Category II proposals for new Bacc Core courses was imposed, along with a moratorium on Cat II proposals involving credit increases in existing Bacc Core courses, given uncertainty about the possible future form of the Bacc Core. Committee members proffered various Bacc Core models, and Jay Noller and his assistants compiled data on Bacc Core enrollments by course category and department from 2002-2006, to facilitate our analysis of possible impacts of credit increases. The need to develop an alternative Bacc Core model was, however, averted, when English agreed to keep all WR courses at 3 credits, and to do the same for all 100-level Literature courses. Further, the numeric analysis of enrollment suggests that the Bacc Core will probably be reasonably resilient to future increases in course credits because its courses are broadly distributed across Departments – no critical bottlenecks are apparent.

The following motions were approved unanimously at the May 4, 2007 BCC meeting: (1) There is no current need to make adjustments to the Baccalaureate Core, (2) These discussions need to continue in a larger forum to determine if a task force should be convened to review the Baccalaureate Core, and (3) We propose that a funded assessment of student and faculty perception of the Baccalaureate Core be conducted. The Executive Committee later expressed agreement with Motion 1, but indicated that Motions 2 & 3 would be tabled for possible future consideration.

APPENDICES

1. Change in standing rules:

   Memorandum to:  Vickie Nunnemaker, Special Assistant to OSU Faculty Senate and Michael Quinn, President, OSU Faculty Senate

   RE:  Change in Baccalaureate Core Committee Standing Rules

   From:  Patricia Muir, Co-chair, Baccalaureate Core Committee

   Date: Jan. 31, 2007

   At its meeting on the morning of Jan. 31, 2007, the Baccalaureate Core Committee unanimously approved the following addition to its Standing Rules:

   Under Section B, BCC Reviews, add item 4.  The BCC has authority to deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the appropriate criteria.

   Previously, the Standing Rules did not acknowledge this authority explicitly.

   Please advise if you need more information, or when this addition has been approved.

2. Description of Baccalaureate Core for inclusion in Schedule of Classes

   Overall Baccalaureate Core Description – approved by the BCC 2/14/07

   For placement in OSU web site, catalog, schedule of classes and other uses.

   The Baccalaureate Core (Bacc Core) Curriculum represents what the OSU faculty believes is the foundation for students’ further understanding of the modern world. Informed by natural and social sciences, arts, and humanities, the Bacc Core requires students to think critically and creatively, and to synthesize ideas and information when evaluating major societal issues. Importantly, the Bacc Core promotes understanding of interrelationships among disciplines in order to increase students’ capacities as ethical citizens of an ever-changing world.

BCC Year End Report 06-07
To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee  

From: Milo Koretsky, Chair  
2005 – 2006 Baccalaureate Core Committee

The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) met 13 times during the 2005 – 2006 academic year. The following were the major activities:

**General Category II BAC Core Review:** The BCC reviewed 15 proposals from OSU faculty members requesting curricular action. The committee approved 14, some following discussions and revisions. One proposal is still outstanding, awaiting input from the DPD director.

**Category Review (Contemporary Global Issues):** The BCC continued its categorical review of a specific Baccalaureate Core (BAC Core) category, as stated in the Standing Rules. This past year, the BCC reviewed all Contemporary Global Issues (CGI) courses that have been in place 5 years or longer (This marks a slight change from the policy of previous years). 48 courses were identified. 37 requests for continuation were approved, 5 courses are awaiting more information, 4 courses (HST 342, NFM 415, PS 455, TCS 300) have been dropped, and 2 courses (ANTH 487, COMM 446) were granted extensions until next year. After discussion and revision, the committee approved 3 courses carried over from the 2004-2005 category review in Difference, Power and Discrimination.

The BCC has identified the following syllabi as exceptional, *model syllabi*: FE 456, GEO 350, SOC 480. It is recommended that an archive of these and other model syllabi be placed on a BAC Core web site.

The BCC collaborated with the Faculty Senate office in the second year of use of a web-based submission system for the Category Review. A delay in identification and input of courses and instructors led to a truncated period for category review. It is recommended that the category for review the following year is identified in the spring and the data entered in the summer. Per this recommendation, the synthesis category Science Technology and Society (STS) has been chosen for review in 2006-2007. In continuing to refine the category review process, a writing chart was developed and implemented and a common assessment rubric was used by committee members conducting individual reviews (see Appendices A and B). The writing chart can, in principle, be used as a source for assessment data.

A Pareto analysis was conducted on the course enrollments of all 56 CGI classes taught during the period from Summer 2005 through Spring 2006. The results are shown in Table 1. The six courses with the greatest enrollment are identified by name, while the cumulative number of students from the other 50 classes is reported in the “All Others” category. The enrollment reported for GEO 300 in CGI was only half the total course enrollment, since it also satisfies the STS synthesis requirement. The percentage (Pct), cumulative percentage (Cum), campus enrollment (Live) and ecampus enrollment are also reported. The total enrollment was 5,550 students; however the top four classes in Table 1 account for over two-thirds of the student enrollment and the top six classes account for over three-quarters. The BCC concluded it would be beneficial to have a redistribution of resource/time spent on course review commensurate with the proportion enrolled. It is, therefore, recommended that the category reviews process be modified in the future with a more extensive review effort going to the highly prescribed classes.

**Table 1. Course enrollment statistics for CGI courses taught in 2005-2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>Cum</th>
<th>Live</th>
<th>ecampus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H 312</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Topics:
The following general topics were addressed:

1. BCC Coordinator. The BAC Core could be more effective if faculty and students had a better understanding of the BAC Core and were more engaged in the process. The BCC recommends the creation of a BAC Core Coordinator and Seminar series for faculty and advisors. (Modeled after the WIC program) and the creation of a BAC Core web site.

2. Assessment. Through the category review, the BCC assesses the BAC Core through regular reviews of courses and categories. The assessment process in place to ensure students are achieving outcomes consistent with the intent of the BAC Core is based on evaluations at two levels: (1) individual course assessment and (2) category reviews. More detail is given in Appendix C. It is recommended this be used as evidence for university accreditation.

3. Minimum Syllabus Requirements. In December 2005, the Curriculum Council announced it was enforcing a set of minimum syllabus requirements for all course Category II requests (http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/policies/S_syllabus.html). Within this framework, the BCC saw an opportunity to communicate a syllabus resolution that was previously approved for BAC Core courses in 2004-2005 (See BCC Annual Report 2004-2005 http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/ar/2004-2005.html). However, presently the committees have divergent viewpoints on this matter. The Curriculum Council has invited a member of the BCC to attend a meeting in 2006-2007 to further explore the merit of this idea.

4. The BCC discussed the General Education outcomes statements produced at the Student Success Conference in February. The following questions were raised: What is the meaning of “diversity” as it appears in the outcomes? Who is the audience for the JBAC/AAOT outcomes? What is the relationship between the JBAC outcomes and real course outcomes? Will the JBAC outcomes limit the course outcomes for courses in that category?

The 2005 – 2006 members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee were: David Bernell, Cheryl Middleton, Pat Muir, Margie Haak, Jay Noller, George Caldwell
Ex-Officio members included: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director) and Jun Xing (DPD director), Executive Committee Liaison was Lynda Ciuffetti.

Appendix A: Writing in Baccalaureate Core Courses–Category Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title and Number</th>
<th>Teacher (for multi-section courses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (for multi-section courses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate all types of written assignments included in this Baccalaureate Core course, along with the type of assessment used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of written assignment</th>
<th>Check if used in course</th>
<th>Times per term</th>
<th>Ungraded minimally graded</th>
<th>Graded on content only</th>
<th>Graded on content and conventions/writing style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal, in-class writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written report (lab or other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay exam: short essays of one paragraph or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay exam: multi-paragraph responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online writing – Blackboard discussion, class blog, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal, log</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News article, release, feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review (written)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short story, fiction piece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: REVIEW CHECKLIST FOR CATEGORY REVIEW OF CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL ISSUES (CGI) COURSES, 2006
From OSU’s Baccalaureate Core Criteria: Contemporary Global Issues courses shall: (A) Be upper division and at least 3 credits, (B) Emphasize elements of critical thinking, (C) Focus, from a historical perspective, on the origin and nature of critical issues and problems that have global significance, (D) Emphasize the interdependence of the global community, (E) Use a multidisciplinary approach and be suitable for students from diverse fields, and (F) Include written composition. Narratives should address each element.

CGI rationale: Our world has become increasingly interdependent. Social, economic, political, environmental, and other issues and problems originating in one part of the world often have far-reaching ramifications in other parts of the world. These issues and problems not only transcend geographical boundaries but also cross academic disciplines. Therefore, if students are to acquire understanding of and to discover effective responses to such issues and problems, they must acquire both global and multidisciplinary perspectives. Narratives should describe how rationale applies to the course.

Course name and number: ____________________________

Syllabus:

Does the syllabus adequately address each of the following elements?

- Indication that the course is a Bacc Core Contemporary Global Issues (CGI) course

- Explanation of how the course addresses the CGI rationale and how the criteria for CGI are integrated into the course

- Student learning outcomes and description of how they relate to the CGI criteria and how they are measured or evaluated

- Description of how critical thinking skills related to course subject matter will be developed in the course.

Enrollment information:

Are enrollment data for the past three years included in the review materials?
Do enrollment data indicate that most students are junior-level or more advanced?

**Narrative portion of review materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Criterion met? (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CGI rationale: (see above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Upper division and at least 3 cr?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Critical thinking: does narrative define it for this class or discipline, what elements are emphasized, how are critical thinking skills developed in the course, how does critical thinking factor into assessment and grading?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Historical perspectives on issues of global significance: does narrative illustrate how the course addresses origin and nature of critical global issues and problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Interdependence of global community: does narrative describe how this is illustrated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Multidisciplinary approach: does narrative describe multidisciplinary aspects of the course approach, and its suitability for students from diverse fields?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Written composition: is the writing summary table completed and does it reflect use of written composition in the class? <em>(Note that word or page requirements are not specified in the CGI criteria.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information (optional)**

If provided, how does it help establish that the course addresses the CGI rationale or criteria?  
Summary evaluation -- do review materials justify continuation of course as a CGI and, if not, what is lacking?

**Appendix C: The Baccalaureate Core Assessment Process**

The intent of this document is to outline the course and category assessment process of the baccalaureate...
As it was designed, the goals of the Bac Core are to:

- Strengthen critical thinking and communication skills across disciplines
- Ensure that all OSU students should acquire a basic understanding and appreciation for the physical and biological sciences, humanities and the arts, and the social sciences
- Strengthen the international dimensions of the University's curriculum
- Encourage interdisciplinary interaction among students and faculty

More generally, as is ubiquitous in the General Education Component of a liberal education, the Bac Core has as its intent to develop a depth of learning in students that lead to a more thoughtful and productive global citizenship. There are many ways to consider student learning and many corresponding models of the learning process. In *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals,* Bloom et al. develop a taxonomy as a set of standard classifications to reflect the depth of the learning experience. The taxonomy consists of a hierarchy of six classes into which student achievement falls: 1. **Knowledge;** 2. **Comprehension;** 3. **Application;** 4. **Analysis;** 5. **Synthesis;** and 6. **Evaluation.** The greater the number of the class is, the greater the depth of understanding. Thus, the higher-numbered classes require an integration of concepts and skills that are objectives of the earlier classes. In terms of Bloom’s Taxonomy, a *threshold* of this activity from lower to higher level cognitive skills lies in the transition from **Application,** where concepts are employed to solve problems in new situations to **Analysis** which includes the breaking down of informational materials into their component parts, and then understanding the individual parts along with the relationships between them. It is one of the functions of the Bac Core to drive students to the higher classes in the taxonomy.

The Bac Core is composed of the following main areas of course study, which comprise a total of 48 credits plus a WIC course. (WIC courses must be at least 3 credits and a requirement of the major.):

- Skills Courses: (primarily first year)
- Perspectives Courses: (primarily lower division)
- Difference Power and Discrimination (DPD) Courses: (upper and lower division)
- Synthesis Courses: (upper division)

Each of the categories in the above areas is depicted in Figure 1. As also shown in Figure 1, each of the categories has a general rationale as well as specific category criteria that can be found at [http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/baccore.html](http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/baccore.html). Inspection of the category criteria shows a design that is intended to drive learning to higher cognitive levels. For example, common threads across many of the categories include "Study, from a historical perspective ...", "Demonstrate interrelationships and connections with other subject areas," and "Emphasize elements of critical thinking."

An assessment process is in place to ensure students are achieving outcomes consistent with the intent of the Bac Core. The assessment process is based on evaluations at two levels: (1) individual course assessment and (2) category reviews.

Assessment at the individual course level is schematically illustrated in Figure 2. Each course is constructed of...
individual elements to promote student learning, e.g., the learning activities and the syllabus. The effect of these is compared to a set of learning outcomes in assessment of the course. This process is typical of that used for all university courses.

On top of the individual course assessment, each category in the Bac Core undergoes periodic review by the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC). For example, in the academic year, 2005-2006, the BCC is reviewing all Contemporary Global Issues courses that are five years or older. This additional level of assessment is illustrated in Figure 3. In this process, the course syllabus and learning outcomes are compared to the category rationale and criteria. Additionally, instructors write a narrative in which they describe specifically how their course addresses the category rationale and meets the category criteria. The purpose is to ensure that Bac Core criteria continue to be addressed in these courses. A review rubric is used by the BCC to maintain consistency of evaluation. Only courses that successfully complete the review process retain their category status in the Bac Core.

Appended to this document for reference are:
- Category review cover letter for 2005-2006
- Category review information requested for each instructor
- Writing in Baccalaureate Core Courses Table (Instructor)
- Review rubric used by the BCC
- A .ppt presentation of the information in this document
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1. A Brief History and Structure of the Bac Core Program,
Baccalaureate Core Committee

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Board

FROM: Joanne Sorte, Chair
Baccalaureate Core Committee

SUBJECT: Baccalaureate Core Committee ANNUAL REPORT 2004-2005

2004-2005 members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee included: Ruth Vondracek, David McMurray, Patty Watkins, Milo Koretsky, Pat Muir, Kevin Ahern (through May 2005), and Joanne Sorte. Ex-officio members included: Vicki Tolar Burton and Jun Xing. The Baccalaureate Core Committee met twice each month from October 18, 2004 through June 9, 2005. The BCC had regular and full participation of the membership. The BCC had no student members during the year in spite of efforts by the Faculty Senate office and BCC members to invite students to participate. The actions and discussions of the BCC during this year are summarized below.

Operating procedures: The BCC adopted operating procedures to guide review of course proposals and to give structure to the year-to-year follow through activities of the committee. These procedures include:

- General Operating Procedures of the Baccalaureate Core Committee
- Expectations of the Baccalaureate Core Course Syllabus
- Operating Procedure for the Writing Intensive Course in Double Degrees and Dual Majors
- Operating Procedure for the Periodic Review of Baccalaureate Core Categories (sometimes called the Categorical Review)

These procedures are attached below for future reference.

Course review: Across the year a total of 32 new or "change" course proposals were reviewed. Review action was as follows: 2 proposals were denied, 8 were approved following return/resubmit, and 22 were approved at first review.

DPD Category Review: As charged by the Standing Rules, the BCC conducted a categorical review of a portion of the Baccalaureate Core. During 2004-2005 the BCC reviewed the Difference, Power, & Discrimination category. DPD courses that had not been reviewed during the previous 5 years were identified. 25 courses were proposed for review. Of these, 5 courses had been dropped, 17 were approved at first review or upon revision/resubmission, and 3 courses were returned for additional information with review and findings to be determined during Fall 2005. These carry forward courses include: HST 201, HST 202, and HST 203.

Establishment of electronic submission system for the category review: The BCC worked with the Faculty Senate office to promote development and use of an electronic submission system for the Category Review. Vickie Nunnemaker supervised student worker Keith Prickett in the development of the system that allows BCC members to access and review materials submitted by faculty teaching the courses under review. The system will be refined and continued in use for Categorical Reviews in subsequent years.

Writing Intensive Curriculum guidance: The BCC worked in collaboration with the WIC Coordinator and WIC Advisory Board to identify the role of the WIC in Double Degree and dual major programs. This is summarized in the procedure attached below.

Participation in faculty discussion of the Oregon Transfer Module - OTM, and management of transfer course fulfillment of the OSU Baccalaureate Core requirements. Members of the BCC
participated in campus and state-wide discussions related to the OTM. Implications of the OTM and other transfer students’ fulfillment of the OSU Baccalaureate Core were discussed. By decision of the committee, the BCC spoke in favor of approval of the OTM design during the Faculty Senate discussions. In doing so, the BCC recognized that the experience of each student with the OSU Baccalaureate Core will be somewhat unique. This variation of experience is to be acknowledged for both the 4-year on-campus student as well as the transfer student. The importance of the upper division OSU Baccalaureate Core was underscored. It was also determined that Academic Programs personnel in collaboration with department advisors would assign fulfillment of Baccalaureate Core requirements to transfer courses on a case by case basis.

**Recommendations for continued Baccalaureate Core Committee discussion during 2005-2006:**

**DPD and transfer courses.** The BCC suggests exploration and discussion around the identification of transfer courses fulfilling the OSU Baccalaureate Core DPD requirement. The DPD is considered to encompass a unique approach to study. It is unclear whether the OSU DPD contribution is unique, and whether transfer courses address the depth and breadth of the DPD as envisioned for this aspect of the Core. To this end, the BCC began discussions with the DPD Coordinator and members of the DPD Advisory Board about the advisability of:

1. recommending changing the DPD to an upper division requirement, or
2. requiring that the DPD be taken at OSU.

In this discussion it was important to recognize that the current lower division DPD courses make a significant contribution to the student experience at OSU. The DPD Advisory Board has proposed that History 201, 202, & 203 be withdrawn from DPD to address the issue of transfer-in DPD credits. These courses comprise a large number of the transfer-in credits assigned to fulfill the DPD core requirement. In this way it was thought that the quality of the student's DPD experience would be enhanced by achieving the Bacc Core requirement here at OSU. The History Department chair countered this recommendation by noting among other points, that withholding DPD Bacc Core assignment from these transfer courses is inappropriate (it is anticipated that transferring institutions pay heed to DPD perspectives in the study of history) and that limiting this current opportunity for students to obtain the DPD requirement through the study of HST 201, 202, 203 (both for transfer students and on-campus students) would significantly increase student enrollment in the remaining on-campus DPD courses creating a situation that would be untenable. The Baccalaureate Core Committee has a logical responsibility to participate in and guide these conversations to promote the DPD in the Baccalaureate Core and to assure an optimal DPD experience for students.

**Electronic delivery of Baccalaureate Core Courses.** During the past year the BCC met with the Director of E-campus and faculty who teach Bacc Core classes through electronic delivery. Currently approved Baccalaureate Core courses that are revised to include electronic delivery receive no BCC review. It is the perspective of the BCC that while electronic delivery may be perceived simply as an alternate form for class presentation, it is also important for the BCC to find ways to ensure that the Bacc Core requirement for interactive learning is satisfactorily achieved. One way of exploring this would be to consider reviewing electronically delivered courses as a categorical review, or to conduct a random review of e-courses. Similarly, it would be incumbent upon the BCC to review the Bacc Core categories represented in the electronically delivered versions to assure that all categories of the Core are satisfactorily represented through this method of course delivery, and to encourage submission of electronic delivery courses in categories that are under-represented.

**General Baccalaureate Core Committee Procedures**

Approved by action of the Baccalaureate Core Committee, October 2005

**AGENDA**

- The Agenda will be forwarded to the committee and posted to the web one week in advance of the meeting.
  - The Agenda forwarded to the committee members will list the name of committee members assigned to review the course proposals. This will assist/remind committee members to identify materials they need to prepare in advance of the meeting.
  - The Agenda forwarded to the web will NOT include the names of individual reviewers.
- The Agenda will list WIC and DPD courses scheduled for review at the beginning of the meeting. This will allow the WIC and DPD directors to attend just a portion of the meeting if they wish.

**MINUTES**

- Minutes will be taken by committee members by rotation.
- The Minutes will list the ACTION items - course review actions, at the beginning of the minutes.
The minutes will be forwarded to the Chair for review.
The Chair will forward the minutes to the Faculty Senate Administrator to post to the web.
Minutes will NOT list the names of individual reviewers.
Minutes will be revised/affirmed by consensus at the following BCC meeting.

NEW/CHANGED COURSE PROPOSAL REVIEWS
(11-2-2004)

- Proposals to be reviewed will be listed on the agenda in advance of each meeting.
- Two committee members will be assigned to review each course proposal.
- The reviewers will conduct their reviews individually but may choose to correspond about their findings before the assigned review meeting.
- If one reviewer is not able to attend the review meeting, that person is encouraged to communicate with the other proposal reviewer so that her/his feedback might still be heard and be part of the decision-making process.
- Feedback from only one committee member may be deemed sufficient to recommend a decision of action as determined by the members in attendance at the review.

THE ROLE OF THE BCC CHAIR

- The Chair is appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- The Chair will work with the Faculty Senate Administrator (Vickie Nunnemaker) to schedule committee meetings. The meeting schedule will be posted on the web.
- The Chair will assist to orient new members, convene meetings, assure timely and appropriate review of course proposals, support the discussion of relevant issues, and forward the findings and concerns of the BCC to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee liaison or others as appropriate.

REGULAR NEW/CHANGE COURSE PROPOSAL REVIEWS

- The Chair will:
  - receive electronic notice of course proposals submitted for review
  - assign course proposals for review to two committee members
  - schedule the proposal review by listing on the agenda
  - track progress related to the course reviews to assure timely management of the review process
  - obtain consensus on action related to course reviews
  - submit electronically, action findings of the committee including request for resubmission of materials and/or approval
  - correspond directly to the submitting faculty member as appropriate, to further clarify the action of the BCC related to resubmission requests, approval with recommendation, or other information as deemed useful by the committee

PERIODIC CATEGORICAL REVIEW

- Each year a category of the Baccalaureate Core will be identified for review. The Chair will work with the BCC to identify the category for review. Categories recently reviewed include:
  - 2004-2005 DPD
  - 2003-2004 Social Processes & Institutions
- Courses reviewed by the BCC in the last 5 years will NOT be reviewed. The Chair will work with the Faculty Senate Administrator to identify courses in the category review that were approved up to 5 years previously.
- The Chair will work with the BCC to draft the category review materials. The materials will direct faculty about how to submit their categorical review proposals. (See the sample from 2004-2005 attached.)
- Courses reviewed in the Categorical Review will be held to the standards currently in place for that portion of the Baccalaureate Core.

Expectations for the Baccalaureate Core Course Syllabus
Approved by Action of the Baccalaureate Core Committee November, 2, 2004

Background & Context
Upon review of Baccalaureate course proposals during 2003-2004, the Baccalaureate Core Committee recognized that, while faculty were ultimately able to articulate how a particular course addresses the Baccalaureate Core criteria, it was unclear if students would know if and how the Baccalaureate Core goals are being met. The following recommendations are proposed in an effort to strengthen the contribution of the Baccalaureate Core to the student experience.
Expectations for the Baccalaureate Core Course Syllabus

- All courses carrying Baccalaureate Core status should clearly identify the category of the Baccalaureate Core on the course syllabus.
- All Baccalaureate Core category criteria should be described on the syllabus. The URL connection to the Baccalaureate Core should be listed, allowing students to know what the Baccalaureate Core is contributing to the course.
- All courses carrying Baccalaureate Core status shall include the Baccalaureate criteria as part of the student learning objectives.

Examples

- All courses carrying Baccalaureate Core status should clearly identify the category of the Baccalaureate Core on the course syllabus
  Faculty will be asked to identify the course as a Baccalaureate Core class on the course syllabus.

  Example: This course satisfies the Baccalaureate Core for Social Processes & Institutions.

- The Baccalaureate Core category will be described on the syllabus.
  Faculty will be asked to include reference to the appropriate Baccalaureate Core category criteria on the course syllabus in a way that briefly describes how the criteria will be integrated in the particular course.

  Example: Human beings are inevitably social, influencing and being influenced by social groups. The social sciences study social institutions and processes and deal with the human behaviors and values that form and change them, and are essential for an understanding of contemporary society. This course aims to improve your critical thinking skills related to the subject matter [xyz] by considering the subject(s) in historical context and demonstrating interrelationships or connections with other subject areas such as [abc]. In addition, we will focus on methods, concepts, and theories for understanding the structure and change of major social institutions, and for understanding individual behavior as part of a social dynamic. We will also examine the nature, value, and limitations of the basic methods of the social sciences, and discuss the interaction of the social sciences and society. Finally we will explore perspectives on the evolution of the theories and ideas that are emphasized in this course. To learn more about this category of the OSU Baccalaureate Core see: [link]

- All courses carrying Baccalaureate Core status shall integrate the appropriate and relevant Baccalaureate category criteria as part of the student learning objectives.
  Faculty will be asked to include specific Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes related to the Baccalaureate Core criteria on the courses syllabus, and use these to assess student achievement related to the Baccalaureate Core.

  Example: Mid-term Paper: You will be asked to explore the evolution of theories related to our topic [123] and describe the interrelationships of factors that have influenced change in thinking since the eighteenth century.

Baccalaureate Core Operating Procedure for the Writing Intensive Course in Double Degrees and Dual Majors

Approved by action of the Baccalaureate Core Committee, May 2, 2005

The purpose of the Writing Intensive requirement is to insure that each graduate is prepared to write in the discourse, conventions, and genres of his or her major field.

A student completing requirements for two majors including Double Degrees as well as dual majors (one degree with two majors) may request that one WIC course satisfy the WIC requirement for graduation in both majors.

This opportunity is available if and only if:

- The discourse, written conventions, and genres of the two majors are closely related, and
- The substitution of a WIC course from one major for that in another major is approved in writing by the Chairs or Heads of both departments involved and the approval is placed in the student's academic file. Students and advisors should be aware that in some cases, the WIC course in a major is an integral
part of the degree and substitution may not be appropriate. The final decision rests with the Department Chair or Head.

**Operating Procedure for the Periodic Review of Baccalaureate Core Categories (sometimes called the Categorical Review).**
Approved by action of the Baccalaureate Core Committee, April 28, 2005

Purpose: the Baccalaureate Core Committee periodically reviews courses to assure their continued appropriateness for their assigned Baccalaureate Core Category.

Previous review protocol has allowed that any course reviewed within the last five years would be exempt from the Categorical Review. This practice became problematic when it was discovered that courses were being missed for full review because of Category II change proposals that brought such classes before the Bacc Core for minor course changes (e.g. Course Description). Because the Category II proposals are not reviewed with the depth of a full review, courses had the potential to be taught for many years without sufficient review to assure that they continued to meet the criteria for listing in the Baccalaureate Core.

The Baccalaureate Core Committee approves the following operating procedure:

All courses older than five years will be reviewed in the Periodic Review of Baccalaureate Core Categories - the Categorical Review. This effectively puts all courses into a cycle of a full review at least every five years -- depending on when the particular category is reviewed.
To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
From: Ruth Vondracek, Chair  
2003 - 2004 Baccalaureate Core Committee  
RE: 2003 - 2004 Annual Report

The following were the major activities of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) over the past year.

1. The BCC reviewed twenty-two proposals from OSU faculty members requesting curricular action. The committee approved all twenty-two, some following revisions and discussions. Two of the twenty-two represented courses taught at OSU-Cascades. One proposal still in the system from academic year 2002-2003 was denied.

2. The committee continued its mandate to periodically review baccalaureate core courses:
   The BCC reviewed all Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions courses that had been approved more than five years ago for continued baccalaureate core status in this area. Twenty-seven courses were reviewed. Nineteen requests for continuation were approved, some following discussion and revision. At the time of this report, approval is pending for further information and/or revisions for six courses. Two courses, PS 200 and PS 204, were removed from the Bac Core by mutual agreement of the offering department, the College of Liberal Arts and the BCC.

   The Committee makes the following recommendations for future category reviews: Begin category reviews as early as Fall Term. If possible, automate the category review process. The current manual system is highly inefficient.

   BCC will review the Difference, Power, and Discrimination category next academic year.

3. Discussions this year focused on formalizing the recommendations that all Bac Core course syllabi a) include learning outcomes, b) include demonstrable evidence that critical thinking skills are developed in the course, c) indicate that the course is a Bac Core course, and d) refer the appropriate Bac Core category criteria and how that is integrated in the course. The Bac Core will begin requiring that these elements be included on syllabi during academic year 2004-2005.

4. Throughout the year, the Committee deliberated over the weight given to the proposal narrative versus the course syllabi in determining whether courses should be approved. Both parts of the review documentation are important; the question is how much of the explanation should be given on the syllabi. This is particularly an issue during the category review process when multiple syllabi are associated with one course number. This issue was not resolved. The Committee believes that criteria be developed in the next academic year to ensure consistency in review.

5. The BCC held on-going discussions with Extended Campus staff concerning how to review Bac Core courses where the entire course or specific sections are changed to online delivery. The BCC wants to ensure that the spirit of the Bac Core is still being met in these courses and that learning outcomes reflect Bac Core category criteria. The Committee recommends that a) BCC courses or sections currently delivered online be reviewed during the appropriate category review, and b) that a change to online delivery be considered a 'change' in the course system and trigger a BCC review.

6. Other recommendations of the Committee include the development of a BCC web site that would provide information to faculty about preparing proposals, link to information on critical thinking and developing learning outcomes, as well as give students more information on the curriculum. Certain
course system improvements were discussed; for example, currently there is no 'action' that allows a Bac Core proposal to be denied; title of the course is not given, nor is it easy to discern the reason that review is requested. The Chair will work with systems on some of these issues this summer.

The 2003-2004 members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee were: Ed Jensen, Milo Koretsky, David McMurray, Joanne Sorte, Ruth Vondracek, and Patti Watkins. Ex-officio members included: Vicki Tolar Burton and Jun Xing.
Baccaulaureate Core Committee

Annual Report 2002-2003

To:
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From:
Mary Burke, Chair
2002 - 2003 Baccalaureate Core Committee

Re:
2002 - 2003 Annual Report

The following were the major activities of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) over the past year.

1. The BCC reviewed twenty-two proposals from OSU faculty members requesting curricular action. The committee approved twenty-one of the proposals (four following revision and resubmission); one was withdrawn.

2. The committee reviewed four community college courses from LBCC and Mount Hood. Three were approved and one was rejected. The committee decided that community colleges submitting bac core proposals must meet the same criteria as OSU bac core courses.

3. The committee continued its mandate to periodically review baccalaureate core courses:
   The BCC reviewed all Cultural Diversity courses that had been approved more than five years ago for continued baccalaureate core status in this area. Fifty-two courses were reviewed. Forty-three requests for continuation were approved, sometimes after discussion and revision. Four courses were removed from the category by the offering departments. Review of ENG 360, HST 350, 351, 381 and 382 was postponed until next year when faculty members return from sabbatical or new faculty members are hired to teach the courses.

4. Along with the WIC director, the committee developed and approved guidelines for using an undergraduate thesis to fulfill the WIC requirements.

5. In connection with OSU 2007, the BCC has submitted a review of the Enrollment Management Report. The committee felt strongly that review, implementation, etc., of curriculum needed to remain under the direction of Academic Programs. The committee also examined and replied to proposed changes in the bac core requirements.

6. At the last meeting of the year, we meet with the Instructional Computing Coordinator to suggest changes to make the web site for category II proposals more users friendly. The committee also requested that our yearly review of bac core courses be set up so that it could also be done over the web.

The 2002-2003 members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee were: Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Joe Kerkvliet, Janet Lee, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanderZanden, Ruth Vondracek and Ex-officio members Vicki Tolar Burton and Jin Xing. Madge Patterson attended many of our meetings to help with development of web site.
The following were the major activities of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) over the past year:

1. The BCC reviewed twenty-two proposals from OSU faculty members requesting curricular action. The committee approved eighteen of the proposals (seven following revision and resubmission); four were withdrawn. In addition, one LBCC transfer course was approved and two are pending.

2. The committee continued its mandate to periodically review baccalaureate core courses:
   
   1. The BCC completed its review of WIC courses begun last academic year. This year seventeen WIC courses were approved based on liaison with the affected departments. During the two-year review process, ninety-one courses were reviewed with the following results: sixty-four were approved for continued WIC status, twenty-two were withdrawn from WIC status by the offering departments, two lost WIC status when the departments did not participate in the review process for those courses, and three "thesis-WIC" courses that currently do not meet the WIC guidelines have had their WIC designation extended until June 15, 2003 at which time they must be modified to meet the WIC guidelines or they will lose their WIC status.
   
   2. The BCC reviewed all Perspectives Science/Lab courses that had been approved more than five years ago for continued baccalaureate core status in this area. Thirty-one courses were reviewed. All requests for continuation were approved, sometimes after discussion and revision. Two courses were removed from the category by mutual agreement of the offering department, the BCC, and the College of Engineering whose students were the principal clientele.

3. The BCC and Academic Affairs still have not resolved how to treat transfer courses with regard to baccalaureate core status. Discussions continue. See last year's annual report for a summary of some of the issues. Here is one unresolved issue: The BCC is currently reviewing on-campus courses for continued baccalaureate core status. There is no similar review in progress or mechanism to accomplish this for transfer courses. The bottom line is that we have a system that approves off-campus courses in perpetuity and periodically reviews on-campus courses. Something has to change.

4. In connection with OSU 2007, the BCC has submitted a review of the current baccalaureate core program and its central role in the education of our undergraduate students. That report is available at either
   
   http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/reports/relevance2002.html
   
   or
   

5. The BCC also met with the Curricular Issues Core Planning Team - 4 to discuss curricular issues related to the baccalaureate core. The BCC provided input to the Planning Team that may be read at
   
   http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/reports/discussion2002.html

The 2001-2002 members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee were: Bonnie Avery, Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Ann Marie VanderZanden, student members Stephany Peebler and Darlene Vranas, and Ex-officio members Lisa Ede and Susan Shaw.
Faculty Senate

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Annual Report 2000-01

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: John W. Lee, Chair
2000-2001 Baccalaureate Core Committee

Re: 2000 - 2001 Annual Report

The following were the major activities of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) over the past year.

1. The committee reviewed thirty-three proposals from OSU faculty members requesting curricular action. All requests were approved, sometimes after discussion and revision. In addition, three LBCC courses were approved for some category in the Bac Core. (See items #4 and #5.)

2. At the request of the Executive Committee the BCC began an extensive review of the Fitness requirement in the Baccalaureate Core last academic year. (See the 1999-2000 BCC Annual Report.) New criteria for Fitness courses were submitted to the Faculty Senate for its consideration at the November 2, 2000 Faculty Senate meeting. The proposed changes, as submitted, were approved by the Senate and are posted on the Web at http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/022_BCSUMM.htm

3. The committee continued its mandate to periodically review baccalaureate core courses. The committee is reviewing one baccalaureate category per year of courses approved more than 5 years ago. This year WIC courses were reviewed. A total of eighty-five courses were reviewed and a follow-up review process will extend through Fall Term 2001. (A very few courses with special situations have a longer follow-up timetable.) The follow-up process will include a review of seven courses overlooked in the original review.

4. Approval of Transfer Courses as Satisfying Baccalaureate Core Requirements: The BCC discussed this difficult issue over two meetings. The topic deserves further study by the BCC. The following issues emerged in the discussions:

   It is important to recognize that the committee is not being asked to review baccalaureate core courses but approve transfer courses as equivalencies.

   If the BCC does not approve courses, these courses will be approved elsewhere on an ad hoc basis or by the administration - how will that affect students? What happens when the committee disapproves a course? How is it tracked, if at all? What if the committee is overruled by the administration? At what point, and in what ways, should Faculty Senate be involved in these discussions?

   Is there a tracking system and expiration dates associated with these courses? What guidelines for evaluating courses should be used given that the committee will most likely be working with inadequate information?

   What are the long-term implications for this process in light of the streamlining of transfers through the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) program? What about advanced placement courses completed by incoming first-year students? How might we develop a fair and appropriate process without jeopardizing student access?

5. As a result of the discussions in the foregoing item, the BCC agreed to request from Academic Programs a content
syllabus as part of every review of a community college course. This is the minimal information necessary for review. In addition, a tracking system should be initiated in order to process any course. The committee will develop new criteria (most likely a subset of the existing criteria) by which to evaluate incoming community college courses. Adjustments to the process and procedure of reviewing community college courses will be worked out in consultation with the Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs.

6. **Tracking WIC Courses Used in a Degree Program**: The BCC recommends that the graduation audit form include a box to check off on WIC completion and a blank line on which to write the WIC course used to satisfy the WIC requirement. Members of the committee are aware of lax procedures in some units regarding satisfaction of the WIC graduation requirement. The BCC will work with Academic Programs and appropriate Faculty Senate officers toward implementation of the recommendation.

7. **The OSU-Cascades Campus in Bend and the Baccalaureate Core**: The BCC assumes that students enrolled in the Cascades campus must satisfy the OSU baccalaureate core course requirements and that the BCC is responsible for reviewing and approving or disapproving such courses, just as is the case for courses on the Corvallis campus.

8. The Faculty Senate approved revisions to the BCC Standing Rules at its April 5, 2001 meeting. The primary change was to include the Writing Intensive Curriculum Program Director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination Program Director as ex-officio, non-voting members of the BCC.

The 2000-2001 members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee were: Bonnie Avery, John Dilles, Bob Jarvis, Janet Lee, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Christine Snow, and Ex-officio members Vicki Tolar Burton and Susan Shaw.
Baccaulaureate Core Committee

Annual Report 1999-00

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: Michael Scanlan, Chair
    Baccaulaureate Core Committee

Re: 1999 - 2000 Annual Report

The following were the major activities of the Baccalaureate Core Committee over the past year.

1. Thirty-eight requests for curricular action were reviewed from OSU. Of these all but three were approved. In addition, nineteen community college courses were reviewed for articulation with the OSU Bac Core requirements. All except two of these were approved for some category in the Bac Core.

2. At the request of the Executive Committee the BCC undertook a review of the Fitness requirement in the Bac Core. After gathering information and after consultation with HHP and other constituencies, the committee produced a report recommending that the criteria be rewritten to make the course offerings under this heading more flexible. This approach was approved by the EC and working with Tony Wilcox of HHP a new set of criteria were written for consideration by the Faculty Senate next Fall.

3. The committee undertook on its own to fulfill its mandate to periodically review the appropriateness of courses currently in the Bac Core. The committee decided that this should be done by reviewing courses whose approvals were older than 5 years in one category of the core each year for the next several years. For this year it was decided to review courses in the Western Culture category. Information requests were sent to departments offering such courses. Using this information, such as current syllabi, the committee was able to determine that all of the courses involved continue to meet the criteria for the Western Culture category.

4. The committee cooperated with the DPD Task Force in its review of the Bac Core requirement.

5. The committee proposed changes in Criteria 1 for the courses in the Perspectives
categories of the core. It also proposed changes in the Standing Rules, notably in having the DPD Director, WIC Director, and Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs as nonvoting ex-officio committee members. These proposals have gone to the Executive Committee for action.

The 1999-00 members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee were: Bonnie Avery, John Lee, Bob Jarvis, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, Christine Snow, and Susan Shaw, Ex-officio.
Baccaulaureate Core Committee

Annual Report 1998-99

FINAL REPORT OF THE BACCALAUREATE CORE COMMITTEE,
ACADEMIC YEAR 1998-99

In the academic year 1998-99, the Baccalaureate Core Committee roster was:
Anita Grunder (Geosciences) as chair
Michael Scanlan (Philosophy)
John Lee (Math)
Christine Snow (Exercise & Sport Science)
Shannon Smith (History)
Robert Jarvis (Wildlife Ecology)
Hsiou-Lien Chen (Apparels, Interiors, Housing and Merchandising)

The committee was ably assisted by Vicki Collins, director of the Writing Intensive Curriculum, and by Joan Gross, director of the Difference Power and Discrimination Program. Dr. Chen retired from the committee in the spring term and was not replaced because the end of the year was so close.

The main tasks of the committee were reviews of courses proposed for the Baccalaureate Core, an evaluation of the Baccalaureate Core, and suggestions for changes and formalization of policies and procedures. A copy of all the minutes of the meetings of the committee reside in the archives. The Baccalaureate Core evaluation and proposed policies and procedures were submitted to the faculty senate executive committee in two documents in June of 1999 and are partially repeated here.

COURSE PROPOSALS:
About fifty proposals were considered. The number approved in each category are listed as follows. CC indicates they are community college listings.

Writing
Writing III - 1CC
WIC - 6
Biological Science - 1

Perspectives
Physical Science - 0
Western Culture - 1
Cultural Diversity - 1+7CC
Literature and Arts - 3CC
Social Proc. and Institutions - 0
Diff. Power and Discrimin. - 4+2CC

Synthesis
Contemporary Global Issues - 4
Science Tech. and Society - 3
SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PROCEDURES AND RULES
The following is taken from a memo submitted to the faculty senate on June 15, 1999

I. The BCC proposes the attached changes to the Standing Rules. In short, the changes include: (a) the DPD and WIC directors as ex-officio (nonvoting) members of the committee; (b) simplification of rule A4 to be in accordance with actual procedures; and (c) elimination of rule A5 because the diverse composition of the committee makes this "watch-dog" clause redundant.

II. We have reviewed the criteria for DPD courses in the curricular procedures handbook, and in concert with Joan Gross, propose the following:

Difference Power and Discrimination courses shall be:

1. Be at least 3 credits.
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking.
3. Provide the historical background so students can critically examine contemporary issues of difference, power, and discrimination across socio-political systems in the United States.
4. Concentrate on two or more types of discrimination (such as discrimination according to ethnicity, class, gender, age, sexual orientation, appearance, belief, etc.).
5. Study the origins, operation, and consequences of discrimination, including structural and institutional discrimination.

Systems of power have been sustained in the United States in part through ignorance of the complex ways in which class, gender, race and other forms of institutionalized bias overlap and reinforce each other. A more informed understanding of the often subtle yet powerful structure of these biases and of their implications is essential in a multicultural society. DPD classes typically encourage students to examine their beliefs concerning difference, power, and discrimination through a variety of pedagogical techniques, especially those that promote student interaction.

III. The committee further recommends that the policies and procedures of the Baccalaureate Core Committee be added to the curricular procedures handbook to clarify how rules are implemented. They are on the next page. Having such guidelines will facilitate smooth transitions from year to year as the committee membership changes. Also, it will make it easier for faculty to understand how the committee functions.

Guideline number 5 is put forward explicitly, because there will be added pressure for the committee to approve upper division (particularly 300-level) courses for Perspectives in light of the financial reward built in by the new funding model.

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Policies and procedures

1. The lifespan of a proposal submitted to the Baccore Committee is 6 months from time of first consideration of the proposal by the committee. If committee requests for additional information are not answered in 6 months, the proposal is considered dead.
2. The baccalaureate core status of accepted courses is effective immediately. The status and term of acceptance are posted on the appropriate website.
3. If resubmittals of existing baccore courses include substantive changes, such as changes in content, prerequisites, or level, then a full proposal must be submitted for review. In this way the content of the core is kept up-to-date.
4. The baccalaureate core status of courses lapses after five years. To maintain baccalaureate core status, courses must be reviewed by the committee for compliance with baccalaureate core guidelines. The object is to ensure continuous evaluation and updating of the content of the core.
5. Perspectives courses are to be lower division. Exceptions require compelling support.
The object is to maintain the accessibility to lower division students and to retain the general education character of the perspectives requirement.

6. In order to keep the credit hours in the baccalaureate core contained, the committee encourages 3-credit courses for the perspectives requirements. 4-credit courses require compelling documentation in order to be approved.

7. Courses submitted for WIC or DPD should be routed to the appropriate program director or review board for comment and recommendation before being submitted to the Baccalaureate Core Committee.

Implementation

Most of these procedures are already in effect, viz., numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and the WIC part of 7. The greatest change is the addition of number 4. The committee suggests adding a roll-over time to the courses so that the core will be constantly evaluated. Many courses are taught by people who did not develop them. Also, baccalaureate core criteria have changed in time. For these reasons, the five-year turnover rule is proposed as a self-regulating system. It will cause some problems in the first few years as implementation is phased in. Many courses predate the system of having the term of BCC status posted, and not all can be reviewed at once. The committee of 1999-2000 will have to formulate a workable reviewing procedure. We suggest that the department and instructor receive notification of upcoming review in the spring term of the third year of the course. Resubmittals can then be prepared in the summer and fall terms and reviewed in the winter and spring and included in the catalog posting in year 5, so that the transition is smooth into the new cycle. Responsibility for securing approval must reside with the instructor of the course, not with the committee.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE BACCALAUREATE CORE EVALUATION

The following was submitted to the faculty senate executive committee on June 15, 1999.

Results of evaluations to date indicate substantial satisfaction with the Baccalaureate Core. Student satisfaction was expressed for the goals of the Baccalaureate Core and the achievement of those goals (1994-95 survey). Students are able to meet their requirements in a timely way and find that their courses meet the criteria set by the Baccalaureate Core (1998-99 survey). Faculty and advisors are largely satisfied with the content and implementation of the core, with controversy centered on the Difference Power and Discrimination and the Fitness requirements (1999 survey).

The Baccalaureate Core Committee recommends the following.
(1) Implement an ongoing review procedure of courses in the core. An outline is included in a separate memo where the policies and procedures of the Baccalaureate Core Committee are summarized.
(2) Establish a DPD Task Force charged with evaluation of the Difference Power and Discrimination requirement. Points that need to be addressed by the task force include:
   a) A clear statement of the goals and justification of DPD
   b) What should be the status of DPD, Perspectives Requirement? Should it be upper and lower division? A separate category?
   c) Is the requirement named appropriately?
   d) Faculty education regarding the goals of DPD
   e) The level, rigour and number of existing courses
   f) Brief faculty workshop for course development
   g) The necessity of a program director in the short term and in the long term
(3) The Baccalaureate Core Committee should evaluate the Fitness requirement Points that need to be addressed include:
   a) Is the requirement necessary and desirable
   b) Is HHP231 the only way the requirement can be met or might there be alternatives? Documentation regarding HHP231 has been provided to the committee by Anthony Wilcox.
(4) Evaluation of student satisfaction with core requirements through compilation of teaching evaluations of courses in each category, sampled at random.
(5) Evaluation of completion of the Baccalaureate Core requirements by random sampling of the transcripts of graduated seniors of the last 3 years (well after DPD requirement).
(6) Compare the OSU Baccalaureate Core to the general education requirements of peer institutions.
The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) conducted two primary kinds of activities during the 1997-98 academic year: (1) consideration of proposals for new or revision of existing baccalaureate courses, and (2) evaluation of existing guidelines for baccalaureate course proposals. Due to the unusually large number of proposals submitted this past year (compared to under 30 in some previous years), most of the committee's effort was devoted to the first.

EVALUATING COURSE PROPOSALS

The committee evaluated a total of 108 proposals from OSU faculty and from several surrounding Community Colleges. The number of approved courses in each category are listed as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approved Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Culture</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature &amp; The Arts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Processes &amp; Institution</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference, Power &amp; Discrimination</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Global Issues</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Technology &amp; Society</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty (20) proposals were rejected. Sixteen (16) were either withdrawn or pending.

CLARIFYING BAC CORE GUIDELINES, CRITERIA AND RATIONALE

The BCC reviewed the Bac Core Criteria and Rationale stated in the most updated version of the proposal guidelines provided by Academic Affairs Office. To ensure timely response from the proposing departments and to avoid accumulation of "inactive" proposals, the BCC set a requirement of six (6) months for response time. Thus, a proposal would remain "active" for a duration of six (6) months from the date additional information/recommended changes are requested by the Academic Affairs Office. Proposals are automatically considered withdrawn if the proposing department does not provide a response to the request after six months.
The BCC worked jointly with WIC Co-ordinator, Professor Vicki Collins, to clarify the Bac Core WIC guidelines, criteria and rationale. The proposal guidelines for WIC requirements were thoroughly revised. The fact that WIC courses should be discipline courses which use writing tasks to help students learn is emphasized. Issues on variable credit WIC courses were resolved.

**BYLAWS CLARIFICATION**

The committee reviewed the BCC Bylaws and proposed some changes to the Committee on Committees to clarify the qualification of BCC members.

**CONTINUING CONCERNS**

There are a couple of related concerns that the BCC did not have a chance to examine due to the large proposal evaluation load last year. They are: (1) the implication of a growing number of 4 or more credit hour courses in the Bac Core, and (2) the original intents and direction of the Bac Core program. The committee thought that with the decreasing number of required credits to obtain an OSU Bachelor's degree and the increasing number of approved 4 or more credit Bac Core courses, a significant number of OSU students may not have any true “free electives” left in their programs. The Bac Core program has been in existence long enough for a “mid-term” review to ensure that: (1) the original intents of the program are preserved, (2) the program continues to head in the right direction, and (2) an optimal number of courses in each category is attained.

**COMMITTEE ROSTER**

Hsiou-Lien Chen          App/Int/Hous/Merch
Anita Grunder        Geosciences
John Lee                Mathematics
David Myrold       Crop & Soil Science
Michael Scanlan       Philosophy
Shannon Smith      History
Solomon Yim     Civil/Const/Envirom. Engineering
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Baccalaureate Core Course Review

- 2013-2014 Course Review Checklists
- 2007 Baccalaureate Core Review Materials
- Baccalaureate Core Category Review Course Webform
- Seven-Year Category Review Calendar
- Assessment Activity by Cycle Year
- Tasks by Category Review Year
Baccalaureate Core Committee Reports

- Final Report from the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core – AY 2011-2012
- Report of OSU Baccalaureate Core Committee on Baccalaureate Core Fitness Requirement – March 17, 2000
- April 2006 Accreditation Report – Baccalaureate Core Section
- Vitalization of General Education at Oregon State University prepared by the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee – May 13, 2010
Baccalaureate Core Category Course Review by Year

2019-2020
- Synthesis:
  - Contemporary Global Issues
  - Science, Technology and Society
- WIC:
  - College of Forestry
  - College of Education
  - College of Pharmacy
- One-year follow-up:
  - Writing I
  - Writing II
  - WIC:
    - College of Science
    - College of Earth, Ocean & Atmospheric Sciences
    - Interdisciplinary Programs:
      - BRR
      - ENC
- Three-year midpoint reporting:
  - Western Culture
  - Cultural Diversity
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Writing, Literature and Film; Psychology, and Arts and Communications)

2018-2019
- Physical Science
- Biological Science
- One-year follow-up:
  - Literature and the Arts
  - Social Processes and Institutions
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Language, Cultural and Society; History, Philosophy and Religion; Public Policy; American Studies, and Liberal Studies)
- Three-year midpoint reporting:
  - Difference, Power and Discrimination
  - WIC: College of Engineering

2017-2018
- Writing I
- Writing II
- WIC:
  - College of Science
  - College of Earth, Ocean & Atmospheric Sciences
  - Interdisciplinary Programs (BRR & ENC)
- One-year follow-up:
- Western Culture
- Cultural Diversity
- WIC:
  - College of Liberal Arts (Writing, Literature and Film; Psychology, and Arts and Communications)

  Three-year midpoint reporting:
  - Speech
  - Mathematics
  - Fitness
  - WIC:
    - College of Agricultural Sciences
    - College of Business
    - College of Public Health and Human Sciences

• 2016-2017
  - Literature and the Arts
  - Social Processes and Institutions
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Language, Cultural and Society; History, Philosophy and Religion; Public Policy; American Studies, and Liberal Studies)

    One-year follow-up:
    - Difference, Power and Discrimination
    - WIC: College of Engineering

    Three-year midpoint reporting:
    - Synthesis: Contemporary Global Issues; Science, Technology and Society

• 2015-2016
  - Western Culture
  - Cultural Diversity
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Writing, Literature and Film; Psychology; and Arts and Communications)

    One-year follow-up:
    - Speech
    - Mathematics
    - Fitness
    - WIC:
      - College of Agricultural Sciences
      - College of Business
      - College of Public Health and Human Sciences

• 2014-2015
  - Difference, Power and Discrimination
  - WIC: College of Engineering

    One-year follow-up: Synthesis

• 2013-2014
  - Speech
  - Mathematics
  - Fitness
  - WIC:
    - College of Agricultural Sciences
    - College of Business
    - College of Public Health and Human Sciences

• 2012-2013 – Synthesis
• 2012-2013 – Mathematics, Speech, Fitness, and selective WIC courses
• 2009-2010 – Biological Science with Lab, Mathematics, Science Technology and Society History
courses, Social Processes and Institution
- 2008-2009 – Fitness, Physical Science with Lab
- 2007-2008 – Science, Technology and Society
- 2006-2007 – Science, Technology and Society (delayed)
- 2005-2006 – Contemporary Global Issues
- 2004-2005 – Difference, Power and Discrimination
- 2002-2003 – Cultural Diversity
- 2001-2002 – Perspectives Science/Lab
- 2000-2001 – WIC
- 1999-2000 – Western Culture

Archives 2003-2004
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2007 Baccalaureate Core Review Materials

- Review/Relevance of the Baccalaureate Core Program
- 2006 Accreditation Report - Baccalaureate Core Section
- AAOT
- AAOT Comparison
- Summary of WIC Board Comments Regarding Potential Reduction of the Writing Requirement
Introduction

From time to time it is appropriate to review the raison d'être of a program, to determine if that reason still exists and, if it does, to determine if the program is serving its intended purpose in the most effective way.

The BCC is aware that both formal and informal discussions are taking place on campus this academic year about the relevance of the baccalaureate core and how it is functioning. Concerns we have heard range from general discussions about the need for a baccalaureate core versus the need to design programs intended to support specific career goals and targeted to individual students. We also heard more specific questions about the core areas themselves. These include, for example, the need for all Perspectives Science Courses to have lab components, and the relevance and affordability of nationally known programs like DPD (Difference Power and Discrimination) and WIC (Writing Intensive Curriculum).

The purpose of this message is to briefly review the history and structure of the current baccalaureate core program and to convey the BCC’s unequivocal affirmation that the baccalaureate core program is and should remain the indispensable core of the OSU undergraduate educational program.

A Brief History and Structure of the Bac Core Program

The Faculty Senate adopted the current baccalaureate core program (now known familiarly as the Bac Core) in January 1988. Specifically, the Senate adopted, with amendments, the report of the Curriculum Review Commission (informally known as the Schaumberg Commission) that was appointed in February 1987 by Provost Graham Spanier. The CRC was charged to develop a new undergraduate core curriculum that would be responsive to the unique mission and goals of OSU and to the changing currents in higher education. In particular the new core was designed to:

- Strengthen critical thinking and communication skills across disciplines
- Ensure that all OSU students should acquire a basic understanding and appreciation for the physical and biological sciences, humanities and the arts, and the social sciences
- Strengthen the international dimensions of the University’s curriculum
- Encourage interdisciplinary interaction among students and faculty

To accomplish these ends, the Bac Core is composed of the following main areas of course study, which comprise a total of 48 credits plus a WIC course. (WIC courses must be at least 3 credits and a requirement of the major.):

- Skills Courses: (primarily first year)
- Perspectives Courses: (primarily lower division)
- Difference Power and Discrimination (DPD) Courses: (upper and lower division)
- Synthesis Courses: (upper division)

Go to [http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/021_The_Baccalaureate_Core.htm](http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/021_The_Baccalaureate_Core.htm) and [http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/022_BCSUMM.htm](http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/022_BCSUMM.htm) for more details.
Since its adoption in 1988 the baccalaureate core and most of the main core areas have undergone incremental change. More substantial changes have been made in the WIC program, which was a work-in-progress in 1988. At that time, national WIC programs that existed were predominately at the lower division level. The decision to have a capstone WIC in the major and at the upper division level was relatively unique to OSU. In the intervening years, the current and previous WIC directors have worked with faculty members across the campus to develop top-notch courses and an overall program of high national regard. In 1994 the Faculty Senate added DPD to the Perspectives category of the Bac Core and in May 2000 the Senate, acting on a report from the DPD Taskforce, revised the criteria for DPD courses and made DPD a separate category of the baccalaureate core. The DPD program has won national and international renown as an innovative, cutting-edge addition to the undergraduate curriculum and for its professional development opportunities.

The faculty development programs in DPD and WIC received special commendation in the recently completed (AY 2000-2001) accreditation review of OSU. It was noted in the accreditation report that "many faculty members commented on the effectiveness of these faculty development efforts, and how teaching and learning have improved as a result."

**Continuing Relevance of the Bac Core Program**

Although the BCC emphasizes that any model program can be improved and adapted to better meet the needs of students, it is in absolute agreement regarding the value of the baccalaureate core in the education of students at OSU. Indeed, it is the purpose of the core to ensure that OSU students receive a well-rounded education that will enable them to understand and evaluate major societal issues because they are informed by the arts, humanities, and social sciences and by science and technology. Importantly, the baccalaureate core encourages an understanding of interrelationships among disciplines to better educate students as global citizens of an ever-changing world.

One purpose of a university education is to equip students with skills and knowledge that will enable them to find and sustain meaningful career opportunities. Our students will enter an ever-changing workplace in which it is generally acknowledged that workers can expect to make several career changes (perhaps five to seven) during their working years. Thus, it is more important than ever for students to have a broad-based education. The Bac Core is designed to provide just such breadth and, equally importantly, to prepare students to synthesize materials and think critically about complex subjects. This experience and breadth of knowledge will enable our students to better adjust to and advance in the diverse workplaces they will encounter.

Many students do not know what they want to major in when they come to OSU. The Bac Core program helps students explore areas of possible specialization and often introduces students to areas that previously they did not know about and that ultimately become their major area of interest.

Any core program of the University must support and advance the institution's principal goals and visions. It is apparent that the Bac Core does this. The Strategic Vision statement that is guiding the current OSU self-examination process called OSU 2007 states: "The University aspires to have positive and measurable impacts on the civic, economic, environmental, and social foundation of society - particularly for the major issues that are important to Oregon in its global context. Building an environment that embraces diversity and a global perspective." To this end, the statement identifies eleven goals, parts of which assert that the University will:

- Provide high quality disciplinary, professional, and interdiscipinary programs
- Accelerate the development of excellence in five thematic areas: arts and sciences; atmosphere, earth, and ocean systems; biosciences and health; engineering and technology; and natural resources
- Be recognized for excellence in providing a nurturing, challenging, and supportive environment for the student experience
- Increase recognition for an international and global perspective, and for providing such opportunities to faculty, staff, and students
- Advance diversity as a core educational value and to foster an environment that welcomes inclusiveness

Turning this vision statement and these goals into reality for OSU undergraduates means providing compelling core learning experiences across the major disciplines (the humanities and arts, the physical and biological sciences, and the social sciences) that form the scientific and societal bedrock upon which the five thematic areas of the Vision Statement ultimately rest. Ultimately, the core learning experiences of every student must include the strengthening of critical thinking and communication skills (including effective writing, speaking, and quantitative skills). It is exactly the function of a baccalaureate core program to be sure that the foregoing broad educational experiences are provided to each student in an intentional way and not left to chance.

Consequently, an OSU Baccalaureate Core Program, improved and strengthened as a result of the OSU 2007 review, should remain the indispensable foundation upon which an undergraduate education at OSU rests.

**Suggestions for Revising/Improving the Bac Core**
In this section, we summarize some issues about the baccalaureate core raised by faculty members outside the committee. This is not offered to suggest that there are fundamental problems with the Bac Core or that it is in urgent need of revision. The BCC finds nothing in the recent OSU 2001 Accreditation Self-Study, in the University Accreditation Report, or in the OSU 2007 planning discussions that would indicate a fundamental weakness in the concepts underlying the Baccalaureate Core. Instead, in the spirit that any program can be improved, our aim is to share information. The intent of each of the Bac Core requirements is good, but sometimes particular courses fall short on implementation. The BCC is working hard to assure that the intent of the requirements is actually being met in all approved courses.

1. The faculty development opportunities under WIC and DPD have proven very effective in developing baccalaureate core courses in those areas. These programs could serve as models for other core areas, helping faculty develop and articulate the Bac Core aspects of their courses. In particular, faculty development programs in strategies and effective means for promoting "critical thinking", a criterion of every Bac Core course, may be very beneficial.

2. Some students and faculty question the need to have a Skills Fitness Requirement under the Bac Core.

3. Under current guidelines, each Science Perspectives course must have a lab component. Students must take three such courses. It has been suggested that the goals of this Bac Core requirement could be met without every course having a lab component and/or that the interpretation of a "lab component" could be broadened from the traditional bench-lab model.

4. Under current guidelines, synthesis courses are required to be upper division. This stipulation is made primarily to ensure that students will need to synthesize ideas at a higher level than may be possible with only lower division training and maturity. Nevertheless, it may be that the goals of a synthesis course could be achieved at the lower division level. If so, this would provide a wonderful opportunity for lower division students to examine the relationships between disciplines at a time that might be very beneficial to them in terms of making career choices.

5. A number of faculty have expressed a desire to have some sort of "teamwork" or "collaborative problem-solving" requirement in the Bac Core. Would this be a requirement for all, some, or none of the core areas?

6. The OSU Accreditation Team identified a need for assessing the effectiveness of the Bac Core in the delivery of individual learning outcomes related to category criteria.

OSU 2007 has started far-reaching discussions across campus about the goals and priorities of this university. In particular, issues about the role and importance of the general education (baccalaureate core) requirements of the university are under discussion. The BCC wants to be fully involved in discussions related to baccalaureate core issues. We are interested in understanding the views of our colleagues across the University and seek to share with them our experiences and insights concerning the baccalaureate core. We ask that you share this report with members of your committee and other interested colleagues.

Respectfully Submitted
2001-2002 Baccalaureate Core Committee
# OSU Bacc Core Comparison with AAOT Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>OSU Bacc Core</th>
<th>AAOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>6-9 credits; total of 9 with 3 possible in comm</td>
<td>8 credits; (WR 121, 122, 123, 127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3-4 credits</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>(3 credits); for a total of 9 credits with writing</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>3-12 credits; from 3 different perspective categories (Lit &amp; Arts, Cult Div, West Cult)</td>
<td>10 credits; at least 2 disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>3-12 credits; from 3 perspective categories (Cult Div, Soc Processes, West)</td>
<td>15 credits; at least 2 disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Math/Computer Science</td>
<td>12 credits; one bio, one phys and one additional</td>
<td>15 credits; 3 lab courses of at least 12 credits in bio/physical science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>6 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Strengths
- AAOT systematically requires more courses in each of a limited number of categories; our Perspectives categories disperse concentration of humanities, arts, and social sciences.
- AAOT categories are traditionally recognized divisions within universities (e.g., science, math, arts/humanities, social sciences, writing, etc.)
- AAOT focused solely on lower division courses – helps students get a general education relatively early in career
- AAOT requires communication class; OSU Bacc Core does not
- AAOT designed as a total package, not meant to be unwrapped – appears to be a coherent whole

## Problems
- AAOT is 10 more credits than OSU Bacc Core **without** WIC, DPD, or synthesis requirements – not a reduction in resources or numbers of credits
- Could potentially narrow the breadth of classes students take; maybe exempt classes in major from serving as bacc core classes?
- AAOT categories don’t appear to recognize the inter- and cross-disciplinary nature of knowledge
- Many Bac Core courses are upper division courses; what would happen if we switched to all lower division Bac Core courses (with few exceptions)? Can departments/colleges handle the shift in numbers?
- Designated OSU DPD courses may be different from equivalently named/numbered courses at Community Colleges
- Students in some majors (engineering, natural and physical sciences, and fine and performing arts) cannot easily accommodate required coursework
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 13, 2013 ~ 3:00-4:00 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

Anticipated absences: Bob Brudvig, Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Melinda Manore

1. Introductions

2. Issues for the Coming Year

3. Review 2012-2013 Annual Report
   - Please review the report prior to the meeting and come prepared with concerns or questions.

4. BCC Leadership and Committee Structure

5. Review BCC Standing Rules

6. Course Proposal Review

7. Discussion Fall 2013 Category Reviews
   - Mathematics
   - Speech
   - Fitness
   - WIC classes from Agricultural Sciences, Business, and Public Health and Human Sciences

8. Future Meetings

9. Matters Arising

Information Item:

- Information related to the Baccalaureate Core Committee can be found online at http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 27, 2013 ~ 1:00-2:00 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Training Sessions
   Set training session(s) for category reviews during Finals Week (12/9-13). Please bring your calendars, though we will likely do a Doodle to reach those who must be absent tomorrow.

2. Course Reviews
   Course reviews for the assignments from last meeting. Kevin has received checklists and comments on 7 of the 11 from at least one person:
   - 85534
   - 85609
   - 86363
   - 86584
   - 86624
   - 86830
   - 88176

   Any additional reports you can provide to Kevin by 11:00 AM (or bring to the meeting) can help us make more progress.

3. Assignment of New Course Reviews
   There are six more course reviews in the queue; Kevin will do a preliminary assignment, but is interested in discussing whether to move to a single-reviewer system either now, or when folks are comfortable with the work.
Anticipated absences: B. Paasch, B. Brudvig

1. Information Items
   a. The chair plans to generate an audio recording to allow Vickie or Britta to generate meeting minutes. We will entertain objections and implement and alternative (i.e., someone will have to take notes) if any are raised.
   
   b. OSU Catalog wording on Bacc Core – Any wording changes are due January 24.

   c. Feedback on category review process. Reminder: first assignments are due January 24. Anyone who missed the two training sessions will need to arrange one-on-one sessions with Kevin & Stefani.

2. Action Items
   a. Course reviews assigned in December:
      86585 (ES 243)
      86921 (FR 334)
      88047 (FES 4/585)
      88146 (HORT 331)
      88267 (ART 310)
      88412 (ART 313)
      88535 (SUS 350)
      NB: Due to the anticipated absences, we may postpone final decisions on 88412, 88146, 88047
      Chair will make tentative assignments based on both systems.

   b. New assignments and timing
      87107 (HST 338)
      87458 (ANTH 374)
      87739 (PHL 206)
      87794 (ANTH 4/566)
      88099 (IE497)
      88100 (IE498)
      88174 (ANTH 371)
      88698 (FR 343)
      88762 (GER 241)
      85534 (QS 4/577) (Resubmitted for consideration as DPD course)
      NB: One question is whether we are yet comfortable moving to a single-reviewer system, or whether we wish to continue with two on each.

   3. New business from members or ex-officios
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 27, 2014 – 1:30-3:00 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

Anticipated absences: B. Paasch, B. Brudvig

1. **Category Review Discussion**
   1. Sorting criteria: Recertify, Likely recertify with stipulations/revisions, need more data, recommend decertification. ~ Kevin Gable

2. **Action Items**
   1. Communication (COMM 11, COMM 114, COMM 114H, COMM 218, COMM 218H)
   2. Mathematics (MTH 105, MTH 111, MTH 112, MTH 211, MTH 241, MTH 245, MTH 251, MTH251H)
   3. Fitness (HHS 231, Lab, PAC)
   4. Preparation for WIC review (VTB)

3. New business
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 17, 2014 – 1:30-3:00 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. **International Programs** – Valerie Rosenberg
   Discuss how to handle Bacc Core requirements in developing dual partner programs with international institutions.

2. **Course Reviews:***
   - ES 243
   - HST 338
   - ANTH 374
   - PHL 206
   - ANTH 4/566
   - IE 497
   - IE 498
   - ANTH 371
   - FR 343
   - GER 241

3. **Primer on Reviewing DPD Courses** – Nana Osei-Kofi

4. **Close-out of Skills Category Review**
   A. Revision of Learning Outcomes
   B. Items to glean from summary IR data
   C. Items to glean from our reviewer comments
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 2, 2014 – 2:00-3:30 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Multistate Cooperative and Participation in an Assessment Conference at PSU – Stefani Dawn

2. New Course Proposals & Resubmissions:

Resubmissions:
87059 IT 331 – Manore
86585 ES243 – Manore
88698 FR343 – Brudvig
87458 ANTH 374 – Bruslind
88762 GER241 – Kayes

Prior assignments:
88677 SOIL102 – Kayes
88339 OC334 – Paasch
87099 MTH338 – Pfeifer

New assignments:
88995 OC201 – Peszynska
88913 IT 261 – Peltomaki
84819 PHL 440 – Winograd
82394 PHL 345 – Olson
89135 ES350 – Pfeifer
89183 WGSS295 – Gable

3. New Assignments:
   • MTH Perspectives courses: Use of Math Placement Test and enforcement of prerequisites (several proposals; how best to coordinate review?)

4. Other Business?
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 7, 2014 – 1:00-2:30 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Outstanding New Course Proposals:
   • #88995 OC201 – Peszynska
   • #88913 IT 261 – Peltomaki
   • #89135 PHL 345 – Olson

2. Debrief on Category Review Process
   a. How to manage confusion between courses in a Category Review and New Course Proposals? This seemed extensive.
   b. What was the valuable information in Category Review? (IR matrices, syllabi, unit responses) - What was not useful?
   c. Are there issues we could have handled better in the training?

   • Changes to general approach (from Item 2) -Specific questions for the DPD category

4. Other issues?
April 16, 2014 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 16, 2014 – 1:00-2:30 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. **Finish WIC Category Review**
   - #AG 421
   - #ANS 420
   - #AREC 434
   - #BOT 323
   - #FST 425
   - #FW 454
   - #HORT 318
   - #HDFS 461
   - #H 434
   - #NUTR 439

2. **Draft Letters: COMM, MTH, Fitness**
   I have placed draft letters on the Sharepoint site (though we still seem to be having authentication issues). If you can get there, go to [https://sharepoint.oregonstate.edu/sites/APAA/bacc-core-review/2013SkillsReview/default.aspx](https://sharepoint.oregonstate.edu/sites/APAA/bacc-core-review/2013SkillsReview/default.aspx)
   Go to the folder "Results-Discussions", then "Letters," then either "COMM" "Fitness" or "Math".

3. **Request from LBCC – GS105**
   - [Request](#)
   - [GS105 Outcomes-based Course Outline and Approval Form](#)
   - [GS105 Course Proposal Form and New/Revised Course Outline](#)
   - [GS105 Syllabus](#)

4. **Other issues?**
1. **Remaining Category Reviews**
   - AG421, FST425 (Giebultowicz)
   - BOT323, NUTR439 (Peszynska)
   - AREC 461, H434, COMM 114H (Gable)
   
   If you cannot be at this meeting, we will proceed on the basis of comments provided.

2. **Resubmitted New Course Proposals**
   - ES243 (Manore)
   - IT331 (Manore)
   - ES445 (Gable)
   - ANTH371 (Peltomaki)
   - OC201 (Peszynska)
   - SOIL102 (Kayes)
   
   Proposal site: [https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals](https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/proposals), select "BCC Committee", and "Search".

3. **An old new course proposal that dropped through the cracks**
   - HST338 (Gable)

4. **Re-review of Synthesis Courses from 2012-2013 Category Review**
   
   Several Synthesis courses were held for re-review this year, either because they were not taught in 2012-13, the submitted information was incomplete, or there were necessary revisions. These are:
   - ANTH432
   - ANTH482
   - HST385
   - HST465
   - HSTS412
   - HSTS418
   - PHL344
   - HST425H
   - Z345
   - ENG497
   
   We need to assign the reviews and establish a time line for decisions. We'll work with Stefani to set up processes and assign responsibilities.

5. **Committee Leadership**
   
   I would like to discuss how to distribute committee leadership. While selection of committee co-chairs is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we have an opportunity/expectation to make recommendations based on our knowledge of who is engaged with the work of the committee. Current members who will be serving in 2014-15 are certainly likely nominees, but we can also suggest others from the faculty who might be effective.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 30, 2014 – 1:00-2:30 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. **New Course Proposals:**
   - Skills-FitnessBruslind
   - HHS231
   - WSE392 SynthSTS Kayes
   - FR429 CD Brudvig
   - QS4/576 SynthCGI Peltomaki
   - ART311 LA Olson
   - HORT115BS Pfeifer
   - BI315 WIC Paasch
   - ANTH478SynthCGI Winograd

2. **Principals of Access to Perspectives/DPD Courses** (Gable). Draft attached; also see analysis of several issues prepared by Stefani.

3. **Update on Provost’s Team for Oregon Higher Education Assessment** (Dawn)

4. **Other items?**
May 14, 2014 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 14, 2014 – 2:00-3:30 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. **3- vs. 4-Credit Course Issue**
   Kevin Gable has spoken with the Curriculum Council, and will be coming to the BCC directly from a discussion with the Advising Council. The BCC needs to decide what (if anything) we intend to do, and make decisions on the several proposals currently held up (ES243, ES445).

2. **Pending but Assigned New Course Proposals**
   - BI 315 (Prop. 89023) – Paasch
   - ANTH 478 (Prop. 90111) – Winograd

3. **New/Resubmitted Course Proposals**
   Plan on getting these through by the end of the academic year; guidance for course proposers for summer/fall committee activity. Currently in the queue but unassigned:
   - 88259 ES233 DPD
   - 88260 ES334 LA
   - 88888 HST353 CD
   - 89136 ES351 DPD
   - 89225 WGSS4/562 DPD
   - 89256 ES201 DPD
   - 89313 ES4/557 LA
   - 89494 WGSS414 DPD
   - 89519 QS431 (CL) DPD
   - 89520 QS477 DPD
   - 90171 SOIS205 PS
   - 90172 SOIL206 PS

4. **Others?** (NB: Kevin plans to have some draft WIC letters by Monday's meeting.)
May 19, 2014 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 19, 2014 – 1:00-2:30 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Remaining WIC courses for Category Review: these slipped by and need Committee decisions:
   - CSS 325
   - EXSS 375
   - EXSS 381
   - EXSS 455
   - H 476
   - HDFS 430

   The compiled reviewer comments will be distributed separately; they are currently in a spreadsheet on the SharePoint site, but the Chair will highlight the courses in that and share around (not a public document and so not a part of the formal Agenda).

2. Review of draft WIC letters posted to SharePoint: Results-Decisions --> WIC --> relevant college (some in each).

3. Any completed reviews of the remaining 14 new course proposals or resubmissions.

4. Other items?

Please note: Associate Deans Marion Rossi and Julie Greenwood have agreed to join us for a discussion of credit loads for courses in the BCC at 3:00 PM on Wednesday, May 28.
1. **Introductions**

2. **Approval of June 6, 2012 Minutes**

3. **2012-2013 Meeting Minutes** – a shared venture!

4. **Informational Items:**
   a. [2011-2012 Annual Report](#)
   b. **Baccalaureate Core Website** (Vicki Tolar Burton)
   c. Accreditation Update: NWCCU site visit on Friday, October 19.
      
      On October 19, OSU will host two site visitors from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities related to the below recommendation from the 2011 comprehensive review.
      
      It is recommended that Oregon State University accelerate its efforts to foster, support, and reward meaningful assessment of learning outcomes that spans from course assessment to program assessment and includes the Baccalaureate Core, all undergraduate programs, and all graduate programs.
      
      We really need your participation in this site visit. If you can, please attend the Open Session for Faculty from 10:30-11:00 AM on Friday, October 19 in MU 213. If you speak to assessment in your programs, please give us 30 minutes of your time. For more information, contact Becky Warner.
   d. Revisions to Perspectives Categories: At the October 11, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate approved our suggested revisions to the Perspectives Criteria:

      For the non-science categories:
      
      Please strike: Be lower division and at least three credits
      
      And replace it with:
      
      Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least three credits and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

      And for the science categories:
      
      Please strike: Be lower division, at least four credits, and contain a laboratory
      
      And replace it with:
      
      Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least four credits, contain a laboratory, and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

5. **Review BCC Standing Rules** and discuss Faculty Senate charge for the 2012-2013 BCC

6. **Course Proposal Review:** process overview and demonstration
7. **Discussion Item:** DPD and Transfer Credits (Kerry, on behalf of Michelle Bothwell)

8. **Category Review**
   a. **2012-2013:** Synthesis
   b. **Category Review Process Overview**
      i. Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation Data Collection
      ii. Demographics, Webform, Syllabi
      iii. Committee Responsibilities
   c. **Category Review Training** (Fall Term Meeting #2): Monday, November 5 in the Academic Success Center Computer Lab (Waldo 114) Two available sessions 3:00-4:30 or 4:30-6:00 (snacks provided)

9. **Other Business**

Upcoming Meetings:
Category Review Training sessions: Monday, November 5
Academic Success Center Computer Lab (Waldo 114)
Two available sessions: 3:00-4:30 or 4:30-6:00
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
February 13, 2013 ~ 9:00-11:00 AM
120 Waldo Hall

1. Introductions and Agenda Review

2. Approval of October 18, 2012 Minutes

3. Course Reviews (BCC):
   a. 83647 – for Western Culture
   b. 85221 – for Cultural Diversity

4. Information Item: WIC Class Anomalies – Vicki Tolar Burton

5. Category Review Statistics and Communication Plan – Marion Rossi and Kerry Kincanon

6. Revisiting the Review of Writing Report
   a. Relationship to Synthesis Category Review
   b. Identifying Priorities

7. Other Business

   Next Meeting: March 1, 2013 – 10:00 AM-Noon – 120 Waldo Hall
Baccalaureate Core Committee

**Agenda**

March 18, 2013 ~ 3:00-4:30 PM
120 Waldo Hall

1. **Introductions and Agenda Review**

2. **Approval of February 13 Meeting Minutes**

3. **Course Reviews (BCC):**
   a. 82234 – BEE 469 WIC
   b. 85386 – PS 343 CD
   c. 85433 – WR 329 WR II
   d. 85872 – WS 463 CGI
   e. 85875 - HORT 111 BIO Science
   f. 86201 – ES 231 CD

4. **Synthesis Category Review Updates**


6. **Other Business**

   *Next Meeting: Spring Term Meetings and Synthesis Category Review follow-ups TBD*
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
April 10, 2013 ~ 9:00-10:30 AM
120 Waldo Hall

1. Introductions and Agenda Review

2. Approval of March 18, 2013 Meeting Minutes

3. Update on Two Pending Proposals – Kerry
   - 85433 (WR 329 WR II)
   - 85875 (HORT 111 BIO Science)

4. Update on Course Proposal System assessment question – Kerry

5. Course Reviews (BCC):
   a. 85345 – Film 255 (Cultural Diversity & Literature & Arts)
   b. 85626 – Film 266 (Cultural Diversity & Literature & Arts)
   c. 82489 – HST 488 (Cultural Diversity & Contemporary Global Issues)
   d. 85229 – AREC 352 (Contemporary Global Issues)

6. Synthesis Category Review Updates – Kerry & Marion

7. Update from Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation – Stefani Dawn


9. Other Business
   
   Next Meeting: April 24, 2013 ~ 9:00-10:30 AM – 120 Waldo Hall
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
April 24, 2013 ~ 9:00-10:30 AM
120 Waldo Hall

1. Introductions and Agenda Review

2. Approval of April 10 Meeting Minutes

3. Guest: Sarah Finger McDonald – HORT 111 discussion

4. Guest: Stefani Dawn – Update from Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation

5. Course Reviews (BCC):
   a. #85345 – QS 262 (Writing I and DPD)
   b. #85619 – QS 461 (Cultural Diversity & WIC)

6. Update on #82489 – HST 488

7. Synthesis Category Review Assignments – Kerry Kincanon & Marion Rossi


9. Other Business

    Next Meeting: May 7, 2013 – 1:00-2:30 PM – Waldo 120
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
May 7, 2013 ~ 1:00-2:30 PM
120 Waldo Hall

1. Introductions and Agenda Review

2. Approval of [April 10] and [April 24] Meeting Minutes

3. Synthesis Category Reviews Phase II – Kerry Kincanon & Marion Rossi

4. Course Reviews (BCC) –
   a. 85532 – QS 364 (DPD)
   b. 85533 – QS 431 (DPD)
   c. 85618 – QS 462 (DPD)
   d. 86192 – WSE 453 (WIC)

5. Addendum to Synthesis Outcomes – Kerry Kincanon & Marion Rossi

6. Upcoming Changes in Academic Affairs – Vicki Tolar Burton

7. Other Business

Next Meeting: May 21, 2013 ~ 1:00-2:30 PM – 120 Waldo Hall
May 21, 2013 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

1. Introductions and Agenda Review

2. Approval of May 7, 2013 Meeting Minutes

3. Transfer Experience and the Baccalaureate Core – Bill Bogley, Director of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation, and Katie Winder, Dean of Liberal Arts, LBCC

4. Perspectives on Assessment and Category Review Workload – Bill Bogley

5. OSU’s Participation in the Multi-State Collaborative – Stefani Dawn

6. Update on Recent Course Reviews – Kerry, Kincannon

7. Other Business

   Next Meeting: June 5, 2013 – 9:00-10:30 AM – 120 Waldo Hall
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 5, 2013 ~ 1:00-2:30 PM
120 Waldo Hall
Agenda

1. **Introductions**

2. **Approval of May 21 meeting minutes**

3. **Course Reviews - BCC**
   a. 85436 – WR 240 (WR II)
   b. Reviews over the summer

4. **Synthesis Category Review Update** - Kerry & Marion

5. **First Year Skills Compliance** - Vicki & Kerry

6. **Dual Degree Programs with International Universities and Implications for the Bacc Core** - Sunil Khanna, Associate Provost for International Programs

7. **Advocating for Bacc Core Leadership** - Kerry

8. **Other Business**
September 27, 2011 Agenda, Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

**Baccalaureate Core Committee**  
**September 27, 2011 ~ 10:00 - 11:00 PM**  
**Faculty Senate Conference Room, 109 Gilkey Hall**

**Agenda**

1. **Introductions**

2. Context, Role, and Responsibilities of the Baccalaureate Core Committee and the Baccalaureate Core
   - Current Standing Rules
   - Minutes
   - BC curriculum course approval and program review
   - Vitalization Report (shared over e-mail) & the LGG's
   - Developments: BC category learning outcomes
   - Developments: Accreditation Mandate
   - Developments: First-Year Skills requirement
   - Developments: Marketing LGG's and Bacc Core (START, Bacc Core web site)
   - Developments: Writing and Math reviews
   - Developments: Human Resources – Global Learning Director, Assistant Director of Assessment, Service Learning Faculty Development Coordinator

3. 2011 - 2012 Work Agenda/Topics
   - Guiding Categories for 2011 - 2012: Design, Quality, Visibility (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) - Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to prescreen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills→perspectives &amp; DPD→Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Other

5. Meeting Dates - All meetings will take place 10-11 AM in the Faculty Senate Conference Room, 109 Gilkey Hall
   - Friday, October 7
   - Tuesday, October 11
   - Friday, October 21
   - Friday, November 4
   - Friday, November 18
   - Tuesday, November 29
Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 7, 2011 ~ 10:00 - 11:00 AM
Valley Library Willamette East Room (3622)

Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Approval of September 27, 2011 meeting minutes

3. Request for minute-taker for October 11 meeting

4. Overview of Curriculum Proposal System; establishing protocol on how the BCC will undertake curriculum proposal reviews

5. Standing Rules Discussion

   Context: In June 2011, the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees conducted a five-year review of the BCC and reported to the EC with recommended changes to the BCC standing rules. Please review the report, which is attached and is also available at http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/coc/ar/attach/2010-2011/AppA.pdf.

   In response, the EC has charged the BCC to formally propose changes to those rules, and to do so early in the academic year. Any proposed changes that we choose to send to the EC will be debated and voted on by the full Senate.

   For our discussion, the co-chairs have drafted proposed changes for your consideration. The proposed changes are tracked on the attached document so that you can compare with the rules that are currently in force. Our proposed changes follow the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for the most part, but with one significant difference. The Committee on Committees recommended to delete items B3 and B4, dealing with category review, from the current standing rules. We propose to retain and rewrite those items.

   For a variety of reasons, from 2009-2010 the BCC suspended category review, which had previously been a centerpiece of BCC responsibilities. During 2010-2011, the BCC focused on developing category level outcomes, so again no category review took place. As a result, some have concluded that category review will no longer be a BCC function, and so the Committee on Committees recommended deletion of items B3 and B4 from the BCC standing rules.

   However, it was a key recommendation of the Ad Hoc review committee that course and category review should be expanded to include "direct and indirect measurements" of student learning in the Core. This implied the need for category outcomes that are now in place and, which in turn, provide the framework for programmatic assessment of the core. Assessment at this level is now an institutional mandate from the accreditors and the EC has asked the BCC to support his effort.

   The proposed revisions of items B3 and B4 address a renewal of the BCC category review responsibilities to incorporate assessment of student learning. The proposed revisions focus on the scope and purpose of category review, rather than the internal functioning of the process.

6. New Business

7. Meeting Dates – All meetings will take place 10-11 AM in the Faculty Senate Conference Room (109 Gilkey)
### Adjourn

#### 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
- Guiding Categories for 2011 - 2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) - Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div requirements for BC categories</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) - Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills→perspectives &amp; DPD→Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC website as it develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 11, 2011 ~ 10:00 - 11:00 AM
Faculty Senate Conference Room, 109 Gilkey Hall

Agenda

1. Approval of October 7, 2011 meeting minutes

2. Request for minute-taker for October 21 meeting

3. Update on BC website development

4. Committee protocol for handling Course Proposals

5. Standing Rules; Discussion and prelude to vote

Context (carried over from Oct 7 agenda): In June 2011, the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees conducted a five-year review of the BCC and reported to the EC with recommended changes to the BCC standing rules. Please review the report, which is attached and is also available at http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/coc/ar/attach/2010-2011/AppA.pdf.

In response, the EC has charged the BCC to formally propose changes to those rules, and to do so early in the academic year. Any proposed changes that we choose to send to the EC will be debated and voted on by the full Senate.

For our discussion, the co-chairs have drafted proposed changes for your consideration. The proposed changes are tracked on the attached document so that you can compare with the rules that are currently in force. Our proposed changes follow the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for the most part, but with one significant difference. The Committee on Committees recommended to delete items B3 and B4, dealing with category review, from the current standing rules. We propose to retain and rewrite those items.

For a variety of reasons, from 2009-2010 the BCC suspended category review, which had previously been a centerpiece of BCC responsibilities. During 2010-2011, the BCC focused on developing category level outcomes, so again no category review took place. As a result, some have concluded that category review will no longer be a BCC function, and so the Committee on Committees recommended deletion of items B3 and B4 from the BCC standing rules.

However, it was a key recommendation of the Ad Hoc review committee that course and category review should be expanded to include "direct and indirect measurements" of student learning in the Core. This implied the need for category outcomes that are now in place and, which in turn, provide the framework for programmatic assessment of the core. Assessment at this level is now an institutional mandate from the accreditors and the EC has asked the BCC to support this effort.

The proposed revisions of items B3 and B4 address a renewal of the BCC category review responsibilities to incorporate assessment of student learning. The proposed revisions focus on the scope and purpose of category review, rather than the internal functioning of the process.

6. New Business

7. Meeting Dates – All meetings will take place 10-11 AM in the Faculty Senate Conference Room (109 Gilkey)
   - Friday, October 21
## Adjourn

### 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011 - 2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visiblity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) - Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div requirements for BC categories</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text_descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills→perspectives &amp; DPD→Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC website as it develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 21, 2011 Agenda, Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 21, 2011 ~ 10:00 - 11:00 AM
Faculty Senate Conference Room, 109 Gilkey Hall

Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Approval of October 11, 2011 meeting minutes

3. Review and discussion of standing rules revisions
   - Mark-up version
   - Clean version

4. Final confirmation of BCC curriculum review process

5. Information item: Three proposals are currently in the proposal system for review. One course is currently under review, but we still need to assign the other two. Assignments of those two reviews are imminent, so the BCC can discuss all three courses at the Nov. 4 meeting.

6. Initial discussion about Category Review, and the Executive Committee charge to integrate evidence of student learning into the category review.

Meeting Dates – All meetings will take place 10-11 a.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room

- Friday, November 4
- Friday, November 18
- Tuesday, November 29

Adjourn

2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011 - 2012: Design, Quality, Visibility (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) - Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div requirements for BC categories</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills→perspectives &amp; DPD→Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole</td>
<td>Vetting the BC website as it develops</td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 4, 2011 ~ 10:00-11:00 AM
Faculty Senate Conference Room, Gilkey 109

Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Approval of October 21, 2011 meeting minutes

3. Standing Rules Vote

4. Course Proposal Review: Proposals up for discussion
   - Proposal ID: 81341
   - Proposal ID: 81773
   - Proposal ID: 82516

5. Initial discussion about BCC relationship to the accreditation report, assessment of learning in the core curriculum, and category review.

Information Item:
- 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

Meeting Dates – All meetings will take place 10-11 a.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room
- Friday, November 18
- Tuesday, November 29

Adjourn
November 18, 2011 Agenda

Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 18, 2011

Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Approval of November 4, 2011 meeting minutes

3. Course Proposal Review: Proposals up for discussion
   - Proposal ID: 81341 (Tabled from last meeting)

4. Continued discussion about BCC relationship to accreditation report and assessment of learning in the core curriculum
   - Roadmap for Information Flow
   - Reporting mechanism
   - 2012 pilot
   - Retreat?

5. Information Items
   - Revised Standing Rules forwarded to the EC
   - BC website architecture session is happening today
   - Initial conversations about Experiential Learning in the Core
   - We will carry over future discussion items noted in previous meeting minutes as "Emerging Issues" which we will note at the end of the agenda
   - 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

Meeting Dates – All meetings will take place 10:00-11:00 AM in the Faculty Senate Conference Room
   - Tuesday, November 29

Adjourn
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
November 29, 2011 ~ 10:00-11:00 AM
Gilkey 109

1. Introductions

2. Approval of November 18, 2011 meeting minutes

3. Information Items:
   - Website update
   - Curriculum Proposal System (CPS) Questions request
   - Upcoming Barometer article

4. Review of Emerging Issues

5. Retreat Workshop Planning – What information about student learning can BCC use to inform category review?

Information Item:
   - 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

Reminder: Fall 2011 BCC Retreat/Workshop from Noon-3:00 PM on Thursday, December 8 in MLM 215. RSVP TODAY to Bill.Bogley@oregonstate.edu for lunch reservation.

Adjourn
Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

End of Fall Term Retreat Agenda
December 8, 2011 ~ Noon-3:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Lunch-Agenda Overview
2. Category Review Process
   - Review Previous Category Review Process
   - Define what information is necessary for category review moving forward
   - Workshop BC Category Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting Form
   - Discussion of departmental record-keeping implications
   - Faculty Development options for next term
3. Bacc Core Question Sets for Curriculum Proposal System
   - Review existing question set
   - Revise question set to reflect new parameters for BC courses
4. Starting the Conversation: The 5-year plan
   - Synthesis pilot timeline and deadlines
   - Annual timeline/deadlines
   - Off-year and category-year reporting

Adjourn by 3:00 p.m.

2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
January 26, 2012 ~ 3:30-5:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Introductions

2. Updates
   - Faculty Senate Presentation
   - Syllabus Minimum Requirements
   - Learning Outcomes Assessment Webform
   - Communication Plans/Faculty Development Sessions
   - Bacc Core Website

3. Discussion Item: Accreditation and Metrics for Outcomes Assessment

4. Curricular Proposal System: Revising the Bacc Core questions – Process discussion

5. Course Review: Recent approvals and courses in the queue

6. Other Business

Winter Term Meetings – Milam 215
Thursday, February 16 – 3:30-5:00 pm
Friday, March 9 – 2:30-4:00 pm

2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
February 16, 2012 ~ 3:30-5:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Introductions

2. Approval of January 26, 2012 meeting minutes (all)

3. Updates
   - UEC and Provost’s Council Presentation (Vicki and Kerry)
   - Pilot Assessment Development Workshops (Vicki)

4. Rough draft of Five-Year plan for Category Review (Kerry)

5. Curricular Proposal System: Revising the Bacc Core questions (all)

6. Vision for Emerging ITEMS discussion

7. Other Business

Winter Term Meetings ~ Milam 215
Friday, March 9 – 2:30-4:00 PM

2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
March 9, 2012 ~ 2:30-4:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Introductions

2. Approval of February 16 minutes (all)

3. Course Proposal Reviews (All)
   - 81308
   - 81309
   - 82348
   - 82991
   - 83514
   - 83089, 83098, 83099, 83101, 83102, 83103

4. Updates
   - Pilot Assessment Development Workshops
   - Bacc Core Website

5. Revised Category Review Plan (Kerry & Bill)

6. Announcements and Other Business

2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
April 13, 2012 ~ 2:00-3:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Introductions

2. Approval of March 9 minutes

3. Course Proposal Reviews (All)
   - 82991
   - 83566
   - 82697
   - 82698
   - 83058
   - 83163
   - 83164
   - 83165
   - 83393

4. Updates
   - Synthesis Pilot
   - ESET pilot proposal

5. Prioritizing Emerging Items for discussion at upcoming meetings

6. Announcements and Other Business

7. 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

Spring Term Meeting Schedule – All Meetings are in Milam 215
Monday, April 23   3:00-4:00
Tuesday, May 8    3:00-4:00
Monday, May 21    3:00-4:00
Wednesday, June 6 4:00-5:00
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
April 23, 2012 ~ 3:00-4:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Introductions

2. Approval of April 13, 2012 Meeting Minutes

3. Updates
   - ESET Pilot
   - Synthesis Pilot: Communication Strategy and Office of Assessment website
     http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment/baccalaureate-core-assessment

4. Course Proposals
   - 83726

5. Discussion Items
   - Revisiting the "Studies In" discussion from April 13, 2012 meeting
   - Lower division/Upper Division policy for Perspectives Categories

6. Emerging Issues for Discussion at Upcoming meetings

7. Announcements and Other Concerns
   - 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

Spring Term Meeting Schedule – All Meetings are in Milam 215
Tuesday, May 8 3:00-4:00
Monday, May 21 3:00-4:00
Wednesday, June 6 4:00-5:00
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
May 8, 2012 ~ 3:00-4:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Introductions

2. Approval of April 23, 2012 Meeting Minutes

3. Policy conversation regarding "Studies In/Topics In" courses in Skills/Perspectives Synthesis
   Guests: Peter Betjemann and Anita Helle, English

4. Updates & Discussion Items
   - ESET Pilot communication
   - Suggested Revision to Lower Division Criteria Statement
   - Feedback on Category Review Complementary Data request to IR

5. Course Proposals
   - 83726
   - 83213
   - 83190
   - 83191
   - 83393

6. Emerging Issues for Discussion at Upcoming meetings

7. Announcements and Other Concerns
   - 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

Spring Term Meeting Schedule – All Meetings are in Milam 215
Monday, May 21        3:00-4:00
Wednesday, June 6    4:00-5:00
June 6, 2012 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
June 6, 2012 ~ 4:00-5:00 PM
Milam 215

1. Introductions

2. Approval of May 21, 2012 Meeting Minutes

3. SOIL 102 proposal discussion. Guest: Kate Lajtha, Crop and Soil Science

Action Items:
4. Final discussion and approval of revised Course Proposal System questions

5. Final discussion and approval of new criteria language for Perspective categories:

"Courses in the Perspectives categories should be accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses should not create unnecessary barriers for student seeking to fulfill these categories"

Discussion Items:
6. AP and Transfer credits counting for DPD

7. Course Proposals
   - #83966 – SOIL 102 Introduction to Environmental Science and Sustainability
   - #83213 – NMC 427 Digital Pornography
   - #83998 – AMS 350 American Culture and the Vietnam Experience

8. Announcements and Other Concerns: Annual Report

9. Emerging Issues

Information Items:
10. Discussion Items

11. 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

Baccalaureate Core Committee
November 29, 2010 – 3:00-4:30 PM
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Follow-up on delegation of review of existing proposals (from November 19 meeting) (VH)
3. Follow up catalog copy language for skills course (VTB)
4. Work tasks (MC):
   1. Determine sub-groups for assigning learning outcomes for BC categories and map to LGG
   2. Discuss focused work day
   3. Review draft of outcomes currently in BC category descriptions; determine others as appropriate
5. Academic Regulations Proposed Revisions - Please review and be prepared to provide input
6. Assign new course approvals - tentative
Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

Baccalaureate Core Committee
February 4, 2011 – 3:30 PM
Milam 215

Agenda

1. Continue discussion of outcomes for Baccalaureate Core categories (60 minutes)
2. Proposal reviews as needed
3. Syllabus template for Baccalaureate Core courses
4. Schedule for Spring term for Baccalaureate Core Committee
5. Approval of January 24 minutes
1. Discussion of further implementation of Bacc Core changes and advising (Susie Brubaker-Cole)

2. Update on category lunch agendas (Vicki Tolar Burton)

3. Update on Proposal reviews (Victor Hsu)
   - GI WS380 Muslim Women
   - DPD WS466/566 Fat Studies
   - CD HST391 Traditional China and Japan
   - CD HST392 Modern China and Japan
   - WIC H476 Health Program Planning
   - LA GER261 Masterpieces of German Cinema

4. Set meeting dates for the remainder of the term

5. New Business
Consolidated Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 20, 2011 ~ 3:00-5:00 PM
Milam 215
Agenda

1. Approval of April 22 minutes
2. Summary of BCC learning outcome lunches with faculty
3. Curriculum Course Proposals (3)
4. Applying Learning Goals for Graduates to the Outcomes
Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 14, 2010 – 10:00–11:30
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Category Review Process – Discuss both immediate and long-term changes to the process
November 6, 2009 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Note taker: Nick Drapela

Old Business

1. None

New Business

1. SPAN 470 – new Writing Intensive course (WIC). The link to the submitted materials was sent out by email a few days ago. Vicki Tolar Burton will be at the meeting to help us understand how this course will work.

2. A department has asked if it is “allowed” to reserve some number of seats in Bacc Core courses for students in that major. They don’t intend to completely limit the enrollment to students in the major, but would like some way to ensure that their students do have easy access to the courses. A search of Bacc Core rules and regulations has not turned up any firm policies on this. We need to discuss this and send our recommendation to the Curriculum Council and Academic Planning and Assessment office.
Joint Meeting of the Baccalaureate Core Committee and the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee
June 8, 2009 – 11:00-12:30
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Report from groups (update, issues, etc.)
   - Physical Science Sub-committee
   - Fitness Sub-committee
   - Ad Hoc Committee
3. Next year
   - Recommendation to not accept Category II proposals for new Bacc Core courses (would continue to do revisions)
   - Working together
   - Other?
Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 5, 2008

Agenda

Note taker: John Bailey

Old Business

1. Review of November 19 minutes

2. NR 350: Roger Hammer discusses resubmission (attached)

New Business

1. Course Reviews:
   - WIC reviews: Lisa Ede and Denise Lach - TCE 340
   - FS 435: Barbara Edwards
   - BI 201: Mary Cluskey

2. Sub-committees and Category Reviews (attached)
October 24, 2008 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 24, 2008
Agenda

Anticipated absences: D. Bernell, M. Cluskey, M. Haak, S. Shaw

Note taker: TBD

- Welcome and introductions
- Description of what BCC does and how it does its work
  - On-going reviews
  - Category reviews
  - Sub-committees
- University/faculty senate exploration of Bacc Core
- Outstanding business
  - 4-credit conversions in English
  - Science and technology review in History
  - PH 331 and 332
- New reviews
  - FST 273
  - NR 350
  - FW 454
  - ANTH 283
  - GEO 306
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 11, 2008 Agenda

Minute Taker: HSU

Minutes Review: Not yet available

Old Business:

STS Courses Review

https://secure.oregonstate.edu/facultysenate/committees/bcc/review/2007/review.php?course=1
Use your password to get into these so you can comment.

General Reviews: Jay will present, please look over so you can comment

ANTH383 Introduction to Medical Anthropology (New Course)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3424

Tentative ANTH483/583 Advanced Medical Anthropology (New Course)

Baccalaureate Core Survey – Noller

New Business:

Committee Wrap Up:

HSTS 423 Science and Religion – Ferngren request for Extension

Next year Committee Chairs
March 11, 2008 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 11, 2008
Agenda

History Proposal to move everything except for 100 level Bacc Core classes from 3-4 credits.- determine whether or not to approve proposal (see attachment)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 7, 2008
Agenda

Minute Taker: David Bernell

Approval of December 3, 2007 Meeting Minutes – George Caldwell (5 minutes)

Old Business:

**Update on STS Category Review – Jay (5 minutes)**

**General Review Presentations – update on responses from Physics Department – Jay (10 minutes)**

PH112 (New Course) (see attached Physics 112 Syllabus)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3153
PH113 (New Course) (see attached Physics 113 Syllabus)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3154

Courses to be reviewed – Distribute at meeting – Cheryl (5 minutes)

HST 353 Early Mexico (New Course) – Assigned Bernell
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3155

NFM312 Issues in Nutrition and Health (Course Change)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3143

WS 235 GLOBAL WOMEN IN THE MOVIES (New Course) – Assigned Caldwell
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=2841

FE 452 FOREST OPERATIONS PLANNING AND SCHEDULING (New Course) – Assigned Bailey
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3285

YDE 492 4-H Youth Development Education (Course Change) – Assigned Hsu
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3285

IE 366 WORK SYSTEM ENGINEERING (Course Change) – Assigned Middleton
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3163

**DPD Course Transfer Statement Presentation Discussion – Susan Shaw (10 minutes)**

Desired outcome: Decision on committee endorsement to send forward to executive committee

**HST increase from 3 to 4 credit hours - (15 minutes)**
Introduction – Cheryl & Jay
Discussion of History response to committee request to leave out 100 level courses.
Inform committee regarding agenda timeline
Desired outcome: Committee response to History
(See e-mail attachment)

**HSTS Course Review – (10 minutes)**
Introduction – Cheryl & Jay
Discussion related to Paul Farber’s request to postpone HSTS course review in STS Category Review
Desired Outcome: Response to Paul Farber
(see Farber memo)

BIOE Proposal (10 minutes)
Discussion
Desired outcome: Committee Response to BIOE
(see attachments: Bothwell memo and BIOE curriculum)

Credit Increase Analysis (10 minutes)
Discussion and decision. We need to move this to the Curriculum Council so that the English and History Departments can be informed of the process that will be used for review

New Business: - 10 minutes

   Committee Ground rules

   International Degree Program

   Agenda Formulation
Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 3, 2007

Agenda

Minute Taker: David Bernell

Approval of November 12, 2007 Minutes, Margie Haak

Information Sharing:

Update on STS Category Review – Jay

General Review Presentations

TOX360 (New Course) – Margie Haak https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3127

Courses to be reviewed – Distribute at meeting

PH231 (New Course) https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3254
PH223 (New Course) https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3256

Distribution of reallocated STS Course Review Assignments spreadsheet to Committee Members

Credit Increase Analysis – Discussion and decision. We need to move this to the Curriculum Council so that the English and History Departments can be informed of the process that will be used for review. Message from Jay Noller: On November 12 we discussed our review of proposed changes in credits for English and History Bacc Core Courses. English, as many of you will remember, has already gone through the process with us on tailoring its bid for this change. History, however, has not yet had discussions with us. I herewith attach spreadsheets that provide data for you to consider in our decision on this. In the first sheet you will note in column (English + History, % of total) that the two Departments host nearly three-quarters of students enrolled in Western Culture courses. In the next column, I devised the School Impact Index to help us consider the impact to schools with little/no leeway in their curricula (COB+COE+COF) for added credit hours. The index shows that there are half again as many "seats" as students needing to stay with 3-credit courses. We know that there is more seat capacity in other 3-credit courses in the category of Western Culture, particularly as 13 other departments contribute courses. As a what-if exercise for comparison, I prepared a table with History 101, 102 and 103 removed from the proposed credit change. This would be similar to the request we made to English. In this case, the probability that a student could take a three-credit course is on par with the rest of the curriculum. Please mull these over for discussion at the next BCC meeting.

New Business:

Winter term meeting scheduling
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 1, 2007
Agenda

Minute Taker: Cheryl Middleton

1. Introductions
2. Review of BCC materials
3. Proposal review protocol
4. Category Review - Science, Technology and Society
   Status Report (Jay)
5. General Reviews and New Proposals
6. Carry-over items from 2006/2007
   Follow-up on H312
7. Other Business
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 1, 2007 Agenda

Note taker: TBA (whose turn is it?)

Old Business

Review minutes from 5-18-07 meeting

Report on responses to draft Bacc Core outcomes -- Jay will report

Report on communication with International Council on Int'l components of Bacc Core -- Pat will report

New Business

DPD transfer issue: Susan Shaw will present a draft proposal concerning this for us to review and discuss. We will vote to approve (or not) the proposal. If we vote to approve, she can carry the proposal to the Executive Council from a strengthened position, having our backing.

Course review – ANTH 482 – Pat will present

Elect new Chair or Co-Chairs (we should have made a recommendation to Vickie Nunnemaker by May 30 – sorry Vickie!)

Review gaps in membership that will be created by members’ leaving the committee this June.

BCC Membership, year, and affiliations:
(Terms end June 30 each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term ends</th>
<th>College/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muir 2007</td>
<td>COS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton 2007</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haak 2008</td>
<td>COS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernell 2009</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noller 2008(?)</td>
<td>CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell 2008</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lach 2009</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey 2009</td>
<td>FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette McFarland 2009</td>
<td>student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional student?

(NOTE: WIC and DPD Directors, ex officio, continue forever on the BCC!)

Rules specify 7 faculty + 2 student members; 2 faculty from COS; 2 from CLA; 3 from “faculty in other colleges” (SO, we are CLA-heavy and will be COS short once Pat steps down this June)
Other items to clean up or take care of before the end of the school year??
May 4, 2007 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 4, 2007
Agenda

Notes taken by: Margie Haak

Introductions – possible new student member?

Old Business:

Review minutes from meeting on 4/27/07

New and Continuing Business:

- Information on recent decisions from ENG re. lower division course credit changes (Vicki Tolar Burton)
- Report on analysis of "seat space" in various courses within Bacc Core categories (Jay Noller) – will 3 credit courses in any categories be a "bottleneck" for those who strive to select on the basis of credit numbers?
- Assess implications of this change alone for our charge re. drafting a revised Bacc Core curriculum. Does this make "tweaking" the core unnecessary?
- Make a decision on whether revisions are or are not needed. Decide what comes next!

Schedule next meeting (Possibly for regular BCC members only), to take up standing rule changes and other BCC matters, depending on outcome of discussion above.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 20, 2007
Agenda

Members who will be absent: Denise Lach, Ken Winograd, Liz Gray, Susan Shaw
Members who will arrive at 2:00: Annette McFarland

Notetaker: George Caldwell (3rd time is a charm?)

Old Business:

Review minutes from meeting of April 13, 2007

Final review of and vote on outcomes for current Bacc Core Curriculum, and accompanying paragraph on how they were created. (Pat has requested a paragraph from Susie Leslie about why we were asked to create these and about how they will be used; no response as of yet). Outcomes and accompanying statements will then be routed to Curriculum Council, Faculty Senate Exec Committee, and Academic Programs for comment.

New & Continuing Business:

Pat & Jay offer comments on “rules for engagement” re: presentation and discussion of various revised Bacc Core models (related, see Paul Axtell’s list of approaches that improve meetings, sent to Pat & Jay by a committee member – see below). Keys include listening openly, showing respect, not mocking or dismissing, encouraging each person to speak freely…….

Continue discussion of alternative models for a revised Bacc Core Curriculum (see Pat’s suggestions for Bacc Core revisions appended to the end of this agenda)

Develop a timeline for presentation of such a curriculum to students and faculty via forums

Paul Axtell’s comments re: “staying on track” in meetings (not developed for our committee in particular, but sent by a committee member as useful to us):

“What makes the most difference in meetings? These are my candidates:

Keep the conversation on track;

Respect each person’s speaking;

Be clear about commitments;

Push back in conversations until the group achieves clarity;

Invite others into the conversation.

Other things are certainly important but, as Cindy and I observe in meetings in many different organizations, these five practices are those most often missing.

Keep them in front of you at your next meeting. If one is missing, put it in – even if you are not the person managing the conversation. Remember, treat each meeting as if its success depends on what you bring to
Schedule next meeting (keeping in mind that BCC itself should meet sometime to discuss general procedural items, as listed in agenda for 4/13/07 meeting)

Pat’s parsimonious suggestions for Bacc Core revisions:
4/16/07

I thought I’d pass along, in advance of our next meeting, the kind of relatively simple approach I’ve been thinking of towards our charge for this spring term. Just throwing it in the hopper for discussion!

Structuring principles (alias the world of Bacc Core revision according to Pat):

1. The BCC was not asked to reinvision the Bacc Core curriculum, but rather to respond to the immediate challenge of how it could accommodate increased course credits. Our charge is not to reinvent the Bacc Core -- there hasn’t been a groundswell of dissatisfaction with the Bacc Core as it currently exists. While some may feel that the charge we have been given by the Faculty Senate President limits us and that it is important to “think outside the box” and be creative and innovative, I feel strongly that we must focus on the charge we were given. If we don’t so focus, we are unlikely to bring closure to efforts we make this spring.

2. If, as a result of our discussions, we think that a major revision is necessary, we can suggest that as a task for next year. I include concepts related to developing portfolios as “major revisions” given the organization, time, and expense that such an effort would involve. But, I feel that if we suggest that major changes are needed, the suggestion should come out of our first having made a good faith effort to examine carefully whether the current Bacc Core could be tweaked to accommodate the changes in course credits.

3. Given these considerations, I offer “tweaks” rather than major changes.

4. The model is based, as is the “TRI” model we started looking at last time, on requiring completion of a certain number of courses rather than of credit.

5. The model assumes that we continue to work basically within the basic Bacc Core course categories that now exist. I think that, unless we can present a really compelling case for change (probably beyond the scope of our charge for this spring), faculty will protest if we suggest that they will need to submit Cat II proposals for courses in new categories – or for moving existing courses into different categories. Everyone is stretched too thinly as it is.

| SKILLS (add appropriate outcomes here) |
| WR I |
| WR II or COMM |
| MTH (105 or higher) |

| PERSPECTIVES IN SCIENCE, SOCIETY, ARTS AND LITERATURE (add appropriate outcomes here). Choose one course from each of the following categories or substitute an approved alternative (list – study abroad for cultural diversity or whatever...): |
| PHYSICAL SCIENCE WITH LABORATORY |
| BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE WITH LABORATORY |
| SECOND LABORATORY COURSE IN EITHER PHYSICAL OR BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE |
| WESTERN CULTURE |
| CULTURAL DIVERSITY |
| LITERATURE AND THE ARTS |
| SOCIAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS |

| DIFFERENCE, POWER AND DISCRIMINATION (add appropriate outcomes here) |
| Choose one approved course (or substitute an approved alternative – e.g., work with an inner city health clinic or whatever....) |

| INTERDISCIPLINARY SYNTHESIS AND PROBLEM SOLVING (add appropriate outcomes here) |

Choose one course from either:
CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL ISSUES
Or
SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY

WIC

Changes from current core:

1. course-focused not credit focused
2. outcomes would be an explicit part of each category identification
3. explicitly allows substitution of qualified experiences for courses (as in study abroad – language still to be worked out, obviously)
4. names of some overall categories are changed slightly to make their contents more transparent (work needed here, of course)
5. reduces courses in WR/COMM from three to two (but credit numbers would be affected relatively little if all WR increase to 4 cr)
6. eliminates fitness (this will be a big issue – note, however, lack of a fitness requirement in AAOT and at most other 4-yr state institutions in OSU – as I recall)
7. reduces courses in “synthesis” from two to one (the two categories have extensive overlap in outcomes)
8. total credits required would be about the same as current (assuming all courses were 4-cr); sums to 48 plus WIC
9. I considered suggesting elimination of the requirement for a second physical or biological science course WITH lab, while retaining a requirement for a second physical or biological science course with OR without lab, but there are actually very few non-lab courses that aren’t already listed in some other Bacc Core category (e.g., a synthesis category)
10. Other possibilities along similar lines are numerous – for example, put fitness back in and eliminate requirement for a second physical or bio sci with lab; pose western culture and social processes & institutions as “choose one” instead of requiring one of each
11. Titles for categories could also be changed to align more closely with AAOT titles, as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTEAD OF</th>
<th>USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS</td>
<td>Writing and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSPECTIVES IN SCIENCE, SOCIETY, ARTS AND LITERATURE</td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences and Culture (would include social processes and institutions, cultural diversity, and western culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature and Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTHESIS</td>
<td>Same?? No analog in AAOT; elaborated version is more descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE, POWER, &amp; DISCR.</td>
<td>Same - no analog in AAOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>Same - no analog in AAOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Senate
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April 13, 2007 Agenda

NOTE location for this meeting – Kidder 128!

Notes taken by: George Caldwell

Introductions – student members, others?

Old Business:

Review minutes from meeting of March 14, 2007

Change in standing rules to indicate that BCC can unlist a course that no longer meets Bacc Core criteria – will be voted on at Fac Senate meeting May 10

Outcomes – Jay report

New Business:

Curricular Review:

NFM 439, Communication in Dietetics (Change – add WIC status) – Pat will present

Bacc Core Review:

Decide on voting policies re. ad hoc members during deliberations on Bacc Core review: Standing rules indicate that course acceptance into the Bacc Core requires approval of 6 of 9 members (e.g., 2/3).
MOTION: Apply the same ratio to votes that involve ad hoc members (e.g., votes related to possible revision of the Bacc Core).

Pat update – no one has been able to locate information on an Academic Assembly that was intended to be held ~ 10 yrs ago to discuss implications for the Bacc Core of changes in course credits from 3 to 4.

Presentations by membership concerning outcomes of their investigations/ponderings re the form of a Bacc Core that we might propose

NOTE: (Items below are of relevance to voting BCC members only; these should be discussed at a meeting where only those members are present, out of consideration for time constraints on the part of ad hoc and ex officio members.)

H 312 – raises procedural issues to clarify that the BCC’s reviews follow consistent procedures, and if different procedures are used for different courses based on enrollment the basis for differential review intensity should be transparent.

- Suggested addition to BCC questions for Bac Core course reviews – “What is done to evaluate and ensure the quality of this course, such as peer-mentoring, monitoring of course evaluations or GPA’s,
etc?" (This intended to formalize procedures for quality assurance.) Associated should be an addition to the standing rules; Part B, rule 3 – modify from “The BCC will periodically review courses accepted for general education to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria,” by adding, at the end, “and expectations of high quality” (or similar).

- If the BCC will subject large enrollment courses to additional scrutiny, this should be made public. Requires defining “large” – actual numbers of students or numbers as a % of the total enrollment in courses in that category? Examples of differential procedures to be used for such courses?
- Standing rules at present do not indicate that the BCC may ask for re-review of courses that are lacking one or more areas; this should be added.
- Procedures for responding to category reviews should be formalized as part of the operating procedures. (Those for responding to Cat II proposals for new courses or course changes are spelled out already.) At present, procedure for category review responses is that the BCC Chair communicates directly with the offering faculty member and Chair/Head of the department (by email) conveying either approval to continue as is, or approval contingent upon XX change(s), which will be reviewed by the BCC at their next meeting following receipt of revised materials. Should be explicit that the course cannot continue to be offered as a Bacc Core course until full approval of the BCC is obtained?
- Items 1 – 3 above will require approval of the Faculty Senate, according to Standing Rule Part C, rule 1.
- We need to draft a standing rule change to institutionalize the current Co-Chair system for BCC (operating procedures state currently only that “The Chair is appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Board”)
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 28, 2007
Agenda

Note Taker: Denise Lach

Introductions - Deb Pence (if present) - new ad hoc member from Engineering
Ken Winograd - new ad hoc member from Education
Pat will provide update on status of Business member
Pat and Jay will provide update on status of student member

Minutes from 2/14 meeting - discuss, revise if necessary, approve

H 312 - no new information; Pat sent memo to Chair along with hard copy of related documents, but no response as of yet

Outcomes for various Bacc Core course categories - Jay will present current version to us for discussion; ACTION = ?

New Bacc Core:
Re: whether we are asked to "fix" or "reinvent" the Bacc Core, the following seem crucial: (1) From related minutes of Feb. Fac Senate meeting (Pat sent to BCC electronically), Quinn stated that we are "reviewing the existing core and not starting from scratch." (2) Minutes also state that, "...based on the discussion during the January Senate meeting, there did not seem to be widespread dissatisfaction with the core itself." It is important that we keep the scope of our charge in mind.

Pat reported on conversation with Paul Farber and on "historical" information related to the development of the current Bacc Core (dating from 1987 - 1988). For more recent history, see memo sent to OSU 2007 Committee by the 2001-2002 BCC (ideally before 2/28/07 meeting) at http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/reports/relevance2002.html

Members report on outcomes from their investigations (e.g., other institutions' GE requirements; possible models, etc.)

Develop a specific approach, assignments and timeline for completing review of the Bacc Core curriculum. Come with ideas about documents we should review as part of the process (OSU's 2001 Accreditation report? NSSE results?)

Schedule meetings for spring term:
If you are unable to attend our 2/28/07 meeting, please send Pat times during spring term that you CANNOT meet.
Faculty Senate

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 14, 2007
Agenda

Note taker: David Bernell

Introductions:

Susan Shaw, DPD Director (ex officio member)
Kim McAlexander (ad hoc member from HHS – will arrive at 10:15)
Deb Pence (ad hoc member from Mech. Engineering – might not be able to attend)

Old Business:
Review minutes from 1/31/07 meeting

Vicki Tolar-Burton will report on student comments on our two draft overall Bacc Core statements. ACTION ITEM: Approve one statement for submission to Schedule of classes

Pat submitted proposed addition to BCC standing rules re. BCC’s authority to remove Bacc Core status from courses that no longer meet criteria, to Mike Quinn and Vickie Nunnemaker for them to carry to Executive Council

Course Review:
BIOE 490 – change course (remove WIC status) -- Pat submitted request for information on start date and requested that syllabus be revised to remove mention of WIC status. Instructors replied that change will be effective as soon as the course change proposal is approved – all students who needed a WIC to graduate took CHE 414 in fall 2006, so their WIC is satisfied and no student programs will be disrupted by the change. Syllabus was revised as requested. Approval submitted.

New and Continuing Business:
Pat to report on correction submitted to Barometer story from 2-9-07

Proposed change in Academic Regulation 13c -- do we want to comment?

Continue work on outcomes for individual Bacc Core course categories and successive aggregations of these. TARGET ACTION ITEM: Try to get lists finished at this meeting and then forward to Susie Leslie in Academic Programs.

Pat and Jay report on conversation with Mike Quinn and Lynda Ciuffetti (Fac Senate President-elect) about (1) whether BCC alone can make the first pass at suggesting revisions to Bacc Core, (2) deferring STS review, and (3) clarification on full faculty senate involvement in Cat II’s that involve increases in credit numbers for existing Bacc Core Courses. Provide update on moratoria in place on various Cat II proposal categories.

H 312 – Pat to offer proposal for dealing with this course (CGI review from 05-06 academic year)

Craft strategy for developing alternative Bacc Core models (and visit the fundamental question of whether we are trying to fix or reinvent...)

Confirm time and date for next meeting
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 31, 2007
Agenda

Note Taker: Margie Haak

Old Business:

Minutes from previous meeting - discuss, revise (if necessary) and approve

Update on STS review progress - Requests have been sent to faculty. I've sent out revised table of assignments for reviews as they come in. Add to JB's list, ENSC 479; Environmental Case Studies. You can check on progress of review material submissions at https://secure.oregonstate.edu/facultysenate/committees/bccreview/2007/. I've asked Vickie Nunnemaker to get passwords to committee members ASAP.

Vickie and I drafted a form letter that will be sent to faculty when we learn that their STS course will not be offered in the current academic year. It indicates that the review must be completed and approved by the BCC before it can be offered again as an STS course. It also indicates that reviews will not occur during summer! Next year's committee will need to keep an eye on this.

Creative vs. critical thinking

I asked Larry Bulling and Alice Tucker to change language in the OSU Catalog and Schedule of classes that used the phrase "creative thinking" instead of "critical thinking" and that change has been made.

Course reviews:
H 312 - defer until next meeting

New Business:

Course Reviews - general:

BIOE 490 - Bioengineering Design - change - remove WIC status
ENVE/CHE/BIOE 414 - Process Engineering Laboratory - new WIC

New DPD Director -- Susan Shaw - will introduce herself to us at the next meeting 9:00 (she's Director of Women Studies too?)

1-25-07 call from Faculty Senate President, Mike Quinn:

1. We are asked to revise standing rules so that it is clear we have authority to remove Bacc Core status from courses that either do not meet criteria or for which faculty did not submit review materials. We are asked to draft this addition to the Standing Rules (part B, would be item 4) - see http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bccsr/ and then to send the draft revision to Quinn and Vickie Nunnemaker, who will carry it forward to the appropriate committee in the Faculty Senate

2. He indicated that Cat II proposals that involve the Bacc Core course credit increases won't stop at curriculum council and Bacc Core committee but will go to the senate floor for discussion and approval. There is concern about depts. making unilateral individual decisions that end up having global implications.
3. He is eager to see our drafts of potential alternative Bacc Core requirements, and indicated that a committee will soon be convened to look at this issue. Our drafts could provide a good starting place for that committee's discussions. It will include representation from the BCC, Curriculum Council, and others.

Draft paragraph on overall mission of the Bacc Core - edit Jay's draft. Please see also similar text (from which Jay drew) concerning the Bacc Core at http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/reports/relevance2002.html

Review and discuss Jay's draft of Bacc Core outcomes.

Draft possible alternative formulations of the Bacc Core.

Schedule next meeting.
November 9, 2006 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 9, 2006
Agenda

Introductions:
John Bailey, new BCC member from Forest Resources

Old business:
Minutes from Oct. 12, 2006 meeting – discuss and approve

Course Reviews:
ENG 362 – General review – change course. Comments received by email; after discussion of that protocol, Pat will submit web approval.
SPAN 333 – General Review – withdrew request for Bacc Core status

Miscellaneous:
Student members of BCC – update on procedures

New business:

Course Reviews:
GEO 330 (ID 2457) New course review (CGI and WIC) – Geography of Int’l Development and Globalization

Miscellaneous:
Update on status of STS category review requests and web site
Proposed BCC and Curriculum Council deadlines for course submissions
Discuss SOC proposal to increase from 3 to 4 credits: SOC 454 & 480 (CGI); SOC 481 (STS), and SOC 416 (WIC) and potential for related changes in other CLA courses
New WIC concept being considered in College of Business – presented by Vicki Tolar Burton and Jim Coakley (or other representative from Business)

Schedule next meeting
October 12, 2006 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University
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October 12, 2006
Agenda

Note taker: George Caldwell

OLD BUSINESS:

Review minutes from 9/26/06 meeting

Proposal reviews:

General reviews (left over from '05-06 academic year and summer):

- GEO 221
- HHS 242
- H 320
- ENG 426
- ENG 362
- ENG 425

Category reviews (Contemporary Global Issues; left over from '05-06 academic year):

- PS 345 (Politics of Developing Nations - ready for review)
- ANTH 487 (materials not submitted)
- COMM 446 (materials not submitted)
- HST 385 (syllabus revisions requested but not yet received)

NEW BUSINESS:

Planning for category review of Science, Technology and Society (STS) courses:

- Review communications to be sent to Chairs and faculty offering STS courses
- Review list of STS courses to be reviewed - assign committee members to courses?

Establish policy on new Perspectives courses - upper division?

General reviews:

To do during last ½ hr when Vicki Tolar-Burton is in attendance:

- ME 418 (ID 2331) - Sr. Design Project (WIC) - change in prerequisites
- AREC 461 (ID 2466) - Agricultural and Food Policy Issues (WIC/CGI) - change in prerequisites and revised syllabus

Determine future meeting dates
Faculty Senate
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Thursday April 14, 2005
9:00–11:00 am
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda
(Minutes taken by: Pat Muir)

Proposal Review:

New and Resubmitted:
ES 221
BIOE 490 - WIC
ANTH 345
NMC 101
NMC 260

DPD Review:
SOC 206
Econ 383
ES 212
ES 213

Reports:
WIC - Vicki Tolar Burton

DPD - Jun Xing
- Follow up on the potential for "D" course identification to indicate DPD (talk with Honor's college - Jun)
- Should we draft recommendation for DPD to be taken at OSU?
- Should/how does the BCC endorse/approve community college courses "approved" as DPD by the Advisory Board?

Chair's report:
OTM work group.
Review of Community College Bac Core Courses - issues and response.

Issue Bin
E-campus - follow-up: Should a change to electronic delivery trigger a review? Should we implement a periodic review of e-Bacc courses? Do we want to engage in some success or outcome measurement of e-Bacc classes? Should the BCC review the breadth of the e-Bacc classes to encourage sufficiently diverse offerings? Etc.

Next meeting: April 28, 2005
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Wednesday February 23, 2005
1:00–3:00 pm
109 Gilkey Hall

Agenda
(Notes taken by: David)

Proposal Review:
ANTH 345
SOC 312
PS 375

Proposals returned and/or pending:
ES 221
NMC 101, NMC 260

New Proposals to assign:
None at present.

Reports:
WIC

Presentation and Discussion:
DPD – history and review of DPD criteria – Jun

Chair’s report:
Oregon Transfer Module – update
DPD category review.

Issue Bin
E-campus – follow-up to January 26 discussion. General topics:
- Should a change to electronic delivery trigger a review?
- Should we implement a periodic review of e-Bacc courses?
- Do we want to engage in some success or outcome measurement of e-Bacc classes?
- Should the BCC review the breadth of the e-Bacc classes to encourage sufficiently diverse offerings?
- Etc.

OTM – Oregon Transfer Module; Bacc Core Review of Community College transfer courses (revisiting the topic; summary attached).

Topics Pending:
Discussion with DPD Board re: DPD and OTM – To be determined.

Next meeting:      March 9, 2005   Gilkey #109

TO:        THE BACC CORE COMMITTEE
FROM: Joanne Sorte

RE: Community College Bacc Core transfer courses

A review of the yearly reports of the Bacc Core Committee have revealed an ongoing concern on the part of the committee about how to manage community college transfer courses that fulfill the Bacc Core requirement. Please find below excerpts from these Bacc Core Committee reports to review as we reflect on our decision at the last meeting to NOT REVIEW community college courses, or otherwise weigh-in on transfer credits for the Bacc Core.

2002–2003: The committee reviewed four community college courses from LBCC and Mount Hood. Three were approved and one was rejected. The committee decided that community colleges submitting bac core proposals must meet the same criteria as OSU bac core courses.

2001–2002: The BCC and Academic Affairs still have not resolved how to treat transfer courses with regard to baccalaureate core status. Discussions continue. See last year’s annual report for a summary of some of the issues. Here is one unresolved issue: The BCC is currently reviewing on-campus courses for continued baccalaureate core status. There is no similar review in progress or mechanism to accomplish this for transfer courses. The bottom line is that we have a system that approves off-campus courses in perpetuity and periodically reviews on-campus courses. Something has to change.

2000–2001: Approval of Transfer Courses as Satisfying Baccalaureate Core Requirements: The BCC discussed this difficult issue over two meetings. The topic deserves further study by the BCC. The following issues emerged in the discussions:

It is important to recognize that the committee is not being asked to review baccalaureate core courses but approve transfer courses as equivalencies.

If the BCC does not approve courses, these courses will be approved elsewhere on an ad hoc basis or by the administration - how will that affect students? What happens when the committee disapproves a course? How is it tracked, if at all? What if the committee is overruled by the administration? At what point, and in what ways, should Faculty Senate be involved in these discussions?

Is there a tracking system and expiration dates associated with these courses? What guidelines for evaluating courses should be used given that the committee will most likely be working with inadequate information?

What are the long-term implications for this process in light of the streamlining of transfers through the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) program? What about advanced placement courses completed by incoming first-year students? How might we develop a fair and appropriate process without jeopardizing student access?
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 9, 2005 – 1:00–3:00 pm
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda
(Notes taken by: David)

Proposal Review:
HST 486

Proposals returned and/or pending:
ES 221
NMC 260, NMC 101

New Proposals to assign:
None at present.

Reports:
WIC
DPD

Chair's report:
Oregon Transfer Module – update
DPD category review.

General Discussion:
E–campus – follow–up to January 26 discussion. General topics: Should a change to electronic delivery trigger a review? Should we implement a periodic review of e–Bacc courses? Do we want to engage in some success or outcome measurement of e–Bacc classes? Should the BCC review the breadth of the e–Bacc classes to encourage sufficiently diverse offerings? Etc.

Bacc Core Review of Community College transfer courses (revisiting the topic; summary attached)

Invited Discussion:
2:00–2:45  Bacc Core classes offered through electronic delivery.

Mark Merickel, Paula Minear, Sunil Khanna will join us to discuss the processes involved in adapting Bacc Core classes for electronic delivery.

Questions forwarded to e–campus to guide our discussion: What do e–campus faculty do when a class is being proposed for electronic delivery, e.g. How is the class presentation screened related to the Bacc Core criteria? What Bacc Core criteria have faculty found to be difficult to address through the electronic method, and what services have e–campus provided to assist?

Topics Pending:
Discussion with DPD Board re: DPD and OTM – To be determined.

Next meeting:    February 23, 2005    Gilkey #109
TO:        THE BACC CORE COMMITTEE
FROM:    Joanne Sorte
RE:        Community College Bacc Core transfer courses

A review of the yearly reports of the Bacc Core Committee have revealed an ongoing concern on the part of
the committee about how to manage community college transfer courses that fulfill the Bacc Core
requirement. Please find below excerpts from these Bacc Core Committee reports to review as we reflect on
our decision at the last meeting to NOT REVIEW community college courses, or otherwise weigh-in on
transfer credits for the Bacc Core.

2002–2003:  The committee reviewed four community college courses from LBCC and Mount Hood. Three
were approved and one was rejected. The committee decided that community colleges submitting bac core
proposals must meet the same criteria as OSU bac core courses.

2001–2002:  The BCC and Academic Affairs still have not resolved how to treat transfer courses with regard
to baccalaureate core status. Discussions continue. See last year’s annual report for a summary of some of
the issues. Here is one unresolved issue: The BCC is currently reviewing on-campus courses for continued
baccalaureate core status. There is no similar review in progress or mechanism to accomplish this for transfer
courses. The bottom line is that we have a system that approves off-campus courses in perpetuity and
periodically reviews on-campus courses. Something has to change.

2000–2001:  Approval of Transfer Courses as Satisfying Baccalaureate Core Requirements: The BCC
discussed this difficult issue over two meetings. The topic deserves further study by the BCC. The following
issues emerged in the discussions:

It is important to recognize that the committee is not being asked to review baccalaureate core courses but
approve transfer courses as equivalencies.

If the BCC does not approve courses, these courses will be approved elsewhere on an ad hoc basis or by the
administration – how will that affect students? What happens when the committee disapproves a course? How
is it tracked, if at all? What if the committee is overruled by the administration? At what point, and in what
ways, should Faculty Senate be involved in these discussions?

Is there a tracking system and expiration dates associated with these courses? What guidelines for evaluating
courses should be used given that the committee will most likely be working with inadequate information?

What are the long–term implications for this process in light of the streamlining of transfers through the
Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) program? What about advanced placement courses completed by
incoming first–year students? How might we develop a fair and appropriate process without jeopardizing
student access?
Baccalaureate Core Committee Meeting
January 26, 2005
1:00-3:00 pm
109 Gilkey Hall

Agenda
(Notes taken by: Ruth)

Proposal Review:
WIC – ANTH 487
   ES 221

Proposals returned and/or pending:
NMC 260
NMC 101

New Proposals to assign:
None at present.

Reports:
WIC
DPD

Chair’s report:
Oregon Transfer Module – Faculty Senate meeting
Update on DPD category review.

General Discussion:
Bacc Core Review of Community College transfer courses (revisiting the topic)

Invited Discussion:
2:00–2:45   Bacc Core classes offered through electronic delivery.

Mark Merickel, Paula Minear, Sunil Khanna will join us to discuss the processes involved in adapting Bacc Core classes for electronic delivery.

Questions forwarded to e-campus to guide our discussion: What do e-campus faculty do when a class is being proposed for electronic delivery, e.g. How is the class presentation screened related to the Bacc Core criteria? What Bacc Core criteria have faculty found to be difficult to address through the electronic method, and what services have e-campus provided to assist?

Topics Pending:
Discussion with DPD Board.

Next meeting:   February 9, 2005   Gilkey #109
TO: THE BACC CORE COMMITTEE  
FROM: Joanne Sorte  
RE: Community College Bacc Core transfer courses

A review of the yearly reports of the Bacc Core Committee have revealed an ongoing concern on the part of the committee about how to manage community college transfer courses that fulfill the Bacc Core requirement. Please find below excerpts from these Bacc Core Committee reports to review as we reflect on our decision at the last meeting to NOT REVIEW community college courses, or otherwise weigh-in on transfer credits for the Bacc Core.

**2002–2003:** The committee reviewed four community college courses from LBCC and Mount Hood. Three were approved and one was rejected. The committee decided that community colleges submitting bac core proposals must meet the same criteria as OSU bac core courses.

**2001–2002:** The BCC and Academic Affairs still have not resolved how to treat transfer courses with regard to baccalaureate core status. Discussions continue. See last year's annual report for a summary of some of the issues. Here is one unresolved issue: The BCC is currently reviewing on-campus courses for continued baccalaureate core status. There is no similar review in progress or mechanism to accomplish this for transfer courses. The bottom line is that we have a system that approves off-campus courses in perpetuity and periodically reviews on-campus courses. Something has to change.

**2000–2001:** Approval of Transfer Courses as Satisfying Baccalaureate Core Requirements: The BCC discussed this difficult issue over two meetings. The topic deserves further study by the BCC. The following issues emerged in the discussions:

It is important to recognize that the committee is not being asked to review baccalaureate core courses but approve transfer courses as equivalencies.

If the BCC does not approve courses, these courses will be approved elsewhere on an ad hoc basis or by the administration - how will that affect students? What happens when the committee disapproves a course? How is it tracked, if at all? What if the committee is overruled by the administration? At what point, and in what ways, should Faculty Senate be involved in these discussions?

Is there a tracking system and expiration dates associated with these courses? What guidelines for evaluating courses should be used given that the committee will most likely be working with inadequate information?

What are the long-term implications for this process in light of the streamlining of transfers through the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) program? What about advanced placement courses completed by incoming first-year students? How might we develop a fair and appropriate process without jeopardizing student access?
Baccalaureate Core Committee Meeting
Wednesday January 12, 2005
1:00-3:00 pm
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda
(Notes taken by: Kevin Ahern)

Proposal Review:
WIC – FE/CE
ES 212
GEO 300

Proposals returned and/or pending:
NMC 260
NMC 101

New Proposals to assign:
WIC – ANTH 487
ES 221

Discussion by Request:

Chair’s report:
Update on electronic submission of yearly category review materials for DPD
Invitations to E-Campus (electronically offered Bacc Core Classes), DPD Board (maintaining the unique quality
of the DPD experience)

Discussion & Action Issues:
Pending: Electronic delivery of Bacc Core courses
Recommendations re: DPD as upper division

Next meeting: January 26, 2005 Gilkey #109

TO: THE BACC CORE COMMITTEE
FROM: Joanne Sorte
RE: Community College Bacc Core transfer courses

A review of the yearly reports of the Bacc Core Committee have revealed an ongoing concern on the part of
the committee about how to manage community college transfer courses that fulfill the Bacc Core
requirement. Please find below excerpts from these Bacc Core Committee reports to review as we reflect on
our decision at the last meeting to NOT REVIEW community college courses, or otherwise weigh-in on
transfer credits for the Bacc Core.

2002–2003: The committee reviewed four community college courses from LBCC and Mount Hood. Three
were approved and one was rejected. The committee decided that community colleges submitting bac core proposals must meet the same criteria as OSU bac core courses.

2001–2002: The BCC and Academic Affairs still have not resolved how to treat transfer courses with regard to baccalaureate core status. Discussions continue. See last year’s annual report for a summary of some of the issues. Here is one unresolved issue: The BCC is currently reviewing on-campus courses for continued baccalaureate core status. There is no similar review in progress or mechanism to accomplish this for transfer courses. The bottom line is that we have a system that approves off-campus courses in perpetuity and periodically reviews on-campus courses. Something has to change.

2000–2001: Approval of Transfer Courses as Satisfying Baccalaureate Core Requirements: The BCC discussed this difficult issue over two meetings. The topic deserves further study by the BCC. The following issues emerged in the discussions:

It is important to recognize that the committee is not being asked to review baccalaureate core courses but approve transfer courses as equivalencies.

If the BCC does not approve courses, these courses will be approved elsewhere on an ad hoc basis or by the administration - how will that affect students? What happens when the committee disapproves a course? How is it tracked, if at all? What if the committee is overruled by the administration? At what point, and in what ways, should Faculty Senate be involved in these discussions?

Is there a tracking system and expiration dates associated with these courses? What guidelines for evaluating courses should be used given that the committee will most likely be working with inadequate information?

What are the long-term implications for this process in light of the streamlining of transfers through the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) program? What about advanced placement courses completed by incoming first-year students? How might we develop a fair and appropriate process without jeopardizing student access?
Baccalaureate Core Committee Meeting
Tuesday - December 7, 2004
9:30 - 11:30 a.m.
Room #208 Gilkey
Agenda

(Notes taken by: Kevin Ahern)

Proposal Review:
Physics WIC
GEO 307

Proposals returned and/or pending:
ANTH 110
NMC 260
NMC 101

New Proposals to assign:
WIC - FE/CE
ES 212

Discussion by Request:
Mina McDaniel and Michele Sandlin - California Community College transfer

Chair's report:
Revised syllabus expectations & general Bac Core Committee operating procedures Update on electronic submission of yearly category review materials for DPD
Identification of Winter term meeting day/time

Discussion & Action Issues:
1. What is the BCC responsibility regarding review of Community College courses proposed for Bac Core transfer?
2. Carry-over discussion topic from 2003-2004: Would the committee care to continue the discussion about electronically delivered Bac Core courses? Eg: The BCC came together around the opinion last year that all Bac Core classes that change from in-class to electronic delivery systems should be reviewed by the committee as "change" proposals. Ecampus views the delivery change as falling under the purview of faculty classroom responsibility, and not that of the BCC.

Next meeting: To be determined (December 13 ~ 2:00-4:00; Gilkey #208)
Baccalaureate Core Committee Meeting
MONDAY- November 15, 2004
2:00 - 4:00 a.m.
Room #208 Gilkey

Agenda
(Notes taken by: Ruth Vondracek)

Christian Matheis for Jun Xing ~ Brief presentation and discussion of DPD
Overview of the goals of the DPD category and the history of DPD at OSU
Sample Learning Outcomes for DPD

Review and respond: Suggestions for Developing Student learning Outcomes for DPD Courses

Proposal Review:
Physics WIC
GEO 307
FST 260
SOC 454

Proposals returned and/or pending:
HSTS 418
BB332
NMC 260
NMC 101

Chair's report:
Common Core
Update on electronic submission of yearly category review materials

Discussion & Action: Bac Core Learning Objectives - setting a goal for the BCC for 2004-2005

Next meeting: TUESDAY, December 7  Gilkey #208
Faculty Senate

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
October 18, 2004 - 2:00 - 4:00 pm
Room #109 Gilkey

(Notes taken by: David McMurry)

Introduction of new members

Review of the Baccalaureate Core Committee Standing Rules

Identify gaps in committee membership; draft plan to fill positions as needed

Review/refresh protocol related to proposal review

Proposal Review:
BB 332
HSTS 418
GEO 309
GEO 307

Next meeting: November 2, 9:30 - 11:30 am Gilkey #208
Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 24, 2004
Agenda

Minute Taker: Patti Watkins

1. Discuss other assigned non-category review proposals
   1. GEO 103
   2. Math 323

2. Category Reviews
   1. Anth110
   2. AREC 205
   3. H101 & H
   4. H102 & 102 H
   5. H103 & 103 H

3. Assign newly received proposals
Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 10, 2004
Agenda

Minute Taker: Joanne Sorte

1. Category Reviews
   1. H 150
   2. H 210
   3. HDFS 201
   4. HDFS 240
   5. PS 201
   6. PS 205

2. Discuss other assigned non-category review proposals
   1. ES 352
   2. NMC 421

3. Assign newly received proposals
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 26, 2004
Agenda

Minute Taker: David McMurray

1. Category Reviews
   1. SOC 204
   2. SOC 205
   3. ECON 201
   4. ECON 202

2. E-Campus Proposal
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 12, 2004
Agenda

Minute Taker: Milo Koretsky

1. Schedule order for category reviews
2. Review of Proposals
   1. HST 350
   2. PHL 251
3. Category Reviews
   1. SOC 204
   2. SOC 205
   3. ECON 201
   4. ECON 202
4. Chair Recommendations, Membership and Annual Reports
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 23, 2004
Agenda

Minute Taker: Ed Jensen

1. Discuss student petition memo

2. Review of Proposals
   - CE 454
   - ES 352
   - HDFS 461
   - WSE 470

3. WIC Credit requirements for double majors
February 9, 2004 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate » Committees/Councils » Baccalaureate Core Committee » Agendas » February 9, 2004

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 9, 2004
Agenda

Minute Taker: Patty Watkins

1. Update on Discussion with Curriculum Council Co-Chairs

2. Update on New Committee Members

3. Review of ES 352

4. Assignment of Proposals
Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Pattie Watkins)

1. Approve minutes from last meeting

2. Update on Category Review Packet

3. Update on PS 370

4. Review PS 425 - Gender and the Law
Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Pattie Watkins)

1. Academic Reg. #AR28a David McMurray

2. Category Review Packet

3. PS 370

4. PS 425
Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 8, 2003
Agenda

1. Review TA 444/544

2. Discuss materials to be sent to faculty for review of the Social Processes and Institutions category courses

3. Discuss framework for meetings with those faculty

4. Follow-up on meeting with e-Campus
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 24, 2003
Agenda

Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Patti Watkins)

1. Identify Minute taker

2. Agenda Check - Additions or Deletions

3. Discussion with E-Campus Representatives (Paula Minear, Rick Eckles) 30 minutes

4. Selection of category for review
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 10, 2003

Agenda

Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Patti Watkins)

1. Agenda Check

2. Extended Campus Discussion - 30 min.
   Paula Minear, Jackson Kennedy, Rick Eckles

3. Completion Cultural Diversity Review
   HST 350, 351

4. Category Review Discussion
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 27, 2003
Agenda

Note Room Change: Kerr 110

Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Patti Watkins)

1. Agenda Check

2. RUS 40/441/442 Update

3. Completion Cultural Diversity Review
   ENG 360
   HST 350, 351
   HST 381, 382

4. Discussion - Outcomes Criteria
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 13, 2003
Agenda

Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Patti Watkins)

1. Agenda Check

2. Overview for 2003-04 Activities & Introductions

3. Summer Term 2003

4. BCC courses changed to online delivery.

5. RUS 440/441/442

6. Updates on:
   - ANTH 370
   - ENG 125, 360
   - HSTS 422
   - SOC 312
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 2, 2003
Agenda

1. Vicki and Kate Field will present thesis WIC course for Bioresources
2. Finish all cultural diversity review
3. New courses ENG
4. New DPD course
5. Never did hear back from computer people but will keep working on it
6. Suggestions for next year
March 17, 2003 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 17, 2003
Agenda

0. Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, Joe Kerkvliet, Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden)

1. Minutes of last meeting - corrected version attached

2. Ed's critical thinking insert - I have inserted a suggestion of Vicki (italicized)
   Fostering Critical Thinking in BAC Classes
   Ed Jensen, College of Forestry, 2/11/03
   
   In many proposals, it is not clear what constitutes critical thinking within the discipline (or class) and specifically how the teacher will develop students' critical thinking skills. The proposal should make clear what constitutes "critical thinking" within this particular discipline (or class). Examples include but are not limited to: development and defense of logical arguments; a specific problem solving technique such as the scientific method; examination of the politics of knowledge and understanding how the individual fits within the larger context of society. The committee won't agree or disagree with the definition given, but wants to see that it's been carefully considered.
   The proposal should make clear how the class would develop critical thinking skills in students. For example, what activities will be used to develop those skills in students and to demonstrate their success in achieving them? Active skill development is encouraged over passive approaches.

3. AREC 253 - I have been promised something by Monday morning - Ruth (it may not be available until the meeting)

4. FW 350 - I have been promised something by Monday morning - Joe (it may not be available until the meeting)

5. COM 432 - Joe

6. GS 111 - Ann Marie
March 10, 2003 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

0. Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, Joe Kerkvliet, Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden)

1. Minutes of last meeting - you should have received over a week ago

2. WIC matters?

3. Ed's critical thinking insert -
   Fostering Critical Thinking in BAC Classes

   Ed Jensen, College of Forestry, 2/11/03

   **Situation:**
   - Nearly all BAC requirements suggest that courses should "emphasize critical thinking."
   - Most proposals that we (BCC) review are weak in this area, and many are returned for additional information. It's not apparent that the proposers are giving much thought to what constitutes critical thinking within their disciplines (or class) and how they will develop critical thinking skills within their students-or, perhaps, it's simply a matter of incomplete instructions and guidelines.

   **Potential Solution:**
   - Improve the instructions/guidelines given to the proposers so they will have a better idea of what's expected.

   For example: We might include under the guideline "emphasize critical thinking" something like the following:
   - The proposal should make clear what constitutes "critical thinking" within this particular discipline (or class). Examples include but are not limited to: development and defense of logical arguments; a specific problem solving technique such as the scientific method; understanding how the individual fits within the larger context of society. The committee won't agree or disagree with the definition given, but wants to see that it's been carefully considered.
   - The proposal should make clear how the class will develop critical thinking skills in students. For example, what activities will be used to develop those skills in students and to demonstrate their success in achieving them? Active skill development is encouraged over passive approaches.
   - The proposal should indicate how critical thinking skills will be factored into the assessment or grading of students.
   - The proposal should also indicate how the structure of the class and chosen teaching methods foster critical thinking.

4. AREC 253 - Ruth - hopefully

5. ENG 240 - Ed and Janet

6. FW 350 - still on hold

7. WSE 470 X - Joanne
8. SOC 481 - Janet

9. COM 432 - Joe

10. assign GS 111

11. Cultural diversity review
   ANTH 210, 311, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319
   ART 207
   CHN 331, 332, 333
   ENG 210, 211, 212, 213, 360
   ES 101, 211, 231, 241, 242, 243
   GEO 105, 325, 327, 328
   HST 320, **350 & 351 (FALL)**, **381 & 382 (FALL)**, 387, 388, 391, 392, 485
   JPN 331, 332, 333
   MUS 108
   NFM 216
   PHL 160, 311, 312, 313, 315, 371
   RUS 231, 232, 233

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admin/db/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review: (If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link you may get better information, and then again)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/bcc.min.htm

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 24, 2003
Agenda

0. Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, Joe Kerkvliet, Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden)

1. Minutes of last meeting

2. WIC matters?

3. AREC 253 - Ruth - hopefully

4. ENG 240

5. FW 350 - will be delayed

6. WSE 470 X

7. Cultural diversity review
   ANTH 210, 311, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319
   ART 207
   CHN 331, 332, 333
   ENG 210, 211, 212, 213, 360
   ES 101, 211, 231, 241, 242, 243
   GEO 105, 325, 327, 328
   HST 320, 350 & 351 (FALL), 381 & 382 (FALL), 387, 388, 391, 392, 485
   JPN 331, 332, 333
   MUS 108
   NFM 216
   PHL 160, 311, 312, 313, 315, 371
   RUS 231, 232, 233

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admin/db/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review: (If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link you may get better information, and then again ♦)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/bcc/min.htm
Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 10, 2003
Agenda

0. Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, Joe Kerkvliet, Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden)
   1. Minutes of last meeting

2. WIC matters - I think HORT 358 belongs up here

3. AREC 253 - Ruth

4. HORT 358 - Joanne:

5. ENG 240

6. FW 350

7. Cultural diversity review
Baccalaureate Core Committee

September 30, 2002

Agenda

0. Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, Joe Kerkvliet, Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden)
1. Introductions of committee and associates
2. How the committee works
3. WIC courses!
4. Work with articulation
5. Courses needing approval HDFS 461, EXSS 381, GEO 201, GEO 202
6. Tasks for the coming year

proposals for bac core
http://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/Search.aspx

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review: (If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link (you may get better information, and then again ...)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm

Review by bac core committee for continued baccalaureate core status of Western Culture - 1999-2000, WIC - 2000-2001, and Perspectives Science courses - 2001-2002. When the BCC started the review of baccalaureate core courses, the BCC was told by AA (Christina Richards, as I recall) that the data on the website http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm was the officially approved and current list of the status of all baccalaureate core courses. Thus, the committee used the information on that web page to determine which WC courses needed to be reviewed (namely, those approved more than 5 years before the review started). We did the same for WIC and Perspectives Science courses.
To: BCC and CIPT4  
From: John Lee, Chair of the BCC  
Subject: Meeting Monday, May 13, 2002

On Monday May 13, 2002 (details below), the Baccalaureate Core Committee has invited members of the CIPT 4 (Shared Undergraduate Experience) who are able to attend to meet with us during our regular meeting time (they will join us at 2:30). We hope to discuss common interests, concerns, and ways to cooperate and avoid duplication of effort in matters concerning review of the undergraduate curriculum as part of the on-going OSU 2007 process. Please come and join us. We can take up to an hour for discussion, more if needed, but the BCC will need about 15 minutes to deal with pending issues. Please come to any part of the discussion you can make. Thank you and see you Monday.

0. Agree on a Minute Taker (Peters, VanDerZanden, Burke, Janet Lee, John Lee, Jensen, Vranas, Peebler, Avery) - choose one from front of list

1. Action on Minutes of 4-29-02 and 4-15-02

2. Discussion with the Curricular Issues Planning Team 4 (AKA, Shared Undergraduate Experience.)

3. Science/lab course reviews: Discuss any responses to our requests for clarification regarding: John Lee (CH 122-123), Jensen (BI 211-213, PH 201-202-203)

4. New courses under review: Peters (LBCC ENG 220 and 240). (LBCC is expecting for some feedback from us.)

5. (WIC Courses about 2:05) (Lisa Ede WIC Director) Nothing on agenda

6. New Business and topics of your choice

Useful Links:

New Academic Programs site (developed by COB) for viewing curricular proposals:  
http://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/

Approved baccalaureate core courses:  
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/adminb/bcc/bccwic.htm

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:  
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Criteria for the baccalaureate core categories (buried in Curricular Handbook):  
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/022_BCSUMM.htm

Minutes of the BCC:  
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):  
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/
Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
April 15, 2002 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 15, 2002
Agenda

0. Agree on a Minute Taker (Peebler, Peters, Avery, VanDerZanden, Burke, Janet Lee, John Lee, Jensen, Vranas) - choose one from bold

1. Action on Minutes of 4-1-02

2. (WIC Courses about 2:05) (Lisa Ede WIC Director) Russ 440-41-42 in the pipeline. Ready?

3. New courses under review: Peters (LBCC ENG 240)

4. Science/lab course reviews: Janet Lee (CH 122-123), Burke (BOT 101), Peters (BI 101-103), Jensen (BI 211-213, PH 201-202-203), Peebler (PH 104). Lead reviewers please bring any specific suggestions you have regarding requesting additional information, if appropriate.

5. 45-60 minute discussion of our review of the OSU baccalaureate core and how to effectively report to the Faculty Senate and broader OSU community. Please review all the historical material distributed by Vickie Nunnemaker and be ready to decide on what issues we want to address and in what format.

6. How is new COB-AA online curriculum proposal website working?

7. New Business and topics of your choice

Useful Links:

New Academic Programs site (developed by COB) for viewing curricular proposals:
http://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Criteria for the baccalaureate core categories (buried in Curricular Handbook):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/022_BCSUMM.htm

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/index.html

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 1, 2002
Agenda

0. Agree on a Minute Taker (Peebler, Vranas, Peters, Avery, VanDerZanden, Burke, Janet Lee, John Lee, Jensen)

1. Action on Minutes of March 4, 2002

2. (WIC Courses about 2:05) (Lisa Ede WIC Director) Nothing ready.


4. Science/lab course reviews: Janet Lee (CH 122-123), John Lee (CH 221-223, PH 211, 212, 213), VanDerZanden (CH 201-202), Avery (FOR 240, GEO 202), Burke (BOT 101, CH 224H-226H, PH 205, PH 206, PH 207), Peters (BI 101-103), Jensen (BI 211-213), Peebler (PH 104), Vranas (PH 106). Lead reviewers please bring any specific suggestions you have requesting additional information, if appropriate.

5. How is new COB-AA online curriculum proposal website working?

6. Discussion about how to proceed with review of the baccalaureate core at OSU

7. New Business and topics of your choice

Useful Links:

New Academic Programs site (developed by COB) for viewing curricular proposals: http://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/

Approved baccalaureate core courses: http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links: http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/


Minutes of the BCC: http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/index.html

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC): http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit: http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
March 4, 2002 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 4, 2002
Agenda

0. Agree on a Minute Taker (Jensen, Peebler, West, Peters, Avery, VanDerZanden, Burke, Janet Lee, John Lee)

1. Action on Minutes of 2-18-02

2. (WIC Courses about 2:05) (Lisa Ede WIC Director) Nothing ready.

3. New courses under review: HORT 311 (John Lee), MB 330 (Burke and committee of the whole), RUS 340-41-42 (Janet Lee)

4. First pass through science/lab course review process, as reviewers are ready: Janet Lee (MB 230, CH 122-123), John Lee (CH 221-223), VanDerZanden (CH 201-202), Avery (FOR 240, GEO 202), Burke (BOT 101, CH 224H-226H), Peters (BI 101-103), Jensen (BI 211-213). Please bring initial impressions (at least)

5. How is new COB-AA online curriculum proposal website working?

6. New Business and topics of your choice

Useful Links:

New Academic Programs site (developed by COB) for viewing curricular proposals: http://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/

Approved baccalaureate core courses: http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admin/db/bcc/bccwic.htm

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links: http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/


Minutes of the BCC: http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/index.html

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC): http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit: http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 18, 2002
Agenda

0. Agree on a Minute Taker (Jensen, Peebler, West, John Lee, Peters, Avery, VanDerZanden, Burke, Janet Lee)

1. Action on Minutes of 2-4-02

2. (WIC Courses about 2:05) Continuation of Review of WIC courses (Lisa Ede WIC Director, Peters (COMM 422) and new WIC BI 315 (Lee))

3. New courses under review: Peeblers (GEO 305 new STS), West (NFM 232 new skills fitness). The full committee should look over the NFM 232 submission at the on-line AA site before the meeting because it is the first new fitness skills course since the original HHP 231 (circa 1989).

4. First pass through science/lab course review process, as reviewers are ready: Janet Lee (MB 230), VanDerZanden (HSTS/FW 470), Avery (FOR 240), Burke (BOT 101), Peters (BI 101, 102, 103), Jensen (BI 211, 212, 213). Please bring initial impressions (at least). Chemistry review material will be parceled out.

5. How is new COB-AA online curriculum proposal website working?

6. New Business and topics of your choice

Useful links:

New Academic Programs site (developed by COB) for viewing curricular proposals:
http://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/
instead of
http://www.cob.orst.edu/Curriculum/

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review: (If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link (you may get better information, and then again...)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/bcc.min.htm

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm
For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
February 4, 2002 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 4, 2002
Agenda

0. Agree on a Minute Taker (Janet Lee, Jensen, Peebler, West, John Lee, Peters, Avery, VanDerZanden, Burke) - choose one from bold
1. Introduction and welcome of new member, Darlene West
2. Action on Minutes of 1-7-02
3. (about 2:05) Continuation of Review of WIC courses (Lisa Ede WIC Director, Peters (COMM 422), VanDerZanden (ECE 441-443), Jensen (NFM 419)
4. (about 2:30) Vreneli Farber will visit to discuss her interest in submitting Russian literature courses as upper division courses under the Literature and Arts Perspectives category. She may also discuss proposing them as WIC courses.
5. Getting baccore courses online from the new COB-AA online curriculum proposal website. I'm trying to see how we plug in. Baccore requests are coming online.
6. LBCC courses: ENG 220 and PH 104 articulation review or update
7. Update on Review of Science courses (they are coming in!)
8. HHP 231 issues and information
9. New Business and topics of your choice

Useful Links:

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review: (If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link (you may get better information, and then again...)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/bcc.min.htm

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 26, 2001
Agenda

1. Agree on a Minute Taker (Burke, Janet Lee, Jensen, VanDerZanden, John Lee, Peters, Avery) - choose one of first four
2. Action on Minutes of 11-12-01
3. Continuation of Review of WIC courses (Avery (PHL 407, Burke (ENG 445), Ede, Janet Lee (COMM 459, ANTH 370), Peters (COMM 422, BB311/317), John Lee (FE 450/451), Jensen (ME 451, PSY 430), VanDerZanden (ECE 441-443))
4. BI 388 (review of situation)
5. Update about support from AA (Madge Patterson)
6. Review draft documents for review of Perspectives Science courses (bring your copy)

Useful Links:

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admin/db/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review: (If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link (you may get better information, and then again...)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/bcc.min.htm

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
1. Agree on a Minute Taker
2. Action on Minutes of 10-29-01
3. Review of WIC courses (Avery, Burke, Ede, Janet Lee, Peters, John Lee, Jensen, VanDerZanden)
5. Continuation of Item 2 (as needed)
6. Status of WIC Review
7. BI 388 (review of situation)
8. Update about support from AA (Madge Patterson)
9. Draft documents for review of lab science courses (if ready)
10. Your Choice

Useful Links:

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review: (If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link (you may get better information, and then again ...)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/bcc.min.htm

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 29, 2001
Agenda

0. Agree on a Minute Taker
1. Introduction of new BCC member Elizabeth Thompson
2. Action on Minutes of 10-15-01
3. Visit by Susan Shaw regarding DPD issues (1:30 to (about) 2:00)
4. Review of WIC courses (Avery, Burke, Ede, Janet Lee, Peters, John Lee)
5. Status of WIC Review
6. Further reports by lead reviewers (if any)
7. Further discussion of charges/concerns from Nancy Rosenberger
8. Discussion of baccalaureate core and Cascades Campus (Henry Sayre e-mail)
9. Input about new baccalaureate core software.

Useful Links:
Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm
To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review:
(If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link
(you may get better information, and then again...)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
October 1, 2001 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 1, 2001
Agenda

0. Agree on a Minute Taker (Ginger Craig is leaving)

1. Introduction of Committee Members (visit by Bob Burton, APAA)

2. Overview of Activities for this academic year
   a. Charge from Nancy Rosenberger
   b. Pending items from BCC AY 00-01 annual report

3. Review of courses for baccalaureate core status: suggestion continue lead review system with committee discussion and follow-up as needed

4. Baccalaureate core category to review this academic year: suggestion Physical/Biological Sciences with lab under Perspectives

5. Status of WIC Review
   a. Approved over the summer by Vicki Tolar Burton and John W. Lee
      i. HST 407 Seminar
      ii. BA 469 Strategic Management
      iii. Two or three others
   b. Bill Keith's e-mail regarding review of Comm 459
   c. Conversation with Physics

Useful Links:

Approved baccalaureate core courses:
http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm

To check on the status of a particular baccalaureate core course, especially one under review:
(If you know the baccalaureate core tracking number click on the Advanced Search link
you may get better information, and then again...)
http://www.orst.edu/admin/uap/curriculum_database/index.cfm?type=BCC

Academic Affairs (Curricular Handbook) has several baccalaureate core links:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/

Minutes of the BCC:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/

Faculty Senate Home Page (several links relevant to BCC):
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/senate/index.htm

For the WIC Review:
http://www.osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Example of a well-prepared request to the BCC for approval for baccalaureate core credit:
http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 5, 2001
Agenda

Review and approve/modify minutes from BCC meeting 5/29/01

1. Review of HHP 231, 241-248, and 251 for the BCC Fitness category. Lead reviewer Christine Snow

2. Review of IE 366 for WIC. (This course has been recommended for approval to the BCC by the WIC director.) Lead reviewer John Lee

3. Prerequisite change to existing BCC course. John Lee will find this request and we can discuss it. It was held pending the resolution of what dates would appear on the Web regarding BCC review of courses. We will have to track minor changes such as this one by another means.

4. Your choice (including a motion to adjourn for the year!)
May 29, 2001 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Review and approve/modify minutes from BCC meeting 5/15/01

Choose a minute taker (if Ginger cannot attend)

1. Act on minutes of 5/15/01

2. Update: Dates of approval of BCC courses will continue to be the latest date when an action was taken, regardless of it's import.

3. Madge Patterson request for input

4. Overlooked WIC courses (related to #2)

5. Review of ANTH / LING 208 and 209 (I can't find my copies but I think the numbers are close). Lead reviewer Janet Lee

6. Recommend (Lee and Tolar Burton) approval of WIC courses BI 371 and SPAN 438

7. WIC Denial / Revision letters will be mailed tomorrow

8. Review of remaining WIC courses (about 5)

9. Next meeting next week? Fitness courses
May 15, 2001 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 15, 2001
Agenda

1. Review and discuss the documents printed below. Hard copies will be available at the meeting. VTB and I will bring completed checklists for several courses for your approval/discussion.

2. Special Cases: Reaffirm how we will treat the senior thesis courses regarding the two-year grace period (a year longer than all other cases).

3. Agree/Reconfirm how we will deal with Seminar courses or multisection

4. Determine which remaining WIC courses will be approved and which denied. (In several cases denial will mean that departments who wish to retain the WIC status of the course beyond Summer Term 2002 must send us a short memo clarifying our concerns.)

5. Discuss next meeting and what remains to be done. Four new proposals have arrived. (FYI, Vickie Nunnemaker has posted our meeting times and rooms for the next three meetings on the BCC part of the Faculty Senate website.)

Information:

I will attempt to deliver to you by hand on Monday the latest version of our WIC spreadsheet. There have been several changes over the past two weeks and I think it will speed our work on Tuesday afternoon if each lead reviewer looks over the status of his/her courses. If there is disagreement with the WIC Director or a blank entry concerning your recommendation, it means I couldn't decide your position on the course. Please come with a position.

Draft Letter of Denial:

May 15, 2001

To: Depthead
   Dept
   Address

From: John W. Lee, Chair of Baccalaureate Core Committee
      and Baccalaureate Core Committee

Subject: BCC Review of WIC Course:
   Coursenum
   Title

The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) has completed its review of the materials you submitted. The
materials included your request that the WIC designation be continued for the course listed above.  

Unfortunately, I must inform you that the BCC has denied continuation of the WIC designation for the course in question beyond Summer Term 2002 because it did not meet all the WIC criteria. The WIC criteria may be found at http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

Please find attached a checklist explaining the basis for denial of WIC status for the course in question. It is possible that the missing elements indicated on the checklist are in fact in the course but that the materials submitted did not convey that information to the BCC. Such issues can be addressed in the follow-up review process discussed below. That process also provides an opportunity to add missing elements to the course and thereby retain its WIC designation beyond Summer 2002.

Follow-Up Review Procedure

The opportunity for follow-up review is open only until November 1, 2001.

The BCC invites you to submit additional materials specifically addressing the WIC criteria that the BCC believes are missing (see the checklist) from your course. If you believe your course does in fact meet the WIC criteria and/or you wish to revise the course so that it will meet the criteria, please respond to us as follows:

1. Send a memo that documents that the existing course meets the criteria by specifically addressing the points checked or highlighted on the checklist;

2. Or provide appropriate new supporting materials, including a revised course syllabus and writing assignment handouts, that explain how WIC elements previously missing from the course will be included in the revision.

In cases where word count or type of writing (ungraded, minimally graded, revised, and polished) is an issue please complete and return the WIC Word Count And Writing Form (attached) with your follow-up materials.

The BCC will endeavor to act on a request for a follow-up review by the end of Fall Term 2001. (A favorable review at that time should enable your course to maintain its WIC designation in the OSU General Catalog without interruption.)

A request for review for WIC designation received after the November 1, 2001 deadline will be treated like a normal request to the BCC for review and will require a full set of supporting documents that address all the WIC criteria.

Support available to you

If you need assistance or more information on what needs to be done, you are invited to consult with the WIC Director, Vicki Tolar Burton, during Spring Term 2001. Next fall, when Vicki is on sabbatical, you can consult with Lisa Ede, who will be acting WIC Director. You might also find helpful information on the WIC web site http://wic.orst.edu.

During Dead Week the WIC Director will offer two workshop sessions designed to help departments understand the reasons for denial of continued WIC status and to suggest ideas for revisions that will lead to continuation in WIC status.

Workshops are scheduled for Wednesday June 6 from 1 to 2:30 PM and for Thursday June 7 from 1 to 2:30 PM in Waldo 125.

The spring issue of the WIC newsletter Teaching With Writing, which is sent to all OSU teaching faculty, will have a college-by-college overview of how writing is being taught in WIC classes that were reviewed by the BCC. You may want to consult this overview for ideas about how WIC criteria are being met in other courses in your college and in other colleges.

If you any questions about the follow-up review procedure, please contact John Lee at 737-2003 or at john.lee@orst.edu.
Send Follow-up Review Materials to:

Ginger Craig  
Undergraduate Academic Programs  
338 Snell Hall - Oregon State University

Denial Check List:

Checklist Explaining Basis for Denial of WIC Status

Course __________________________

☐ Your department did not respond to this review or send material as requested.

☐ Class size is inappropriate for a writing intensive course. Recommended size is twenty; acceptable is up to thirty.

☐ Materials submitted do not include current syllabus (or syllabi if taught by multiple teachers) and handouts given to students explaining in detail what major writing assignments involve.

☐ This appears to be a course taught by multiple instructors. If the course is taught by several different teachers, submit each teacher’s syllabus for review. Please check to make sure that each syllabus fully indicates how students achieve all of the WIC goals, including word count and revision after feedback.

☐ This is a course taught by multiple instructors. You have submitted each teacher’s syllabus. As indicated, one or more meet WIC criteria and others do not.

☐ Materials do not clearly indicate that each student will individually complete at least 2000 words of formal writing that has been revised after the student receives feedback. Feedback on drafts can come either from the teacher or from peer review by other students. Revision is a required element of a WIC course, not an option. Collaborative documents do not count in the 2000 words of individual, polished writing.

☐ Materials do not clearly indicate that informal ungraded or minimally graded writing is used as a mode of learning course content.

☐ Materials do not clearly indicate that at least one paper asks students to integrate information from more than one source (and document appropriately for the discipline).

☐ Materials do not clearly indicate how students will complete a total of 5,000 words of writing (including drafts, in-class writing, informal papers, and polished papers).

☐ Materials do not clearly indicate that papers form at least 30% of the overall grade, with at least 25% of the overall course grade based on evaluation of individually written papers.

☐ This does not appear to be an actual course but rather a thesis written on an individual basis, separate from a course. "A writing intensive course should be a course, or sequence of courses, in the discipline and integral to the degree program. The course should have a structured syllabus with disciplinary content and an enrollment of students who interact with each other and with their professor on a regular term schedule" (WIC Guidelines, Criterion 3).

☐ This course does not appear to meet the requirement that a WIC course must total three or more credit hours.

WIC WORD COUNT AND WRITING FORM

FOR COURSE: __________________________

The Baccalaureate Core Committee needs additional information in support of your request to continue WIC
designation for the course listed above. Please answer the following questions, check the appropriate boxes, and complete the following tables. Add clarifying comments as needed. Thank you for your cooperation.

In your course, formally graded written work is normally typed:
Double spaced (approximately 250 words per page)
Single spaced (approximately 500 words per page)

The WIC guidelines require at least 5000 words (including drafts, in-class writing, informal papers, and polished papers); 2000 words of this total should be polished papers, which students have revised after receiving feedback and criticism.

How Much Formal Graded Writing Does Each Student Do? (Include only individually written and graded work.) (Example: A term paper may have 2,500 draft words that lead to 2,500 revised words for 5,000 total word of formal graded writing.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Writing Assignment</th>
<th>Draft Words</th>
<th>Revised Words</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informal Writing

(Informal writing activities can be varied and either graded or ungraded, but they are not drafts or revisions of formal graded writing assignments. Example: A student keeps a journal that requires one entry per week of approximately 150 words for each of 10 weeks. The tabular entry would be: Journal/one per week/150/1500.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Informal Writing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Approximate Word Count</th>
<th>Total WordsPer Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 1, 2001 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 1, 2001
Agenda

1. Welcome Ginger Craig, who will take minutes for the BCC and help with liaison to the APAA.

2. Approve Minutes from 4/17/01.

3. Discuss and take final action on policy matters (items 5-8 of the minutes of 4/17/01) discussed and provisionally approved at our 4/17/01 meeting.

4. Discuss the two pending proposals:

   PS 204 for Social Process and Institutions -- lead reviewer Snow
   HSTS 422 for Science, Technology, and Society -- lead reviewer J. W. Lee

5. Discuss a problem regarding minor changes in BCC courses and the effect on timely review, now that we are reviewing baccore courses. Cases in point are Chem 130 and HDFS 201. In both cases there was a change in designator and not much more. My thought is that if we make a minor change in an existing BCC course the date of the last review on the baccalaureate core web page should not change. If you agree, we need to know if it is feasible to make this happen.
April 17, 2001 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

1. Assign minute taker

2. Approve/amend minutes of BCC meeting 4/5/01

3. Discuss/approve WIC submissions (about 20-25) that have been recommended for approval by both the WIC Director and the lead BCC reviewer in previously distributed documents.

4. Discuss how to proceed on approximately 6 WIC courses that seem to be strong candidates for deWICing.

5. Discuss how to proceed on WIC courses that need further clarifying documentation before the BCC can act.

6. (Should come before #4 and #5) Resolve the issues raised at our April 5 meeting:
   
   (a) Can a WIC course be recertified if it has no ungraded writing? (Ungraded writing does not include the revision of a major paper.)

   (b) Can a sequence of short papers meet the WIC requirement that students receive feedback on a draft (usually of a major paper) and have an opportunity to revise it? (At least three proposals we have received use this alternative method and say it is more effective than revising one major paper. Vicki Tolar Burton reports that there is some national discussion in support of this alternative approach.)

   (c) Can a senior thesis or independent writing project be recertified as a WIC? (The preliminary agreement of the BCC seems to be that such writing experiences may be very valuable but they are not WIC classes. It was noted that preceding a senior thesis with a WIC should result in a better senior thesis experience. We have two or three such proposals pending.)

General Suggestion: Because we haven’t been able to find a meeting time when all BCC members can meet, we should allow absent members to vote via email on any motions made at our 4/17/01.

General Comment: Regarding our next meeting I will bring Office Hours Cards for BCC members to fill out. I will send the cards to those not present. We will see if there is any hour during the week when we can meet. If that fails, I suggest we hold meetings at different hours on alternative weeks so as to maximize overall in-person participation and use email to give those disenfranchised among us a chance for input. What do you think?
April 5, 2001

Agenda

1. Determine minute taker. Ginger Craig may be available as a minute taker if we so desire. Discussion.

1 1/2. Bob Burton is our new Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs (APAA)

2. Approve/amend minutes of March 19, 2001

3. Please read the proposals that Ginger distributed of problematic WIC submissions:
   CSS/HORT 480, HORT 311, PH 401, ENG 452, BA 469
   4. Please read and bring the WIC review precis of the BCC committee members.

5. Discussion of #3

6. Discussion timeline for specific review actions; begin to make decisions at the meeting on April 12
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 19, 2001
Agenda

Agenda/Procedures for WIC Review:
Here are a few things to consider and do before our BCC meeting of March 19, 2001.

1. Some of you are lead reviewers for courses that have requested a drop of WIC status. I will assume that approval is automatic unless you tell me differently. I will bring a spreadsheet next Monday of where we stand so far regarding actions. These will include all known drops and extensions and phase-outs, and the honored sabbatical request.

2. Item #1 takes care of the easy courses. The next step is to identify as many courses as possible where we believe there are serious problems. A serious problem is one where the lead reviewer recommends a direct contact by the BCC chair to the department in question. Since word count seems to be a problem for several proposals, I will bring a sample word-count request from for your consideration.

3. (Reaction please on this one) After thinking further about some comments made at our last meeting and a chance discussion afterwards, I want to suggest that we change a little how we proceed with our review of WIC documents. Basically, I propose that we review the WIC documents just like we review all new course proposals. This means that each lead reviewer will present his/her cases to the entire committee before we act. The main reason for this is fair and consistent treatment of all the proposals. We need to achieve a committee consensus on what constitutes an acceptable proposal, just as we do for new course proposals. It is rare in any area of the core to get a proposal that is exemplary in all respects and we use our best judgement in deciding whether or not to approve a course. My former proposal on how to proceed limited that judgement to just two people. I prefer a broader consensus.

4. If Item #3 is satisfactory to the BCC, then I suggest we proceed as follows next Monday. Each of us reports on our weakest proposal (or perhaps raises the biggest concerns we see across our proposals). Then we can have some conversation about how serious the issues are and what we should do to address them. This should give us a common basis for proceeding with the review of all courses. It also may enable me (on your behalf) to try and get some additional information before our next meeting in early April.
February 19, 2001 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Approve minutes of previous meeting(s)

Decide on minute taker for 2/19/01

Further discussion and action on BI 388

Agree on a plan for reviewing the WIC review materials (see #2 and #3 below concerning the materials you now have and the review process) I think Vicki Tolar Burton will participate.

Further discussion of the review process for CC course approval for areas of the Baccore. (There has been a very thoughtful exchange about this. We will not finish it on Monday.)

2. Vicki Tolar Burton and I thought it would be good to review the WIC materials roughly college by college. To get the ball rolling and because of progress that Vicki and her student helpers have already made, we decided to start with the Colleges of Science and Agriculture. To spread the lead review work evenly among us, I made a spreadsheet of (Avery, Dilles, Snow, Lee Janet, Lee, John, Peters, and Jarvis) and distributed the courses from the two colleges among us by cycling through our names and assigning courses. This led to one committee member (at least) getting a course from his/her own department. I suggest we change the process. If you got a course from your home department, return it to me next week and I will reassign it to another committee member. Else, I think this procedure will spread the lead reviewer work equitably among us.

3. How to proceed? We might conduct the review process along the following lines: (I put this out partly to provoke alternative better proposals and/or suggestions from you.)

   (a) If the lead reviewer and the WIC director agree that a course should have continued WIC status based on the materials initially submitted, then the BCC would approve that course.

   (b) Some proposals may be incomplete in an essential way. That is, they lack some essential materials requested by the BCC cover letter. What missing items should be re-requested before we even begin a review?

   (c) Some proposals may be incomplete but basically look promising. In such cases the lead review and WIC director would decide how best to get clarifying input about the course. If (a) is the result, then we are done. Else the lead reviewer and/or WIC director reports to the BCC concerning what makes the course problematic for WIC continuation and the BCC decides how best to proceed.

   (c) Some proposals may appear on the surface to both the lead reviewer and the WIC director to be inappropriate for continued WIC status. Then what? Do we inform the dept and invite further input before an official vote? If a course is not to be continued, what is the appropriate sunset timeline? Does the course continue for a year and then lose its WIC status. Is it dropped from WIC at the end of Spring 2001?

4. Paul Farber has proposed that HSTS 415, 417, 418, 419, 425 have their WIC designation removed after the 2001-2002 academic year. These are courses currently used to satisfy WIC requirements for certain COS students. Dick Thies, Head Advisor of the COS, has a cc of the letter from Paul to me. I have discussed this with Diick and told him I didn't see any reason for the BCC to interject itself into this potential problem for the
COS. From now the COS has about 1 2/3 years to provide classes for its students. I will bring the letter to you next week. I had intended to distribute it today, but there was no time. Do you agree with my line?

5. We have one returned WIC review request for a course normally taught by a faculty member who is currently on sabbatical. What do we do in such cases? One suggestion: Give a year extension with a proviso that if the WIC review materials are not returned and positively reviewed by the BCC in the subsequent academic year the course will lose its WIC status. (My concern is that we have some way of not losing track of such a situation.)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 12, 2001

Agenda

1. **12:00 - 12:25:** Discussion with Leslie Burns about approval of CC courses for baccore categories. Leslie will give some background and answer questions.

2. **12:25 - 12:50:** BI 388 discussion of WIC proposal with Vicki Tolar Burton as lead reviewer. Mike Mix will join in the discussion of BI 388. We will also discuss with Vicki ways we might best coordinate the WIC review now underway. For example, it might be best to review the proposals by college.

**WIC Update:** There are about 30 proposals not returned, 6 requested drops, 7 extensions, and 51 completed and returned proposals.
January 29, 2001 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 29, 2001
Agenda

1. Action on minutes from 11/20/00 and 1/22/01
2. Choose a minute taker for today
3. Date of next meeting. (I suggest two weeks)
4. WIC Update and Discussion (5 minutes or less)
4+ What do we do about CC requests for baccore areas? Some continuation of last week's discussion seems appropriate before #5. Also, more materials are coming in and they seem to vary a lot in detail.
5. Action of Pending Courses: (Bonnie is up first with HSTS 440.)
November 20, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 20, 2000
Agenda

1. Finalize (hopefully) WIC Review Documents
2. Discuss changes to bylaws -- due Jan. 1 to Committee on Committees
3. Discuss how we interpret the criteria for various Bac Core Categories
4. Hand out new DPD Criteria, etc.
5. Handout new Fitness Criteria
6. Christina is having a student hand deliver today a new course request from History of Science 440 for STS, tracking #00B028. She hopes we will review it quickly because if we are quick enough it could make next year's catalog. So let's all take a look at this and act on it as a committee of the whole. If there are problems, we can farm it out to a lead reviewer and defer action until our next meeting.

PS At present #6 and one WIC that Vicki has are the only pending courses.
November 6, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Faculty Senate

Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 6, 2000
Agenda

0. Conscript minute taker.

1. Discuss how we will interpret the guidelines that various Bac Core courses must meet. Please bring copies of the guidelines. They are on the Web, except for current DPD guidelines*.

2. Get an update on the materials being developed to help us review WIC courses this year.

3. Discuss pending course proposals in the following order. The person assigned to take the lead in the discussion of a particular course is listed beside the course. The rest of us should at least skim proposal we are not presenting.

   AREC 434 for WIC -- Christine Snow
   Z 414 for WIC -- Janet Lee
   ECON 463 for WIC (on express track) -- John Lee
   ANTH 251 for DPD -- Bonnie Avery

4. Discuss possible revisions to our Standing Rules. (Proposed changes must be submitted to the Committee on Committee by Jan. 1, 2001.)

5. CH 201 "Chemistry for Engineering Majors" is now 3 credits and no lab but is in the Bac Core in a section where labs are required. What to do? Take action when the science perspective courses are reviewed?

* Lee will (hopefully) sort out the new DPD guidelines as per Senate action last June and bring hard copies for all.
October 23, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 23, 2000

Agenda

1. Final approval of minutes from 10/9/00.

2. Discuss procedure for review proposals for this year. Shall we continue the procedure of last year?

3. For this meeting, we have only a few pending proposals (listed below). Please read all the proposals and come prepared to discuss them. We will take them up in the order listed, seeking more information as needed. Remember we should endeavor to act on HST 104,105,106 which is pending from last Spring:

   Pending Courses for which you should have received Baccaulareate Core Request Forms:
   - HST 104, 105, 106
   - FW 340
   - GEOG 107 from Western Oregon Univ
   - BI 420
   - MTH 401 (drop WIC status)
   - G101 from LBCC
   - G102 from LBCC
   - G103 from LBCC

4. Bac Core Standing Rules -- the changes we have been discussing for about two years now are still in process. We submitted proposed changes to the EC last spring. They have some concerns and put the changes on hold pending resolution of the concerns. Concerns -- DPD director not yet permanent, deleting Writing Advisory Board from the WIC. We need to get some further input concerning the Writing Advisory Board. I’m not sure the DPD director is still an issue.

5. URLs that may be useful:
   - http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/aa/curric/index.htm
   - http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/ (scan down to the section related to the Baccalaureate Core)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 9, 2000
Agenda

1. Introduction and brief overview of our charge
2. Direct Transfer A.S. Degree from LBCC -- Leslie Burns will join us for this item
3. Fitness Criteria for the Baccalaureate Core -- the EC has suggested a minor change in our suggested new criteria. If there are no problems with the change, the EC will put this item on the Faculty Senate Agenda for November and I will present it to the Senate.
4. Review of WIC course during 2000-2001 as part of our continuing review of all baccalaureate core courses. (We did WC last year.)
5. Bac Core Standing Rules -- the changes we have been discussing for about two years now are still in process. We submitted proposed changes to the EC last spring. They have some concerns and put the changes on hold pending resolution of the concerns. Concerns -- DPD director not yet permanent, deleting Writing Advisory Board from the WIC. We need to get some further input concerning the Writing Advisory Board. I'm not sure the DPD director is still an issue.
6. Pending Courses for which you should have received Baccalaureate Core Request Forms:
   - HST 104, 105, 106
   - FW 340
   - GEOG 107 from Western Oregon Univ

As time permits we will begin a review of those courses. Please read over the submissions.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 8, 2000

Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of May 11 and May 25 meetings.

2. Discussion of UAP Director as ex-officio.

3. Consideration of community college courses:
   - Chemeketa C.C. - HST 199B Modern Japanese History CD
   - Lane C.C. - ES 101 CD/DPD
   - ES 102 DPD
   (Please pre-screen these for any problems.)

4. Discussion of revision of Perspectives criterion 1 to something that assures course accessibility in a less restrictive fashion than the current criterion.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda
May 25, 2000 -- 11:00 AM
MU 204

1. Approval of minutes of May 11 meeting.
2. Announcements, administrative issues
3. Art 469 for WIC.
4. Consideration of revised Fitness Criteria (to be sent separately).
5. Consideration of responses from Foreign Languages and English on Western Culture reviews.
   (You should have the response from FL, the English response will be sent separately)
May 11, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 11, 2000
Agenda

1) Approval of minutes of 4/27/00
2) Consideration of HST 111, 112, 113 (lead: Satish?)
3) Proposed criteria revisions for Fitness Requirement
4) Proposed revision of Criteria 1 for Perspectives to insure course accessibility
5) Western Culture review. Among other things, consider response from English which will be forwarded separately
April 29, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 29, 2000
Agenda

1. Approve draft minutes of meeting of 4/13/00.

2. Further discussion of issues identified in review of Western Culture courses. In particular, we need to discuss our policy on 300-level courses in the perspectives category.

3. Revisit Geog 105 (Chemekeha Comm. College). We asked for more info on this as a Science course. You should have all received a hardcopy of an e-mail sent in by the instructor.

4. Next meeting will be May 11 in *Bates 129*.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 13, 2000
Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of meeting of March 30, 2000.

2. Review of Western Culture courses

3. Consideration of H 210 for Social Processes and Institutions. (lead reviewer: Scanlan) (please check that you have a copy of this proposal, it came about a month ago)

March 3, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 3, 2000
Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of meeting of 3/15/00
2. Consider RHP/NE 482 as WIC (lead reviewer: Kurt)
3. Consider PSY 470 as WIC (lead reviewer: Bonnie)
4. Consider GEO 307 as STS (lead reviewer: Satish)
5. Proposal to drop TA 330, 331 as WIC (Michael)
6. Consider justification for approving ES 334 as Perspectives: Cultural Diversity? (lead: Bob)
7. Plan for conducting review of Western Culture courses (Michael)
8. Discussion of Bac Core involvement in May Outcomes workshop (Michael)
9. Schedule future meetings
March 6, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

March 6, 2000
Agenda

1. Approval of draft minutes of 2/28/00

2. RHP 482/NE 482 considered as WIC (approval recommended by Vicki)
   (lead reviewer: Kurt) note that the documentation is messed up on this, but that is someone else's problem.
   Just consider as WIC.

3. PSY 470 considered as WIC (approval recommended by Vicki)
   (lead reviewer: Bonnie)

4. Chemeketa C.C. ENG 269 Enviro. Lit. considered for Lit. & Arts
   (lead reviewer: Bonnie)

5. Linn-Benton C.C. ANS 121 Intro to ANS considered for Bio. Science
   (lead reviewer: Bob)

   (lead reviewer: Satish)

7. Linn-Benton C.C. Hum 101 Prehist to Middle Ages considered for both Cultural Diversity and Lit. & Arts
   (Lead reviewer: John)

8. Linn-Benton C.C. Hum 102 Ren to Enlightenment considered for both Western Culture and Lit. & Arts
   (lead reviewer: Michael)

9. Linn-Benton C.C. Hum 103 Romant. to Contemp. Considered for both Western Culture and Lit. & Arts
   (lead reviewer: Kurt)

    (documentation on this will be sent out today)
February 28, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 28, 2000
Agenda

Discussion of the report on the Bac Core fitness requirement for the Faculty Senate.
February 21, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 21, 2000 Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of 2/7/00 meeting (I will send these our shortly)

2. Consideration of revisions of standing rules for submission to Committee on Committees. (We proposed some last Spring, but they haven't been acted on. The Comm. on Comm. is now ready to act and we will review the changes first.)

3. Consideration of Mt. Hood C.C. BI-235 as filling Bio. Science requirement. (Scanlan lead reviewer)

4. Discussion of content/structure of HHP 231 review report.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 7, 2000
Agenda

Lead reviewers have been indicated next to courses.

1. Approve minutes of January 24 meeting
2. Chair announcements
3. Review AIHM 481 for WIC (This has been approved by V. Tolar Burton) (Bob for lead reviewer)
4. Review Community College courses
   Chemeketa Community College
   Geog 105 as Physical Science (Satish)
   Geog 106 as Cultural Diversity (Bonnie)
   Geog 107 as Cultural Diversity (Kurt)
   (Materials not currently available on BI 235 at Mt. Hood)
5. Review of latest draft of DPD criteria (John)
6. Reconsideration of Biological Science designation for CSS 205 (based on last meeting's discussion with Dave Myrold.)
7. Schedule next meeting
January 10, 2000 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 10, 2000
Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of 12/6/99 meeting (you should have all received copies.)

2. Discussion with Anthony Wilcox about HHP 231.

3. Discussion of review process for Western Culture courses.
   (My meeting with Leslie Burns and Christina Richards led to some significant changes in the
   cover letter and review documents. In particular, Leslie suggested that her office could generate
   enrollment and other info from the Banner system. Thus she suggested dropping the request for
   that info, esp. since it won't be obvious to most recipients how it connects with the criteria.
   Christina will send you copies of the revised materials.)

4. Review of FCS 201 as DPD course. Susan Shaw has recommended approval.
   (Bonnie can you lead the discussion on this?)

5. Review of prereq changes AREC 433/533 (Contemp Glob. Issues).
   (Satish can you lead discussion on this?)

6. If the Chair gets his act together, he will report on the issues raised at the last meeting about
   the STS status of ENSC/BOT 479.

7. Consideration of future meeting times.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 12, 1999
Agenda

0. Agree on minute taker (Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, Joe Kerkvliet, Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden)
1. Minutes of last meeting

2. WIC matters - I think HORT 358 belongs up here

3. AREC 253 - Ruth

4. HORT 358 - Joanne:

5. ENG 240

6. FW 350

7. Cultural diversity review
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 29, 1999

Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of 11/15 meeting.
2. Review of criteria and narrative proposed by the DPD Task Force.
3. Review of Bob Jarvis' documents for the 5-year reviews.
4. Discussion of plans for HHP 231 review.
5. Course Requests:
   - BOT/ENSC 479 for Synthesis (Christine)
   - Chemeketa Comm. College
   - HST 228 (Bonnie)
   - CHLA 203 (Satish)
6. Schedule meeting in Exam Week.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 1, 1999

Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of 10/18 meeting (assuming we've gotten them from Kurt).

2. Discussion of Bob Jarvis' ideas on the 5-year review process.

3. Course requests:
   (Satish Reddy) SW Oregon CC: Hum 204, 205, 206
   (Kurt Peters) Lane CC: Gen Sci. 101
   (John Lee) CSS 205 (two sci. categories)

4. Christine's ideas on 300-level perspectives policies.

5. Anything else.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 18, 1999
Agenda

Baccalaureate Core Committee
October 18, 1999

Business Items:

1. Approval of minutes of meeting of Oct. 4

2. Discussion of restriction of Perspectives courses to lower-division. (The only course request we have in our hopper is HST 320, which has a conflict with this policy. You should have gotten a copy of this proposal before the last meeting. Please look it over so we can act on it if that is appropriate in light of our discussion.)

3. Discussion of revised DPD requirements proposed by the DPD task force.

4. Short presentation by Bob Jarvis of ideas/issues related to implementation of 5 year course reviews. (This will be informational to give us a chance to think about these issues before the next meeting where we'll try to have a full discussion.)

5. Anything else.
October 15, 1999 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 15, 1999
Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of 10/1 meeting (you should have gotten copies)
2. Discussion of review procedure for HHP 231.
3. Review/discussion of Bob's cover letter and form for 5-year BCC reviews.
4. Review of pending course requests.
   (I list people I'd like to have give a run through of any Bac Core issues in the request.)
   - Chemeketa Comm. College
     HST 228 (Bonnie)
     CHLA 203 (Satish)
   - BIOE 459 for WIC (Kurt)
   - Bot/ENSC 479 for synthesis (Christine)
5. Anything else.
0. Introduce Committee members.

1. Introduce Susan Shaw, DPD director to fill us in on the DPD task force.

2. Short orientation for members, e.g. BCC policies and Criteria as revised last year.

3. Overview of some potential issues for the committee, e.g. 5 year reviews of Bac Core Courses, status of HHP 221.

4. Consideration of requests received over the summer.

   A. The following requests might be routine/non-controversial. Can returning members look them over before the meeting and see if they concur?

   H 312 (99-B019) (Adds harmless prereq to existing course)
   H 445 (99-B020) (Drops a prereq from existing course)
   ES 233 (99-B021) (Changes descrip of existing course to drop ref.to 90's)
   CSS 335 (99-B012)
   GEO 335 (99-B013) (Changes in existing crosslisted STS courses that seem to make them fit category better)
   CH 462 (99-B014) WIC course proposal that Vickie Collins has approved.
   COMM 432 (99-B015) Drop WIC designation from existing course

   B. The following two requests present conflicts with our policies that need to be discussed.

   HST 320 (99-B008) This was returned last year for more information to justify having a Perspectives course at 300-level with the credits raised from 3 to 4.
   ES 334 (99-B017) This requests a change in an existing Perspectives course from 200 to 300 level.
May 26, 1999 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 26, 1999
Agenda

1. Approve minutes of May 19, 1999.

2. a. Consider course proposal WS 224 (99B016) for DPD. The proposal is endorsed by Joan Gross.

b. Reconsider course proposals 99-B002, 99-B003, and 99B004 (BA465, HORT 490 and H490, respectively), submitted for Contemporary Global Issues. The course BA465 was approved for CGI on June 5 1998 by the Baccalaureate Core committee.

3. Review Document to go to the Faculty Senate. - I will bring it.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 5, 1999
Agenda

1. Approve minutes of April 28, 1999.

2. Revisit 99B002, 003, 004- the course BA465 was approved by the BCC in June of 98. Undergrad affairs and the Curriculum Council are willing to let the course have inconsistent crosslisting between departments. The BCC needs to decide whether to approve the courses. Anita Grunder will bring a copy of the original proposal. You may have received it from Christina.

3. Consider a memo to the Committee on committees regarding changes in standing rules. The text of the memo is below; a copy of the revised standing rules will be brought to the meeting by Grunder.

4. Discuss the possible implementation of an expiration policy of BC courses - see the following comment on possibilities from Christina Richards.

"I would think this would need to be approved by Faculty Senate first and liaison done with various units including Admissions/Registrar's, etc. But as far as the details, I would think there would be a couple of ways to go about this. The first could be similar to Experimental "X" courses in that you could put an expiration date on the attribute code in Banner. Automatically the BCC status would come off the list when the termination date arrives. Secondly, we run a program every Spring to notify units of "courses not taught within 3 years" that are slated to be terminated. The Faculty Senate approved this policy and Deans requested to see the list before units returned their agreement to either have the course terminate or indicate when it would next be scheduled to be taught. So I'm sure a program could be run every year to pull up courses where the attribute code is set ahead to terminate. I don't know if all this lingo makes sense to you, but in short, I think technically it is possible."

5. Other items as possible - such as survey results and how to include faculty response into the BC.

Anita
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 28, 1999
Agenda

1. Approve minutes of April 21
2. Review recommended revisions to the curricular procedures handbook.

There are some additional recommendations:

a. John Lee suggests for the standing rules: It might be a good idea to make both the WIC coordinator and the DPD coordinator (whatever the titles are) non-voting, exofficio members of the BCC. I think effectively that is the case for Vicki Collins now. The difference in formalizing this would be that the coordinators would presumably be on the mailing list of the BCC and, hence be able to see when we meet and the general progress being made. My guess is that they would only attend meeting when a particular course in their area was on the agenda. The point is to keep them in the loop, perhaps better than now, but to keep the final say (vote) with the BCC, as now.

b. Anita Grunder suggests for the policies and procedures page: An approved baccore course has a lifespan of 5 years. The course must be submitted to the BCC for review and renewal or it will be dropped from the core.

3. Consider survey results

Vickie Nunnemaker will send around the tallied portion of the survey we sent out. We will consider how to use the survey results. I will also bring the written comments.

-Anita
1. Approve minutes of March 31, 1999.

2. Consider the standing rules of the baccalaureate core committee. In particular:

   a.) consider whether to formally add the DPD director as an ad-hoc committee member. Points to think about: if we do this, do we also add the WIC director? Remember adhoc means non-voting. How do we rephrase the standing rules to incorporate the change?

   b.) Should we add two items to the list under "B: BCC reviews" that includes (1) our policy on review of courses as they come up for reevaluation in order to keep BCC listings current; and (2) the policy that lifetime of a proposal for which additional material has been requested is six months.

3. Update on HHP231
March 17, 1999 Agenda, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

1. Approve minutes of March 10, 1999

2. Consider the existing criteria for DPD courses and those proposed by Joan Gross.

The existing criteria for the DPD requirement in the curricular procedures handbook are:

1. be lower division and at least three credits;
2. emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas;
4. address a wide range of historical and contemporary examples of difference, power, and discrimination across socio-political systems;
5. study the origins, operation, and consequences of different types of discrimination, including structural and institutional discrimination; and
6. concentrate on two or more ethnic or cultural groups (e.g., race, gender, class, etc.) that have or are currently experiencing discrimination, discussing similarities and differences between these groups and others.

Systems of power have been sustained in the United States in part through ignorance of the complex ways in which class, gender, race and other forms of institutionalized bias overlap and reinforce each other. A more informed understanding of the often subtle yet powerful structure of these biases and of their implications is essential in a multicultural society.

Proposed criteria:

1. be at least 3 credits. Both upper and lower division.
2. Provide the historical and theoretical background so that students can critically examine contemporary issues of difference, power, and discrimination in the United States.
3. Include discussion of different types of discrimination such as racism, sexism, ageism, heterosexism, or discrimination according to belief, appearance, or ability.
4. Address a wide range of historical and contemporary examples of difference, power, and discrimination across socio-political systems.
5. Study the origins, operation, and consequences of different types of discrimination in order to shed light on the workings of structural and institutional discrimination and intellectual bias.

DPD classes typically encourage students to critically examine their own beliefs concerning difference, power, and discrimination through a variety of pedagogical techniques. Class discussion is strongly suggested. Upper division classes ideally are taken in a student’s major and must include a writing component.
3. Announcement of new charges by the executive committee. They are:

   a. Consider the committee standing rules in light of new funding model
   b. Consider the Baccalaureate Core fitness requirement.
March 10, 1999

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Agenda

1. Approve minutes of February 10, 1999

2. Proposals to consider:
   a. 98B059 WR411/511 change in approved WIC course
   b. 99 B001 ENGR 350 consider for STS
   c. 99B005 AG 492 drop STS, for our information
   d. 99B008 HST 320 consider for Cultural Diversity
   e. 99B009 PHL 380, change in title
   f. 99B010 WS499, consider for DPD
   g. 99CCBC019 Central Oregon Community College WS102, additional information as requested, consider for L&A

3. Update on questionnaire

4. Update on request by committee on committees to review our standing rules. We will tackle this the following week.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 12, 1998

Agenda

1. Approve minutes of last meeting.

2. Consider OSU course proposals
   a. RUS 331, 332, 333, change from 200 to 300-level.
   b. BCC proposal for STS credit for ANS, HORT, PS, SOC 485/585, renewal of existing BCC status.
   c. Econ 340 request for CGI.


4. Discuss evaluation.

Chances are we will not get through all of this, so plan on meeting the following Thursday as well. We shall see.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 15, 1998

Agenda

1. We will consider the remaining outstanding proposals.

   These are: 98-B021 (FR270); 98-B032 (AS411/412); 98-B036 (HST 494) and three proposals from Chemeketa Community College (ENG257; ANTH 201; MUS205).

2. As time allows we will discuss the issues we have identified to tackle for the year.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 13, 2013
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable (Chair), Lori Kayes, Bob Paasch, Kirsi Peltomaki, Malgo Peszynska, Rebecca Olson, Ken Winograd
Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton, Stefani Dawn

Introductions
Kevin Gable is currently serving as the Chair of this committee. Please take the time to review last year’s Annual Report. Two years ago there was an implementation to do a report on writing at OSU. Last year’s co-chairs will be presenting at the Faculty Senate meeting tomorrow, November 14, on this topic and their recommendations.

Issues for the Coming Year
The plan for this committee is to start with course reviews. There are currently eleven course proposals in the cue.

Review 2012-2013 Annual Report

BCC Leadership and Committee Structure
We are still looking for co-Chairs. Please consider the possibility of taking a role as co-Chair of the committee in anticipation to continue next academic year as Chair. We do have ex-Officio members from administration working with the committee. I would value students or colleagues who may be willing to serve as long as they meet the statutory requirements.

Review BCC Standing Rules

Course Proposal Review
We have a list of 11 courses that are in need of approval by the committee. There’s a set of checklists for this academic year which can be found on the Faculty Senate website: http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/resource/2013-2014.html. Each of our categories have word by word requirement; please check those. If these are new courses, they will also be reviewed by the Curriculum Council. New course reviews go through the college first, then the academic program, then Baccalaureate Core, then Curriculum Council. Review of current course proposals in the review summary on the secure site. At the very bottom of each of these proposals there is an accordion for Baccalaureate Core questions. One typical send back reason is that issues need to be visible on the syllabus for the students.

Kevin gave out assignments for course numbers to review to the present members of the committee. If there is a conflict of interests e.g. the course is something you, yourself proposed, then another committee member will review it. Kevin will email a link to the proposals on the secure site and also the assignments. You will need to review the courses on a .docx document and then email them to Kevin Gable. Kevin would appreciate having these reviews done and in his inbox by next Friday, November 22.

Discussion Fall 2013 Category Reviews

- Mathematics
- Speech
- Fitness
- WIC classes from Agricultural Sciences, Business, and Public Health and Human Sciences
There are a total of forty-three courses per the current category reviews. Roughly twenty-five of them are WIC.

**Future Meetings**

At the next meeting, the reviewers will present what they have found and what, if anything, needs improvement. We try to accommodate the breadth of schedules and understand that not everyone can make every meeting. We are going to try to find a time when those who were absent today can make it, and hopefully as many of us as possible can be there. Please try to make it at least every other meeting. Kevin would like another meeting before Thanksgiving, probably in the morning. We also need to schedule training for everyone for the technology to access the tools and Qualtrics.

Meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 17, 2014
Minutes

No attendance available.

1. Information Items
   a. OSU Catalog Wording on Bacc Core – Registrar's office sent a portion of the catalog for the Baccalaureate Core for review. The chair did not see anything that needed to be changed. Invites members to review.
   b. Feedback on category review process. There has not been a lot of feedback yet, so the chair would like to wait to see if he receives more input from members. Please note comments while reviewing assigned courses.
      - Does there need to be another training session?
      - Chair asked for a synopsis of review form information.

2. Action Items
   a. Course reviews assigned in December:
      86585 (ES 243) – reviewer not present.
      86921 (FR 334) – submitted by reviewer; questions of prerequisites and whether or not that would make it difficult for undergraduate students to apply.
      88047 (FES 4/585) – submitted by the reviewer.
      88146 (HORT 331) – exemplary proposal well-defined. Submitted for approval.
      88267 (ART 310) – syllabus grading criteria is minimalist. Approve if authors can address learning outcomes.
      88412 (ART 313) – submitted for approval.
      88535 (SUS 350) – submitted for approval.
      NB: Due to the anticipated absences, we may postpone final decisions on 88412, 88146, 88047 Chair will make tentative assignments based on both systems.
   b. New assignments and timing
      87107 (HST 338)
      87458 (ANTH 374)
      87739 (PHL 206)
      87794 (ANTH 4/566)
      88099 (IE497)
      88174 (ANTH 371)
      88698 (FR 343)
      88762 (GER 241)
      88534 (QS 4/577) (Resubmitted for consideration as DPD course)
      NB: One question is whether we are yet comfortable moving to a single-reviewer system, or whether we wish to continue with two on each.

3. Adjourn

Future Meetings
At the next meeting, we will discuss new assignments and the WIC reviews.

Transcribed from the Chair's voicemail recording.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 27, 2014
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable (Chair), Jaga Giebultowicz, Lori Kayes, Melinda Manore, Bob Paasch, Kirsi Peltomaki, Malgo Peszynska, Ken Winograd

Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton, Stefani Dawn

1. Category Review Discussion
   a. Sorting criteria: Recertify, Likely recertify with stipulations/revisions, need more data, recommend decertification.
      • In trying to ascertain whether or no to recertify or decertify the courses we have reviewed keep mind questions like, "How are student learning outcomes being met?" Whether at the request of the unit or thorough things we have observed, we may decertify. Anything in provisional approval will review comments and ask for action depending on the reviewer’s observations. Each proposal should make a clear category for learning outcomes and give examples of the work required to meet those outcomes. Limit outcomes to what’s relevant to the student. ~ Kevin Gable
      • Borderline courses that need more information should be listed as a provisional certification. There was a place on the reviewer form to ask if the responses were notable. Last year, the Academic Affairs office gave awards depending on quality of submissions. We have copies of your submissions which will be on the SharePoint. ~ Stefani Dawn

2. Action Items
   a. Communication (COMM 11, COMM 114, COMM 114H, COMM 218, COMM 218H)
      COMM 111 – looks good. Some small change suggestions were made.
      COMM 114 – reviewer recommends recertification. Well done review, but the example was weak.
      COMM 114H – still under review. Did not submit a syllabus or answer all questions on the form.
      COMM 218H – same situation as 114H.
      COMM 218 – reviewer asked for clearer examples of a demonstration of course requirements.

   b. Mathematics (MTH 105, MTH 111, MTH 112, MTH 211, MTH 241, MTH 245, MTH 251, MTH 251H)
      MTH 105 – two syllabuses were very clearly outlined. Learning objectives were great.
      MTH 111 – the syllabi were not clearly stated; had a very high rate of withdrawal; did not list learning outcomes. Course instructors need to fix the syllabi. Provisional approval
      MTH 112 – reviewer not present
      MTH 241 & 245 – questions were answered very well, but syllabi was not covered well. Provisional approval.
      MTH 251 & 251H – the 251 form went through exams and that were clearly defined. No analysis on 251H. In review process, ask the instructor to give examples.

   c. Fitness (HHS 231, Lab, PAC)
      HHS 231, Lab, PAC - Only student learning outcome number 3 is addressed which applies to all. Not all outcomes were clearly stated. Provisional approval.

   d. Preparation for WIC review (VTB) – Stefanie Dawn passed this handout to the committee members
      This WIC review is different from other Bac Cor reviews because there is a clear University guideline. The category specifies a specific amount of writing. Please read through the handout before you start your review. Look for whether or not revision is required. We have divided the total number into seven groups. ~ Vicki Tolar Burton
3. New business

**Future Meetings**
At the next meeting, we will discuss new business and assign WIC reviews within the next month.

Meeting adjourned at 3:01 PM
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 17, 2014
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Kevin Gable (Chair), Jaga Giebultowicz, Lori Kayes, Rebecca Olson, Bob Paasch, Kirsi Peltomaki, Malgo Peszynska, McKenzie Pfeifer, Ken Winograd

Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton, Stefani Dawn, Nana Osei-Kofi

Guest: Valerie Rosenberg

1. International Programs – Valerie Rosenberg
   - Dual partner programs/shared agreements with international partners. Reviewing proposal evaluation for these classes. Attached is the handout. There may not be a course to course articulation. Listed in white are classes that can be taken overseas and/or transferred over.
   - Request was made for time to reflect. Will revisit this for approval March 17th.

2. Course Reviews:
   - ES 243 - send back; clarify assessment.
   - HST 338 - reviewer not present.
   - ANTH 374 - send back; ask for clarification on section size.
   - PHL 206 - submit for approval.
   - ANTH 4/566 - submit for approval.
   - IE 497 - ext. to Cascades. Submit for approval.
   - IE 498 - ext. to Cascades. Submit for approval.
   - ANTH 371 - existing catalog states it is for Anthro majors; either catalog needs to be changed or it should not be in the Bacc Core. Assessment is not addressed.
   - FR 343 - prereqs are such that it is taught in French. Limits accessibility by lower division students. Send back with feedback.

3. Primer on Reviewing DPD Courses – Nana Osei-Kofi
   - Please check DPD process
   - Learning outcomes need to be listed seperately
   - Make sure that each proposal is U.S. focused and each needs to offer multi-disciplinary perspectives
   - Evidence of active learning; what will students be engaged in/participation
   - Students need to understand social construction
   - Intersectionality - students need to understand social identities and social structure, depending on class level i.e. entry level courses should have more emphasis on this as students should be learning these subjects to help them navigate higher level courses
   - Most DPD courses are in Women’s Studies and Ethnic studies, so larger issues addressing others courses will need to be addressed in the future

4. Close-out of Skills Category Review
   A. Revision of Learning Outcomes
   B. Items to glean from summary IR data
   C. Items to glean from our reviewer comments

5. For Future Meetings:
- Kevin will be sending out new course numbers for review this week.
- A catch-up meeting will be scheduled in the near future.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 17, 2014
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable (Chair), Jaga Giebultowicz, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Kirsi Peltomaki

Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton, Stefani Dawn, Nana Osei-Kofi

1. Course Reviews:
   - ECE 441/442 - together the two courses satisfy WIC. This is a new course proposal. Request to increase credits from 2 to 3. This is justifiable. Submit for approval.
   - ES 355 - syllabus looks good. But not particularly clear why extra assignments merit an extra credit. Flag credit issue to the Curriculum Council.
   - ANTH 371 - they took out statement about this course being for Anthro majors. However, there was misunderstanding about outcome expectations. The syllabus was the same, they have not yet touched the content. The questions being asked have not been addressed.
   - ES 453/553 - didn't address why writing new assignment merits an extra credit hour.
   - WS 495/595 - great proposal, but again, didn't address why this merits an extra credit hour.
   - HIST 365 - excellent proposal. Submit for approval.
   - ES 445 - it appears to meet all requirements however, there is a requirement for a writing exercise out of class which is not explained very well. Re-submit for more specific details.
   - EXSS 455 - submit for approval.
   - EXSS 381 - submit for approval.
   - HLTH 476 - update "College of Public Health" and "Department of Public Health" verbiage for consistency. Submit for approval.
   - HDFS 461 - uncertain about whether it met the criteria. Wait for reviewer to state correction suggestions before re-submitting for corrections.
   - NUTRI 416 - learning outcomes are blended with cultural foods for WIC. Make a suggestion for WIC audience. Provisional.
   - CSS 325 - submit for approval.
   - FW 435 - provisional based on outcome revision.

2. Course Related Topics
   - At what point do we address the credits offered in the Bac Core and the credits required to fulfill Bac Core? As more and more of these course become 4 credit versus 3 credits, it eliminates the possibility to complete the credits advertised.
   - We need to address the inflation of credits in Bac Core versus major credits by submitting draft recommendations for this to the Curriculum Council.
   - Robert Brudvig volunteered.
   - Kevin suggested using 300 versus 400 level courses as a starting point. Lay out the issues, list options for recommendations we might make as policy options. Getting some of the associate Deans in here to discuss this with us would also be a good starting point.

3. For Future Meetings:
   - Kevin will be sending out new course numbers for review this week.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 7, 2014 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Bob Paasch, Malgo Peszynska, Ken Winograd
Voting Members Absent: Jaga Giebultowicz, Lori Kayes, Kirsi Peltomaki, McKenzie Pfeifer
Ex-Officio Members Present: Stefani Dawn (Academic Affairs), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

1. Outstanding New Course Proposals:
   - #88995 OC201 – Peszynska
     Could be considered as exemplary, but syllabus was scary in terms of breadth. Grading policy was very intricate. The course was originally OC331 and the request is to change to 201; the proposal was submitted as a new course rather than a change; and concerned whether 300-level course is sufficiently watered down for a 200-level course. It was not specifically indicated whether intensity and depth was decreased from OC331, which needs to be dropped. It may only be interdisciplinary within Science.
     - Are there connections outside of science?
       Action: Kevin will indicate that BCC was impressed with proposal, approval presumes that OC331 would be dropped so students could not take both courses for credit; is the course really 200-level; and lab syllabus needs to be more detailed.
   - #88913 IT261 – Peltomaki
     Good course and good fit for category, checklist items are fine, answers to assessment question are less well-thought out than the rest of the proposal (the first question is not answered), recommendation is to pass, although supportive of committee returning for assessment issue.
     - The committee did not wish to return the proposal.
       Action: Kevin will inform the proposers that the course is approved.
   - 89135 PHL 345 Olson
     Looks great, no concerns or objections,
     Action: Kevin will inform proposers that the course is approved.

2. Debrief on Category Review Process
   a. How to manage confusion between courses in a Category Review and New Course Proposals? This seemed extensive.
     - Suggested to include in the message: Category Review or New Course Proposal and link to number
     - Could the BCC concentrate on either the reviews or new course proposals, and how much could be moved online?
       - Focusing on one or the other is not likely due to the volume, and Kevin didn’t feel it could be condensed into a shorter timeline.
       - Suggested having one group focus on one area, rather than each member moving between the two.
     - Is there someone who could provide clerical support to determine deficiencies? Stefani noted that the purpose is to ensure that all BCC members are looking equally at the same information.
     - What is the value of the committee pulling out IR data and transferring data to Qualtrics? What if some members only did IR data? Some felt they would need to
refer back to the spreadsheet to determine what occurred, so there would be duplication. Could ask proposers to look at areas (i.e. DFW rate).

- Sometimes meaning of data on Qualtrics was duplicated – is there a way to avoid this? Stefani noted that the process still needs to be tweaked.
- Regarding moving the course review process online – Stefani felt it would be easy to do this.
- When generating an online form for reviewing new course or course changes, incorporate checklists and a comments field. Whatever is placed online would need to look very different from the category review to easily differentiate the two.

   - Changes to general approach (from Item 2) – Specific questions for the DPD category
     - Stefani noted that they are developing a draft of a new form for proposers to use for the category review; the members reviewed the draft and suggested revisions.
       - Include CLOs as part of the Student Evaluation of Teaching and ask every student to rate themselves for every course. Stefani indicated this is already done by category, and is included with data that reviewers see on Share Point. Faculty Senate agreement is that data will only be aggregated by category; could ask instructors to include if they have the course information from students.
     - Is anything missing that would have helped with reviews?
       - There is not an open-ended question about how the unit handles assessment.
       - Stefani will work on changing the reviewer form and bring back to the BCC.
   - WIC draft changes are not yet ready.

4. Other issues?
   - Multi-state Collaborative Pilot Project
     - Ways to recruit faculty:
       - Email from Kevin inviting faculty to participate in the Provost’s Team for Oregon Higher Education Assessment early next week. Target audience: faculty teaching high enrollment courses,
       - Create webform of faculty interests.
       - There could be levels of participation:
         - Level 1 – provide student work samples;
         - Level 2 – participate in state-wide conference in Portland;
         - Level 3 – participate as a state-and national level reviewer for the Multi-State Collaborative
       - Host explanatory sessions during the last week of April.
       - Expand form to gauge interest.
     - The members present felt this was a reasonable approach.
   - Course Specific Outcomes Related to Writing
     - Vicki distributed a draft document and requested input:
       - Add the Honors course – Vicki will request information from the University Honors College
       - Contacts: the information will be sent to advisors, placed on Bacc Core website, and Vicki will meet with both advising councils to respond to WRII inquiries. Vicki would like one BCC member to accompany her to the advising councils.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 16, 2014
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable, Lori Kayes, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, McKenzie Pfeifer, Ken Winograd
Voting Members Absent: Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Bob Paasch, Kirsi Peltomaki, Malgo Peszynska, Ex-Officio Members Present: Stefani Dawn (Academic Affairs), Nana Osei-Kofi (DPD Director), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

1. Finish WIC Category Review:
   - AG 421 - they have 2 different instructors and special sections which were lacking adequate syllabus information, particularly in regards to paper length. Otherwise approved.
   - ANS 420 - Reviewer not present.
   - AREC 434 - this is the first year this course was taught. Writing assignments need to be more clear and request for more detail. Criterion 1 is not fully met. Criterion 2 grading is not clear. Learning outcomes need to be addressed in more detail.
   - BOT 323 - Reviewer not present.
   - FST 425 - Reviewer not present.
   - FW 454 - Exemplary proposal. Submit for approval.
   - HORT 318 - Submit for approval.
   - HDFS 461 - this needs a lot of improvement. Word count is not addressed at all. Informal/formal information lacking. Criterion 1 does not meet the word count. Criterion 2 is also vague.
   - H 434 - Reviewer not present.
   - NUTR 439 - Reviewer not present.

2. Draft letters: COMM, MTH, Fitness
   - Kevin Gable will highlight the action and will also re-send out the Sharepoint link with courses and who is responsible for them. Send via email please.

3. Request from LBCC
   - Proposing some minor changes to the GS 105 course. Does Chemistry, Admissions office or others need to be involved before it goes to Bacc Core? Yes. It needs to be reviewed by the Chemistry department and then sent to Stefani Dawn and Admissions before it goes to Bacc Core review.

4. Other issues?
   - Vicki Tolar Burton wants the Bacc Core to be aware of the swelling course sizes in the WIC section. A lot of these courses are being covered by GTAs. A lot of these courses are not going to meet WIC criteria because of the size of the classes. Bacc Core may be asked to put forth a proposal to address this topic.
   - We currently have 4 courses that are over the limit.
   - Kevin Gable sent out the Invitation to the synthesis for the Provost Team for Statewide Assessment.
   - Stefani Dawn wants everyone to know we are gearing up for the DPD, WIC, etc. Deadline will be June 23.
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April 21 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable, Jaga Giebultowicz, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Bob Paasch, Kirsi Peltomaki
Voting Members Absent: Trischa Goodnow, Lori Kayes, McKenzie Pfeifer, Malgo Peszynska, Ken Winograd
Ex-Officio Members Present: Stefani Dawn (Academic Affairs), Nana Osei-Kofi (DPD Director), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

1. Remaining Category Reviews
   - AG421 (Giebultowicz) - lacking outside resources requirements. WIC course objectives are not stand alone. Send back and ask for formal requirements and more about the research based paper. Assignment sheet for the syllabus is very vague.
   - FST425 (Giebultowicz) - very extensive on outcomes, goals, term papers, labs. Very nice rubrics. Class size is the one issue that the Bacc Core needs to review. Submit for approval upon further investigation of class sizes for all Bacc Core classes.
   - BOT323 (Peszynska)
   - NUTR439 (Peszynska) - Submit for approval.
   - AREC 461 (Gable) - review is missing; showing up as a blank page. Reviewer said first 2 learning outcomes were not clearly addressed.
   - H434 (Gable)
   - COMM 114H (Gable)
   - FW 435 (Brudvig) - WIC team had questions about the word count.

2. Resubmitted New Course Proposals
   - ES243 (Manore) - concerned with whether or not the instructor's name needs to be included.
   - IT331 (Manore) - review to see if it fulfills the diversity requirement.
   - ES445 (Gable) - this will be flagged for further investigation on the Bacc Core's part into 4 credit requirements.
   - ANTH371 (Peltomaki) - fixed course description, but is this a Bacc Core course? This is a field course. Is it too advanced? ANTH110 is a prereq. The main concern is about outcomes. They are not being articulated well enough to know if they are being met.
   - OC201 (Peszynska) - make sure that OC331 are made aware that this is a parallel course.
   - SOIL102 (Kayes) - requested corrections have been made. Submit for approval.

3. An old new course proposal that dropped through the cracks
   - HST338 (Gable) - syllabus was very thorough. Submit for approval.

4. Other Business
   - Stefani Dawn, Vicki Tolar Burton - There was a lot of discussion on class sizes exceeding expectations. The Bacc Core will investigate this further before approving any more courses that are not specifying class size. Writing must include assignment sheets for outcome 3. Stefani will look at draft and modify it based on feedback. Is there independent data that will help the Bacc Core assess this issue?
   - Kevin Gable - Committee interest forms went out today. If you would like to continue on this committee, please indicate that on the interest form.

5. Future Business
   - Committee Leadership discussion
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 30
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable, Lori Kayes, Rebecca Olson, Kirsi Peltomaki, McKenzie Pfeifer, Ken Winograd
Voting Members Absent: Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Melinda Manore, Bob Paasch, Malgo Peszynska
Ex-Officio Members Present: Stefani Dawn (Academic Affairs), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

1. **New Course Proposals:**
   - HHS231 (Brusalind) - missing course schedule in the syllabus. Resubmit.
   - WSE392 (Kayes) - did not indicate materials needed on the syllabus; did not review assignments on the syllabus very well, but it was listed well on the course proposal. Flag this for the curriculum council before approval.
   - FR429 (Brudvig) - not sure that this fits into the cultural diversity requirement because most of the films listed were in France as opposed to non-Western cultures. Ask if this includes other countries as in North African cinema? Is this center on the indigenous colonial communities to the French culture coming in? Is the focus on the diversity? How do the course activities align with the learning outcomes? Make this syllabus visible. Resubmit.
   - QS4/576 (Peltomaki) - fix syllabus because they listed the wrong category for synthesis. Resubmit for correction.
   - ART311 (Olson) - applying for literature/arts and cultural diversity. The link listed to academic dishonesty is not working. Some discrepancy between assignments listed and then scheduled essays due. Online there was a short research paper due, but not on the syllabus. What are the seven essays listed? Resubmit for clarification.
   - HORT115 (Pfeifer) - the syllabus did not make the physical and bio science differences clear; learning outcomes not clear; lab assignments were not clear; assessment was not made clear; no course schedule. Resubmit for correction.
   - BI315 (Paasch) - reviewer not present.
   - ANTH478 (Winograd) - no outcomes for CGI; other things missing; no description of the research paper; was this an accidental submission to Bacc Core? Will continue to research; revisit at the next meeting.

2. **Principals of Access to Perspectives/DPD Courses** (Gable). Draft attached; also see analysis of several issues prepared by Stefani.
   - Focus will be on courses with the highest number of credit hours, frequency and the number of seats available.
   - Without a consistent policy, it's difficult to maintain classes. Coming up with a solid policy would make it much easier for the Bacc Core to regulate.
   - Is there some component of writing that should be included if it is a 4 credit hour course?
   - Kevin would like the Bacc Core Committee to spend some time brainstorming criteria for this.

3. **Update on Provost's Team for Oregon Higher Education Assessment** (Dawn)
   - There was a very good response. Moving forward with this.

4. **Adjourn**
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May 14 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Linda Bruslind, Kevin Gable, Rebecca Olson, McKenzie Pfeifer, Ken Winograd

Voting Members Absent: Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Lori Kayes, Melinda Manore, Bob Paasch, Kirsi Peltomaki, Malgo Peszynska

Ex-Officio Members Present: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director), Stefani Dawn (Academic Affairs), Nana Osei-Kofi (DPD Director)

1. 3- vs. 4-Credit Course Issue:
Stefanie Dawn brought a handout analysis of the 3 credit and 4 credit hour courses. Most of the students are choosing to take 3 credit courses over the 4 credit courses. DPD courses follow the offerings. However, a majority of the 4 credit courses have a really large student sign-up. We need to focus on whether or not students have a choice about whether or not that have to take a 4 credit course to fulfill their Bacc Core curriculum. How do we come up with a straight-forward set of guidelines that is easy enough to follow which we can implement for continued use?

Before we push anything through, we will need to present this before the Faculty Senate and present in the Fall. What criteria shall we present that will apply to everyone? This course meets a high priority university need in the strategic plan. Diversity trumps other arguments. Synthesis classes are not a problem right now. CLA is a big one.

Let's bring in a few of the Associate Deans to discuss this. How do they view this issue from an administrative point of view? What if we were to say no if the courses are over 50 percent? Why does a course have to be 4 credits? Could it be done in 3 credits? Is this being driven by teaching loads? How do we collectively insure an appropriate level of choice for our students? Each college often functions within it's own microcosm without taking into consideration the larger aspects of the university goals as a whole. Kevin will Draft some of the basic concerns for review soon.

2. Pending but Assigned New Course Proposals
   - BI 315 (Prop. 89023) – Paasch. This will be re-assigned as the reviewer was not present again today.
   - ANTH 478 (Prop. 90111) – Winograd. Needs to be re-submitted for a few requirements nto addressed in the course proposal.
   - ART 311 has been re-submitted and will be assigned shortly.

3. New/Resubmitted Course Proposals
   Plan on getting these through by the end of the academic year; guidance for course proposers for summer/fall committee activity. Currently in the queue but unassigned:
   - 88259 ES233 DPD
   - 88260 ES334 LA
   - 88888 HST353 CD
   - 89136 ES351 DPD
   - 89225 WGSS4/562 DPD
   - 89256 ES201 DPD
   - 89313 ES4/557 LA
   - 89494 WGSS414 DPD
   - 89519 QS431 (CL) DPD
89520 QS477 DPD
90171 SOIS205 PS
90172 SOIL206 PS

We will discuss these after Memorial Day.

4. **Other**

Stefani Dawn – Curriculum Council has a meeting set-up with some eCampus folks because policies for eCampus have been inconsistent with the university policy. Extension of an existing course to eCampus has often been bypassed in review. The current policy for a course to be extended to Cascades has to go through a Category II review, but not eCampus. These need to be treated the same way. eCampus courses must go through Cat II proposal reviews through the Bacc Core and a syllabus with outcomes MUST be included.
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May 19
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Robert Brudvig, Kevin Gable, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Malgo Peszynska, Kirsi Peltonaki, McKenzie Pfeifer, Ken Winograd

Voting Members Absent: Linda Bruslind, Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Lori Kayes, Bob Paasch

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

1. Remaining WIC courses for Category Review:
   CSS 325 – Reviewer Linda Bruslind. There was some concern over assessment and mechanics of writing versus critical thinking. Data we received is unclear about material presented at LaGrande. Otherwise, Re-certify.
   EXSS 375 – Reviewer Robert Brudvig. Very clear syllabus, outcomes, etc. Re-certify.
   EXSS 381 – Reviewers Lori Kayes & Kevin Gable. The informal writing is ungraded and while their is grading of the formal writing, there is no real indication of how they are assessing critical thinking. But they do seem to have a good feel for where their students are it is just not well articulated. Not all syllabi are clear. This is well addressed in most of the syllabi, in the Schary syllabi the use of different genre was less evident. This is assessed by individual instructors but it is not evident that there is a well-defined structure to do so. Provisional.
   EXSS 455 – Reviewer Robert Brudvig. It is not clear if the included grading rubric is used in this class, the rubric is from another university. It is also unclear how the rubric levels translate into writing scores/grades. Re-certify.
   H 476 – Reviewer Robert Brudvig. Formal writing requirements for the course are very clear. Hard to assess the informal writing - two syllabi indicate the informal writing entails writing questions from the readings, two of the indicate the informal writing entails writing questions from the readings, two of the syllabi do not indicate what the informal writing is. From the form - question 22 , length of the informal writing is indicated as 1-2 paragraphs. Re-certify.
   HDFS 430 – Reviewer Kevin Gable. There was some small discrepancy in the way this course was coded. Please make note of that. Everything else looked very good. Re-certify.
   NUTR 439 – Reviewer Malgo Peszynska. Did not see much information in syllabus as concerns the informal writing assignments. The 2000 word paper was not listed. Re-submit for clarification.

2. Review of draft WIC letters posted to SharePoint: Results-Decisions --> WIC --> relevant college (some in each).
   - Flag grading issue as a "to be considered" item.

3. Any completed reviews of the remaining 14 new course proposals or resubmissions.
   ES 457 – Reviewer Kirsi Peltonaki. Send back and recommend the literature and arts be taken out of the proposal to make sure it's inclusive of a broad range of undergraduate students.
   BI 315 – Reviewer Melinda Manore. Approve.
   ART 311 – Reviewer Rebecca Olson. Approve.

Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 18, 2012 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Uta Hussong-Christian, Lori Kayes, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Rebecca Olson, Joe Zaworski

Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton

Summary of Meeting Agreements/Action Items

- June 6, 2012 meeting minutes approved.
- Baccalaureate Core website features profiled, and BCC agrees to build periodic audits of the site into the yearly agenda to ensure content is kept up-to-date.
- In light of heavy category obligations the next three months, the co-chairs will monitor individual course proposals fall term and communicate electronically with the BCC as issues arise.
- BCC discussed the ongoing DPD program concern about transfer courses meeting the category obligation and whether or not to eliminate that possibility. Comments and suggestions were subsequently forwarded to Michelle Bothwell, interim director of DPD.
- Category review overview provided, and BCC informed about upcoming November 5th training sessions on the Category Review process.

Information Items

Meeting minutes from June 6, 2012 were approved, and a plan for distributing meeting minute responsibilities amongst members was shared.

Kerry Kincanon shared selected highlights from the 2011-2012 annual report, particularly the end section with "On the Horizon" items for the 2012-2013 BCC agenda.

Vicki Tolar Burton profiled the new Baccalaureate Core Website, which was developed with BCC, faculty, and student input over the course of 2011-2012. The site is linked off the "Current Student" section of the OSU homepage and is operational. Vicki highlighted several site features including the section for current students, the section for faculty and advisors, and the Bacc Core Playlists, which establish optional themed pathways/threads that students can consider pursuing through the Bacc Core.

- Michael Lerner expressed concern about the profile of the site and the ease with which students can find and access it. It does come up first as a keyword search for "Baccalaureate Core" or "Bacc Core" off the OSU website. But a general Google search for "Bacc Core OSU" does not privilege this site. Michael suggests employing Google Analytics to help determine how and when the site is being utilized.
- Joe Zaworski inquired about oversight for the content to make sure that everything is up to date. This would be particularly salient for any philosophical or structural content relevant to the Bacc Core and the content of the playlists. Other items on the site related to Bacc Core content or process are linked to other sites on campus (e.g. General Catalog, Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation). Marion Rossi suggested that we build in periodic audits of this website into our agenda for the year.
- Michael and Joe also suggested more clarity in the language of the Playlist section to make sure students understand that a playlist pathway is an option, not a mandate.

Marion Rossi notified BCC members of the impending visit by NWCCU accreditors on Friday, October 19 and invited them to participate in the Open Session for Faculty from 10:30-11:00 in Memorial Union 213. BCC leadership and representatives from the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation will be meeting with the accreditors in the afternoon.

Last spring, the BCC voted in favor of amendments to the criteria for the Perspectives categories. The
following amendments were approved by the Faculty Senate on October 11, 2012:

For the non-science categories:
Please strike: Be lower division and at least three credits

And replace it with:
Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least three credits and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

And for the science categories:
Please strike: Be lower division, at least four credits, and contain a laboratory

And replace it with
Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least four credits, contain a laboratory, and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

Committee Business and Discussion Items
Kerry Kincanon reviewed BCC Standing Rules as way to highlight the primary functions of the committee and to share the Faculty Senate Executive Committee charge to BCC for 2012-2013:

- Engage in Category Review for Synthesis Categories in the Fall and Early Winter, with a particular attention to how the courses within these categories are being attentive to student learning relative to the Category Learning Outcomes
- Be poised to advise on and respond to developments or action items that may come from further consideration of 2011-2012 committee report on the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core

Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi reviewed the process the BCC used for course proposal review last year and demonstrated how to access the system.

- The committee will maintain the same review process this year.
- Recognizing that the Committee’s primary focus will be on Category Review for the next few months, the co-chairs will monitor proposal submissions and engage the committee electronically as needed to ensure that these proposals are addressed in a reasonable amount of time.
- Michael Lerner commented that we should be expeditious in our reviews, given the layers already inherent in a Category II proposal, and promoted the idea that electronic discussion would be a good way to promote expediency.

On behalf of Michelle Bothwell, ex-officio from DPD to the BCC, who was unable to attend, Kerry Kincanon introduced a discussion relative to DPD and transfer coursework. Last spring, Michelle reported on successful efforts to no longer allow AP courses to articulate in a way to satisfy the DPD category, and briefly raised the idea of making it impossible for the DPD category to be covered by a transfer course. To be approved as a DPD course, some individual affiliated with the course must have gone through the DPD seminar that focuses on content and pedagogy related difference, power, discrimination, systems of oppression and social justice. The issue with transfer courses is the lack of guarantee that they were executed under the parameters established for a DPD class at OSU, and Michelle would like to move forward with the embargo on transfer credits counting for DPD. Kerry collected suggestions and comments for Michelle from BCC members about this possible shift in policy and invited BCC members to follow up with Michelle individually if other questions or concerns arise.

Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi provided a brief overview of the Synthesis Category Review which will be a primary focus of the committee in the coming months.

- Demographic information, as well as info and syllabi submitted by units, have been collected by the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation (APAA).
- This information has been collated and organized on a secure SharePoint site hosted by the Office of APAA.
- Reviewing responsibilities will be divided amongst BCC members, and in-person meetings will be sacrificed in the next three months in favor of time dedicated towards Category Review.
- The BCC, in conjunction with the Office of APAA, will hold a Category Review training session on Monday, November 5 in the Academic Success Center Computer Lab (Waldo 114). Members can come for a 90-minute session either from 3:00-4:30 PM or from 4:30-6:00 PM. For those unable to make a training session on that date, the co-chairs will offer individual consultation on the process.
- Categories that will be responsible for reporting in 2013-2014 are: Mathematics, Speech, Fitness, and WIC classes offered by the following colleges: Business, Agricultural Sciences, and Public Health and Human Sciences.
Meeting adjourned at 10:18 AM.
February 13, 2013 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Uta Hussong-Christian, Lori Kayes, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Mike Lerner, Melinda M. Manore, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Ken Winograd

Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

Summary of Discussion/Action Items

- October 18, 2012 minutes approved
- Two courses, GER 231 (Western Culture) and PHL 214 (Cultural Diversity) were approved for addition to the Baccalaureate Core.
- Some WIC courses inadvertently made it through the Category II process last year without BCC and WIC director approval. The BCC will be asked to look at these courses in spring term.
- The Co-Chairs provided an update on the Category Review Communication plan.
- The BCC started preliminary conversations around identifying which recommendations from the 2011-2012 Review of Writing report we want to champion.

1. Minutes were approved from previous meeting: October 18, 2012

2. Question raised by one committee member: What to do with routine notices to committee regarding courses subject to review? Individual members of committee should wait for direction from committee chairs regarding individual review assignments.

3. Course Reviews:
   a. GER 231: German Dictatorships (83647): approved for Western Culture with syllabus recommendations and follow up regarding assessment plan for the course
   b. PHL 214: Intro Islamic Traditions (85221): approved for Cultural Diversity with follow up regarding assessment plan for the course

4. Vicki Tolar Burton report on WIC: Due to a system glitch in the Course Proposal System, some WIC courses proposed in 2011-2012 skipped BCC and Vicki’s review and approval and were subsequently approved by the Curriculum Council.
   - Bill Bogley has asked Vicki to determine status of these courses. She indicated that most would not have been approved had they been reviewed. Bill has agreed to temporarily redact the approval until such time as the BCC and Vicki approves the courses. These reviews would occur offline as the courses cannot be resubmitted through the Course Proposal System.
   - It appears that the system has been fixed so WIC-proposed classes will be caught by the BCC and Vicki’s office.

5. Kerry Kincanon report on Category Review statistics and communication plan: An If/Then Flow Chart was shared showing the various letters that will be sent to individuals who submitted Synthesis Reviews. School/Department heads will be cc’d on this communication, and Associate Deans in the colleges will receive a summary letter outlining results relative to courses in their college. Units with courses with incomplete files (e.g. missing syllabi or webform) will be asked to submit missing information by April 1. Proposals/courses that received a ‘no’ initially will be asked to submit additional information by April 15. The BCC will use spring term to review this new information.

With a few files still awaiting final review, we currently have:
25 that require additional information
20 incomplete files
52 recertified
6 recertified and exemplary
25 not offered in 2011-12, had no data

Marion noted that, hopefully, the follow-up process goes smoothly and that it is clear what the BCC needs to complete the review. He reported some general crankiness out there about this and that there are units out there questioning the value of what we are asking units to do now with category review. Kerry shared that he presented the communication plan at the University Assessment Council where many of the Associate Deans were in attendance. The co-chairs will also be meeting with Faculty Senate President Kevin Gable later this week to share the communication plan. An update on that conversation will be provided at the next meeting.

6. The committee revisited the Review of Writing report to start the process of prioritizing what recommendations we might want to champion. One logical possibility is a recommendation in the report centered on uneven execution of the writing outcome (outcome #3) for each of the Synthesis Categories. Preliminary indication from our category review anecdotally supports these findings. Vickie noted that she has an intern, trained in teaching of writing, who is poised to get us more info on this. The intern is going to drill down into data from the Category Review to offer recommendations on any relationships she might find between class size and the role that writing is playing in the course. A discussion also ensued from the recommendation in the report regarding information literacy and how it should be interwoven in the Bacc Core. It is currently an essential part of the Writing I category curriculum in WR 121, but Vicki presented a statistic that some 40% of OSU students take their WR 121 elsewhere. She expressed concern about this, particularly as it related to community college. She was at a recent statewide meeting where she learned that many Oregon Community Colleges are now without a degreed librarian. Uta Hussong-Christian reported the perspective from the library that Information Literacy should not necessarily be a stand-alone course or category. Information literacy needs to be tied to the discipline to be most relevant and effective.

Next meeting: March 1, 2013 ~ 120 Waldo Hall
Update from faculty senate president on assessment issues

Minutes recorder: Ken Winograd
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 18, 2013
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Trischa Goodnow, Uta Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Ken Winograd

Ex-officio Non-voting Members Present: Vicki Tolar Burton, Michelle Bothwell

Summary of Action Items

- Three new courses were approved for addition to the Baccalaureate Core, and one change course proposal to an existing Bacc Core course was also approved. Decisions on two other courses were deferred pending the BCC receiving additional information.
- The BCC co-chairs updated the committee on additional Synthesis Category Review work, which will commence spring term.
- Under the guidance of Vicki Tolar Burton, the BCC engaged as a group in an exercise aimed at prioritizing recommendations from the Review of Writing Report. The BCC agreed to continue the process individually prior to our first meeting of spring.

Meeting Minutes from February 13 were approved.

Course Reviews

BEE 469 (WIC), PS 343 (Cultural Diversity), and WS 463 (Contemporary Global Issues) were approved as additions to the Baccalaureate Core. A change course proposal to an existing Cultural Diversity course, ES 231, was also approved.

Per the BCC Standing Rules, WR 329 (Writing II) was referred to the Writing Advisory Board. The BCC was concerned with the narrow focus of the course. The content of the course focuses heavily on preparing a law school admission essay. Writing II is a Second Year Skills requirement, meaning students should complete it by the end of their second year. The BCC was concerned about a second year student's readiness to focus on preparing a law school essay, but the BCC deferred decision until we hear back from the Writing Advisory Board.

A decision was also deferred on HORT 111 (Biological Science). The BCC wanted to get more information from the proposal originator regarding the proposed shift of what was formerly a departmental orientation course to a Bacc Core lab science and have requested that the co-chairs invite the proposer to a meeting early spring term.

The BCC noted that proposers continue to struggle with the last question in each BCC question set in the Curricular Proposal System. This question specifically refers to unit level assessment plans for the course. A request was made to talk with the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation to incorporate instructions to proposers to consult with the school or department head prior to answering the question. The co-chairs will move this request forward.

Synthesis Category Review Updates

Kerry Kincanone and Marion Rossi shared updates regarding the Synthesis Category Review follow-up. Units with courses who had incomplete files (Category Review webform and/or syllabi) have an April 1 deadline for submitting outstanding materials. Those units whose initial submission was insufficient for us to recertify have an April 15 deadline to submit follow-up information. We will commence with reviewing these courses during spring term.
Review of Writing Report Prioritization Exercise
Vicki Tolar Burton led the group in an initial exercise to start prioritizing recommendations from the 2011-2012 Review of Writing in the Bacc Core Report. Vicki created a review rubric that we initially started considering as a group. Given the number of considerations, the BCC decided as a group that this was an activity best handled individually prior to our next meeting, and Vicki agreed to provide specific instructions to the group via email. Vicki will collect and collate responses.

Other Business
Vicki Tolar Burton also reported on positive developments relating to a project to update WIC Writing Guides. WIC has applied for a Technology Resource Fee (TRF) grant to help facilitate continued movement forward on this project.

A request for spring term meeting availability will be forthcoming from the co-chairs prior to the start of spring term.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 10, 2013 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Uta Hussong-Christian, Lori Kayes, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Ken Winograd
Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)
Guest: Stefani Dawn

Summary of Action Items

- The BCC discussed and proposed additional revisions to the assessment question that culminates the Bacc Core question sets in the Category Proposal System. Suggested revisions will be incorporated in another draft that will be shared with Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation.
- One change course proposal was approved to an existing Bacc Core course. One course was returned to its originator for suggested revisions, and another course was returned as not approved. Two other courses were reviewed and a decision was tabled pending additional review.
- BCC members were updated on Synthesis Category Review follow up. Additional category review assignments on resubmitted materials will be forthcoming.
- BCC members continued to work with prioritizing recommendations from the Review of Writing report and are close to have a manageable list of resource-neutral and resource-needed priorities.

The Meeting Minutes from March 18, 2013 were approved.

Course Reviews

Kerry Kincanon provided an update on two course reviews from the March 18 meeting. Per the BCC Standing Rules, the Writing Advisory Board was asked review the proposal for WR 329, which was seeking addition to the Writing II category. The Writing Advisory Board recommended not approving the course in its current format. Their concerns echoed those that surfaced from the BCC review at our March 18 meeting. Also, per the request of the BCC, the originator for the change course proposal for HORT 111 has agreed to come and talk with BCC at our April 24 meeting to provide more context and information about this potential addition to Biological Science.

Kerry Kincanon also presented a draft revision to the Category Proposal System Bacc Core question regarding how units will coordinate assessment of Category Learning Outcomes. BCC members have noted in consecutive meetings in February and March that proposers seem to be struggling with responses to this question and more specificity is needed in the question to help proposers understand the intent of the questions. The co-chairs took the concern to Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation, and a potential revision was developed. The BCC discussed the revision today. Ideas were suggested ranged from semantic changes to potential changes to other questions in the Bacc Core question set. The co-chairs collected feedback and agreed to review the question sets in depth to determine if revisions were needed to other questions, or if we can simply incorporate the BCC’s suggested ideas into a better assessment question.

A change course approval to shift AREC 352 from Science, Technology, and Society to Contemporary Global Issues was approved. The proposal cited its exemplary plan outlining the assessment of Category Learning Outcomes.

HST 488 was seeking inclusion in Cultural Diversity and Contemporary Global Issues. The BCC recommended approval for the latter, but expressed concern regarding the fit of the class in Cultural Diversity. The course was sent back to the originator with a request to remove the request for inclusion in Cultural Diversity.
Proposals for Film 255 and 256 (both seeking inclusion in Literature and the Arts and Cultural Diversity) were discussed, and a decision was tabled pending additional committee review.

**Synthesis Category Review Updates**
Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi shared that all units who had courses with incomplete files had submitted the requested follow up materials by the April 1 deadline. Those courses whose initial review in the fall prompted the BCC to request additional information have an April 15 deadline, but most units had already submitted the requested follow-up information. Assignments for review of these courses will be made at the next BCC meeting.

**Update from the Office of Academic Programs, Accreditation, and Assessment**
A planned presentation from Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment, was tabled due to time constraints and three members needing to leave prior to our end time. Stefani will return for our April 24 meeting, where we'll provide her an earlier agenda time.

**Update on the Review of Writing Report Prioritization**
Vicki Tolar Burton presented a summary of feedback provided by BCC members regarding resource neutral and resource required recommendations. We are getting closer to setting a short list of priorities that we can move forward to the Executive Committee for suggested implementation. A final summary will be presented to the BCC on April 24th with the goal of this priorities report drafted by early May.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 AM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 24, 2013
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Uta Hussong-Christian, Lori Kayes, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Joe Zaworski
Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton
Guests: Stefani Dawn, Sarah Finger McDonald

Summary of Action Items

- The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) welcomed Sarah Finger McDonald from Horticulture for a conversation about her change course proposal for HORT 111. The BCC shared feedback and suggested revisions for the syllabus and course proposal.
- The BCC reviewed and sent back proposals for QS 262 and QS 461 for revisions. The BCC approved the addition of HST 488 for Contemporary Global Issues.
- Vicki Tolar Burton shared a final summary of our prioritization process for the Review of Writing Report. The BCC co-chairs will reach out to the Writing Advisory Board for consultation on writing in Synthesis classes and will get an update from the School of Writing, Literature, and Film on recommendations in the Review of Writing Report related to the Writing II category.

Course Reviews

Per the request of the BCC, Sarah Finger McDonald from Horticulture joined our meeting to discuss her change course proposal for HORT 111 (85875). Sarah was tasked by her department with redesigning this class, currently a two-credit introduction to the discipline class, into a four-credit Bacc Core class aimed at a broader audience of Ecampus students. The Horticulture department has moved to a different two-credit class, HORT 112, as its introductory course for majors, although both it and HORT 111 are still listed in the catalog as part of the Ecampus General Horticulture major. McDonald discussed her vision for the new course and shared several examples from her lab manual to demonstrate how online students would realize the lab component of the course. The BCC expressed concern about potential student confusion about the HORT 111 still being listed in the major curriculum, when the intent of the new class is to reach a broader audience. The BCC recommended that Horticulture get its major curriculum adjusted before resubmitting the proposal. The BCC also suggested that McDonald consider proposing the course as a new course under a new number rather than a change course to mitigate any potential confusion with the old version of the course. Finally, BCC members recommended that McDonald consider adding greater detail to the syllabus about lab activities and make a more transparent connection between activities in the course and the Biological Science Category Learning Outcomes. The proposal was sent back to McDonald in the Curriculum Proposal System with these recommendations.

The BCC also discussed two other proposals for new courses under the Queer Studies (QS) designator from the School of Language, Culture, and Society. The originator for both proposals was seeking admission to Writing 1 and DPD for QS 262 (85345) and Cultural Diversity and Writing Intensive Course (WIC) for QS 461 (85619). Per our standing rules, the QS 262 course was submitted to the Writing Advisory Board for consideration for the Writing I. The Writing Advisory Board recommended that the BCC not approve the course for Writing I. The primary focus of Writing 121 and the primary intent of the Writing I category is the practice and refinement of writing skill. While QS 262 may have assignments and activities that facilitate writing improvement, the primary intent of the class is providing an Introduction to Queer Studies. The Writing Advisory Board also noted that having WR 121 as the only approved Writing I class is congruent with policy and practice at institutions throughout the state. The BCC voted to approve the course for DPD, but the course was returned to remove the Writing I request. For QS 461, the BCC thought it worked well for WIC, but expressed concern about adding the class to Cultural Diversity. Our reviewers understood and appreciated how the course could fit into Cultural Diversity. Ultimately, though, the BCC wasn’t comfortable
with having a 400 level class with a Writing Intensive focus in Cultural Diversity. The committee noted the progressive nature of writing in the Bacc Core. WIC classes are purposefully upper division and thus inherently assume completion of the lower-division writing experiences in the Bacc Core (Writing 1 [a first year skills requirement] and Writing II [a second year skills requirement]). Placing the class in Cultural Diversity (a category traditionally accessible to and promoted to lower-division students) would mean that a student would potentially access a WIC class prior to completing Writing I and Writing II. The BCC voted to return the course to the originator and request removal of the Cultural Diversity request, and also had recommendations for the originator to reconcile some discrepancies in the WIC word count chart.

Kerry Kincanon updated the committee on HST 488 (824489). We had previously reviewed this course for Cultural Diversity and Contemporary Global Issues. We agreed it would be a good addition to Contemporary Global Issues, but we returned it to the originator and asked him to remove the request for Cultural Diversity status. He did so, and the course was approved.

**Academic Programs, Accreditation, and Assessment (APAA) Update**
The Office of APAA played a key role in our Category Review process as it collected and organized requested materials from the units. Stefani Dawn, the Assistant Director of Assessment, shared a presentation called "Building a Bigger Picture," where she offered a summary of the process and shared how the way we have set up the Category Review process might lead us to make conclusions about the efficacy of the classes in a category. Eventually, Category Review in the aggregate will allow us to make overall conclusions about the Baccalaureate Core and whether it is fulfilling its defined role in undergraduate education. A copy of the presentation will be sent to the BCC.

**Review of Writing Report Prioritization Update**
Vicki Tolar Burton presented a summation of where we ended up with our prioritization process for the Review of Writing Report. This list will inform an update that the BCC co-chair will have an opportunity to present to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee likely in the summer. We still need to reach out to colleagues for assistance in helping us to frame our top two low/no cost priorities. We’ll seek feedback from the Writing Advisory Board to offer suggestions on how we can augment our Synthesis outcomes to clarify the writing expectations. We’ll also reach out to the School of Writing, Literature, and Film to get an update on any progress made with recommendations from the meeting related to the Writing II category.

**Synthesis Category Review - Phase II**
Kerry Kincanon handed out review assignments for Phase II of the Synthesis Category Review. Courses in this phase had incomplete files at our initial deadline and submitted complete files by a secondary deadline (April 1) established by the BCC. These reviews are due on May 7.

Meeting adjourned at 10:25.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, May 7 from 1:00-2:30 PM in 120 Waldo Hall.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 7, 2013
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Melinda Manore, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Ken Winograd, Joe Zaworski
Ex-officio Non-voting Members Present: Michelle Bothwell, Vicki Tolar Burton

Summary of Action Items

- Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) members submitted the last of the individual course reviews for the Synthesis Category Review. The BCC co-chairs will now review BCC feedback and make final recommendations on these courses.
- Four proposals were reviewed (QS 364, 431, and 462 for DPD and WSE 453 for WIC). All were deemed solid additions to their respective categories, but were sent back to proposers with suggested revisions.
- The BCC reviewed recommendations shared by the Writing Advisory Board regarding writing in Synthesis classes and agreed to integrate the recommendations as explanatory matter to supplement the outcomes.
- It was announced that Academic Affairs is phasing out the Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation now that recommendations from the Ad Hoc Baccalaureate Core Review Task Force have largely been implemented. The BCC recommended drafting a letter to Academic Affairs leadership advocating for a permanent Director of Baccalaureate Core position.

The BCC approved minutes from the April 10 and April 24 meetings.

Synthesis Category Reviews Phase II

BCC members submitted complete reviews for assigned Synthesis courses in Phase II. These courses were either missing part or all of requested materials by the initial deadline last year. BCC members shared general observations from their reviews and noted that these courses, like those in Phase I, generally met the criteria of the category, but most instructors/units had not yet fully integrated assessment or consideration of Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes into the course. The BCC co-chairs have designated time later in the month to make final considerations based on the feedback provided by BCC members.

Course Reviews

The BCC completed four course reviews. Three Queer Studies (QS) courses, 364, 431, and 462, were submitted for consideration for Difference, Power, and Discrimination. All reviewers felt the courses fit well with the category and complemented the courses on their design and integration of creative pedagogy. The only concern surrounded the issue of prerequisites and limitations. All three courses list unenforced prerequisites. QS 262, which the BCC just approved for DPD, is listed as an unenforced prerequisite on all three, and the 431 and 462 have it set up as an “or” situation with WGSS 223 or WGSS 224. BCC members did not feel we could approve a situation where one DPD class (QS 262) is a prerequisite for another DPD class (QS 364, 431, 462), even if it is not a mandatory prerequisite. Students are strongly encouraged by advisors to abide by listed perquisites, even if they are unenforced. Students also only need to take one class to meet the category requirement. If the class a student ultimately wants to take for DPD is QS 364, 431 or 462 having QS 262 as a prerequisite, essentially makes them take two DPD classes instead of one in order to ensure success in upper division QS course. Having WGSS 223/224 as recommended or even enforced prerequisites was easier for BCC members to reconcile because even though these two courses are DPD, they also are part of Social, Processes, and Institutions. So, in that instance, students can still meet another category by taking the prerequisite.

The BCC decided to send back these courses with recommended changes to ensure students who potentially will take these classes have the appropriate academic background and acumen to succeed. Our reviewers
noted that the curriculum of these courses, as outlined in the proposals, is appropriately upper division in its rigor. Given that rigor, and that the 431 and 462 are slash classes with graduate students, the BCC would like to see the following changes before we can add these courses to DPD.

1. Remove QS 262 as a recommended prerequisite on all three classes.
2. Class restrict QS 364 to sophomore level and above.
3. Class restrict QS 431 and 462 to junior level and above.

The BCC was fine with the proposer leaving WGSS 223/224 as recommended prerequisites on QS 431 and 462. The BCC felt that adding the class level restrictions would be a good way to assure that students are prepared to manage the expectations and workload of the course.

The final review this week was for Wood Science and Engineering (WSE) 453 as a possible addition to WIC. The proposal is strong, but the course will be sent back to the proposers with a request to have the WIC Category Learning Outcomes listed distinctly from the course outcomes and clearly identified as Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes.

**Addendum to Synthesis Outcomes**

Given that both the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report and the Synthesis Category Review both illuminated the great variability amongst Synthesis courses with regard to addressing and integrating the Category Learning Outcome and criteria related to writing, the BCC co-chairs followed up on a BCC recommendation to reach out to the Writing Advisory Board (WAB) for suggestions on how we might augment the Synthesis Outcomes to clarify writing expectations in these categories. The WAB responded with the following recommendation:

**From the Writing Advisory Board**

Thank you for inviting us to consider ways to strengthen writing in Synthesis courses. We have discussed the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core recommendations.

We recommend that Synthesis courses include the following:

- A course cap of 70 students. If enrollment is over 70, then break-outs (recitations) or GTAs should be used to ensure that students receive adequate and timely writing feedback.
- A single out-of-class written assignment with a minimum of 1250 words plus references that develops and sustains a critical perspective using evidence as support and a multidisciplinary approach. The assignment should include at least 2 outside sources.

We also recommend that the Bacc Core Committee develop a Synthesis rationale statement that will precede the learning outcomes for CGI and STS on each syllabus. Students and faculty need a stronger understanding of what “synthesis” means.

We are willing to provide supporting materials that Synthesis faculty might use to strengthen writing in their courses. These will be available on the Bacc Core website Faculty page and will include a rubric for responding to writing that faculty can adapt to their needs, if they desire.

The BCC discussed several possibilities for incorporating this recommendation in a visible way to help Synthesis faculty better understand means to best achieve the Bacc Core Category Learning Outcome in both Synthesis categories that references evidence-based writing. Ideas ranged from changing the criteria to be more specific, to changing the outcomes. Vicki Tolar Burton noted that there was precedence with the BCC adding explanatory matter to help clarify criteria/outcomes in the WIC category. BCC members agreed to take the bullet-pointed portion of the WAB recommendation, preface it with commentary on how these recommendations generated from the Review of Writing report and the 2012 Synthesis Category Review, and add it as explanatory matter to supplement the outcomes. The BCC co-chairs will also propose revisions to the Synthesis Bacc Core Question sets in the Curricular Proposal System to incorporate the WAB recommendations.

**Update from Academic Affairs**

Vicki Tolar Burton shared with the BCC that her position as Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation is being phased out. The original intent of the position was to be transitional to see through recommendations generated by the Ad Hoc Task Force review of the Bacc Core, and that intent is now largely complete. She will remain in her WIC director position and will return to her faculty position in the School of Writing, Literature, and Film. While the BCC acknowledged the completion of the implementation phase,
members were interested in advocating for the creation of a permanent Director of Baccalaureate Core given that the institution is shifting toward thinking of the Bacc Core as a program. Such a position would help with oversight, advocacy, and consultation around the Bacc Core, and be of great resource and continuity to the BCC co-chairs and committee members, who turn over frequently. Based on suggestions and recommendations generated by the BCC at the meeting, the BCC co-chairs will work on drafting a letter to Academic Affairs leadership advocating for such a position.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, May 21 from 1:00-2:30 in 120 Waldo Hall.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 21, 2013 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Trischa Goodnow, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Marion Rossi (co-chair), Ken Winograd, Joe Zaworski
Ex-officio Non-voting Members Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)
Guests: Bill Bogley, Stefani Dawn

Summary of Action Items:

- An emerging issue for the BCC to consider is how to ensure the efficacy of transfer courses in meeting Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes. Future iterations of the BCC may want to engage in a more formal investigation of this, and potentially pursue greater involvement as a second-level approver of transfer courses seeking approval as OSU Baccalaureate Core classes.
- Stefani Dawn presented on OSU’s involvement with the Multi-State Collaborative and extended an invitation to participate in a pilot project involving the application of VALUE rubrics to assess relevant Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes in our Writing and Mathematics Baccalaureate Core Categories.

The BCC approved the May 7 Minutes.

LBCC Transfer Degrees and the Baccalaureate Core
Bill Bogley, Director of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA), joined us for a discussion regarding LBCC transfer students and the Bacc Core. Bill has been in conversation with Katie Winder, Dean of Liberal Arts, regarding LBCC’s efforts to attend to our Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes (CLO) in their transfer degree programs (Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer [AAOT] and Associate of Science [AS]) and their courses that articulate to our Baccalaureate Core (Katie was slated to join us for this meeting, but had to cancel at the last minute). The AAOT and AS contain established learning outcomes, and while there is certainly crossover with the Bacc Core CLO, there are nuances. For example, LBCC has one set of outcomes for Writing/Composition whereas OSU has distinct sets of outcomes for both Writing I and Writing II. LBCC will continue to work on reconciling differences, but Bill suggested that this discussion potentially raises questions for future iterations of the BCC to consider. For example, should we consider a study or investigation of transfer courses from our key community college partners to examine the efficacy of course content and student learning in these courses relative to the Bacc Core CLO? Also, currently new direct transfer articulations are managed solely by the equivalent department at OSU. Should the BCC be a second-level approver on those courses that would articulate as meeting a Bacc Core requirement at OSU?

APAA and BCC Category Review
Bill also checked in with the BCC on the Category Review process as it relates to the bigger picture of assessment of General Education at OSU. Concerns abound from all players in the process about the workload and the impact on both the units offering the courses and the faculty who constitute the BCC and must engage in a very involved process. APAA is committed to helping facilitate an ongoing assessment process that is tenable to units and allows them to tap into processes already occurring at the unit and classroom level. This includes both positioning APAA to offer practical advice to units on creating a manageable and sustainable process for considering student learning relative to Bacc Core CLO in their Bacc Core classes, as well as defining an appropriate threshold of data that the BCC needs to make Category Review decisions.

OSU and the Multi-State Collaborative
Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment, joined the BCC to share a working-group opportunity related to OSU’s participation in the Multi-State Collaborative. This is a national pilot effort involving OUS schools...
(OSU, UO, PSU, OIT) and schools in Massachusetts, Kentucky, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Indiana, Minnesota, and Utah that has the goal of finding a way to compare the level of learning achieved by students in the various "segments" of the public system (community colleges, universities) with the level of learning achieved by students at peer institutions in other states **without relying on a standardized test.** The collaborative is exploring whether using VALUE rubrics established by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is a more viable and authentic assessment of student learning. Stefani gave a presentation outlining the genesis of our involvement in this process. Stefani is convening a working group to investigate the application of VALUE rubrics to assess relevant Bacc Core CLO in our Writing and Mathematics categories, and BCC members were invited to participate, if interested.

Stefani’s materials appear below:

- [Multi-State Collaborative Principles](#)
- [Scope of Work OSU Multi-State Collaborative Working Group](#)
- VALUE Rubrics
  - [Quantitative Literacy](#)
  - [Written Communication](#)
- Stefani’s [Multi-State Collaborative PowerPoint](#)

**Update on Recent Course Reviews**

Per our May 7 course reviews, Kerry Kincanon shared an update that the BCC’s suggested revisions to QS 364, 431, and 462 have been implemented by the proposer. These courses have been approved for addition to the Bacc Core.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

Next Meeting: June 5, 2013 – 9:00-10:30 AM – Waldo 120
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 5, 2013
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Uta Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Rebecca Olson, Marion Rossi (co-chair)
Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)
Guests: Sunil Khanna, Valerie Rosenberg

Action Items:

- The BCC completed one course review, WR 240, a potential addition to Writing II. The BCC tabled a decision until the Writing Advisory Board has a chance to look at the course.
- The BCC co-chairs shared final decisions on Phase II of the Synthesis Category Review. All courses in Phase II will be approved, but the co-chairs will provide targeted feedback to certain courses and flag them for a follow-up review in 2014-15.
- BCC members are invited to share feedback on a memo from the BCC to Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate leadership advocating for a permanent Director of the Baccalaureate Core. Hard copies were distributed, and an electronic copy was sent to each BCC member.

May 21 minutes not yet complete. Approval of May 21 and June 5 minutes will happen electronically

Course Reviews

The BCC completed one course review – WR 240, a course proposed for addition to Writing II. Reviewers expressed a generally favorable response to the course, the originator’s responses to the BC questions, and the fit with the category. The only concern was that assignments were very narrowly defined on the syllabus (which is common) and there wasn’t a transparent connection made to the relationship between the assignments and the learning outcomes. Per our standing rules, the BCC will await word from the Writing Advisory Board before proceeding on approval or request for additional changes.

As it is our last meeting of the academic year, the BCC will not have occasion to conduct reviews in person until next fall. The co-chairs will monitor incoming reviews through the end of June to determine which need immediate attention and which can be held until next fall.

Synthesis Course Review Update

The co-chairs have finished considering the BCC’s Category Review for Phase II of the process. All courses in Phase II will be approved, although some units will be provided targeted feedback and their courses will be flagged for priority follow up in the 2014-2015 academic year. Decisions will be communicated to the units in the coming weeks.

First Year Skills Compliance

Vicki Tolar Burton updated the BCC on undergraduate compliance with the First Year Skills requirement. With the implementation of the First Year Skills Requirement starting in the fall of 2011, incoming OSU undergraduates are required to complete Writing I, Speech, and Mathematics requirements before they complete 45 credits. At the time of this requirement, the decision was made not to create an enforcement mechanism, but rather to rely on advisors to promote and advocate for completion of these three categories. Vicki shared data showing a comparison by college of 2010-11 (the year before the requirement was implemented) and 2012-13 cohorts. The numbers demonstrate marked improvement in almost all colleges for compliance in all three categories. Vicki and Kerry will be taking these numbers to both the Academic Advising Council and the Council of Head Advisors workgroup to get feedback on reasons for non-compliance and whether or not the BCC should pursue an enforcement policy. Kerry noted that, from his experience, students often have valid reasons for non-compliance with First Year Skills classes the first year.
Dual Degree Programs with International Universities
Sunil Khanna, Associate Provost for International Programs, and Valerie Rosenberg, INTO Director of Student Experience and Director of International Admissions, visited the BCC to discuss an emerging priority for internationalization efforts at OSU – the establishment of Dual Degree programs between OSU and international universities. The Dual Degree program, whereby a student would earn two degrees (one from OSU and one from the international partner) has precedence at other institutions, and there is desire on the part of international universities to create such a program at OSU. A task force has been formed to look at models for such a program, and that group has initiated work to create a template for a Memo of Understanding. As this program incorporates all aspects of an undergraduate degree, the role and position of the Bacc Core in the Dual Degree program and how much of it a student would need to complete is germane to how the program develops and any agreements that are established. Sunil and Valerie would like representation from the BCC on the task force, particularly when they get to the stage of site visits from potential partners to OSU. The co-chairs will make sure that this request is included in the annual report under emerging issues for the BCC to consider next year.

Advocating for a Director of Baccalaureate Core
Per conversations that happened at the May 7 BCC meeting, Kerry shared a draft of a memo to be sent to Academic Affairs and Senate leadership advocating for the creation of a Director Baccalaureate Core. Members were invited to review the memo and share feedback over email. The memo will also be sent electronically to individual members of the BCC with an invitation to suggest additions or revisions before the co-chairs forward the memo to intended recipients. Those present noted that a Director of the Baccalaureate Core would actually be the ideal person to liaison to the aforementioned Dual Degree task force and suggested adding it as an example.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 AM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 7, 2011 ~ 10:00 - 11:00
Minutes

Submitted by Bill Bogley

Voting Members Present: Victor Hsu, Rebecca Olson, Penny Diebel, Uta Hussong-Christian, Marion Rossi, Kirsi Peltomaki, Kerry Kincanon, Bill Bogley, Joe Zaworski
Ex-Officio Members Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD Director), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director)

Summary of Actions/Agreements from this meeting:

- Each committee member has the right and responsibility to review and provide needed changes to meeting minutes prior to consensus acknowledgment at a subsequent meeting.
- Actions on course proposals will be by the committee as a whole; individual roles in proposal review and presentation will be redacted from the minutes and agenda.
- Co-chairs will assign new proposals from the CPS to committee members. Proposals will be discussed in alternate committee meetings, as listed in meeting agendas. Co-chairs will enter actions into CPS.
- The BCC is not responsible for conducting institutional assessment. Our role in review and evaluation of assessment data is under discussion.

Minutes from the Sept 27, 2011 meeting were acknowledged by those present as written. No comments or questions were received from the committee. P. Diebel will take minutes at the Oct. 11 meeting.

Curriculum Proposal System

- Co-chairs will verify that all members are enrolled in the system. Vicki Tolar Burton reviewed the course-level approval process.
  - Student workers have been helpful to vet syllabi for required elements. Category checklists have required objective elements "above the line." Subjective elements for committee member scrutiny are "below the line." E.g. determining whether the "course emphasizes elements of critical thinking" properly lies below the line. Checklists do not yet reflect the new category outcomes requirement for syllabi that was adopted in May 2010. A student worker has not yet been identified for this year.
  - CPS lists proposals from draft stage through final approval. Users can search for proposals that have or will be routed to BCC. Can also refine list to proposals currently for review/approval by BCC.
  - Actual proposer may not be evident at first look. Some units list clerical staff.
  - Campus/Ecampus status is listed. Once a course is approved for any location/mode, it is approved for all. A request is pending to Registrar for all BC courses relative to when they were offered and in what mode.
  - There are general category level policies concerning prerequisites and level.
  - Answers to BC questions should be reflected in the syllabus. Questions are category specific. BC questions are subject to review and revision by the BCC.
  - Committee review process was discussed as summarized above.
    - Suggestion: create BCC login to CPS that does not identify commenter individually (to Sara Williams).
    - Agenda is public. Share internal information, such as proposal review assignments and discussion scheduling, by listserv.
    - Course reviews at every other meeting at most.

Standing Rules

The Committee on Committees has proposed changes to BCC Standing Rules. The BCC had a brief and preliminary discussion of draft changes that were presented with the agenda for this meeting. BCC does not take the lead on institutional assessment. BCC reviews and evaluates assessment data in order to include...
considerations of direct and indirect measures of student learning into category and BC program review. BCC can specify or shape what assessment data is reported to BCC. Committee members will provide suggested changes to the co-chairs for further discussion at the next meeting.

Future meetings will not adjourn so late as this one was.

**Fall Meeting Dates:**

*All meetings will take place 10-11 a.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room (109 Gilkey) unless noted.*

- Tuesday, October 11
- Friday, October 21
- Friday, November 4
- Friday, November 18
- Tuesday, November 29
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 11, 2011
Faculty Senate Conference Room, Gilkey 109
Minutes

Submitted by Penny Diebel

Voting Members Present: Penny Diebel, Rebecca Olson, Marion Rossi, Kerry Kincanon, Bill Bogley, Jaga Giebultowicz
Ex-Officios Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD Director), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director)

Summary of Actions/Agreements from this meeting:

- Co-chairs will create a Curriculum Proposal Review Process template for members.
- U. Hussong-Christian and M. Rossi will be representatives from the committee to attend an architectural meeting for the BCC website. V. Tolar-Burton solicited a few advisors names (from K. Kincanon) and students (from B. Bogley).
- B. Bogley will provide another revision of the BCC Standing Rules based on the committee recommendation at the next meeting.

Minutes from the October 7, 2011 meeting were acknowledged by those present as written. R. Olson will record minutes for the October 21st meeting.

Curriculum Proposal System
Process decisions made at the October 7, 2011 meetings were reviewed. Co-chairs will create a review process template for members.

Discussion:
- There is still no student worker yet to complete cover sheets. Only cover sheets will be sent to reviewing members, other materials must be reviewed in the Proposal System on-line.
- Review comments/recommendations will be brought to designated meeting, discussed and final decision of committee will be recorded in the on-line system by the co-chairs. Reviewers should highlight for the Committee both issues with specific proposals, as well as examples of outstanding proposals.
- Agenda for meetings should list the proposal numbers to be discussed.

BCC Web Development
A media review group reviewing university web sites found that OSU ranked poorly compared to peer institutions with regard to student access and overall web presence of the Bacc Core message and associated materials. Therefore a small group will be working with web design students to improve the web presence.

U. Hussong-Christian and M. Rossi will be representatives from the committee to attend an architectural meeting for the BCC website. V. Tolar-Burton solicited a few advisors names (K. Kincanon) and students (B. Bogley).

Discussion:
- Design should reflect final audience. There are really two audiences – students and advisors/faculty. Each needs something different from the site and therefore should be linked, but the opening should not contain the details that faculty may be looking for (proposal guidelines, etc.). The opening page should draw in students to the purpose, story, and meaning of Bacc Core (as directed by the ad hoc committee recommendations for Bacc Core, as well). Bacc Core should be purposeful on campus and not surrounded by dismissive language from students, faculty, advisors, or administrators. Committee members may be asked to assist in writing elements of the content, particularly the statement of purpose.
2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
B. Bogley pointed out that several of our current working items are on the chart of the work to be done by the committee in the Guiding Categories for 2011-2012 on the back of each meeting agenda.

Standing Rules
Revisions to the standing rules, as suggested by the committee, were distributed by B. Bogley.

Discussion:
Preamble. All favored some-type of added language in the preamble that emphasized that BCC reviews data and incorporates that data into the Bacc Core review process but is not an initiator of assessment data collection.

A. Course Selections. There was general acceptance of the changes to incorporate the corrected description of writing skills in A4.

B. BCC Reviews. There was extensive discussion about the meaning and linkages between 1 through 5 of this section, as revised. Discussion centered on both the BCC not being the initiator of assessment tools and the division of the process into Course and Category reviews and their linkages. In addition, the question was raised how BCC insures the correct type of assessment is collected to be useful for this process; where is BCC in the determination of assessment needs (University Assessment Directors Office). B. Bogley will provide another revision based on the committee recommendations below:

- B.1. focuses on new courses
- B.2 and B.5. moved, focus on review of courses, are combined and fall within B.3.
- B.3. Is the Category review which includes course review (B.2. and B.5.) the general statement in B.3. should include the language "...will periodically request and review assessment institutional data in order to evaluate Bacc Core categories based on:"
- B.3.a. is ok as revised
- B.3.b. is ok as revised
- B.3.c. is ok as revised
- B.3.d. should be from B.2. – consistency of individual course learning outcomes to those of the category criteria. The BCC has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuations of Bacc Core status for courses that no longer meet the criteria (from B.5.).
- B.4. A two-thirds majority of the Bacc Core committee is required to approve or deny any course Bacc Core status.

Meeting was adjourned on time, but with much discussion still on the table.

Fall Meeting Dates:
All meetings will take place 10-11 a.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room unless noted.
- Friday, October 21
- Friday, November 4
- Friday, November 18
- Tuesday, November 29
Minutes submitted by Rebecca Olson

Voting Members Present: Bill Bogley, Penny Diebel, Jaga Giebultowicz, Victor Hsu, Ute Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon, Rebecca Olson, Kirsi Peltomaki, Marion Rossi, Dawn Sherwood

Ex-officio Members Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD)

Summary of Actions/Agreements

- Standing Rules draft was amended (this included a new definition of committee quorum). The newest draft will be circulated via email and will be voted on at the November 4 meeting.
- Current course proposals will be assigned to reviewers and discussed at the November 4 meeting.

Minutes from the October 11 meeting were acknowledged by those present. U. Hussong-Christian will take minutes at the Nov. 4 meeting, provided she can attend.

Standing Rules

Members reviewed and acknowledged changes made to the draft of the Baccalaureate Core Committee Standing Rules since the last meeting, and in response to member feedback via email. One of the most significant of these revisions was the dedication of Section A to protocol having to do with new proposals and Section B to category review (it will therefore be renamed to reflect this change).

Discussion of the draft began with questions about A.5. (specifically, whether or not review by the Curriculum Council occurs prior to BCC approval) and A.3. (which seemed to be inherited from a previous committee for reasons unknown). Members concluded that the wording of the draft was sufficiently flexible.

It was suggested that the second sentence of B.4. (regarding the BCC's authority to request changes to and/or deny continuation of existing courses) be made its own item. As currently worded, the authority to change or discontinue courses would depend on satisfaction of category criteria. This initiated discussion about the differences between (or lack of differences between) category review and course review. It was suggested that the clause "that no longer meet the appropriate criteria" be removed, and that the new sentence should become B.2.

The committee next addressed the issue of quorum (addressed in A.6. and B.2 – in the future B.3 of the standing rules). Concerns were raised as to the likelihood of 2/3 of the voting members of the committee (14 faculty and 2 students, as specified in the preamble to the standing rules) being present at a vote. The option of email voting was discussed, and how best such a vote could be facilitated. Some felt that the Standing Rules themselves should be voted on this way, as some members active in its revisions were not able to be present at the meeting. It was pointed out that holding online votes after the minutes had been distributed would allow members to make a more informed decision, as would access to proposals themselves. Another member observed that minutes do not always include detail on specific courses. Members expressed concern that a quorum of 2/3 of members present would not always mean sufficient participation, while a 2/3 majority of all voting members could slow the committee's ability to act. The committee was informed that, without defining quorum in its Standing Rules, the Roberts Rules of Order would be applied, wherein a majority of all voting members would constitute a quorum. Members then agreed to amend the standing rules so that A.6 will read "A majority of voting BCC members present is required to approve or deny the status..." and to revise B.3. to be consistent with this definition. This is in line with Faculty Senate protocol. Should attendance at a particular meeting be considered insufficient, items can be reserved for a future meeting.

The committee reviewed the newly proposed amendments to the Standing Rules draft: quorum will be
defined in A.6 (and defined similarly in B.3); B. will be titled "Category Review"; the current second sentence of B.d. will become new item B.2.

There was a motion to vote on the Standing Rules, amended as proposed, via email. This was seconded. The motion was then withdrawn. Members agreed that the new draft should be circulated, to allow for discussion via email, and voted on at the November 4 meeting.

Course proposals
K. Kincanon acknowledged three course proposals awaiting committee review. One of these is currently under review, the other two will be assigned to reviewers, and proposals will be discussed at the next meeting.

Meeting was adjourned on time.

Fall Meeting Dates:
All meetings will take place 10-11 AM in the Faculty Senate Conference Room unless noted
Friday, November 4
Friday, November 18
Tuesday, November 29
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 4, 2011
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Bill Bogley, Penny Diebel, Victor Hsu, Ute Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon, Michael Lerner, David McMurray, Marion Rossi, Dawn Sherwood
Ex-officio Members Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

Summary of Actions/Agreements:
- Motion to approve revised Standing Rules was passed.
- ENG 330 recommended for BCC approval pending addition of missing syllabus elements.
- SPAN 237 recommended for BCC approval pending addition of BCC category learning outcomes.
- A number of big picture issues arose in consideration of these proposals. These are itemized below for future discussion.

Minutes from Oct 21 were acknowledged, as written, by those present. M. Lerner will take minutes on November 18, provided he can attend.

Standing Rules
Members reviewed and acknowledged several changes to the BCC Standing Rules made subsequent to the October 21 meeting. Changes included: 1) clarification in A.4 that courses seeking approval as WR I or WR II courses are routed to the Writing Advisory Board for review, and 2) incorporation in A.5 that courses need to address category learning outcomes.

Discussion centered on the issue of denial of approval for course inclusion in the BaccCore if a given category is replete with courses and no additional courses are needed to enhance category course access. Current language of "will be approved" if criteria met and learning outcomes addressed does not allow flexibility for denial by BCC. Suggestion to amend language to "can be approved" was put forth and approved. Motion to vote on revised and amended Standing Rules was seconded; BCC members present voted unanimously to approve Standing Rules. Rules now pass back to the Committee on Committees for review.

Course Proposal Reviews
ENG 330
New course. Proposal will go back for inclusion of missing syllabus elements; pending these changes, course is recommended for BCC approval. Issues with upper division numbering and requisite sophomore standing sparked much discussion, and will be noted in review, but BCC will not deny approval on these concerns at this time.

Discussion centered around need to continue with Perspectives courses generally having no prereqs or having prereqs that are not "restrictive." Historically, Perspectives category was aimed at lower-division students. But upper division courses, that may require academic skills not yet well-developed in lower-division students, have been regularly approved. And "restrictive" prereqs are regularly appearing. Accepted practices differing from original intentions for Perspectives categories (and others). Do we start denying upper-division courses in Perspectives? Do we start denying courses with prereqs that knock out lower-division students? What about the need for 300-level courses so that students can fulfill upper division course requirements for graduation. The issue of 3-credit vs. 4-credit courses was also raised.

- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional application of "no prereqs" policy.
SPAN 237
Requested revisions have resulted in solid proposal. Course increases diversity of offerings in Cultural Diversity category and helps meet high demand in category. Data supplied through IR by Susie Brubaker-Cole indicates that during 2010-2011, offered sections of Cultural Diversity classes were filled to more than 96% capacity. So the presence of additional offerings is welcome here.

The course is proposed as an Ecampus course with no face-to-face offerings planned in the immediate future. The general principle exists that no campus student should be forced to take an Ecampus course in order to fulfill degree requirements for graduation. In another data set from IR, again provided by Susie Brubaker-Cole and provided to the BCC, 2006-2007, 13.6% of all Cultural Diversity enrollments were through Ecampus. That figure rose to 17.4% during 2008-2009. The committee should monitor the growing proportion of Ecampus offerings within the Bacc Core.

Proposal will go back for inclusion of missing BCC learning outcomes; pending these changes, course is recommended for BCC approval.

Discussion around plan to offer only through Ecampus and larger issue of BCC courses transitioning to Ecampus without BCC reviewing revised course to ensure it meets BCC criteria. Additional discussion around timeline of course submissions. When courses are submitted late in the academic year (after March), it is very difficult to provide timely review given academic year-end activities. May need to provide guidance on review timeline in relation to submission date; this does commit us to make timely review of courses submitted earlier.

- **Discussion ITEM:** BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in Ecampus course conversion process.
- **Discussion ITEM:** BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not addressed until the following September.

WS 462
BCC learning outcomes are not explicitly stated as BCC learning outcomes; needs to go back to have outcomes added. Approval recommendation tabled as proposal needs further discussion.

**Accreditation, Evaluation of Student Learning in Category Review & Assessment of Student Learning in the BaccCore**
Assessment of student learning in the General Education curriculum is the primary function of Administration through Assessment Director (reflected in 50% appointment to Gen Ed assessment for the new Assistant Director of Assessment that OSU is in the process of trying to hire). Deficiencies in addressing assessment of student learning in the BaccCore is highlighted by the Accreditation Site Visit Team and University needs to respond with changes. BCC is responsible for, as part of the category review, reflecting on assessment data and what it means for changes to the Core and faculty development for those teaching in the BaccCore. But BCC is not responsible for collecting the data or doing the assessment; this is a function of Assessment staff.

What assessment data/reports do we need passed to us?

- **Discussion ITEM:** BCC needs to decide what data/reports are needed from Assessment staff.

Meeting adjourned at 11:21 AM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 18, 2011 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Bill Bogley, Penny Diebel, Jaga Giebultowicz, Ute Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon, Michael Lerner, Dawn Sherwood
Ex-officio Member Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD)

Summary of Actions/Agreements:

- WS462/562 sent back for syllabus revision, with notes on slash and prereq issues discussed.
- The BCC role in BaccCore category assessment was discussed, and a sample assessment course report distributed.
- A BCC retreat, probably during finals week, will address implementing a trial assessment process in Sp12.

Meeting opened at 10:38 AM. Minutes from November 4 were acknowledged, as written, by those present. No recorder of minutes was identified for the November 29 meeting; someone needs to be found.

Review of Proposal 81341 (WS 462/562 Introduction to LGBTQ Studies)

Two concerns from last meeting were reviewed, (1) that this is a slash course (there are other examples, but this is not optimal for a BCC course), and (2) there are significant prereqs that may impede student access.

The general issue of prereqs for BaccCore courses was discussed, as was the general makeup of DPD and completion trends surrounding the category. It was noted that 20% of students meet DPD by transfer credits, and an additional 10% by AP credits. Bill has relevant OSU-IR data on course capacities and enrollment demographics to share. Also, instructor approval can replace some prereqs. A related concern is that departments might use BaccCore prereqs to increase participation in lower-level courses.

Since BCC learning outcomes are not explicitly stated as BCC learning outcomes, this proposal needs to go back for revision. The issues over slash courses and prereqs might be noted to the submitters, but these should be addressed separately, perhaps during category reviews.

- Discussion ITEM: Should the BCC consider a blanket "philosophy" be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (Similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampsus courses to obtain their degree.)
- Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?

Accreditation, Evaluation of Student Learning in Category Review & Assessment of Student Learning in the BaccCore

The BCC will contribute to assessment of student learning in the Gen Ed curriculum and needs to design a process for category review. The open position of Assistant Director of Assessment will also contribute significantly to this task, with details to be clarified. Departments offering Core courses are also key participants in course-level assessment of Core courses.

A schema of the assessment protocol was distributed. The BCC’s role is to help evaluate whether course offerings are addressing BaccCore category learning outcomes, whether these outcomes are being met and, where needed, to implement changes in the Bacc Core structure and courses. Departments will be responsible for Bacc Core course assessment. The Office of Assessment will be asked to provide process infrastructure and collate summary assessment info for the BCC. Towards the issue of how this information transfer will occur, a sample online assessment course report was distributed and discussed. Further input will be solicited at upcoming meetings.
An accreditation plan must be in place by March 2012 to allow data collection in Sp12 and analysis by F12. The target will be synthesis categories in the BaccCore. A retreat during Finals week will be planned to move this along.

- **Discussion ITEM:** Further, are all courses (and all sections) assessed each year, or just a subset (random sample)?
- **Discussion ITEM:** How can these course reports help address specific issues – can they include prereq details, etc...

Meeting was adjourned at 11:32 AM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 29, 2011 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Bill Bogley, Penny Diebel, Kerry Kincanon, Marion Rossi, Rebecca Olsen
Ex-officio Members Present: none

Summary of Actions/Agreements:

- Reminder: Fall 2011 BCC Retreat/Workshop from Noon-3:00 PM on Thursday, December 8 in MLM 215. RSVP TODAY to Bill.Bogley@oregonstate.edu for lunch reservation.

Meeting opened at 10:00 AM. Minutes from November 18 were acknowledged, as written, by those present. No recorder of minutes was identified, as meetings beyond December have not been scheduled.

Information Items:

- Website update: A meeting with designers, committee members, advisor and students about the architecture of the new website was held about website. Vicki Tolar Burton was not present for an update.
- CPS questions request: the committee now has copies of the BCC Proposal questions from the Curriculum Proposal System and we will be evaluating and revising at the December workshop. It may be some time before changes can be reflected in the System.
- Upcoming Barometer article: B. Bogley reported that there will be a Barometer article regarding Bacc Core requirements. B. Bogley and V. Tolar Burton met with reporter. (Article appeared in the November 30, 2011 issue).

Review of Emerging Issues

The list of current Discussion Items included with the Agenda for today’s meeting was updated and distributed by B. Bogley (see updated Nov. 29 agenda included with these minutes as an attachment). List will be used at our December workshop.

- The BCC will likely be part of a team being put together to develop BCC Assessment for accreditation. We need to prepare our input. There will be opportunity for faculty input (Vicki will be arranging focus group meetings this winter) and BCC will have a role on how those sessions are constructed.
- 3 types of issues emerge:
  - Structure of BCC Program (prereq, slash, AP, UD/LD) etc.
  - Process (Ecampus, proposal submission process/timeline)
    - We should consider what the Curriculum Council policy is for completing reviews; so we are not holding up their work (i.e. summer reviews)
  - review/assessment criteria (these will be treated systemic in the workshop next week)

Category Review Process/information Preliminary Discussion

What is it that we need for review?

- Review Roadmap – distributed at previous mtg (three primary sources – Assessment Office, Departments, Colleges)
- Review Proto-type web form
  - data is collected and assessment at the department level
  - department submit one page per BCC course per year
    - Generally the format is good
    - Make box titles more reflective of what we want in the box, "current", "analysis and
changes", etc.
  ● Do we look at five years of annual reports every category review cycle? That creates a question of workload for Committee.
  ● What evidence would we get from this of any courses not meeting criteria and Category Learning Outcomes?
    ○ Are assessment tools/measures appropriate to Category Learning Outcomes?
    ○ What are we sending back to departments? (close the loop)
  ● The greatest challenge is not the input form, but is the rhetoric and frame that addresses the resistance to the process, e.g. the flowchart.
  ● BCC committee and then department/colleges present most of the work and the institution is only a flow through – how do we reflect this is valuable to you as a teacher?
  ● The Office of Assessment has existing program level assessment reporting frameworks and can adapt to BC Category Learning Outcomes assessment.
  ● Should we do a sampling so they simply respond to a single Category Learning Outcome?
  ● Can we use the online SET to get student perceptions of meeting BC Category Learning Outcomes?
  ● Link this review form/information to the new course proposal information to track changes and consistency?
  ● Some of this discussion needs to occur with the new Assistant Assessment Director position – but we cannot wait until filled.
  ● Timeline for Developing this Process:
    ○ March 15th we have to have a five-year plan for reviewing/assessing BCC.
    ○ Pilot done in the spring before the accreditation team returns.

Retreat Workshop Planning
Primary Topics:
  ● What information about student learning can BCC use to inform category review?
    ○ We should look at student learning as part of our mission. Does the course and student learning reflect BCC Category LOs?
    ○ Start at course level in the department, information will be limited and funneled up to our committee?

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.
Voting Members Present: Dawn Sherwood, Michael Lerner, Penny Diebel, Joe Zaworski, Ute Hussong-Christian, Bill Bogley, Kerry Kincanon
Ex-officio Members Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD ex-officio), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC ex-officio)

**Action Item:** Either the BCC as a whole or a subcommittee will be called upon to help create or vet narrative for the Bacc Core website that is in development.

**Action Item:** At the next meeting on February 16, the BCC will begin review of a draft of a five-year plan for category review.

**Action Item:** The BCC will be revising the current questions in the Curricular Proposal System. BCC members will be paired up and assigned question revisions for a couple of categories. Templates will be provided that include category criteria, rationale, outcomes, and current question sets. Revisions will be due at the next meeting on February 16.

**Action Item:** Two proposals are currently in the Curricular Proposal System. These will likely be assigned to two specific BCC members in the coming week.

**Updates:**

- The BCC now has a student member, Brian Powell. Brian is very active in ASOSU. He has class conflicts with our first two meetings, but he should be at our March meeting.
- Co-Chairs Bogley and Kincanon presented an update at the January 12 Faculty Senate meeting on vitalization agenda implementation and BCC activities in the last year and half. The two, along with V. Tolar Burton, are scheduled to present to the Undergraduate Education Council on February 2, and have a tentative agreement to present at an upcoming Provost’s Council meeting.
- V. Tolar Burton and Associate Provost S. Brubaker-Cole will present to the Council of Head Advisors on Fall Term compliance with alpha-sectioned Writing I and Speech categories, which are both part of the First-Year Skills requirement.
- Per a recommendation generated at the BCC retreat in December, Academic Programs will be updating the Syllabus Minimum Requirements section of its web site to incorporate language about Bacc Core courses needing to include appropriate Category Learning Outcomes and information about how students will achieve these outcomes.
- The web form used to gather data and syllabi for BC assessment and BC Category Review is nearing final revision, and it will soon migrate to the Office of Assessment web site. They will have processes in place to collect and collate materials for the BCC to use in category reviews and for colleges and departments to download as output for future consideration. M. Lerner suggested that the web form be revised to include the question, "Do you want to renew Bacc Core status for this course?" The group concurred that this was a good addition. Preliminary conversations have been initiated with the Office of Assessment about other indirect measures through student surveys and Institutional Research that can be provided as complementary data to support BC Category Review.
- V. Tolar Burton and S. Dawn, the new Assistant Director of Assessment, will be offering workshops in February to help unit leaders prepare for the upcoming pilot involving the Synthesis categories and the new BCC Category Review.
- V. Tolar Burton reported that the architecture for the Bacc Core Website is in place, but the site still needs to be populated with information and content. The BCC as a whole or a subcommittee will be called upon to help create or vet narrative on the site. BCC members discussed looking to other university pages to help us shape voice and attend to the various audiences. V. Tolar Burton pointed
out that many sites her intern audited last year tended to drift towards faculty-focused language and being repositories for general education assessment data and processes. BCC members also discussed tapping into language from the AAC&U publication "Why Do I Need to Take This Course?" and the Vitalization report.

**Discussion:** Accreditation and Metrics for Outcomes Assessment – The BCC is aware that we will be asked to provide input on the Accreditation follow-up report. The BCC agreed that our response to the recommendation about Bacc Core assessment of learning outcomes needs to align with our proposal for how the BCC will move forward with a Bacc Core Category Review process that is attentive to student learning in the core. A percentage-based performance metric of outcomes assessment doesn't account for the complexity and layers inherent in general education. The BCC will be contributing to the follow-up report by drafting a five-year plan for a category review process that is informed by and laden with learning outcomes assessment. We will review a first draft of this plan at the next meeting on February 16th.

**To-Do List:** The BCC will begin the process of revising Category Proposal System (CPS) questions for new Bacc Core courses to reflect the adoption and implementation of Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes. The co-chairs will pair up BCC members in teams and assign two categories per team. Each team will be provided with a template for each category that includes category criteria, rationale, learning outcomes, and current CPS questions. Drafts of revisions will be due at our February 16 meeting.

**To-Do List:** There are two proposals currently in the CPS queue for BCC review. The co-chairs will potentially assign these to specific BCC members for review.

**Other Business:** K. Kincanon was contacted by another advisor on campus wondering if the BCC wanted to be involved with making judgments on whether transfer courses without direct equivalency at OSU met individual Bacc Core Categories. The BCC was fine with advisors making those judgment calls and reinforced the notion that they should consult category criteria and learning outcomes when doing so.

Meeting adjourned at 4:51 PM.

Upcoming Winter Term Meetings in Milam 215
Thursday, February 16 – 3:30-5:00 PM
Friday, March 9 – 2:30-4:00 PM
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 16, 2012
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Penny Diebel, Ute Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon, Karli Olsen, Rebecca Olsen, Kirsi Peltomaki, Brian Powell, Marion Rossi, Joe Zaworski

Ex-officio Members Present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD Director), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director)

Action Item: Initial drafts of revised curricular proposal system Bacc Core questions were presented today. The co-chairs will review these revisions and make decisions on how to proceed with subsequent refinement of the new question sets.

Action Item: Discussion was initiated today around a possible five-year cycle for Bacc Core Category Review. Based on feedback from the committee, a longer assessment cycle is more realistic given the capacity of the BCC. A plan for a longer cycle will be presented to the BCC at the March 9, 2012 meeting.

Action Item: BCC members are invited to review and offer feedback on proposed changes to Academic Regulations. Please share feedback with the co-chairs by the end of the day on February, 28.

Action Item: Currently there are four proposals in the Curricular Proposal System awaiting BCC review. These will be assigned, and we will discuss the courses at the March 9, 2012 meeting.

Updates

Our new student members, Karli Olsen and Brian Powell, were both in attendance and were introduced to the committee.

K. Kincanon and V. Tolar Burton shared that the BCC co-chairs and Tolar Burton recently presented to the Undergraduate Education Council and the Provost’s Council on the Bacc Core Vitalization agenda progress, tentative plans for Bacc Core Assessment and the pilot for the new Bacc Core Category Review process. Both councils were supportive of progress thus far, and the concerns that were expressed by members of both groups surrounded the human resources impact on units, echoing the concerns of BCC members expressed at our earlier meetings. BCC members again today expressed concern that changes are being implemented too quickly, and that units are being asked to respond to queries about learning outcomes achievement with little or no time to fully implement learning outcomes measurement in their Bacc Core classes. V. Tolar Burton acknowledged that the process is being expedited by accreditation demand. K. Kincanon noted that the BCC would need to accommodate the fact that units will undoubtedly be at different stages in terms of their consideration of these outcomes. Some units just may not have much information to provide us.

V. Tolar Burton shared updates on the upcoming Bacc Core Assessment Development Workshops geared to support units that have courses in Synthesis Category Review pilot. Notice was sent to school heads and chairs for units with Synthesis courses, and they were encouraged to invite relevant personnel to attend one of the workshops in preparation for Bacc Core Category Review reporting at the end of the academic year. BCC members encouraged a follow-up message to school heads and chairs, as some in our group have direct responsibilities relative to Synthesis classes in their units and have not been notified of the workshops. Tolar Burton invited all BCC members to attend any of the upcoming workshops, and she will send out a link to the registration form following today’s BCC meeting:

Bacc Core Assessment Development Workshop Dates
Tuesday, February 21, 3 to 5 pm in Milam 215
Tuesday, February 28, 3 to 5 pm in Milam 215
Wednesday, February 29, noon to 2 pm in Milam 215.
Agenda Item – Category Review Plan
As part of the Accreditation follow-up self-study report, the BCC has been asked to contribute information on the new Category Review process that considers evidence of student learning in Bacc Core courses. Specifically, the institution is to report on the planned assessment cycle for gathering data relative to the Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes, and the co-chairs were asked by OSU administration to create a draft of a five-year reporting cycle. A vision of this cycle was shared with the BCC today, and members concluded that a five-year cycle would be very challenging to execute given the workload it would create for the committee and for the reporting units. The suggestion was put forth to propose a longer assessment cycle that will be more manageable for all constituents. The co-chairs will move forward on creating a draft plan for a longer cycle and will bring it back to the BCC for consideration at the March 9, 2012 meeting.

Agenda Item – Curricular Proposal System Question Revision
Prior to this meeting, BCC members were divided into small groups and asked to evaluate current Curricular Proposal System Questions and revise them to assure they are aligned with our Category Learning Outcomes and our current processes for evaluating course proposals. BCC members briefly shared their experience with the revision process and reported that varying degrees of change was necessary depending on the question sets. The co-chairs will now review these revisions and make decisions on how to proceed with subsequent refinement of the new question sets.

Agenda Item – Plan for addressing BCC "emerging items" List
As the year has progressed, the co-chairs have collected a list of "emerging items" for BCC discussion, and these have been posted at the end of each agenda. Our spring term agenda will center on allocating targeted time to discussing topics on this emerging items list.

Agenda Item – Other Business
K. Kincanon shared a document forwarded from the Academic Regulations Committee regarding proposed changes to AR 1a-c and AR 25h. All members of Faculty Senate Committees are invited to provide feedback on these changes. BCC members should send any feedback to one of the co-chairs by the end of the day on Feb. 28th.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM

Upcoming Winter Term Meetings in Milam 215
Friday, March 9 – 2:30-4:00 PM
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 9, 2012 Minutes

Voting members present: Kerry Kincanon, Bill Bogley, Kirsti Peltomaki, Michael Lerner, Marion Rossi, Victor Hsu, Jaga Giebultowicz, Ute Hussong-Christian, Penny Diebel, Joe Zaworski
Ex-officio members present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD Director), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director)

Summary of Agreements/Action Items

- The BCC discussed several course proposals: HST 391/392, PSY 426, ART 208 were approved. WSE 266 and the new 200 level Chemistry sequence were sent back to the proposer for revision.
- Action Item: Determine a mechanism for offering faculty advice on incorporating concepts inherent to Bacc Core category questions sets into syllabi to make them more transparent to students.
- Update Items included discussion of recent Assessment Development Workshops and the ongoing development of the campus-wide Bacc Core website.
- The five-year Category Review plan shared at the February 16, 2012 meeting has been extended to a seven-year plan per the recommendation of the BCC. A draft of the seven-year plan was shared today.
- Action Item: Spring term meeting availability request will be sent out during Finals Week.
- The spring term agenda will be highlighted by discussion of "emerging issues" that the BCC has identified throughout the course of the year.

Approval of Minutes – The minutes from February 26 meeting were approved.

Course Proposal Discussions

- History 391/392 – Current bacc core course seeking a name change. Proposer incorporated learning outcomes into new syllabi. Proposals approved.
- PSY 426 – Existing course seeking DPD status. Proposal approved.
- WSE 266 – New course. BCC recommends adjustments to the syllabus to address Category Learning Outcomes. Returned to proposer for revision.
- Art 208 – Existing course seeking Cultural Diversity and Literature and the Arts status. Proposal approved with recommendations to enhance the syllabus

The BCC has initiated a process of revising the Bacc Core Category question sets in the Curricular Proposal System. During this round of course reviews, the suggestion was made that the BCC offer instructions to faculty for incorporating concepts inherent in the question sets into syllabi to make them more transparent for students.

Updates

V. Tolar Burton provided a verbal recap of the assessment development workshop that she and Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment, offered for units and faculty who have courses in the Synthesis categories. She and Stefani offered the workshop at three separate times in February, and feedback was largely positive. The second and third offerings were particularly well attended, and all sessions yielded feedback that has helped refine the pilot process.

V. Tolar Burton also provided a brief update on the Bacc Core website development. She again reminded the committee that she may put out a call in spring term for assistance with vetting website content.
Revised Category Review Plan
At the February 16, 2012 meeting, K. Kincanon presented the BCC with a draft of a five-year plan for Category Review. This plan was, in part, created to map out the future of Category Reviews for the BCC and, in part, created for inclusion in the assessment plan for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities mid-year report in preparation for the accreditation follow-up visit in the fall. BCC members agreed that a five-year plan was too aggressive and not a feasible workload for a volunteer Faculty Senate committee. The BCC suggested the plan be extended to seven years. This proved to be acceptable to administrators in charge of the mid-year report. B. Bogley noted that Vice Provost Becky Warner felt it important to maintain mid-cycle accountability hence the presence of an "interim report". The plan was adjusted, and K. Kincanon and B. Bogley shared the revised draft plan today. The group found the elongated cycle more reasonable. This seven-year cycle will be further vetted through Faculty Senate leadership and the University Assessment Council. Also yet to be determined will be how review of WIC courses will be allocated over the seven-year cycle. For now, the seven-year plan that was shared is still considered tentative, but it will ultimately be brought back to the BCC for approval. The record of this seven-year cycle will ultimately reside on a targeted web site that Stefani Dawn from the Office of Assessment is developing for Bacc Core assessment as well as the Bacc Core web site that V. Tolar Burton is shepherding.

Announcements
- Requests for spring term BCC meeting availability will be sent out during Finals Week.
- The spring term BCC agenda will include a review of discussion points that have surfaced in the first two terms and identified as "emerging issues" for BCC consideration.

Meeting adjourned: 3:55 p.m.
Voting members present: Kerry Kincanon, Bill Bogley, Kirsti Peltomaki, Marv Pyles, David McMurray, Rebecca Olsen, Jaga Giebultowicz, Michael Lerner, Marion Rossi, N. Rodriguez (for Karli Olsen)
Ex-officio members present: Michelle Bothwell (DPD Director), Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director)

Summary of Agreements/Action Items
- The BCC discussed several course proposals: ENGR 363 and CH 271, 272, and 273 were approved. WSE 266 and FR 329 were returned to proposers for revision. ENG 320, 321, and 322 were tabled for additional discussion.
- Update Items included the latest on Synthesis Pilot and the launch of reporting webform on the Office of Assessment website. The co-chairs also reported on a pilot that would add Bacc Core Learning Outcomes questions to ESET for Synthesis courses
- The BCC identified discussion items for our next meeting on April 23, including further discussion of allowing "Studies In" classes in Perspectives categories and discussion about Perspectives categories that have a "course must lower division" clause in their criteria.

Approval of Minutes – The minutes from February 26 meeting were approved.

Course Proposal Discussions
- WSE 266 – New course that was reviewed at March 9 meeting and returned to the proposer for revision. Committee recommended that syllabus still needs work and noted that there may have been a misinterpretation of the BCC’s initial feedback. One of the co-chairs will reach out to offer consultation on syllabus.
- ENG 320, 321, 322 – This grouping of new courses from English are "Studies In" courses. Potentially, these could cover a different topic with each offering. Currently only DPD and WIC have "Studies In" or "Topics In" courses. The BCC noted that those categories have additional oversight with a director who can monitor compliance with criteria and outcomes and expressed concern about syllabus drift with this type of course in a Perspective or Synthesis category. The BCC tabled a decision in favor of additional discussion. The suggestion was made that we could potentially develop a policy to accompany this precedent. The BCC may also invite the proposal originator to a future meeting.
- CH 271, 272, 273 – These new labs, exclusively for Chemistry majors, accompany the recently restructured 200-level General Chemistry sequence (CH 231, 232, 233 [lectures] and CH 261, 262, 263 [labs]). Proposal approved.
- FR 329 – New course seeking Western Culture, Cultural Diversity, and Literature and the Arts status. Committee expressed concern about the capacity for course assignments to address three sets of Category Learning Outcomes. While the course theoretically could fit all three categories, the BCC recommends choosing two. Some concern over this being a repeatable course, but there is precedence in the Bacc Core for repeatable courses (MUS 101, 102, 103, 108). A co-chair will reach out to the proposer.

Updates
- Synthesis Pilot – The co-chairs reported that the official webform that will be used to collect materials and feedback on Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes will be available on the Office of Assessment Bacc Core website on Monday, April 16. An announcement will be sent to unit head/chairs and Associate Deans soon. K. Kincanon and V. Tolar Burton will join Stefani Dawn from the Office of Assessment to present to the University Assessment Council on Wednesday, April 18.
- ESET Pilot – The co-chairs reported on the pilot proposal to add Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes
questions to the ESET for Synthesis classes. The Executive Committee approved the pilot and asked that the co-chairs report on the pilot to the Senate on Thursday, April 12. Feedback on the pilot will be gathered via an anonymous reporting form on the Faculty Senate website.

**Prioritizing Emerging Items**

- Time was limited for this agenda item, but the committee agreed that we should continue discussion about "Studies in" classes in Perspectives categories at our April 23 meeting, and also that we should start the discussion of upper division courses in Perspectives categories, particularly those that include "must be lower division" in the category criteria.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 23, 2012 Minutes

Attendance
Voting Members: Bill Bogley, Kerry Kincanon, Michael Lerner, David McMurray, Rebecca Olsen, Kirsi Peltomaki, Mary Pyles, Dawn Sherwood
Ex-officio Members: Michelle Bothwell, DPD; Vicki Tolar Burton, WIC

Summary of Agreements/Action Items
- The BCC discussed the lower division criterion for Perspectives categories and agreed that these should be changed to acknowledge and validate longstanding inclusion of selected upper division courses in those categories.

Approval of Minutes
The April 13 minutes were approved.

Updates
- Synthesis Pilot – The co-chairs reported the webform has been launched (on the Assessment website) and academic units notified. Reactions from various quarters of campus were discussed (positive and negative) and committee members were asked to reiterate that the webform represents a renewed and streamlined form of unit-level input for category review, a practice that has been an ongoing charge for the committee since the inception of the Core.
- Users have brought a small number of technical issues regarding the webform to our attention and those issues have been fixed.
- eSET Pilot – The co-chairs reported on the decision to transform the Spring 2012 eSET pilot (adding questions related to category learning outcomes in Synthesis courses) into a voluntary program. This is to ensure that all faculty feel protected and considered in this application of the eSET. A comments page regarding the pilot is on the Faculty Senate website; responses are both positive and negative. Concerns center around possible impacts of the Core-specific questions may impact on use of eSET for P&T and evaluation of teaching. The co-chairs are working with Vicki Tolar Burton and Stefani Dawn to implement communication and logistics for the voluntary pilot.

Category Criteria Discussion
- With the sole exception of Cultural Diversity, category criteria for all Perspectives categories declare that courses shall be lower division. Kerry Kincanon shared a handout detailing the broad extent of upper division (300-level) courses that have nevertheless been approved for Western Culture, Literature and the Arts, and Social Processes & Institutions. (There are also numerous upper division courses in Cultural Diversity, including one 400-level course.)
- General discussion about what distinguishes 200, 300, and 400-level courses brought up factors such as the amount of required reading and writing, the nature of grading, maturity level of students, and the complexity and depth of material.
- There was general agreement that the presence of some upper division courses in a category is a good thing, enabling students with keener interest to explore topics more deeply in satisfying Core requirements. This aligns with finding from the Ad Hoc Review during which students expressed a desire for ‘rigor’ and ‘depth’ in Core offerings.
- There should be a balance between upper and lower division offerings within Perspectives categories. Pre-requisites or enrollment restrictions should not create access barriers that are not intrinsic to the progressive nature of the Core.
- Draft language for changes to the relevant criteria will be drafted and shared at the May 8 meeting. Changes to category criteria must be approved by the full Senate.
Meeting adjourned at 4:10 PM.
May 8, 2012 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 8, 2012
Minutes

Attendance


Ex-officio Members: Michelle Bothwell, DPD; Vicki Tolar Burton, WIC

Guests: Peter Betjemann, Anita Helle

Summary of Agreements/Action Items

- Institutional Research has agreed to supply complementary data for category review.
- Committee committed to proposing criteria changes relative to lower division requirement in Perspectives categories.
- WS 495/595 approved for Contemporary Global Issues
- HST 396/7 approved for Cultural Diversity

Approval of Minutes

The April 23 minutes were approved.

Conversation with Anita Helle and Peter Betjemann (School of Writing, Literature, and Film)

Colleagues from the School of Writing, Literature, and Film joined the committee to discuss proposals for adding "topics" courses in Perspectives categories. Topics courses already exist within DPD and WIC, but the committee wanted input relative to a potential precedent for topics courses in categories that do not have independent directors. Helle summarized unit-level oversight processes, which include:

- Review by a curriculum committee
- Review by the director
- Master syllabus in shared network space
- Annual review & syllabus collection by curricular groups

Helle articulated an overarching oversight philosophy of "curricular congruence" in which content, outcomes, and assessment are all aligned. Betjemann observed that the proposed courses emphasize "critical habits of mind" and that the three proposed courses derive their focus from separate areas of inquiry or methodology. The courses are taught independently. One committee member praised the interdisciplinary connections inherent in the proposals.

Discussion then passed to positive unit-level practices for ensuring coherence and consistency in these and other course offerings. Best practices include:

- Periodic review at the unit level
- Analysis of alignments (content, outcomes, assessment)
- Identification of topics courses within category review (additional review criteria or processes?)
- Promotion and documentation of mentoring for faculty who are new to courses
- Course design and unit practices that are sturdy enough to survive transitions

Updates & Discussion

- eSET Pilot communications were reviewed without comment.
- Language was proposed and discussed relative to the lower division requirement currently included in the Criteria for most Perspectives categories, but which is not currently enforced. Final language will be presented at the June 6 meeting for approval by this committee. The new language will then go to the
EC, where we will ask them to bring it before the full Senate, which must approve changes to Category Criteria.

- Stefani Dawn has consulted with IR Director Salvador Castillo, who agreed to the concept of having IR provide complementary enrollment and demographic data for use in category review. This relieves departments from reconstruction of enrollment and staffing information that had previously been a burden under category review. The committee received a summary of their discussion, including data types to be collected by IR and delivered to the BCC for category review (along with webform and eSET data). Some refinements in these specifications will be necessary.

- Summary of Complementary Data supplied by IR:
  - Course data will be broken out by CRN and provided in summary form
    - Instructor rank
    - Instructional mode (lecture, lab, recitation, etc.)
    - Mode (Corvallis Campus, eCampus, or Cascades Campus)
  - Enrollment by Term Data
    - Maximum course capacity
    - Enrollment by term
    - Last three years of data for each CRN of the course
    - Probably best displayed via a single bar graph that includes all of the CRNs for the course so comparisons can be made between the sections of the same course and within a course over time (3 years).
  - Student Demographic Data
    - Class (1st year, sophomore, junior, senior, postbac, other)
    - College of major
    - GPA
    - Gender?
    - Ethnicity?
  - Student Success Data
    - Grade distribution (average, StDev, median)
  - Indicators of course management
    - Number of sections cancelled/opened and then cancelled?

- The committee offered some additional suggestions relative to data requests for category review. 
  (Note added: As of May 21, 2012: these have been communicated to Stefani Dawn.)
  - Scheduling trends (e.g., do campus sections always tend to meet TR?)
  - Note "most commonly assigned grade"
  - The College of Agriculture administers Agricultural Business and Rangeland Ecology and Management programs through EOU, and the data should cover courses now being offered at EOU that figure in OSU's Bacc Core.
  - Finally, complementary data pulled for category review can/should be shared directly with academic units.

- The committee is grateful to Stefani Dawn for facilitating this request, and to Sal Castillo for assistance provided to the Category Review Process.

**Course Proposals**

- WS 495/595 – approved for Contemporary Global Issues, noted a very complete syllabus.
- HST 396/7 – approved for Cultural Diversity.
- NMC 427 – sent back. Must address BC syllabus requirements; consider suitability for multiple categories, and whether writing requirements are addressed.
- FR 329 – sent back. Must address BC syllabus requirements, status of repeatability for a course proposed for multiple categories caused concern. Co-chair to consult with Registrar’s Office. (Note added: This concern is obviated by AR 25.a.5(2), which states: "No single course may be used by a student to satisfy more than one subject area of the core even though some courses have been approved in more than one area.")

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 PM.

Next Meeting, May 21, 2012, 3:00-4:00 PM in MLM 215

Last Meeting, June 6, 2012, 4:00-5:00 PM in MLM 215
May 21, 2012 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 21, 2012 Minutes

Attendance
Voting Members: Kerry Kincanon, Bill Bogley, Penny Diebels, Kirsi Peltomaki, Michael Lerner, Marv Pyles, Dawn Sherwood, Uta Hussong-Christian, Victor Hsu
Ex-Officio Members: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC), Michelle Bothwell (DPD)
Guest: Susan Meyers (School of Writing, Literature, and Film)

Summary of Agreements/Action Items
- BCC approved proposals for PHL 432/532 (Contemporary Global Issues) and FR 329 (Cultural Diversity)
- BCC Co-chairs to write letter of support to the EC supporting the report of the Baccalaureate Core Writing Review committee and addressing potential BCC action/discussion items for 2012-13.

The May 8 meeting minutes were not yet available for review.

Baccalaureate Core Review of Writing Report
In August 2011, the EC commissioned a review of writing in the Baccalaureate Core pursuant to the Vitalization Agenda that was approved by the Senate in June 2010. Review committee chair Susan Meyers, Director of Writing in the School of Writing, Literature, and Film, presented an overview of their report prior to final submission to the EC. Meyers shared an overview and summary of recommendations with the committee.

After discussing the charge to the committee and the inputs that went into the committee’s deliberations, Meyers summarized the situation relative to writing in the Core by saying that we are not in crisis, but that we are not where we want to be. Recommendations, summarized in the handout, focus on involvement of student, faculty, and the university in developing and expanding a culture of writing throughout the curriculum and student experience. Clarity of expectations, quality of assignments, and effective assessment of student work are all areas where specific recommendations are contained in the report.

Resource and access issues affecting class size in the upper division, especially Synthesis courses, were acknowledged as having material effect on the student engagement with writing in those courses. Pedagogical strategies can only go so far to offset the need for students to engage in sustained writing assignments, such as those with set minimum word or page count (e.g., 5 pp. minimum, double spaced). Student support and course supplementation (e.g., study tables) may be of value for the less-prepared students. We discussed several possible sites for addressing development of information literacy skills. Possibilities include WR II or Synthesis. But Synthesis is late and Uta Hussong-Christian notes that information literacy programming is most effective when situated within a discipline of study.

The BCC thanked Professor Meyers and the co-Chairs agreed to provide a letter of support for the final submission of the report to the EC. Items and recommendations from the report should be taken up by the BCC for future consideration in 2012-13.

Course Proposals
- PHL 432/532 was approved for CGI.
- FR 329 was approved by Cultural Diversity.
- SOIL 102 was sent back. Additions to the Science Perspectives category are welcomed by the Committee. The Committee discussed its processes for reviewing labs in the Bio Sci and Phys Sci categories. The SOIL 102 proposal lacks a lab manual and further detail, such as lists of lab exercises and activities, and their relation to what students learn are sought. The Committee discussed inviting
proposer Prof. Kate Lajtha to visit the Committee to help us formulate responsible policy for review of Perspective labs and proposals.

- HEBR 231 was sent back. Syllabus requirements must be met, along with other minimum syllabus requirements. Additional information is needed relative to critical thinking. Unit level liaison was also incomplete. Proposer has instructor rank and unit head has not completed liaison. Co-chairs will follow up.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 PM.

Last Meeting for 2011-12: June 6, 2012, 4-5 in MLM 215
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 6, 2012
Minutes

Ex-Officio Non-voting Members: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC), Michelle Bothwell (DPD)
Guest: Kate Lajtha, Department of Crop and Soil Science

Summary of Agreements/Action Items

- SOIL 102 approved for Perspectives (Biological Science) and AMS 350 for Synthesis (CGI).
- The BCC adopted a proposed new set of Baccalaureate Core questions for the Curriculum Proposal System. The new questions will be referred to Academic Programs for implementation in the CPS.
- The BCC approved new language for Perspectives categories dealing with upper division courses and prerequisites. The new language will be forwarded to the EC as proposed action items for the full Senate in Fall 2012.
- DPD Director Michelle Bothwell reported on steps taken and planned to ensure the integrity of the DPD requirement relative to transfer and AP/IB exam credit.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes for May 8 and May 21 accepted with one amendment (M. Rossi was in attendance on May 21)

Conversation with Kate Lajtha (CSS)
Professor Lajtha led a discussion to help the committee develop review expectations for laboratory courses in the Core. Lajtha shared course design principles for SOIL 102 as a new course in the Biological Sciences category. The proposed course highlights information literacy and critical thinking in the context of climate change. The course targets freshman non-majors and is developed around a new textbook from a leading national consortium. At least two "wet" labs are included in the design and an early-draft lab manual was shared with the committee. BCC member review prior to meeting deemed the lab manual, which is still under construction, as suitable for approval.

Dr. Lajtha offered some suggestions for review questions in lab courses:
- Is the content at the appropriate level?
- Does the course address the scientific method, or how science is done?
- Does the course address evolving techniques in scientific inquiry (e.g. modeling, data, sensors)?
- Are the students required to take data, design experiments?
- Do the labs stress the necessity that experimental findings be repeatable and verifiable?
- Are the roles of error and uncertainty addressed?
- Is the distinction between causality and correlation addressed?

Dr. Lajtha further observed that the goals of a course for non-majors are more general than foundational courses for majors, where content coverage is at a premium.

Curriculum Proposal System Baccalaureate Core Questions
Earlier work done by BCC working groups had produced new Baccalaureate Core questions for the Curriculum Proposal System (CPS). The new questions transfer the focus from faculty actions and course content to student experience and activities. A new question asks proposers to address plans for assessment of student achievement of category learning outcomes. Kerry Kincanon edited the new questions to uniformize the language for all categories. The new questions were approved by unanimous consent of those present (in accordance with BCC quorum/business practices). The new questions will be referred to Academic Affairs for implementation in the CPS. The new questions are appended to these minutes.
Additional discussion surrounding the CPS included suggestions that proposers should have access to (new) examples of good proposals, that syllabi should identify proposed courses as Skills/Perspectives/Synthesis to reinforce the progressive nature of the Core, and that the Core-specific aspects of the minimum syllabus requirements be clarified and further explained in the Curricular Policies and Procedures page in the Academic Programs web site.

**Perspectives Pre-requisite Policy**
The committee adopted new language regarding prerequisites for Perspectives categories to acknowledge the presence and value of some upper division courses in those categories. (Current criteria prescribe that Perspectives courses be lower division.) Upper division courses have a positive role to play in Perspectives categories for those students who wish to pursue those subjects at a deeper level, but perquisites or class standing restrictions should not limit access to Perspectives courses. The proposed language for all Perspectives category criteria was discussed, edited slightly, and agreed to as follows.

"Courses in the Perspectives categories should be accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories."

Changes to category criteria must be approved by the full Senate, so these proposed changes will be referred to the Executive Committee this summer as proposed action items for Fall 2012.

**AP/Transfer Credits and the DPD Requirement**
DPD Director Michelle Bothwell is engaging in liaison with Admissions, as well as leadership from Liberal Studies, General Science, and American Studies, to ensure that students receiving advanced standing exam or transfer credit for courses in the DPD category actually meet the category criteria for DPD. To this end, beginning Summer 2013, Admissions will articulate AP/IB History exam credit as LDT rather than HST 20x. Discussions for analogous provisions relative to transfer credits are underway.

**Course Proposals**
- SOIL 102 (83966) was approved for Biological Science. The committee engaged in a brief discussion about liaison on the proposal, agreeing that the co-chairs should follow up with Dr. Lajtha.
- NMC 427 (83213) was sent back for revisions.
- AMS 350 (83998) was approved for CGI.
- The Co-Chairs will continue to monitor submissions to the BCC through the CPS during the summer, and will act upon routine matters. More complex matters requiring broader faculty input will be held until the fall term, when all actions will be reported as an information item to the BCC.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.
Present: Mary Cluskey, Victor Hsu, Mina Carson, Nick Drapela, Kirsi Peltomaki, Hal Parks, Penny Diebel, David McMurray, Marion Rossi, Uta Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon, Michael Lerner, Joe Zaworski
Absent: Marv Pyles

1. Introductions

2. New Business

2. Review of existing proposals- change course

   Approved:
   1. FST461/FST561 Brewing Analysis - Approved the removal of WIC designation.
   2. WR362 Science Writing - Approved with the suggestion to change the two occurrences of "understand" to more active, directly measurable verbs.
   3. WR121 English Composition - Approved to require a grade of C- or better to obtain Bacc Core credit

   Sent Back:
   1. GER361 - Introduction to German Cinema - Not approved. The course syllabus is lacking Bacc Core specifics (no indication of Bacc Core category, how the category criteria are integrated into the course, no description in the syllabus of how critical thinking skills are to be developed, or how learning outcomes are related to the category criteria).
   2. PS205 - Introduction to International Relations - Not approved because the course syllabus does not contain all of the elements required for a Bacc Core course syllabus. (No objections to the removal of the prerequisite course, but the syllabus was the sticking point. We would also like to see the answers to the "Bacc Core Questions" on the Curriculum Proposal System).

3. Catalog Additions/Changes - The committee approved the following catalog additions and changes in order to implement the First Year Skills and Second Year Writing II requirement adopted by the Faculty Senate in June, 2010.

   [Existing text below]

   The Baccalaureate Core (Bacc Core) Curriculum represents what the OSU faculty believes is the foundation for students' further understanding of the modern world. Informed by natural and social sciences, arts, and humanities, the Bacc Core requires students to think critically and creatively, and to synthesize ideas and information when evaluating major societal issues. Importantly, the Bacc Core promotes understanding of interrelationships among disciplines in order to increase students' capacities as ethical citizens of an ever-changing world.

   [New text below]

   Skills Course (15)

   To support students' success in all courses, the following first year Skills courses are to be taken and completed satisfactorily within the first 45 hours of OSU-generated credits.

   Writing I (WR 121)
Mathematics (approved list below)
Speech (approved list below)

To prepare for the upper division Writing Intensive course in the major, the following Skills course is to be taken and completed satisfactorily within the first 90 hours of OSU-generated credits:

Writing II (approved list below)

For transfer students with sophomore standing or above, Writing II must be completed within the first 45 hours of OSU-generated credits. These requirements apply to all students, whether full-time or part-time.

Skills Courses (15)

Fitness (3)
Choose HHS 231, plus a 1-credit course from HHS 241-HHS 248 listed below or any PAC course:
HHS 231 LIFETIME FITNESS FOR HEALTH (2)
HHS 241 LIFETIME FITNESS (1)
HHS 242 LIFETIME FITNESS FOR HEALTH: CARDIO CONDITIONING LAB (1)
HHS 243 LIFETIME FITNESS: RESISTANCE TRAINING (1)
HHS 244 LIFETIME FITNESS: WEIGHT MANAGEMENT (1)
HHS 245 LIFETIME FITNESS: RUNNING (1)
HHS 246 LIFETIME FITNESS: WALKING (1)
HHS 247 LIFETIME FITNESS: AQUATIC EXERCISE (1)
HHS 248 LIFETIME FITNESS: YOGA (1)

Mathematics (3)
MTH 105 INTRODUCTION TO CONTEMPORARY MATHEMATICS (3)
MTH 111 COLLEGE ALGEBRA (4)
MTH 112 ELEMENTARY FUNCTIONS (4)
MTH 211 FOUNDATIONS OF ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS (4)
MTH 241 CALCULUS FOR MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL SCIENCE (4)
MTH 245 MATHEMATICS FOR MANAGEMENT, LIFE, & SOCIAL SCIENCES (4)
MTH 251 DIFFERENTIAL CALCULUS (4)
MTH 251H DIFFERENTIAL CALCULUS (4)

Writing I (3)
WR 121 ENGLISH COMPOSITION (3)

Writing II (3)
HC 199 HONORS WRITING (3)
PHL 121 REASONING AND WRITING (3)
WR 201 WRITING FOR MEDIA (3)
WR 214 WRITING IN BUSINESS (3)
WR 222 ENGLISH COMPOSITION (3)
WR 224 INTRODUCTION TO FICTION WRITING (3)
WR 241 INTRODUCTION TO POETRY WRITING (3)
WR 323 ENGLISH COMPOSITION (3)
WR 324 SHORT STORY WRITING (4)
WR 327 TECHNICAL WRITING (3)
WR 330 UNDERSTANDING GRAMMAR (3)
WR 341 POETRY WRITING (4)

Speech (3)
COMM 111 PUBLIC SPEAKING (3)
Mary Cluskey is going to send recommendations from the BCC to Susie Brubaker-Cole and Leslie Burns regarding our decision about enforcement of the first year skills requirements.

The BCC committee agreed that they will not recommend penalties for enforcement of the first year skills requirement and second year WR II beyond the language in the catalog copy that indicates that the courses "are to be taken." It was believed that the advisors can use that language to instruct students that they are supposed to take those courses early in their academic programs. In addition, it was suggested that the requirement be included in the My-Degree web pages and in Advisor training. The BCC recommended that the issue of the necessity for enforcing the requirement or adding consequences for failure to meet the requirement should be assessed after a two-year period in order to determine adherence to the first year skills requirements and second year WR II.

4. **Work tasks** -
   The committee determined sub-groups for writing learning outcomes for BC categories and mapping them to Learning Goals for Graduates. The outcomes groups are:

   - Skills: Wr I, Wr II, Speech: Marion Rossi and Uta Hussong-Christian
   - Cultural Diversity/Western Culture: David McMurray and Kerry Kincanon
   - Math and Science: Nick Drapela/Hal Parks/Michael Lerner
   - Literature and Arts/Fitness: Kirsi Peltomaki and Joe Zaworski
   - DPD (will assign to the DPD Director)
   - WIC: Vicki Tolar Burton
   - Syllabus template: Mary Cluskey/Victor Hsu

   Vicki Tolar Burton will send a Doodle meeting request to BCC members to see what date might work for a 2-3 hour focused work meeting to discuss and approve work of the subcommittees.

5. **Academic Regulations Proposed Revisions** - It was recommended that the Academic Regulations changes be adopted with the recommendation that the AR 20 regulation text be changed as follows:

   "...after the second attempt to (waive) meet unit degree requirements..."

   The BCC did not think that waiving the degree requirement was the objective of the change.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 24, 2011 Minutes

Attendance: Victor Hsu, Marion Rossi, Vicki Tolar Burton, Mary Cluskey, Nick Drapela, Mina Carson, Uta Hussong-Christian, Joe Zaworski, Penny Diebel, David McMurray, Michel Lerner, Hal Parks, Kerry Kincanon, Marvin Pyles

Vicki Tolar Burton called the meeting to order and had distributed packets with the meeting assignments.

- Vicki indicated that the Registrar suggested a few wording changes to the statement for Skills courses that was approved at our last meeting.

Vicki introduced the topic by asking: What makes a good outcome?

- Joe indicates - measurable
- Practical, Distinctive
- Understandable, simple, general

A general discussion of the role of outcomes in learning and teaching took place.

Some ideas included:

- Clarification for assessment belongs in the classroom.
- What is being learned in the classroom?
- BCC courses may need to document evidence of meeting outcomes by the instructor of those courses.

It is not clear how the evaluation of assessment will be overseen. The assessment method and the evaluation mechanism will be part of the proposal. The BCC is shifting away from clerical to policy driven emphasis with a focus on enhancing the Bacc Core rather than simply processing proposals.

Outcome discussion continued:

The outcomes for BCC need to reflect BC rationale and criteria. For some BC categories, the outcomes may be more numerous. Not every aspect of the rationale can track to a specific learning outcome and we should not try to force them to do so. It cannot match each of the criteria.

The meeting then divided into groups of members who did not work together on the assignment of submitting an outcome for BCC courses. The groups discussed each BC category and then were asked after approximately 30 minutes to engage as a whole group in looking at the revised outcomes. The results follow:

- The committee was able to review and agree on outcomes for approximately half of the BC categories.
- Due to complexity, the category for Science was tabled for later discussion. It was determined that the committee needs to meet again (2/4 & 2/18) to complete the outcomes assignment.

Vicki reviewed catalog copy change for policy for sequence of BCC skills course requirements. All BCC members were in support of change.

[New text below]

Skills Course Requirements (15)

To support students' success in all courses, the following first year Skills courses are to be taken and completed satisfactorily within the first 45 hours of OSU-generated credits.
Writing I (WR 121)

Mathematics (approved list below)

Speech (approved list below)

To prepare for the upper division Writing Intensive course in the major, the following Skills course is to be taken and completed satisfactorily within the first 90 hours of OSU-generated credits:

Writing II (approved list below)

For transfer students with sophomore standing or above, Writing II and Speech must be completed within the first 45 hours of OSU-generated credits. These requirements apply to all students, whether full-time or part-time.

For the final 20 minutes of the meeting Victor Hsu and Mary Cluskey provided an overview of the new process for approval of BCC courses, and assigned some pending proposals to faculty. All BCC members can now enter the online course proposal system.

The following process was provided to the BCC:

**PROCESS FOR BC COURSE PROPOSAL**

1. Review by BC student-worker; student sends review checklist to Victor.
2. Pass on to BCC member (Victor or Mary send email to BCC member assigning review).
3. BCC member takes hard copy from student and checks aspects of the approval that requires judgment.
   BCC member enters into the system approval or notes for revision.
4. BCC member summarizes approval or brings concerns to committee for discussion.
5. When concerns occur: changes submitted by proposing faculty member are reviewed by the whole BCC.
6. After final approval after changes: Approved in system by BCC Chair.

The meeting was concluded and the follow up meetings (2/4 and 2/18) will address:

1. Completing the outcomes assignment
2. Examining how BC outcomes track to LGG
3. Approving a syllabus template for BCC courses
4. Course proposals as needed
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 22, 2011
3:30-5:00 PM ~ Milam 215
Minutes

Absent: Mina Carson, Mary Cluskey, Penny Diebel, Nick Drapela, Kirsi Peltomaki, Marion Rossi, Joe Zaworski

New Business

1. Susie Brubaker-Cole spoke to the committee to get their response to the current draft of the Plan and Agenda for the "Workshop on the LGGs and Bacc Core for OSU Advisors." It was recommended to make the Bacc Core more visible in the Agenda and workshop, to somehow try to induce faculty advisors to attend the workshop, and to have the BCC read the current draft of the OSU version of the AAC&U "Why do I have to take this course" booklet.

2. Vicki Tolar Burton updated the committee on the Bacc Core category lunch agendas. Due to a lack of responses to the Literature & Arts/Social Processes workshop, a new strategy that involves notifying chairs of departments involved in Bacc Core instruction of upcoming category workshops will be used.

3. Review of existing proposals:

   Approved:
   a. PSY 434/PSY 534 Brain and Behavior Methods – Approved.
   b. WS 380 Muslim Women – Approved.
   c. HST 370 Social Change and American Popular Music – Approved.

   Sent Back:
   a. WS 466/566 Fat Studies – Not approved. Bacc Core courses are not to have any limiting pre-requisites, yet this course has listed a pre-requisite of WS 223 or WS 224. There is no written reason or justification and thus should be addressed. Likewise, crosslisted courses should indicate the ongoing contributions from the participating units to the course.

   b. HST 391 Traditional China and Japan – Not approved. The course syllabus is lacking the required Bacc Core specifics (no indication of Bacc Core category, how the category criteria are integrated into the course, no description in the syllabus of how critical thinking skills are to be developed, or how learning outcomes are related to the category criteria).

   c. HST 392 Modern China and Japan – Not approved. The course syllabus is lacking the required Bacc Core specifics (no indication of Bacc Core category, how the category criteria are integrated into the course, no description in the syllabus of how critical thinking skills are to be developed, or how learning outcomes are related to the category criteria).

   Pending:
   d. GER 261 Masterpieces of German Cinema – Due to the seemingly inordinate amount of content overlap between the syllabi of GER 261 and GER 361, it is almost as though the proposer is wanting to teach a slash course. The two classes meet the same amount of time each week (indicated as three hours per week on one syllabus and twice a week, 80 minutes each meeting –
or two 1.5 hour classes a week – on the other syllabus), and the exact same fifteen movies are watched and discussed in each of the two classes. The only required book in both classes is also exactly the same. David McMurray will discuss with the proposer the intention of these two classes before the committee makes the final decision.

4. Committee members were asked to save May 6th, May 20th and/or June 3rd for additional meeting(s) this term.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 9, 2009 Minutes

Present: Margie Haak, David Bernell, Victor Hsu, Jill Ferris, Barbara Edwards
Absent: Nick Drapela, John Bailey

Note taker: Margie Haak

Minutes from 3/10/09 – Approved

Course Reviews

PH 205, 206, 207 – Approved
GEO 102 – syllabus does not include any mention of Bacc Core materials. Syllabus does not address critical thinking. Ask for syllabus to be revised and resubmitted. – Not approved at this time

Next meeting: Thursday April 23, 10-11:30 am in Gilkey 206

The meeting was adjourned.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 10, 2009
Physical Science Subcommittee
Minutes

Note taker: Nick Drapela

Old Business:

Minutes from previous meeting approved.

New Business:

GEO 102 – Course looked good except for the lack of a coherent syllabus. Committee agreed to ask course authors for a syllabus.

GEO 103 – No syllabus was included with the course proposal, therefore committee agreed to ask course authors for a syllabus.

GEO 103e – Learning outcomes and critical thinking strategies not listed on syllabus. Lab component of course was a concern. Committee agreed to ask to see more examples of labs for the course.

Substantial discussion on what constitutes a lab. Concern was expressed that eCampus courses should allow/require the same lab experience as on-campus courses.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 24, 2009
Physical Science Subcommittee
Minutes

Notetaker: David Bernell

Old Business
Meeting minutes from previous meeting approved.

New Business
Category reviews for AY 09-10 approved: Biological Sciences and Math

Course Reviews

GEO 101, 101E, and 102E all approved.

CHEM 122, 122E, 123, and 123E all rejected. Concerns included insufficient description/clarity involving the labs, learning outcomes, critical thinking, and how course addresses Bacc Core rationale. The committee will contact and request revisions.

PH 211, 212, and 213 all approved. However, there were concerns with syllabi, as they were all very similar, and that discussions of critical thinking were not connected to specific content, but very general.

PH 211H, 212H, and 213 H all rejected. The three syllabi were virtually identical. They did not include a discussion of the Bacc Core rationale and how it applies to the class. Nor did they include discussions regarding critical thinking and science and society. Need to note that these are Bacc Core classes.

Next meeting is March 10, at 2:30 in Gilkey 206.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 27, 2009
Physical Science Subcommittee
Minutes

Present: Barbara Edwards, Victor Hsu, Nick Drapela, John Bailey, Margie Haak, David Bernell, Jill Ferris

Note taker: Victor Hsu

Old Business:

John Bailey presented possible recommendations for the handling of non-traditional international experiences as acceptable substitutions for Global Issues courses.

New Business:

Course Reviews:

CH 221, CH 222: Approved

CH 223: The provided narrative needs to be revised before approval can be given.

GEO 221, GEO 221E: Approved, but it is to be requested that the material be revised to directly address the Physical Sciences rationale, not just the BaccCore rationale.

OC 103: Crosslisted with GEO 103, decision delayed until GEO 103 is reviewed.

Next meeting is scheduled for February 24, 2:30-4:00 in 206 Gilkey.

The meeting was adjourned.
Present: Mary Cluskey, Barbara Edwards, Cary Green, Victor Hsu, Denise Lach, Nick Drapela, Roger Hammer

Note taker: Barbara Edwards

Old Business:

Minutes from previous meeting were approved.

NR 350: approved with a recommendation to clarify grading.

Vickie Nunnemaker sent out requests for the category review for science; we’re still waiting on clarification regarding the fitness review. The deadline has been moved to January 15 for the physical science reviews. One department asked why they had to do the Category Review since they just got the courses approved last year. The decision is that all courses in the Category will be reviewed during the review period regardless of their approval date.

New Business:

Course Reviews:
TCE 340: WIC has approved. Approved by BCC.

FS 435: Approved.

BI 201: Questions and discussion about on-line labs. Other concerns included an ambitious list of topics. The committee will send the proposal back to the department and ask for more information on how labs will be conducted.

Winter schedule:
The two subcommittees will meet on Tuesdays once a month during winter term. The fitness subcommittee will meet on the 2nd Tuesday from 10:00-11:30 in Gilkey 109 and the physical science subcommittee will meet on the 4th Tuesday from 2:00-3:30 in Gilkey 206.

The meeting was adjourned.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 19, 2008
Minutes

Present: David Bernell, John Bailey, Margie Haak, Denise Lach, Lisa Ede, Chris Anderson, Roger Hammer

Notetaker: David Bernel

Old Business:

Minutes from previous meeting were approved.

Announcement made that John Bailey will co-chair the ad hoc committee on the review of the Bacc Core and will, therefore, step down as co-chair of the Bacc Core committee. Margie Haak will succeed John in this position.

History has requested that their STS courses, in the History of Science program, be reviewed in two years. There have been some retirements, and new faculty are coming who will teach new and/or revised courses. This will allow for new faculty and new courses to get some road testing before BCC review.

PH 331 and 332 – we should expect to see revised syllabi and narrative for these two classes which were not approved during last year’s STS category review.

CH has inquired with BCC to find out if two new online courses, CH 231 and 241, can be paired as a five-credit sequence and made to count as a Bacc Core Science requirement. Students would not receive credit for having completed the Bacc Core until both classes were completed. BCC said it had no objection to the arrangement and will review the courses when they are submitted. (These courses will be the equivalent of CH 221.

New Business:

NFM 419 – The Department has asked that this course no longer be a WIC course. Approved.

Botany 323, WS 460, and EXSS 375 were all approved as new WIC courses.

FW 360 – Approved as addition to STS category, but BCC asks that syllabus be changed to note that this is a Bacc Core class.

EXSS 450 – This course is being de-listed as a WIC course. It will reappear as EXSS 350 (not a WIC course). Approved.

TOX 435/535 and all cross listed courses – Approved as a new STS course, but BCC asks that syllabus be changed to note that this is a Bacc Core class.

CSS 340 – This is a new online course on agriculture and food in literature, to be in the Literature and the Arts category. Not approved. Why is this in CSS? They need to liaison with English, who will co-teach it, get the department’s formal approval in the submission to BCC, and satisfy concerns about CSS teaching an English class.

HST 396 and 397 – Not approved for Cultural Diversity category. Concerns were that there is not a good sense of what is going to be included in the course and how it is to be assessed. The narrative describing the
course to BCC provided insufficient clarity and detail. BCC will request more information.

AREC 253 – New title change approved.

NR 350 – New Cascades campus course. Not approved. Syllabus did not provide much detail. The course isn’t finalized yet because it hasn’t been taught, and it’s unclear what will be covered, what readings and assignments will be. Description included a number of possibilities about what might be included, but no certainty yet. BCC will request additional information.

PH 231, 232, 233 – Not approved. The courses all consist of similar syllabi, without noting Bacc Core science criteria and how the course will meet these criteria. BCC will request additional information.

PH 112 and 113 considered for BC status (PH 111 has already been approved). PH Dept. resubmitted requests to approve. Old concerns from last year have not been addressed. The course does not satisfy BC idea of providing rigorous science education at college level. The courses were not approved for Bacc Core. BCC will request additional information.

The next BCC meeting will be on December 5, at 1:00 in Gilkey 109.
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 4, 2008 Minutes

Minute Taker: Hsu

Approval of February 19, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Old Business:

1. Update on STS Category Review
2. **STS Category Courses available for review:**
   - ECON 352/AREC 352ab – Middleton
   - CS391+H – Bernell
   - NE319 – Bernell
   - ART367 – Lach
   - GEO380* -Lach
   - PH331-Lach
   - ANTH330a – Caldwell
   - ANTH481-Caldwell
   - CSS 395c – Caldwell
   - PHL436 – Caldwell
   - ES445-Noller
   - GEO 335 – Cheryl

3. New General Course Assignments:
   - HST 396 Gender in Traditional China (New Course) Assigned Caldwell
   - HST 397 Gender in Modern China (New Course) Assigned Bailey
   - GEO 105 Geography of the Non-Western World (Course Description Change) The proposal is available at: [https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3427](https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3427)
   - GEO 106 Geography of the Western World (Course Description Change) The proposal is available at: [https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3429](https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3429)
   - DHE 481/581 Professional Practice in Housing and Interior Design DH481 (Change in Course Prerequisite numbering) The proposal is available at: [https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3404](https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3404)

New Business:

Invitation to Curriculum Council to discuss impacts of credit changes. (See e-mail and memo from History faculty)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 19, 2008
Minutes

Minute Taker: Lach

Approval of February 5, 2008 Meeting Minutes

1:40 pm History Department Presentation – Jon Katz, Nicole von Germeten, Paul Farber and Ben Mutschler

OLD BUSINESS

Update on STS Category Review

STS Category Courses available for review:
https://secure.oregonstate.edu/facultysenate/committees/bcc/review/2007/review.php. (Use your e-mail address and password to review the files)

ECON 352/AREC 352ab Environmental Economics and Policy – Middleton
HST 481* Environmental History of the United States - Lach
ANTH330a Evolution of People, Technology and Society – Caldwell
CSS 395c Social and Ethical Issues in Computer Science – Caldwell
PHL 325 Scientific Reasoning – Caldwell
ATS 320/W Mans Impact on Climate (2) – Noller
GEO 335 Introduction to Water Science and Policy – Middleton

*denotes extended campus courses in addition to campus

NEW BUSINESS

STS Category Courses for Review at Future Meetings

ANTH432 The Archaeology of Domestication and Urbanization – Haak
CSS395 & 395C World Soil Resources (2) - Caldwell
ANTH481 Natural Resources and Community Values – Caldwell
BB331 Introduction to Molecular Biology - Hsu
GEO380 Earth Quakes in the Pacific Northwest - Lach
NFM312 Issues in Nutrition and Health - Hsu
HSTS412E History of Science - Bernell
PHAR321 Science and Culture of Cosmetics - Hsu
RNG477 Agroforestry - Haak
PH331 Sound, Hearing and Music - Bailey
PH332 Light, Vision and Color - Hsu
ARTS367 History of Design – Lach
NE319 Societal Aspects of Nuclear Technology – Bernell

Course Title Change for HST 385

From REGIONAL CONFLICT IN GLOBAL CONTEXT to THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3355
Present:       David Bernell, John Bailey, Cheryl Middleton, Vicki Tolar Burton, Susan Shaw, Denise Lach, and Jay Noller
Absent:        George Caldwell, Margie Haak, and Victor Hsu
Notetaker:    John Bailey

Old Business

Minutes: 1/22 minutes will be emailed for review and approval.

STS Category Review:
Passwords have been sent to all committee members in need of one.
The review rubric has been distributed.
NOTE: we plan a 2-week turnaround, so have your assignment(s) ready for the next meeting each time.
Three-step process recommended:

1. Check each assignment to make sure the pieces are there (i.e., narrative, syllabus, enrollment numbers, and potentially other information) and notify Middleton/Noller if they are not.
2. Review and fill out the rubric ON PAPER – enough to prompt your memory for discussion and provide a record for the BCC files.
3. Give a brief oral summary at the next BCC meeting, with a recommendation for fail, pass with qualifiers, or pass as is.

Physics Courses: That department is considering an appeal of our decision to reject 112 and 113.

General Review:
HST353 – pending
FE452 – approved
WS235, YDE492, and GEO323 – approved
HST385, 396 and 397 – postponed to future meeting

DPD Position Statement: Endorsed by those attending meetings, but will need at least one more to be an official vote.

History and English Credit Increase: Noller provided an overview of Curriculum Council duties; we agreed to a process on reviewing BC learning objectives only, perhaps in tabular form, for all courses. History Department will be visiting the next BCC meeting.

New Business

ASOSU Environmental Sustainability Proposal: There is general support to consider this proposal in the larger context of BC design, should we be asked to pursue that (see below), but it is a big task.

BC Overhaul: Despite occasional comments otherwise, a major overhaul does not seem to be a current priority within the campus. Should that change, we will recommend a separate Faculty Senate subcommittee to address the issue with representatives from the BCC perhaps.

Meeting adjourned. The next BCC meeting will be on Tuesday, February 19, at 1:30 in Gilkey 208.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 22, 2008
Minutes

Present:  David Bernell, John Bailey, Victor Hsu, Cheryl Middleton, Vicki Tolar Burton, Susan Shaw, Margie Haak, Denise Lach, Jay Noller, George Caldwell

Notetaker:  David Bernell

Old Business

STS Category Review:

Update – notices have been sent to faculty and departments that need to submit course reviews.

General Review:

GEO 323 to be added to list of courses to be reviewed. Members will also divide work to review HST 353, WS 235, FE 452, YDE 492, IE 366.

PH 112 and 113 considered for BC status (PH 111 has already been approved). PH Dept. responded to BCC concerns, revising syllabus and opening class to all, not only students studying science education. New concerns based on syllabus: Does course satisfy BC idea of providing science education, or just about how to teach science to children? Motion to approve courses failed. A letter will be sent to the PH Dept. informing it of the committee decision and concerns.

NFM 312 prereq change approved.

DPD Statement:

DPD program recommends disallowing transfer equivalencies, but allowing case by case exceptions. DPD will draft statement for BCC review, and will also investigate how many students this impacts, and how much of this concern revolves around HST 201, 202, and 203. The BCC will review issue at its next meeting.

History Change to 4 Credit Courses:

HST is moving to 4 credit courses. The BCC has requested doing this for all but 100-level courses (or 200-level courses), to limit Bacc Core impacts. HST does not want to do this, and will be invited to make their case to BCC at the next meeting.

HSTS Request:

HST requests holding off on reviewing HSTS courses. New faculty is coming in after two retirements; this would allow new faculty to propose new courses. BCC has done this before. BCC will allow this, with a deadline of June 1, 2009, and an opportunity for extensions with a compelling case.

BIOE Request:

BIOE has requested that 2 non-bacc core courses be counted as an equivalent to BIO 314. Motion passed.

Credit Increase Analysis:
At issue – what information does BCC want from department and programs in order to consider their requests for course credit increases? The major need is to be certain that Bacc Core learning objectives will not be impacted. BCC will draft a note to appropriate departments requesting this analysis/information.

**New Business**

BCC Chair will email an email to members on items that will require action in the next meeting. To the extent that any items can be handled via email, all the better.

The next BCC meeting will be on February 5, at 1:30 in Gilkey 208.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 3, 2007
Minutes

Present: John Bailey, Vicki Tolar Burton, George Caldwell, Margie Haak, Victor Hsu, Denise Lach, Cheryl Middleton, Jay Noller

Note taker: George Caldwell

Old Business

1. Minutes from previous meeting differed.

New Business

1. STS Category review update: J. Noller reported that the letters have been sent to the departments.
2. The BCC membership schedule of assignments for STS Course Review was passed out. STS is one of the smaller categories, and there appeared to be an equal number of category and course change applications. The assignments were made by C. Middleton based partially on previous choices.
3. The co-chairs requested of the membership to complete the reviews within two weeks from the previous meeting and/or application availability. J. Noller and C. Middleton will do a preliminary check of the applications and will notify the members when they are ready for review.
4. The committee reviewed the tables of proposed credit increases to Bacc Core as prepared by J. Noller. A 5-year mean was used for English courses at 3 credits, excluding graduate and transfer students. It was noted that an Impact Index of 1 or less is a problem. 2.4 is considered healthy, equaling 4,000 potential seats. The question was raised, is 1.5 a significant impact? The committee considered whether to ask the History Department to withdraw its 100 level courses from the 3 to 5 credit change. Accordingly, such a motion was made but failed owing to lack of a second. However, a sense of the committee was reached that the BCC co-chairs meet with the Chair of the Department of History with the request that the History 100 level courses remain at 3 credits.
5. The application of TOX 360 (new course) looks favorable and will be handled via e-mail by the end of the week.
6. The application of PH 112 (new course) indicates it is part of a sequence, named for education students and aimed at how to teach physics. The courses and skill sets build through the course of a year. PH 112 is part of 111 and 113. The course uses a model curriculum based on national standards. Deficiencies cited by the committee include: the syllabus does not indicate Bacc Core status or the category; inclusion of pedagogy in the description should be considered; laboratory requirement is not in the syllabus, although it is in the application; the syllabus lacks a schedule of lab activities; the syllabus should list the required readings; and, the syllabus lacks sufficient detail. The reviewer recommended approval of the application following a positive outcome in a discussion with the departmental chair. Owing to the schedule, an assessment will be made by the committee via e-mail by the end of this week. PH 111 and 113 will be reviewed Winter Quarter.
7. J. Noller will discuss similar issues regarding the PH 231, 232 and 233 sequence with the chair.
8. V. Tolar Burton explained to the committee that the review of every WIC course varies significantly, because every syllabus is different. Typically, the Word-Count Table for Proposed WIC Courses is requested only for submissions seeking assistance. A motion was made to require the Word-Count form of all applications seeking WIC status. The motion was seconded and passed.

The meeting was adjourned.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 12, 2007
Minutes

Minute Taker: Maggie Haak

Introduction of new member, Victor Hsu, of the Department of Biochemistry (COS)

Information Sharing:

- Increase in Credit Hours: English, History, History of Science - Cheryl/Jay
- Review of the entire Baccore related to what direction this maybe headed per Vickie Nunnemaker

Overview and Demonstration of General Category II Course Review – Cheryl

New Course Review – PH111

Course Change Review – FOR375 (change course to WIC)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=2897

General Reviews Received to date:

PH231 (New Course)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3254

PH232 (New Course)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3255

PH233 (New Course)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3256

HORT385 (Course change WIC)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3164

PH112 (New course)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3153

PH113 (New course)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3154

ANTH487 (Course change to 4 hours and WIC)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=2879

BA469 (WIC)
https://curriculum.bus.oregonstate.edu/XmlViewer.aspx?requestID=3300

Distribution of General Reviews to Committee Members

Overview and Demonstration of a STS Course Review – Jay
Distribution of reallocated STS Course Review Assignments spreadsheet to Committee Members
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 1, 2007
Minutes

Recorded by: Cheryl Middleton

Members present: John Bailey, Margie Haak, Cheryl Middleton, Jay Noller, Susan Shaw (ex-officio) and Vicki Tolar Burton (ex-officio),

Members absent: David Bernell, George Caldwell and Denise Lach

New Business:

Introductions

This was the first meeting of the BCC in the 2007/2008 academic year. Attending members were presented with committee standing rules and a draft of the Baccalaureate Core Committee 2006-2007 Annual report. There were no new members present. John Bailey noted that with Pat Muir rotating off the committee there were no longer 2 members from the College of Science on the committee as per our standing rules.

Action Item: Jay Noller will check with Vickie Nunnemaker to determine if we need an additional committee member to be in alignment with our standing rules.

Proposal Review Protocol

The committee reviewed the protocol letter dated January 15, 2007 that was prepared for the STS category review that was postponed. We agreed to update the letter with current dates with the final date for material to be submitted for review on December 15, 2007. The bulk of the work done by the committee will be done winter term.

Action item: Jay Noller will talk with Vickie Nunnemaker to have the changes made to the letter.

Category Review – Science, Technology and Society

Committee members who were present received an updated spreadsheet of the STS courses assigned to each individual. There are several courses that have more than one section and they are noted by an H after the course number. Two of note are GEO 300, ANTH 330, Cheryl & Jay will be reviewing these items. If there are additional courses that come in they will be distributed.

Regarding the review process itself, we’ll need to do an informational session because last years category was postponed. We have several new members on the committee who need to become familiar with the process. Those members of the committee who have been through the process before will be asked to model the process for our newer members and we will make sure that everyone has all the documentation and information needed to streamline the review process.

General Reviews and New BCC Course Proposals

General reviews and new course proposals will be received by Cheryl who will do a review and make a recommendation. The review or new course proposal will then be sent to BCC committee members by e-mail for a discussion regarding any questions about the proposal. The intent is to be better prepared in the committee meeting to make a good decision.
English Department

Vicki Tolar-Burton shared with the committee the information that the English Department was getting ready to begin converting their 3 credit courses to 4 credit courses. After a brief discussion of the best way for the BCC committee to handle the influx of courses, the committee recommended that each course go through the review process in the same way all Bacc core courses do and that we'll divide the courses up for review amongst ourselves in the same way that we do the category reviews.

**Action item:** Cheryl will contact the Curricular Council to find out if they have been approached by the English Department and get their input.

**Carry Over from Last Year**

H312 per the BCC 2006-2007 Annual Report the course will be reviewed again by the BCC in winter of 2008 to determine if BCC committee concerns have been met.

**DPD and transfer courses:**

We need to revisit this agenda item. Below is the excerpt from the May 18, 2007 meeting minutes.

Susan Shaw, DPD Director, presented her concern that many transfer courses currently used to fulfill the DPD requirement do not actually meet the criteria for DPD courses. She indicated that she will bring a written proposal to us regarding use of transfer courses as DPD for us to discuss at the June 1, 2007 meeting. The hope is that we can vote on the proposal (or a modified version of it) and that, if the vote is affirmative, she can then carry it forward to the EC and onward.

**International components of the Bacc Core:**

(Excerpt from May 18, 2007 meeting minutes)

We discussed a proposal sent to the BCC by Jim Johnson (College of Forestry) on behalf of the International Council, which urges that a mechanism be established that would make it easier for students to receive Bacc Core credit for education abroad experiences. Susan Shaw had previously discussed with them her concerns about use of international experiences to fulfill DPD requirements. While the BCC supports the general concept that courses (or other experiences) taken outside the US should certainly be useable for appropriate Bacc Core categories, we were unclear about the mechanism being proposed by the International Council.

**Action item:** We will invite Jim Johnson and Joe Hoff to our next scheduled BCC meeting to discuss this proposal in more detail.

Next meeting: TBA
May 18, 2007, Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 18, 2007  
Minutes

Recorded by:  Pat Muir

Members present:  John Bailey, David Bernell, George Caldwell, Margie Haak, Denise Lach, Cheryl Middleton, Pat Muir, Jay Noller, Susan Shaw (ex officio), Vicki Tolar Burton (ex officio), Annette McFarland

Members absent:  None!

Unanticipated guest:  Mike Quinn, Faculty Senate President

Old Business

Minutes from meeting of May 4, 2007 were discussed, revised, and approved as revised

Mike Quinn presented Executive Committee (EC) response to the three motions that we passed at the meeting on May 4, 2007. The EC was happy with Motion 1 (“There is no current need to make adjustments to the Baccalaureate Core”) and will keep Motions 2 and 3 in mind, but is unlikely to act on them in the short term (#2 –“These discussions need to continue in a larger forum to determine if a task force should be convened to review the Baccalaureate Core;” #3 – “We propose that a funded assessment of student and faculty perception of the Baccalaureate Core be conducted.”). We discussed whether any revisions to the motions were necessary. ACTION: Vote was unanimous to let the motions stand as passed at the May 4, 2007 meeting.

We encouraged Mike Quinn to publicly acknowledge the generosity of ENG re. the decision to keep WR I, II and III courses and all 100-level ENG courses at the 100 level, and also to acknowledge the shuttle diplomacy conducted by Vicki Tolar Burton in this matter. He will do so at the June Faculty Senate meeting.

Jay Noller updated us on his meeting with the EC about our decision that the Bacc Core does not need to be revised immediately. A question arose about whether some courses have more prerequisites than is reasonable for Bacc Core courses, and about whether language concerning prerequisites in the criteria for Bacc Core Courses should be made more explicit. Decision: We need more information on the current distribution of numbers of course prerequisites in various categories before we decide whether action on this is needed. How common is it for Bacc Core courses to have several prerequisites at present?

New Business

Course Reviews:

PS 425, Gender and the Law – change in prerequisites approved unanimously; Pat will submit approval along with a request that DPD status of the course be included on the syllabus

ME 418, SAE Senior Design Project – change in prerequisites approved unanimously; Pat will submit approval.

DPD and transfer courses:

Susan Shaw, DPD Director, presented her concern that many transfer courses currently used to fulfill the DPD requirement do not actually meet the criteria for DPD courses. She indicated that she will bring a written proposal to us regarding use of transfer courses as DPD for us to discuss at the June 1, 2007 meeting. The
hope is that we can vote on the proposal (or a modified version of it) and that, if the vote is affirmative, she can then carry it forward to the EC and onward.

International components of the Bacc Core:

We discussed a proposal sent to the BCC by Jim Johnson (College of Forestry) on behalf of the International Council, which urges that a mechanism be established that would make it easier for students to receive Bacc Core credit for education abroad experiences. Susan Shaw had previously discussed with them her concerns about use of international experiences to fulfill DPD requirements. While the BCC supports the general concept that courses (or other experiences) taken outside the US should certainly be useable for appropriate Bacc Core categories, we were unclear about the mechanism being proposed by the International Council.

**Action:** It was agreed that Pat Muir would contact Jim Johnson and suggest that she or Jay Noller meet with the Council for clarification, with that possibly followed by a representative from the Council meeting with us so that we understand the proposal and can take action on it.

Operating procedures and standing rules:

We discussed whether formal changes are needed in either our operating procedures or standing rules, which would be intended to make more explicit some of the rationale we use to make decisions (e.g., that courses with disproportionately large enrollment and multiple sections receive closer scrutiny at review time than do smaller, single-section courses; that, when reviewing course change proposals, we will consider impact of changes in course credits on access; and others – see a listing in the Agenda for this May 18 meeting).

**Decision:** It is important for the BCC to be transparent about operating procedures, but we also need to retain flexibility for dealing with new or unanticipated situations, hence it is neither possible nor useful for us to try to write out every nuance of our process and considerations. Rather, as situations are encountered, procedures used to address them will be recorded in BCC minutes. Be it here noted that, in addition to items already listed in operating procedures, on the Cat II proposal web site, and on the annual category review web site, the outcome of the BCC’s review of proposed changes to existing Bacc Core courses and of proposed new Bacc Core courses can be affected by:

- impact of proposed change on access to courses in the relevant category and
- considerations of consistency in course quality across multiple sections or offerings.

Furthermore, courses that do not appear to meet one or more criteria can be re-reviewed at a set date in the future, pursuant to notice to appropriate department Chair and faculty.
In addition, we **recommend** that the BCC continue to send beginning-of-term notice to Chairs/Heads and Office Managers of Departments that will offer Bacc Core courses that term, asking them to remind the appropriate faculty to make the role of the course in the Bacc Core clear to students, most commonly by mentioning the category, rationale, and criteria during an early meeting in the term.

We also discussed whether we should institutionalize the co-chair system that we’ve used this year (via a change in Operating Procedures). **Decision:** Doing so is unnecessary – as it stands currently, the BCC nominates a chair or co-chairs to the EC, and there is nothing to stop us from nominating co-chairs.

Next meeting:

June 1, 2007, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. Gilkey 109
May 4, 2007, Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University


Absent: David Bernell, John Bailey, Deb Pence, Michael Olson, Ken Winograd.

Minutes from 4/27/07 – Approved

Vickie Tolar Burton reported that Tracy Daugherty felt that it was very important for Literature and the Arts to be recognized as a separate category in the Baccalaureate Core. To ensure that Literature & Arts remains a separate category, the English department is willing to keep all WR I, II and III courses and all 100-level English classes at 3 credits rather than increasing them to 4 credits.

Concern was expressed by several committee members that in the future more classes may increase to 4 credits. Also, the committee would like to convey some of the concerns that have arisen during this review of the Baccalaureate Core even though we do not feel that any adjustments need to be made immediately.

Three motions were put forth and approved unanimously:

**Motion #1:** There is no current need to make adjustments to the Baccalaureate Core.

**Motion #2:** These discussions need to continue in a larger forum to determine if a task force should be convened to review the Baccalaureate Core.

**Motion #3:** We propose that a funded assessment of student and faculty perception of the Baccalaureate Core be conducted.

After motion #3 was passed, there was discussion about the outcomes that this committee has developed. It was felt that these outcomes should be forwarded to any group convened to review the Baccalaureate Core to help inform the discussion.

There was discussion about whether the outcomes for the Bac Core have completely eliminated any content-specific knowledge as they are all at the higher levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.

There was discussion about whether students understand why they need to take Bac. Core classes and what they should be able to take away from these classes. Some simple ways to address this issue might be:

- Helping instructors include this type of information on the syllabi of Bac Core courses.
- Developing a website specifically for the Baccalaureate Core. This would include listings of the categories and courses that make up the Baccalaureate Core, outcomes of the Baccalaureate Core, explanation of the mission of the Baccalaureate Core, etc.

A recommendation was made that a policy be developed to address requests for credit increases for courses in the Baccalaureate Core. It was felt that this was not within the scope of the BCC, but that the BCC could recommend what policy they would like to see in place.

The committee would like to thank our ad hoc members for their hard work and valuable input during this review process.
Action Item: Pat will contact Paul Farber to ask about keeping 100 level history classes at 3 credits each.

Future discussion topic: Susan would like to discuss removing DPD courses from the list of credits that can be transferred in from high school or community colleges.

Next meeting: Friday May 18, 1-3 pm in Gilkey 109.
March 14, 2007
Minutes

Present: Pat Muir, Susan Shaw, Vicki Tolar Burton, Dave Bernell, John Bailey, Denise Lach, Jay Noller and Liz Gray;
New Ad Hoc member: Manolete Gonzalez
Excused: George Caldwell, Margie Haak and Ken Winograd

Minutes:
Approved with modification: “Vicki Tolar Burton”
Emerging design trend to ease review of minutes: italicize recommendations; bold on actions

Old Business:

1. Student members for BCC: ASOSU has identified two members (plus an alternate) but they are absent today given tight timing and final approval issues.

2. Information: Vickie N. has posted handy materials on the web for our access

3. H312: Pat  and Jay met with Donna Harvey; they are already working toward more consistency and training instructors; Donna will be supervising the course instructors in the future and they will continue (in the interim) to offer the course as CGI. ACTION: revisit this course next academic year at the end of winter term.

4. Course Reviews: ENG204 and ENG206 approved.

New Business:

5. Faculty Senate: Pat and Jay have met with Faculty Senate President Mike Quinn for an update on the need for faculty and/or student ‘forums’ to present a preferred alternative for retooling the Baccalaureate Core program and several options. Following these forums, this committee will proceed with a revision and final recommendation to the Faculty Senate before the end of the term (Spring 07). In this way, the Senate can debate the topic in October. ACTION: present this schedule to Mike for approval.

6. BC Director: We have been asked to consider whether the program and university as a whole would benefit from have a “Director” for the Baccalaureate Core overall. In a quick discussion, we thought the pros would include an obvious investment by the campus in the program and (likely) some additional clarity in organization and procedures. Cons would include poor timing associated with expanding our soviet-style bureaucracy during budget cuts to other programs as well as any related rigidity/policing that might come from a full-time director. At a minimum, we can use this programmatic interest to codify our current (and quite) functional arrangement with staggered co-chairs. TABLED

7. Future request to Mike Quinn: We see a need for a transparent funding formula/model and timely access to classes for students – two current shortcomings that need to be addressed and are tightly interwoven with our restructuring process. ACTION: present to Mike.

8. Outcomes synthesis: We spent the remainder of our time discussion outcomes. Jay is looking for feedback and compiling our last ideas on his synthesis. ACTION: distribute revision to Levels 1, 2 and 3 by 4/6; review and finalize at 4/13 meeting.
Future Business:
Various members agreed to work towards development of alternative models for the Bacc Core for presentation and discussion at the next meeting:

- Vicki Tolar Burton – examine issues of writing across the whole Bacc Core
- David and Pat – offer “minimal change” models
- Denise – study the AAOT model and offer suggestions
- Jay and Liz – develop a model that reflects our work on outcomes (?)

Pat sent request to absent members requesting them to come to the next meeting with some sort of model in mind as well.

Next meeting: April 13 1:00-3:00 in Kidder 128 (NOTE different time AND location)
February 28, 2007
Minutes

Members present: Pat Muir (co-chair), Vicki Tolar Burton, John Bailey, David Bernell, Margie Haak, Susan Shaw (DPD Director, ex-officio), George Caldwell, Cheryl Middleton, Jay Noller (co-chair)

New members: Ken Winograd, College of Education, Liz Gray from HHS joining as ad hoc members

Deb Pence, COE, cannot make it during this time this quarter
Haven’t heard back from COB, Vickie Nunnemaker will contact COB
Jay Noller is looking for a student member – ASOSU needs to approve a student, Mike Olson (Pres) will need to approve any nominated student

Minutes from 2/14 meeting – accepted without change

H312 – Co-chair (Pat Muir) sent hard copy of information to Chair of Department of Health; Liz Gray reported that they would be looking at the information this week and get back to the BCC

Outcomes for various BCC categories – The co-chair (Jay Noller) described how he developed the Learning Outcomes of the BCC. Some discussion among group about how valuable the consolidation of outcomes is; discussion about how Academic Affairs would be creating an assessment based on these outcomes.

Potential recommendation for BC instructors: at end of each BC course have students write a reflection piece related to the outcomes/goals of BC.

Action: Committee to review list of outcomes to identify any gaps, or suggestion for improvements. We need to decide what to pass along for development of assessment effort by Academic Programs (e.g., whole document, single page, common learning outcomes, etc).

Bacc Core Discussion

Fixing or reinventing the Bacc Core: Reviewed charge to the group from EC, Faculty Senate, and Academic Affairs. No perception that the BC needs to be overhauled.

Review of 1988 Report re General Education program, report from National Leadership Council regarding college outcomes, other 4-year colleges in Oregon, AAOT process, and BC/Student Engagement Sub-Committee comments.

General education programs at other OUS universities are confusing and difficult to fully comprehend; they tend to have less “cerebral” or “erudite” categories (e.g., social science, writing, humanities). PSU has required common courses at freshmen and sophomore level, and a few electives at the upper division level. Other universities tend to have a limited number of courses that fulfill general education requirements. Maybe category labels present some obfuscation for students about what they’re supposed to be about. Most programs don’t have required credits, instead they have required number of courses because courses range from 3-5 credits.

George is going to go back and look at how the outcomes and the OSU BC categories go together.

SOU program described with a year-long freshmen seminar experience that includes writing, fitness. Discussed integrating “use of best learning practices” as part of the guidelines and requirements of BC
courses. Should there be faculty development for other BC skills (e.g., critical thinking, educational practices)? EOU has outcomes built into the general education requirements.

AAOT proposed outcomes reviewed. These outcomes were developed by representatives of multiple disciplines from multiple universities. They should be seen as the skills and knowledge that students with AA degree bring to OSU (or other four-year university). Articulation agreement is that students can use these to fulfill BC courses except for WIC and synthesis courses. Currently, do not have to take an additional DPD course.

**Liz Gray will bring information about the number of courses required to next meeting**

Concerns raised about students not learning about OSU/research library/information technology through AAOT program.

Issues raised by BC/Student Engagement Sub-Committee included the role of study abroad and other experiential learning activities in meeting the outcomes of the BC, and thus using these in lieu of specific BC requirements.

**Action: 1) review material passed along today and 2) start thinking about ways to assign tasks that will lead to a recommendation at the end of the spring term.**

**Time to meet next term: every other Friday 1 – 3, beginning April 13 (save all Fridays at this time spring term just in case)**

*Minutes submitted by Denise Lach*
Baccalaureate Core Committee
January 31, 2007
Minutes

Members present: John Bailey, David Bernell, George Caldwell, Margie Haak, Denise Lach, Cheryl Middleton, Pat Muir (Co-chair), Jay Noller (Co-chair); Vicki Tolar-Burton, ex officio

Old Business:
1) Minutes from January 31, 2007 meeting APPROVED (thank you John)

2) STS website is now working, one course has been submitted. Vickie Nunnemaker sent out passwords to all committee members.

3) Pat will resend the STS rubric to everyone.

4) Course updates: H 312 discussion deferred to next meeting (AGENDA)

New Business:
5) ENVE/CHE/BIOE 414 was reviewed and approved unanimously

6) Removal of WIC status from BIOE490 was approved unanimously. Pat will check with the department to see if removal should be immediate or should take place after Spring term 2007

7) It was reported that the BCC may be asked to set aside the STS category review scheduled for this year and instead deal with more global Bacc Core issues that have arisen as a result of many courses in CLA changing from 3 to 4 credits.

8) If the BCC is to look at the Bacc Core as a whole it was felt that there should be a member of the COE involved since they have very little room to add more credit hours to their programs.
   ACTION: Pat will talk to COE to find a representative willing to work with BCC
   ACTION: BCC will try to have a well thought out proposal ready to take to the Faculty Senate by May 1

9) There was much discussion about the paragraph Jay wrote describing the overall purpose for and vision of the Bacc Core curriculum. Input was offered and a revised paragraph was drafted.

10) BCC will meet every other Wednesday 9-11 am for the remainder of this term.

11) A fourth standing rule for BCC, stated below, was drafted, voted on, and approved.

The Baccalaureate Core Committee has the authority to deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the Baccalaureate Core criteria.

ACTION: Pat and Jay will meet with Mike Quinn to decide if we will put aside the STS category review and instead address more global Baccalaureate Core concerns.

Next meeting: February 14, 2007 9:00-11:00 in Gilkey 109

Minutes submitted by Margie Haak
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 17, 2007
Minutes

Members present: All present (including Vicki Tolar-Burton, ex officio) except Margie Haak (gave advance notice)

Old Business:
1. Minutes from December 7, 2006 meeting APPROVED

2. Message from Vickie Nunnemaker - STS category review in process with some delays; should go out soon. BCC discussed shortening the revision period to as little as one month so that we still have time for appropriate review.
   **ACTION:** Pat to relay this plan to Vickie

   NOTE SINCE MEETING: Revision requests have gone out; some departments have requested delays for a year, and some courses are no longer offered; our list is shrinking; Pat has reworked the matrix for reviews to reflect this and balance BCC workloads.

3. Memo to winter-term BCC Instructors - Jay solved some issues, compiled a list, and distributed the memo intended to prompt instructors to identify with and discuss BC purposes with their students. Jay and Pat received good feedback about this reminder but at a significant time cost. Though that cost could be reduced in the future, a better approach may be to distribute to Academic Chairs to be forwarded to their instructors. In addition, we can/will provide verbiage (currently in editing) for syllabi.
   **ACTION:** Jay to revise verbiage and distribute before spring term

4. Course updates: ANTH487 is no longer a CGI (REQUEST FOR REMOVAL FORM COMPLETED); GEO300X is now GEO390 (APPROVAL SUBMITTED); H120 has met our requirements and Pat recommends approval (APPROVAL SUBMITTED)

New Business:
5. Faculty Senate "deliberations" on BC: (Based on partial attendance by Vicki Tolar-Burton with notes from early part of Senate meeting). It appears that most concern in the Senate is over pedagogy in courses (e.g., student engagement) rather than structure/delivery of the current BC program, though there was vague talk of "other models" and "objectives and evaluation criteria." There were no motions or actions taken. Three groups will likely be considering aspects of the BCC over the coming year: UCSEE, Assessment Council, and Undergraduate Education Council. Items #6 and #8 below may proactively alleviate some concerns in these three groups.
   **ACTION:** Jay and Pat to continue tracking the work of these three groups

6. Moving to more than 3 credits for BC courses: (Becky Warner, Tracy Daugherty and Michael Oriard visiting). Departments are considering this move for their own curricula as well as BC courses to encourage: a) engagement of students and other related pedagogical issues related to pace of instruction, and b) better alignment with other universities for transferring credits. However, there are tough logistical issues involved that are made worse by current budgetary times (e.g., loss of positions, use of adjuncts and lecturers, and general lack of course offerings). The BCC feels that we have to move to be more flexible and work with departments, which probably translates into a "minimum core credits" approach by category with a reduced number of categories so the total remains at 48 credits (51 including WIC). This new flexibility and reduced categories relates well to the "outcomes" discussion (#8 below).
   **ACTION:** Jay to continue work on outcomes; BCC to brainstorm on this new structure at next special meeting (AGENDA)
7. GEO352: approval confirmed from earlier email (APPROVED)

8. New "outcomes language" for BC: Jay has been processing the current wording of BC categories into outcome language and is realizing the similarities among many categories. We also have parallel concerns that the sum of good pieces does not necessarily translate to a good whole.

**ACTION:** Jay to continue revisions including consultations with Peter Saunders (CTL) and Rebecca Sanderson (NSSE); BCC to review at the next special meeting as related to #6 above (AGENDA)

9. Jay drafted a paragraph intended to describe the overall purpose for and vision of the Bacc Core curriculum, which, when finalized, will be inserted into the Schedule of Classes. Two members had already submitted comments on the draft text; others are asked to review the draft and bring comments to the next meeting (AGENDA)

**Next meeting:** January 31, 2007 9:00-11:00 in Gilkey 109; three agenda items flagged above.

*Minutes submitted by John Bailey*
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 9, 2006
Minutes

Members present: Pat Muir (co-chair), Jay Noller (co-chair), Vicki Tolar Burton (ex-officio), George Caldwell, Denise Lach, John Bailey (new member)

Members absent: David Bernell (excused), Margie Haak, Cheryl Middleton.

New member, John Bailey, was introduced and welcomed to the Committee.

Minutes:
The minutes from 10/12/06 were reviewed by the committee and approved.

Old Business
General Reviews from '05-06 Academic Year and Summer:
Committee approved process to e-mail individual reviews to committee members with a discussion (if needed) and approval made in next meeting

Eng 362 – Approved. Pat Muir will submit approval
Span 333 – Withdrawn. The Department decided to withdraw the request due to the issues raised by the BCC.

Category Reviews (Contemporary Global Issues) from ‘05-06 Academic Year:
ANTH 487 - Withdrawn. The department will submit a Request for Removal from the Bacc Core. Co-chairs will sign.

Student members: If committee members know of students who might be interested in serving on the BCC, they should forward names to Pat Muir who will help students apply to ASOSU for the assignment.

New Business
General Reviews 2006-2007 Academic Year
Geo 330 – Delayed. Committee will review during next meeting.

Miscellaneous

- STS Category Review: notification of the review has been sent to relevant Department Heads. Because some work is being done on the web site to which faculty submit syllabi, notice to faculty will be delayed. We decided that the due date for faculty members will reflect at least 60 days for response, so we may need to change the due date (earlier decided as January 15, 2007). When the web site is ready, professors will be notified that it is time to submit syllabi for review.
- Curriculum Council’s proposed deadlines for submission of Category I and Category II proposals (minimum times required final approval after submission of proposals to the appropriate first-stage reviewer). We agreed with all proposed deadlines except recommend that the deadline for courses that are WIC or DPD be changed from the recommended 10 weeks to 12 weeks, to allow for their additional layer of review. Pat Muir will communicate this recommendation to John Lee, Chair of Curriculum Council.
- Pat Muir and Jay Noller will be added to the review team for the review of ANTH 330. It was agreed earlier that the BCC would provide increased scrutiny for reviews of the largest synthesis classes. This scrutiny may include, but not be limited to, multiple reviewers looking at syllabi, face-to-face conversations with instructors, and attendance at class(es).
GEO 300 is both a STS and CGI synthesis course, so even though it was reviewed last year we will ask Vickie Nunnemaker to check when the last STS review of the course was conducted. If it hasn’t been reviewed within the last five years, we’ll add it to our list for this year.

- BCC support for Sociology conversion of upper division BCC courses from 3 to 4 credits: After some discussion, the committee decided that the BCC supports departments’ efforts to increase the quality of the curriculum. If this (and other conversions in the CLA) creates difficulties for students looking for 3-credit synthesis courses, the BCC will solicit new bacc core courses, maybe even providing incentives (i.e., streamlined processing) to increase the number. The BCC agrees that it is quite reasonable to have synthesis courses offered for 4 credits. Pat Muir will communicate the BCC’s sentiments to John Lee, Chair of the Curriculum Council.

- New WIC concept for College of Business: Jim Coakley and Vicki Tolar-Burton described a proposed model (still under discussion) for implementing WIC in the College of Business. WIC methods and assignments would be integrated into multiple classes and students would be required to complete three WIC assignments in different classes. They will not receive the WIC credit until they have completed all three courses and received at least a C- on the papers. The BCC is very supportive of this model and others that integrate better writing skills into courses.

Next Meeting:
Thursday, December 7, 10:00 am to 12:00 pm (or as needed), 109 Gilkey.

Minutes submitted by Denise Lach
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 12, 2006
Minutes

Members present: Pat Muir (co-chair), David Bernell, Vicki Tolar Burton (ex-officio), George Caldwell, Margie Haak, Denise Lach, Cheryl Middleton.

Members absent: Jay Noller (co-chair, excused).

Minutes: The minutes from 9/26/06 were reviewed by the committee and approved.

General Reviews from '05-'06 Academic Year and Summer:

GEO 221 - Approved. Proposal requested a change from 3 to 4 hours credit and to be added as BAC course, intended to make it easier for non-majors to take the class. The course meets all the applicable criteria. The committee will check if its Bacc Core status is indicated on the syllabus and, if not, will recommend its inclusion.

HHS 242 - Approved.

ENG 320 - Delayed. Recommendation by committee will be handled by e-mail.

ENG 426 - Approved with the recommendation to indicate its Bacc Core status on the syllabus.

ENG 362 - Delayed. Recommendation by committee will be handled by e-mail.

ENG 425 - Approved with the recommendation to indicate its Bacc Core status on the syllabus.

Category Reviews (Contemporary Global Issues) from '05-'06 Academic Year:

PS 345 - Approved. The course proposal meets all applicable criteria.

ANTH 487 - Withdrawn. The instructor has informed the committee that the course will be withdrawn from BAC status pending departmental approval.

COMM 446 - Delayed. The instructor will submit all required proposal materials prior to the next BCC meeting.

HST 385 - Approved. The syllabus revision with appropriate adjustments was submitted just prior to the meeting.

New Business:

General reviews:

ME 418 - Approved. The proposal requested to add WR 327 as a prerequisite. The syllabus includes writing outcomes and WIC designation. An elaboration of WIC requirements is recommended.

AREC 461 - Approved. The proposal requests a change of prerequisite to just 200 level. The syllabus now contains BAC material, writing outcomes and WIC designation.

Various:
As a result of the notice by the instructor of ANTH 487 to withdraw the course from BAC status, Pat Muir (BCC co-chair) presented to the committee a sample form, “Request for Removal of Baccalaureate Core Status.” The form is intended to accompany any request from a department or instructor to withdraw a course. The committee reviewed the form and associated procedures. These were approved. Later in the meeting, it was suggested that a signature from the WIC Program be included in the form when appropriate.

Pat Muir (co-chair) will e-mail to the BCC members the Science, Technology and Society (STS) review assignments. ANTH 330 has an enrollment of approximately 700. It was agreed by the committee that two reviewers will examine the class with request for additional materials for the initial analysis. One other class shows an enrollment of 200, and seven have figures of approximately 100. It was agreed that these courses would be assigned multiple reviews and receive extra scrutiny. GEO 300 will be reviewed again.

The co-chair distributed copies of notice to instructors/departments informing them of Periodic Category Course Review with deadlines and requirements. Also included were copies of the instructor’s check sheet found on the web materials along with the “Request to Continue BAC Core Designation.”

The co-chair distributed copies of the STS course review rubric for Committee members.

The committee discussed the policy on proposed new Perspectives courses that are upper division. The question was addressed, should new courses be strictly lower division when Bacc Core criteria so specify, given that some upper division courses already exist in these categories? The committee determined that all existing upper division Perspectives courses be retained. A motion was made and seconded that the current criterion limiting new Perspectives courses to lower division be enforced when applicable. The motion was carried and approved.

The committee discussed a request that a 200-level COCC Human Anatomy and Physiology course be granted Bacc Core status. The discussion by the committee determined that the current OSU 300-level equivalent, Human Anatomy, is not a Bacc Core course; therefore, the request was denied.

The committee suggested April 15, 2007 as the deadline for Category I and II new and changed course proposals.

Next Meeting:
BCC meetings may be every month rather than every two weeks. The next meeting will be in one month. Date, time and locale to be announced.

Minutes submitted by George Caldwell
Baccalaureate Core Committee

September 26, 2006
Minutes

Members present: George Caldwell, Denise Lach, Cheryl Middleton, Patricia Muir, Jay Noller
Members absent with advance notification of absence: David Bernell, Margie Haak, Vicki Tolar Burton (ex-officio)

New business:
(1) Introduced committee members
(2) Gave overview of committee responsibilities
(3) Demonstrated how to access information on:
   - BCC committee membership, agendas, minutes, etc.
   - General Bacc Core materials (lists of courses, rationale, criteria)
   - General (new and change) course reviews
(4) Discussed handling of minutes. It was agreed that draft minutes would be made available before each meeting; if relevant, committee members would offer revisions/comments; minutes would then be revised (if relevant) and approved at the next BCC meeting and submitted to Vickie Nunnemaker for posting.
(5) Discussed division of duties. We agreed that the co-chairs (Muir and Noller) will participate in reviewing courses to diminish the review demands on other committee members. However, in recognition of their additional responsibilities, they will review, collectively, the equivalent of one regular committee member’s review load.
(6) Discussed, briefly, the category review that we will undertake this year (Synthesis – Science, Technology and Society). Enrollment numbers for each course to be reviewed are being compiled so that our review efforts can be made proportional to enrollment.

Old business:
(1) Courses remaining for general review (new or changed courses) from last year: GEO 221; HHS 242; H 320; SPAN 333; ENG 425, 426, 356 and 362. Courses were assigned to committee members for review and discussion at the next BCC meeting. We reviewed two of these courses during the meeting as part of training and calibration of committee members and will forward recommendations on these courses to last year’s BCC Chair, Milo Koretsky; he will communicate with appropriate faculty members.

ENG 356 – approve
SPAN 333 – approval to retain status as a Perspectives Western Culture course withheld. Committee needs more information on [a] how the course studies the subject from an historical perspective, [b] how it demonstrates influences on US culture and institutions, and [c] is considered accessible to most students given that it is 300-level, taught in Spanish, and has a prerequisite of at least 9 credits of 300-level SPAN courses.

Next meeting: Thursday Oct. 12, 2006 (location TBA)
Members present: Milo Koretsky (Chair), Margie Haak, Cheryl Middleton, Jay Noller

Members absent: Pat Muir, Vickie Tolar Burton (Ex-officio), and Patti Watkins

Proposal Reviews:
- GEO311 -Approved
- BA469 -Approved

Category Review
Paperwork packet was just finalized, which will be sent to Department heads and cc:'d to their assistants and course instructors.

First order of business during the Winter 2006 term is to develop template for review of CGI documents. An example of a review template was handed out for the committee to look at. It is agreed that the committee will follow this approach and develop a review template for CGI in January '06 (next month).

WIC Overview
Passed on as Vicki was not in attendance.

"Easy A" BCC Courses
Chair expresses concern with integrity in BCC offerings. Some questions arise: Is there a mismatch between the intent and operation of BCC courses? Is there a way for this to be reasonably addressed? Chair suggests this as one of our themes for the upcoming CGI reviews.

Meeting Time for Winter '06 Term
Wednesday afternoons, 2:00-3:30; 4-5 times and mostly after January

Next Meeting:
TBA

Minutes submitted by Jay Noller
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 11, 2005
Minutes

**Members present:** Milo Koretsky (Chair), Pat Muir, Jun Xing (Ex-officio), Vicki Tolar Burton (Ex-officio), Margie Haak and Cheryl Middleton

**Members absent:** Jay Noler and Patti Watkins

**Proposal Reviews:**
- PSY480 - Approved
- GEO311 - In review pending further information
- MUS121 - Postponed; concern that students can fulfill requirement for this BacCore category by taking a test in week one.

**Action item:**
Chair of BacCore will investigate precedents.

**DDP HST 201, 202, 203**
This agenda item is a carry-over from last year's review of the DDP Category. BCC Chair updated current members on the review. Based on this information, the committee reviewed the HST 201, 202 and 203 based on the History department's response to requests for information from last year's committee. 1) More information regarding active learning components in the U.S. History Survey Courses and 2) Revision of course syllabus to include DPD criteria and integration of DPD criteria throughout the syllabus. Upon review, the BCC committee members found they need more information regarding the interactive learning activities used by the faculty member who teaches the course for extended campus.

**Action item:**
BCC chair will contact the History Department and gather more information regarding the syllabus for the extended campus course.

**Category Review - Contemporary Global Issues**
BCC chair is in the process of finalizing the materials to be sent out to faculty teaching courses that fall into the Contemporary Global Issues category.

**Action item:**
Committee members should review category review materials and send any comments to the committee chair.

**WIC Overview**
Vicki Tolar Burton presented a draft of an assessment tool related to the Writing in Baccalaureate Core Courses. The assessment would become a piece of the category review process and allow the University to get a snapshot of writing in the curriculum. The committee reviewed the assessment and recommended small changes.

**Action item:**
With approved changes made, the assessment document will be added to the category review process by the committee chair.

Next Meeting: December 2, 2005, 109 Gilkey Hall

*Minutes submitted by Cheryl Middleton*
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 18, 2004
Minutes

Members present: Joanne Sorte (Chair), Ruth Vondracek, David McMurray, and Pat Muir
Members absent: Milo Koretsky and Patti Watkins
Ex-officios present: Vicki Tolar Burton, WIC and Christian Matheis, DPD
Visitors: Mina McDaniel, Susie Leslie, Gina Shellhammer

Joanne welcomed guests and new member Pat Muir to the committee. The Standing Rules for the Bac Core Committee were reviewed; Joanne laid out the meeting schedule for fall term.

Vicki suggested soliciting funds to set up a Bac Core web site that would:
1. Provide students with a central location for information, explanations, etc., about the Bac Core.
2. Provide teaching faculty with a central location for information on how to propose a Bac Core course, as well as examples of good syllabi from up and running courses. We will put these ideas in the "think tank" for future consideration.

DPD Category Review for 2004-2005
David asked that DPD chair, Jun Xing, present to the committee an explanation of why DPD is important to the campus. This would be a way of energizing the committee as it begins its annual review of the DPD category of the Bac Core curriculum. Ruth raised the problem of Periodic Category review documents being available only in hard copy. While new/change proposals can be submitted and managed electronically, no electronic system is available for the Periodic Category Reviews. Hard copy proposals have fallen through the cracks. An electronic system will be explored.

Proposal Reviews and Action:
NMC 421 - APPROVED.
GEO 309 - new course. Returned for resubmission: The committee requires that the syllabus better articulate and integrate the Baccalaureate core criteria in the student learning outcomes.

HSTS 418 - change course. Returned for resubmission: The committee requires submission of the course syllabus showing inclusion of the Bac Core criteria in the student learning objectives.

HDFS 201 - change course. Returned for resubmission: The committee requires submission of the course syllabus showing inclusion of the criteria in the student learning objectives.

Recommendations from Bac Core Committee 2003-2004
Joanne distributed a draft for discussion at the next meeting. Topics addressed: how to evaluate DPD courses during the review; how to balance the proposal narrative related to the Bac Core criteria against the sample syllabi; recommending to faculty that the course syllabi include listing of the course as Bac Core approved, describing the Bac Core category "rationale" on the syllabus, and including the Bac Core criteria as part of the course learning objectives.

2004-2005 Focus on Learning Objectives
Susie and Gina, who work under Mina in the Academic Programs and Assessment office, then led a discussion of how to move teaching faculty away from concentrating on teaching objectives and towards concentrating on learning outcomes, which is a movement sweeping the academic countryside. The committee discussed referring Bac Core course proposers to the campus assessment website:
http://oregonstate.edu/ap/assess/index.htm
Future Topics

- Common core
- Learning Outcomes

Minutes submitted by David McMurray
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 2, 2004
Minutes

Members present: Joanne Sorte (Chair), Kevin Ahern, Milo Koretsky, David McMurray, Pat Muir, and Patti Watkins

Members absent: Ruth Vondracek

Ex-officios present: Vicki Tolar Burton, WIC and Christian Matheis, DPD

Visitors: Ronnie Sue, Graduate Student-DPD

Proposal Reviews & Action:

GEO 309 - Approved
HDFS 201 - Approved
FST 424/524 - Approved

BB 332 - Request for resubmission with modifications to the syllabus to more explicitly reflect BC, i.e., Synthesis (Science, Technology, & Society) criteria

NMC 101 - Request for resubmission with modifications to both the narrative and the syllabus to include and/or more explicitly reflect BC criteria, with a particular emphasis on critical thinking

NMC 260 - Request for resubmission: recommendation to consider whether the proposed Literature & Arts category is an appropriate fit for this course, and if so, further rationale is required; modifications to both the narrative and the syllabus are needed to include and/or more explicitly reflect BC criteria with a particular emphasis on critical thinking; A question was raised as to the appropriateness of a prerequisite course for this class in that the BC courses are meant to be readily accessible to students across a variety of disciplines


GEO 307 - Review postponed until next meeting

General Business:

New committee member, Kevin Ahern, was introduced.

Vicki communicated an update regarding the Department of Physics' work to develop their thesis option to meet criteria for Bac Core WIC identification. She has been working with the department and with the changes now having been accomplished, she recommends continuing the WIC status for this plan. The Physics WIC proposal will be reviewed by the BC Committee at the November 15th BC meeting.

A Baccalaureate Core Committee procedural point was discussed and clarified.

Two committee members will be assigned to review each course proposal; proposals will be listed on the agenda in advance of each meeting; the reviewers will conduct their reviews individually but may choose to correspond about their findings before the assigned review meeting. However, if one reviewer is not able to attend the review meeting, that person is encouraged to communicate with the other proposal reviewer so that her/his feedback might still be heard and be part of the decision making process. Feedback from only one committee member may be deemed sufficient to recommend a decision of action as determined by the members in attendance.

The document, Recommendations Follow-up from 2003-2004, was discussed. The committee generally favored the enactment of recommendations that would require instructors to expand their coverage
of BC criteria within the syllabus itself. Suggestions concerning wording and the inclusion of the website address for BC criteria were made. The revised document will be presented to the committee for further review.

The committee discussed the draft of materials and the proposed timeline for the categorical review of DPD classes during this academic year. The materials for the categorical review were discussed. Only classes that have NOT been reviewed in the last 5 years will be reviewed. 17 classes were identified for the DPD categorical review. The course proposals will be forwarded to both the DPD office and the BCC. The DPD office will review the proposals and work with faculty to assure compliance with all DPD criteria prior to the BC Committee review rather than the reviews being conducted concurrently. In this way, it was deemed that efforts would be less likely to be duplicated. Also, a suggestion was made (and adopted) to change the due date for DPD review materials from January 15th to **January 30th**. The DPD office will schedule a training/technical assistance meeting for faculty to help clarify this review process and to share resources to support proposal review.

Christian presented a document draft entitled, *Suggestions for Developing Student Learning Outcomes for DPD Courses, soliciting feedback from the committee*. Suggestions included an instruction that faculty members tailor the examples provided in the document to suit their individual classes. It was also suggested that the document advise faculty members to include the DPD rationale on their syllabi.

Joanne has scheduled a meeting with Mark Clements on November 9th at 9am in Bexell 202 to discuss issues involving electronic submission of the full category review materials. Other BC Committee members are welcome to attend.

*Minutes submitted by Patti Watkins*
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 15, 2004
Minutes

Members present: Joanne Sorte (Chair), Kevin Ahern, David McMurray, Pat Muir, and Patti Watkins

Members absent: Milo Koretsky, and Ruth Vondracek

Ex–officios present: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC), and Christian Matheis representing Jun Xing (DPD)

Visitors: Ronnie Sue – Graduate Student – DPD

Proposal Reviews & Action:

FST 460 – Approved with recommendation that the appropriate BCC category (Western Culture) be indicated explicitly on the syllabus, and that the syllabus also provide the URL for the web site that describes the criteria for this category.

SOC 454/554 – Approved

HSTS 418 – Approved following receipt of a syllabus that was revised in accordance with this committee's request.

BB 332 – Approved following receipt of a syllabus that was revised in accordance with this committee's request.

Proposals returned or pending:

Physics WIC – Action postponed until the December 7, 2004 meeting so that committee members can review the proposal in light of a document titled, "Guidelines for Thesis as WIC," which Vicki Tolar Burton distributed today, and which had been approved by the Baccalaureate Core Committee on November 11, 2002.

GEO 307 – Review and action postponed until additional committee members were present.

NMC 101 and NMC 260 – Pending resubmission of requested materials.

ANTH 110 – Pending resubmission of materials requested for the 2003–2004 Social Processes & Institutions categorical review (formal response to previous review has not been received).

General Business:

Members agreed that the discussion of the DPD goals and history, which appeared on the agenda for today's meeting, would be deferred until Jun Xing, DPD Director, could be present.

A document titled, "Suggestions for developing student learning outcomes for DPD courses" was discussed, it having been reviewed previously by the DPD Advisory Board. Discussion about the role of the Baccalaureate Core Committee in assessing whether Baccalaureate Core courses succeed in meeting the learning outcomes identified on syllabi ensued. It was agreed that, unless otherwise directed, this committee should continue to focus on ensuring that course proposals meet BCC criteria and on periodic review of existent BCC courses, rather than becoming involved in assessing the degree to which courses actually meet the objectives described in course proposals and syllabi.

Chair's Report:

Common core discussions and actions: Joanne Sorte shared a draft document being formulated by the
Interinstitutional Faculty Senate for presentation to the OUS State Board of Higher Education. Progress of discussions on the common core will be monitored.

**Update on electronic submission of yearly category review materials:** The meeting to discuss creating a way for the categorical review materials to be submitted electronically was moved to November 17, 2004 at 2:00 p.m. in Bexell 202.

*Minutes submitted by Pat Muir*
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Members present: Joanne Sorte (Chair), Milo Koretsky, David McMurray, Pat Muir, Ruth Vondracek, and Patti Watkins
Members absent: Kevin Ahern
Ex–officios present: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC), Jun Xing (DPD)
Visitors: Mina McDaniel, and Susan Leslie (Academic Programs) Michele Sandlin (Admissions)

Next meeting: 12 January 1-3 PM

Proposal Reviews & Action:

ANTH 110 – Approved with a review in 1 year. It is recommended to make discussions mandatory or available on blackboard.

GEO 307 – Approved.

Physics WIC – Approved The Physics department is commended for the effort that went into this proposal. There is a concern about the limited student contact time (1 hr every other week for 2 quarters).

Proposals returned or pending:

NMC 101 and NMC 260 – Pending resubmission of requested materials.

General Business:

Michele Sandlin presented an articulation agreement with Santa Monica Community College. This agreement could be applied to the entire California Community College system. The committee agreed that this was a beneficial agreement to facilitate the transfer of students from California to OSU. With agreements now in place with Washington and California, it is proposed only agreements that differ substantially from these two need BCC review. However, BCC should be notified of any new agreements.

The BCC again supported the position that all Bacc Core classes that change from in–class to electronic delivery systems should be reviewed by the committee as "change" proposals.

There was discussion over two issues regarding DPD. 1.) The suitability of articulating classes from other institutions to satisfy the DPD requirement. It is felt that the experience offered in DPD is unique to the expertise of OSU. 2.) It was proposed to place an upper-division requirement on DPD courses. This discussion will be continued.

The committee discussed the possibility of reviewing the Bacc Core PERSPECTIVES category high attendance courses. This was suggested as a way to provide a focused consideration of the Bacc Core experience of a large number of students.

It was requested the BCC examine the WIC requirements, i.e., are 1 or 2 WIC classes required for a Double degree?

Minutes submitted by Milo Koretsky
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 12, 2005
Minutes

Members present: Milo Koretsky, Patti Watkins, Pat Muir, David McMurray, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Kevin Ahern
Ex–officios present: Jun Xing, Vicki Tolar-Burton
Visitors: Cristian Matheis
Minutes taken by Kevin Ahern

Proposal Reviews & Action:

ES 212 – APPROVED. This is a DPD course proposal submitted to replace an existing course (ES 211). The proposal was determined by reviewers to have met all criteria for DPD designation. Reviewers expressed concern over poor writing and misspellings in the proposal and syllabus. Overall, they recommended that the Bacc Core Committee approve the proposal with instructions to the proposer that spelling and grammatical deficiencies be rectified. Other discussion revealed that the syllabus did not exactly repeat the wording of the DPD criteria; however, the committee’s consensus was that exact wording of this criteria was not necessary so long as the spirit of the wording was addressed. The committee as a whole agreed with this and approved the proposal as recommended above.

GEO 300 – APPROVED. This is a large, existing Bacc Core Synthesis course that meets criteria for both Global Issues and Science, Technology, and Society identification. The action requested of the committee was to approve a title change, description change, and make upper division standing a requirement for students to register for the course. The aim of these changes was to include current issues relevant to the course content: sustainability. Committee members noted that Change Proposals for existing Bacc Core courses, such as this one, do not need to address each Bacc Core criteria so long as the aspects changed do not suggest a significant variation from the criteria of the approved designation [BCC Synthesis]. The reviewers recommended approval with the recommendation that the syllabus be amended to include mention that the course meets Bacc Core criteria. The Bacc Core Committee as a whole concurred.

WIC FE/CE – ACTION: REFERRED TO CURRICULUM COUNCIL. The Bacc Core Committee reviewed a request forwarded from Vicki Tolar Burton, WIC Coordinator, that has been submitted from Forest Engineering and Civil Engineering. The proposal requests that students pursuing a dual FE/CE major be exempted from the requirement to complete WIC requirements specific for each major. In this case, the proposal notes that both FE and CE have existing WIC classes that overlap in content both existing courses are exit classes that prepare for graduation and the job market, etc. Approval of the exemption would not affect students majoring in one or the other discipline alone, but allows that one WIC be required for the dual major. The aim of the exemption request is to avoid repetition of content for dual major students. Arguments in favor of and opposed to the exemption were presented.

Arguments in favor – The FE WIC course is 6 credits already and would be the course required for the dual major students. By having 6 credits of WIC (more credits than required by Bacc Core), dual major students wouldn’t be ‘skirting’ WIC from the perspective of credit hours.

Arguments against – Approval of a single WIC for the dual major could open floodgates for departments to work around WIC requirements.

Considerations:
1. Would this set a precedent and would it also require Faculty Senate action?
2. Departments that have specific WIC courses required as part of the requirements for their...
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Reviewers of the FE/CE proposal felt that the departments made a good case for the exemption and that the 6 credit WIC class in FE addressed the spirit of the Baccalaureate Core. The similarity of the courses under consideration made a good argument and less of a precedent-setting event. One also noted that the faculty in the respective departments were much in favor of the proposal, and that the programmatic decision to allow a single WIC for a dual major might well be best addressed by faculty in the two programs. That is, faculty would best be able to weigh-in on the similarity of writing in the major fields under consideration.

The Bacc Core Committee agreed that the request asking to allow dual majors in FE/CE to use the FE WIC course as their sole WIC requirement meets the spirit of the Bacc Core. However, the Committee members as a whole expressed uncertainty of what they were being asked to approve, since both CE and FE have existing WIC courses and the request is not aimed at changing them. The committee as a whole decided that instead of taking formal action, they recommend that the question be taken up as an item for action by the Curriculum Council.

Committee members also requested that the meeting's minutes read that:

1. We see no reason not to approve the request.
2. This proposal is in the spirit of the Bacc Core.

General Business:

Variable Credit DPD Courses
A discussion item was added to the agenda and presented concerning ED 219, an education course of two credit hours with a format that is already very DPD-like. Education is exploring the possibility of modifying ED 219 to be a variable credit course that students could take for either 2 credits or 3 credits. The idea would be to allow students taking the 3 credit version to get DPD credit; students taking the 2 credit version would not receive DPD credit. This would, in fact, set a precedent, since current DPD requirements include the absolute requirement that the course have 3 credits. No DPD course currently can be taken for variable credit. The way in which Education would likely implement this would be to have different course sections for the different credit. It was noted that Education cannot simply make ED 219 a 3 credit course for everyone taking it because it is a required course and the major is at the maximum credit limit they have designated for students in their major. Numerous possible problems with the matter were raised:

1. Graduation audits currently screen by course number. This potential change would require that audits screen by course number and section, which is not currently done.
2. This could be opening a Pandora's Box that would provide a model for departments to create their own DPD courses as add-ons to existing courses and subvert the aims of imbedding the DPD concepts within the full course structure.

One committee member noted that this did not seem to be a big leap to approve the request, since the existing two credit course currently meets the DPD requirements in spirit and that any students taking it for DPD would, in fact, be taking it for three credits, as currently required.

The committee took no action, but gave feedback to the DPD office for the New School of Education resulting from its discussion.

DPD Category Review – The Committee Chair noted that distribution of the materials for the yearly category review of DPD has been delayed, due to illness in the Faculty Senate Office. Department chairs have not yet been notified of the review, but will be notified this week. Electronic materials are in place for review by the faculty. It was determined that the deadline for feedback, currently February 4, would be changed to February 7.

Community College Transfer Credit – The Bacc Core Committee also discussed the issue of Community
College transfer credits as dealt with in the Oregon Transfer Module (OTM) due for discussion at the Faculty Senate meeting on January 13. The Oregon Transfer Module ([http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/dirOTM/OTM.html](http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/dirOTM/OTM.html)) is an effort from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) to define a three term (45 credit) modular set of course work for students in the Oregon education system to at least partly meet general education requirements. Guidelines and notes of the OTM are noted in the Appendix to these minutes. The Bac Core Committee considered and discussed several aspects of the OTM proposal. Specific discussion focused on how DPD would fit, if at all, in the OTM. One asked, "should all DPD courses be upper division?" Another felt since DPD courses are not all currently required to be upper division, that DPD was "at risk." It was noted that the IFS proposal proposed to the OSU faculty "may not meet all requirements of programs" and that there are some differences with respect to the Bacc Core. One committee member noted that at the open forum on the subject, it was stated that DPD, WIC, and Synthesis were considered as not a part of the OTM. This suggested to the committee that it could make specific recommendations regarding the understanding of what the OTM was providing and that getting those recommendations acknowledged was an important mechanism of keeping OSU Bacc Core requirements intact. Consequently, the Committee recommended to the Faculty Senate that it consider a "rider" to the proposal stating that if it is understood as part of the Faculty Senate approval, that OSU's requirements for DPD, WIC, and Synthesis are NOT part of the OTM, then we can approve the OTM.

**E–Campus and Delivery of Bacc Core Courses** – The Committee discussed the issue of Bacc Core classes offered by the E–campus. Concerns were raised that the E–campus may have put themselves in the position of deciding whether their courses were meeting Bacc Core criteria. It was noted that E–campus courses are different from campus lecture, lab, and discussion designsations of the Bacc Core, so it was proposed that E–campus courses be given an alternate designation – e.g. "ONLINE". This was generally agreed by Committee members as a good idea. It was recommended that Mark Merickel and Paula Minear of the E–Campus be invited to discuss in a future meeting with the Committee the Bacc Core classes offered by the E–campus. It was further suggested that including E–campus representation on the Committee would include them in the normal decision process and this, too, was generally agreed upon by Committee members. All agreed to leave this as a pending issue.

The next meeting of the Baccalaureate Core Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, January 26, 1:00–3:00 p.m. in Gilkey 109.

Included below are guidelines from the Oregon Transfer Module considered by committee members at the meeting.

**Appendix – Oregon Transfer Module**

**GUIDELINES**

The Oregon Transfer Module includes the following course work, which is equivalent to 3 academic quarters. The coursework must be chosen from the courses approved for the categories below by the institution issuing the credit. In the case of community colleges, these will be courses approved for the AA/OT degree; in the case of universities and 4–year colleges, they will be courses approved for the General Education part of a baccalaureate degree. All courses must have a grade of "C–" or better, must be worth at least 3 credits (quarter system). Students must have a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 at the time the module is posted.

**Foundational Skills (Referred to as General Requirements in the current AA-OT degree)**

- Writing: Two courses of college–level composition.
- Oral Communication: One course of fundamentals of speech or communication.
- Mathematics: One course of college–level mathematics, for which at least Intermediate Algebra is a prerequisite.

**Introduction to Disciplines (Referred to as Distribution Requirements in current AA–OT Degree)**

- Arts and Letters: Three courses.
- Social Sciences: Three courses.
- Science/Math/Computer Science: Three courses, including at least one biological or physical science with a lab.

Electives
- As required to bring the total credits to 45. Courses must be from the Introduction to Disciplines areas (Arts & Letters, Social Science, or Science/Math/Computer Science).

NOTES
1. Courses that are designed to prepare students for college-level work are not applicable to the transfer module.
2. When choosing courses in science and mathematics, students and advisors should check the specific requirements at receiving schools. Courses that include a laboratory component, or that deal with specific subjects, may be required for majors or degrees.
4. In Arts and Letters, the second year of a foreign language may be included, but not the first year. American Sign Language (ASL) is considered a foreign language.
5. All Oregon community colleges and Oregon University System institutions will offer students the opportunity to complete an Oregon Transfer Module and the OTM designation will be posted on the transcript by the issuing institution upon request. Regionally accredited private colleges and universities within the state are also welcome to offer and issue Transfer Modules, which will be accepted at any Oregon public college or university.
6. Oregon Transfer Module credits may not match program requirements in the receiving school. The OTM supplements, but does not supplant existing articulation agreements and does not replace effective advising.
7. [Proposed to Faculty Senate 1–13–2005; approved] The OSU Faculty Senate commits to maintaining the 12 credit upper division (Synthesis and Writing Intensive Course–WIC) and Difference, Power, & Discrimination – DPD core requirements for every student receiving the baccalaureate degree from Oregon State University.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 26, 2005
Minutes

Members present: Joanne Sorte (Chair), Kevin Ahern, Milo Koretsky, David McMurray, Pat Muir, Ruth Vondracek, and Patti Watkins
Ex-officios present: Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC), Jun Xing (DPD)
Visitors: Mina McDaniel, and Susan Leslie (Academic Programs)

Next meeting: February 9, 1–3 PM, 109 Gilkey Hall

Proposal Reviews & Action:

ES221 – referred back to DPD and faculty member to be resubmitted with ES223 in DPD category review
WIC 487/587 – Approved

General Business:

WIC Requirements in Double Degrees and Dual Majors

The WIC Advisory Board met for the first time last week. Vicki Tolar Burton summarized for the Committee the WIC Advisory Board views on WIC requirements in double-degree and dual majors. She will be preparing a summary of the WIC Board discussion. The Committee discussed the issue at some length and agreed to develop a recommendation in the next meeting that would be forwarded to the Curriculum Council.

DPD Category Review

DPD Director Jun Xing plans to meet with the DPD Advisory Board either February 18 or 24. He and interested DPD Board members will then meet with the BCC on February 23 or March 9 to discuss the category review, implications of the Oregon Transfer Module, etc.

Extended Campus Report and Discussion

Mark Merickel, Assoc. Dean for Extended Campus, Paula Minear, Director of Department & Student Services and Sunil Khanna, Assoc. Prof. Anthropology, joined the Committee to discuss once again the process for adapting Bac Core courses or sections to the online/electronic delivery. The Committee presented its concern about how to ensure that the spirit of the Bac Core curriculum is maintained in the online environment. Discussion resulted in the acknowledgement that maintaining the integrity of the Bac Core is the responsibility of the departments. The E-Campus role is to work with the faculty members to transfer course content and learning outcomes in a meaningful way to the online delivery environment. Mark Merickel offered to set up an assessment program to test whether the students were achieving learning outcomes. Paula Minear referred the Committee to "About Online Learning – Research" http://ecampus.oregonstate.edu/about/welcome/online-learning/research.htm, a webliography of research related to online learning. Sunil Khanna provided his observations about delivering a course online.

The Committee agreed that it would discuss the matter further at its next meeting. Ongoing topics suggested for consideration included: Should the development of on-line course offerings be considered a "change" and require category II proposal? Should the Bac Core Committee periodically review on-line courses separate from the categorical reviews? Does the Bac Core Committee wish to engage in some kind of measurement of student success related to learning outcomes for the online course delivery? Should the Bac Core Committee review the current offerings of courses provided by E-campus to assure that there is a comprehensive breadth in disciplines represented in the online course offerings?
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 9, 2005
Minutes

Members present: Joanne Sorte (Chair), Kevin Ahern, Milo Koretsky, David McMurray, Pat Muir, Ruth Vondracek
Ex-officios present: Vicki Tolar-Burton (WIC), Jun Xing (DPD)
Guests: Susie Leslie (Academic Affairs)

Proposal Review – Action:

HST 486 – History of Christianity in Africa (Proposed as a Cultural Diversity course, to be cross-listed: 486/586) Proposal Denied – Baccalaureate Core Perspectives courses are to be lower division, which this is not.

Proposals returned and/or pending:

ES 221 – Survey of African American Studies 1 – No new information has been received.
NMC 260 (New Media Futures) and NMC 101 (Introduction to Media Communication) – No new information has been received.

New Proposals to assign:

None.

Reports:

DPD – Jun Xing reported that the DPD Board will meet on February 25, 2005, and our committee suggested that Board provide us with information on how we can be most helpful to them (e.g., are there particular DPD criteria that they believe are not being met by some DPD courses, such as limitations on class sizes and expectations re: interactive communication?). Our committee will hear from the Board at our first meeting in March 2005, during which time we will also be provided with background information on the history of decisions relative to DPD criteria and on decisions regarding acceptance of transfer courses as fulfilling DPD criteria. With regard to the DPD Categorical Review, the Baccalaureate Core Committee will review ~ 17 courses this year; committee members committed to lead review of ~ two courses each, and specified which courses those would be.

WIC – Vicki Tolar-Burton facilitated discussion of how the WIC requirement is being dealt with for students completing dual majors (two majors within one degree) or double degrees (two different but simultaneous degrees). More information is needed to enable assessment of whether or not there are problems in this area that might necessitate formulation of a written policy. Information needed includes the number of students who are completing two or more degrees or majors and what such students have done to fulfill the WIC requirement. Vicki will write a summary of the discussion. She also presented an informal proposal being put forth by HDFS concerning potential changes in their WIC offerings; the committee agreed that the ideas had enough merit that we could encourage development of formal proposals.

General Business:

Deferred discussion of issues related to E-campus and transfer baccalaureate core courses as several committee members had to leave the meeting early and some were absent at the outset.

Pending Topics:
See items mentioned under DPD, WIC, and General Discussion headings, above.

**Next meeting: February 23, 2005 – Gilkey 109**

*Minutes submitted by Pat Muir*
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 9, 2005
Minutes

Members present: Joanne Sorte (Chair), Kevin Ahern, Milo Koretsky, David McMurray, Pat Muir, Ruth Vondracek, & Patti Watkins
Ex-officios present: Jun Xing, DPD Director
Guests: Joan Gross & Janet Nishihara, DPD Advisory Board Members

General Discussion:

DPD Advisory Board members were present to discuss the status of DPD at OSU. They shared a motion that had been unanimously adopted by their advisory committee on February 25, 2005. This motion stated: "We move that the Difference, Power, and Discrimination requirement be fulfilled only by courses taken at Oregon State University or approved by the Oregon State University Difference, Power, and Discrimination Program." The BCC suggested that this motion be modified as follows (see italics): "We move that the Difference, Power, and Discrimination requirement is fulfilled only by courses taken at Oregon State University or transfer courses approved by the Oregon State University Difference, Power, and Discrimination Program and the Oregon State University Baccalaureate Core Committee." The DPD Advisory Committee members agreed to these modifications and will take this revised motion to their committee for another vote. The DPD Advisory Committee members reported that nine courses from LBCC have already been approved by the DPD program and will be listed on the OSU DPD website. In the future, classes from Lane and Chemeketa Community Colleges may also be designated as such. However, the BCC expressed concern about their ability to review the number of classes that may potentially be submitted due to the possibility of a provost-mandated review of all OSU Baccalaureate Core courses in the near future. During this discussion, it was clarified that potential DPD courses (whether originating from OSU or various community colleges) would be approved on their own merit, independent of which instructors may be teaching them. Another concern that was raised during the course of this discussion was potential problems in advisors being able to recognize transfer courses as DPD courses when conducting senior audits for graduation. One suggestion was to include a letter designator along with the course number to clearly demarcate which classes meet DPD eligibility and which do not. The BCC’s final suggestion to the DPD Advisory Committee members was to include an implementation clause in the aforementioned motion.

The DPD Advisory Committee members also discussed two goals for the future:

(1) to increase the total number of DPD courses available.
(2) to increase the disciplinary representation of DPD courses.

Other business discussed was the issue of whether offering an existing course through E-campus (i.e., a change in delivery) should trigger a change proposal as is the case when an instructor proposes a name change for a course. The BCC agreed that this would seem appropriate, but there was a sense that higher administration had previously communicated that this was not necessary. One BCC member agreed to investigate the history of decisions surrounding this topic.

Proposal Reviews & Action:

SOC 312 - Approved to retain DPD status; the BCC wishes to commend Dr. Rebecca Warner for the quality of her materials and recommend that other instructors of this course use her syllabus as a model for their own.

ES 223 - Approval to retain DPD status withheld; the BCC deemed that while the course appears to satisfy
DPD criteria, the quality of the materials was such that revisions are warranted before approval can be granted. Thus, a resubmission will be requested.

**DHE 270** - Approval to retain DPD status withheld; the BCC noted that while the course generally appears to meet DPD criteria, important information (e.g. enrollment information, DPD rationale in the narrative; an elaboration of critical thinking in the syllabus) was missing from the materials. The BCC requests resubmission of the materials with such information included, as well as an explanation of how the interactive learning criterion is met in a class in which enrollment is approximately 150 students.

**ANTH 345** - Approval to retain DPD status withheld; the BCC discussed this proposal in the previous meeting (noting that important information was missing from the materials submitted); however, the instructor had not yet been contacted with feedback or a request from the BCC to resubmit these materials. Thus, a resubmission will now be requested.

**ES 221** - Proposal pending

**NMC 101** - Proposal pending

**NMC 260** - Proposal pending

Minutes submitted by Patti Watkins
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 26, 2004
Minutes

BCC Members Present: Patti Watkins, Ruth Vondracek (chair), David McMurray, Joanne Sorte, Ed Jensen, Milo Koretsky; Ex-officio - Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)

Category Review – Perspectives – Social Processes & Institutions

Approved:

Soc. 204
Soc. 205

Action pending further information:

Econ201
Econ202

Other Proposals:

Approved: IE497 to be withdrawn as a WIC course from the Bac Core

Action Item: It was decided that next year, the Bac Core Committee would ask that submissions for review include on the syllabi the respective criteria of the subsection of the Bac Core under review.

The annual Bac Core review of a subcategory began this year with Perspectives – Social Processes & Institutions. The first two courses reviewed were Soc 204, a course taught by many faculty in quite varied ways, and Soc 205. The Sociology Dept. teachers of Soc 204 had each written answers to the Bac Core criteria, which was noted and appreciated. Discussion revolved around the need for uniform course outcomes and objectives across all syllabi for the same course, regardless of who teaches it. The Bac Core Committee decided to ask the Sociology Dept. to consider standardizing their objectives and outcomes within the same course.

Econ 201 & Econ 202: The Committee then turned to Econ 201 & Econ 202 for review under the Social Processes subsection. Both are large, introductory courses taught by many professors on a rotating basis. The Committee thought that the narrative covering the Bac Core criteria is quite well written and would be a useful syllabus synopsis of what the course is about and why students should take it. Approval on these two courses is pending a request for more information concerning some of the category criteria, such as critical thinking.

Respectfully submitted,

David McMurray & Ruth Vondracek
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 12, 2004
Minutes

BCC Members Present: Patti Watkins, Ruth Vondracek (chair), David McMurray, Joanne Sorte, Milo Koretsky; Ex-officio - Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)
Guest: Christian Matheis/DPD Graduate Teaching Assistant

Information Items:
1. Spring term BCC meetings will be held from 2:15-3:30 in 208 Gilkey
2. Scheduling of category reviews was discussed; Ruth Vondracek will update committee members with review schedules.
3. Nominations for vacant BCC positions are being sought; Joanne Sorte will consult with Ruth Vondracek about being chair for 2004-2005.

Action Items:
1. HST 350, Colonial Latin American History 1400-1810
   1. Request: Change of title and change of description
   2. Action: Approved

2. PHL 251, Knowers, Knowing and the Known
   1. Request: Western Culture
   2. Action: Decision postponed pending additional information

3. ES 352, Asian Representation in Hollywood and Independent Cinemas
   1. Request: Difference, Power and Discrimination
   2. Action: Approved

Discussion:
There was discussion over what response to take if a class requesting a minor change contains a syllabus that does not meet present BCC requirements. It was agreed that such vigilant action would discourage continuous improvement processes and that such comments are more appropriately addressed during routine review cycles.

Detail that should be in the BCC course proposal was discussed. It was agreed that this document becomes the record of the expectation of how the course addresses the BCC requirements and should be able to stand alone; conversely, the syllabus may change with instructor. Discussion also focused on the degree to which the class syllabus and BCC proposal should articulate how the assignments that the students are given in a class maps to the achievement of the critical thinking skills associated with the class.

Jun Xing will be invited to attend the BCC meetings.

Minutes submitted by Milo Koretsky, Chemical Engineering
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 23, 2004
Minutes

BCC Members Present: Patti Watkins, Ruth Vondracek (chair), David McMurray, Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, Milo Koretsky; Ex-officio - Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC)
Guest: Tracy Ann Robinson (WIC)

Previous Minutes
The committee unanimously approved the minutes for the February 9 meeting.

Discussion Items:
1. Student request to waive HHP requirement. Committee discussed this request and several associated issues, but chose to take no action, believing the request to be beyond the purview of the committee.

2. WIC requirement for double majors. The current OSU position is that the WIC requirement is an integral part of each degree being sought; therefore a double degree requires a WIC course in each major. The BCC supports that approach, although issues were raised as to whether to treat a dual (concurrent) major the same as a double major—no consensus was reached on the latter issue.

3. Communicating BCC suggestions to OSU faculty.
   1. When BCC approves a proposal, but has suggestions for the faculty member submitting the proposal, either the BCC reviewer or the BCC chair should convey those suggestions directly to the faculty member submitting the proposal.
   2. BCC should explore ways to share issues of concern with the OSU faculty at-large—to help communicate how the BCC works and to create an opportunity for them to share their views with the BCC. No specific mechanism was agreed upon.
   3. BCC chair will recommend changes for the online BCC course proposals 1) including course title on the proposal page, and 2) make clear what BCC action is being requested (e.g. WIC, DPD, Western Culture, Contemporary Global Issues)

Action Items:
1. CE 454, Civil and Environmental Engineering Professional Practice
   1. Request: WIC status
   2. Action: Approved

2. H 320, Introduction to Human Diseases
   1. Request: Science, Technology, and Society
   2. Action: Decision postponed pending additional information

3. HDFS 461, Program Design and Proposal Writing
   1. Request: WIC status
   2. Action: Approved

4. WSE 470, Forests, Wood, and Civilization
   1. Request: Contemporary Global Issues
2. Action: Approved. Reviewer will forward several suggestions for improvements to syllabus directly to the instructor.

Minutes submitted by Ed Jensen, Forestry
February 9, 2004
Minutes

Baccalaureate Core Committee

BCC Members Present: Patti Watkins, Ruth Vondracek, David McMurray, Ed Jensen

Guest: Christian Matheis/DPD Graduate Teaching Assistant

Minutes
The committee unanimously approved the minutes for the January 12th and January 26th meetings that had been made available on the web prior to this meeting.

Update on Discussion with Curriculum Council Co-Chairs
Ruth reported on her meeting with Curriculum Council Co-Chairs, Charles Boyer and Jack Drexler, that addressed two main topics: (a) learning outcomes and (b) e-campus classes.

1. Ruth stated that the Curriculum Council’s goals align with those of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) in that both groups currently require a delineation of learning objectives on course syllabi. The group acknowledged that the term, "learning objectives," may not be universally employed. However, syllabi that clearly articulate learning expectations, along with some formal means of assessing these outcomes, will be deemed acceptable by both committees. Thus, the BCC will ask to see such objectives described on syllabi that are now subject to area review.

2. Online Course delivery: the BCC and Curriculum Council chairs agreed to bring the discussion of BCC reviewing Bac Core courses that have been changed to online delivery, with a proposal to bring a recommendation to the Faculty Senate. The joint proposal would be routed first to the Faculty Senate Distance Education Committee for their comments. Reviewing these types of courses would require that the change to online delivery would be added to the list of changes requiring review.

3. Ruth indicated that neither the Curriculum Council nor the BCC seek to hinder the development of e-campus courses, but rather seek to insure that these courses meet the Baccalaureate Core requirements when they are transformed from live to virtual delivery. As such, any course switching to on-line delivery is subject to BCC review. Discussion ensued as to the best means of accomplishing this. A decision was made that rather than ask instructors to submit two separate proposals for each delivery system, a question would be added to the application asking instructors to specify what provisions they have made to ensure that the e-course still meets the Baccalaureate Core requirements given the qualitative differences caused by the delivery system. Although the call for review of courses constituting the Perspectives-Social Processes & Institutions category have already gone out, information pertaining to e-delivery versions of these courses may not be provided. However, this information may be explicitly sought in next year's area review.

Update on New Committee Members
Prospective members who had been invited to join the BCC had either declined or failed to respond to the request for their participation. Patti agreed to contact Michelle Bothwell and Joe McGuire in the Bioengineering program as well as Frank Bernieri, the new chairperson of the Psychology Department to solicit participation. Other members agreed to contact parties in other underrepresented areas including Science, Business, and Education.

Review of ES 352
Although the committee member who had reviewed this proposed course voted favorably for its inclusion in
the DPD curriculum, other committee members questioned this decision on the basis that the course did not appear to sufficiently satisfy the criterion that states that DPD courses must "focus primarily on the United States." This seemed to be a particular concern in that the course would initially be taught as a summer class on CUN campus in Beijing, China. Although the proposed syllabus states that the course is divided into three parts, the first and last emphasizing American contexts, the committee questioned whether this percentage of time was indeed sufficient to satisfy the aforementioned criterion. Christian Matheis was present to elaborate on the information presented in the course proposal. In particular, he emphasized that the course would rely on the pedagogical strategy of comparative analysis to ultimately achieve the United States focus--thus explaining why the middle portion of the course would examine Chinese cinema. It was decided that a decision on approving the course would be withheld until the instructor proposing the course could address these concerns more explicitly in writing. For instance, feedback was given to alter the syllabus so that the reading assignments more clearly indicated that the course would reflect representations of Chinese in America.

An additional area of concern was that the proposal did not clearly indicate if this course would continue to be offered either in China or on campus. The BCC is reluctant to grant Bac Core status to a one-time course.

Assignment of Proposals
Each committee member present received a proposal for evaluation at the next meeting. These included proposals for H320, WSE 470, CE454 and HDFS 451.

Respectfully submitted by Patti Lou Watkins, BCC

**ACTION: PS 425 - Gender and the Law approved for Baccalaureate Core - DPD status.**

Joanne will summarize minutes for 1-26-04. Subsequent meeting minutes will be recorded on a rotating alphabetical basis by last name as follows: Patti Watkins, Ed Jensen David McMurray, Joanne Sorte, etc.

1. Minutes from the previous meeting (1-12-04) were not available for review or approval. Ruth will forward these to members at a later date.

2. Update on the Category Review Packet.
   Revisions to the packet materials were made by members. Changes were suggested (use 12 pitch font; condense layout of the enrollment information form; adjust return time to read March 1 to allow a full month preparation and turn around time.) Ruth forwarded the changes to Vickie N. during the meeting, and it is anticipated that they will be sent to relevant department heads today or tomorrow.

3. PS 370. The proposal for this class is not yet complete. When all materials are available, the course proposal will be reviewed by all members of the BCC. Issues under consideration at this time include for example: reflecting on the receipt/review protocol for Bac. Core classes initiated at the Cascades campus, depth of description for critical thinking, presentation of learning outcomes in the proposal.

   This proposal will be reviewed at the next meeting.

5. Other topics:
   Ruth will continue to seek 2 additional members for the Baccalaureate Core Committee.

**Future Topics for discussion:**
What is acceptable regarding learning Outcomes? Perhaps a joint meeting with the Curriculum Council would be advisable for general discussion of this topic.

**Next Meeting:**
February 9, 2:00

Respectfully submitted: Joanne Sorte
1-27-04
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 12, 2004
Minutes

1. Academic Reg. #AR28a
   The Academic Regulations Committee is bringing this regulation in line with current usage. David McMurray, as a member of that Committee and of the BCC, wanted the BCC to be aware that advisors in colleges make the final adjustment, waiver, or substitutions on Bac Core courses. Following discussion, the BCC agreed that it does not object to this practice, although it is an area of concern for WIC requirements. Vicki Tolar Burton agreed to contact the Registrar to discuss why WIC courses that are waived do not show up on the student’s course audit.

2. Category Review Packet
   The Committee reviewed the materials that will be included in the packet for the review of the Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions category courses. A return date of February 20 was agreed upon. Ruth Vondracek will send out the revised materials to the Committee for final edits and then work with Vickie Nunnemaker to send out the packet to the department heads.

3. Review of PS 370 deferred to January 26 meeting.

4. Review of PS 425 deferred until all materials are received.

Respectfully submitted, Ruth Vondracek
Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 8, 2003
Minutes

Present: McMurray, David, Member & Ruth Vondracek, Chair, Vicki Tolar-Burton, ex-officio, Bob Burton
Due to absences, there was no quorum.

Note: Next meeting scheduled for January 12 in the Castles Conference Room, 3rd floor, Valley Library

Actions Taken:

TA 444/544: approved as BCC/DPD/WIC course with recommendation that the syllabus indicate that it qualifies for BCC/DPD/WIC credit. Decision based on the email discussions of the proposal, and the WIC director former approval.

Discussion:

Informal discussion focused on the materials to be sent to faculty for review of the Social Processes and Institutions category courses and setting up meetings with the faculty. One suggestion was that the Committee develop a statement that requests faculty to describe outcomes based on the statement about the Social Processes and Institutions category (see below) and the associated criteria.

Human beings are inevitably social, influencing and being influenced by social groups. The social sciences study social institutions and processes and deal with the human behaviors and values that form and change them, and are essential for an understanding of contemporary society.

Respectfully submitted Dec. 9, 2003: Ruth Vondracek, Chair
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 24, 2003
Minutes

BCC Members Present: Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Ruth Vondracek, Vicki Tolar Burton
Ex-officio: Robert Burton

ACTIONS:

CSS 360 was presented by Ruth. The file had come in during the summer recess. Ruth had okayed it at that time. The committee confirmed her acceptance of the course. The committee then approved the minutes of the last meeting.

Discussion:

The Committee had a discussion with Paula Minear and Rick Eckel of E-campus. Their visit was arranged because E-campus is offering a number of previously on-campus Bac Core courses for distance delivery without passing proposals by the Committee. The Committee is concerned to make sure that E-campus Bac Core courses provide equal or equivalent opportunities for students to develop things like critical thinking.

The E-campus representatives told us about a provost-initiated program to encourage putting heavily enrolled courses at least partially on-line in some kind of hybrid format (i.e. partial classroom time combined with on-line exercises, etc.). They then gave us examples of the syllabi of completely on-line courses and talked to us about the course development process. As it works now, E-campus people begin to develop a distance Bac Core course with a faculty member by discussing how to alter the delivery of the original on-campus Bac Core course so as to achieve its outcomes. Each department is ultimately responsible for insuring the quality of the pedagogy, the content, whether it still meets Bac Core requirements, etc. The Bac Core Committee has not been involved except in that they approved the original on-campus course.

The Committee and the E-campus representatives then discussed at what stage we could intercede to evaluate a distance delivery Bac Core course. Our summary understanding of the meeting was that starting very soon, if a Bac Core course comes to E-campus for development, they will send the proposal to the Committee at some point for our input and approval. In order to clarify our position further, the Committee set out the following position statement on the subject. Here is the wording:

Distance delivery creates a different experience for both teachers and students. To insure the quality of the Bac Core courses, the Bac Core Committee will review all new E-campus courses which request Bac Core status, whether they are entirely new courses or existing Bac Core courses seeking distance delivery.

On other business, the Committee suggested that summertime submissions not be allowed. Instead, we will set a spring deadline and then have an early fall meeting to deal with any interim requests.

The Committee also discussed centralizing web sites containing Bac Core content as well as instituting a FAQ page for proposal writers.

The Committee also decided to review the Bac Core category: Social Processes and Institutions. We will hold a meeting in January with all interested professors who are teaching courses in that category so as to explain to them the review process. Their submissions will be due in February.
Present: Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, David McMurray, Patti Watkins, Ruth Vondracek, Vicki Tolar Burton, ex-officio

**Actions Taken:**
HST 350, 351 Referred back to faculty member for more information. Syllabus needs to better convey BCC basic tenants and how critical thinking is developed in the course. Committee also had questions about the upper level course definition and whether HST 350 is a prerequisite for 351.

**Discussion:**
1. Extended Campus Faculty members unable to attend. Discussion postponed until November 24 meeting. Committee discussed online delivery briefly and agreed that there should be one standard for all BCC classes and that instructors need to demonstrate how critical thinking will be developed in these classes. The Committee would like to pursue requiring a review for BCC courses that move from standard to online delivery. Suggestion that these could be triggered for review by considering this a change.

2. Upcoming category review was discussed. Once the category is selected, the Committee will send out the packet and invite all of the faculty members who will be involved in the review to attend a Bac Core meeting for tips on how to prepare for the review. Committee agreed that it would not review DPD courses this year, given that they are currently in transition, moving from organization to another and doing an internal review of the associated courses.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 27, 2003
Minutes

BCC Members Present: David McMurray, Patti Watkins, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte
Ex-officio: Vicki Tolar Burton, Robert Burton

ACTIONS:

Course Reviews:
- ENG 360 - APPROVED as Cultural Diversity
- HST 381 - APPROVED as Cultural Diversity
- HST 382 - APPROVED as Cultural Diversity

Recommendation to the Curriculum Council
The Baccalaureate Core Committee recommends that the course syllabus for each Baccalaureate Core class include reference to the Baccalaureate Core and the Bac. Core category being addressed. Ruth will draft and forward the recommendation.

Business from the previous meeting
The minutes of 10-21-03 were approved as revised.

Ruth shared feedback from Dr. V. Farber regarding the "Not approved as WIC" finding of the RUS 440/441/442 proposal. Ruth will recommend to Dr. Farber that she consider resubmitting the proposal considering the recommendations of the BCC.

Committee Openings
Paul Jepson has agreed to serve on the BCC.
One position remains open. Ruth will seek to fill this position from the list of names generated at the 10-13-03 meeting.

Completion of the Cultural Diversity Review of 2002-2003
ENG 360, HST 381, 382 were approved as CD courses.
Review of HST 350, 351 was postponed until the next meeting.

Discussion: The role of the BCC in review of Extended Campus courses
Ruth will forward the Standing Rules for the BCC and the Extended Campus for review. While the BCC is not responsible for reviewing the E-classes (as all Baccalaureate core classes offered on campus are categorically available to be created for offer through the Extended Campus course delivery system), the BCC is interested in assuring that the goals of the Baccalaureate Core are met in all delivery styles. Representatives from the Extended Campus will attend the 11-10-03 BCC meeting. BCC members are primarily interested in discussion that focuses on:

1) working to assure that the intent of the Baccalaureate Core subject areas are addressed in the electronic delivery styles, and
2) finding ways to identify barriers to meeting the intent of the Baccalaureate Core when face-to-face contact and "in-class" deliberations are not part of the course delivery.

Discussion: Creating Outcomes For the Baccalaureate Core
The BCC is interested in gaining more schooling about the goal of designing "outcomes" for the Baccalaureate Core. Bob Burton made the recommendation at the 10-13-03 meeting that the BCC consider this as an action item in the next year or two, to support the University's re-accreditation activities. The Curriculum Council has forwarded a request for further information on learning outcomes for the HSTS 422 course (BCC
approved 10-8-03). At this point is unclear if the move to establish "outcomes" for the Baccalaureate Core is a recommendation or requirement. The BCC would like to learn the basis of this expectation, and move to be in accord with efforts being conducted on campus. The BCC agreed to take on development of BC Outcomes this year if sufficient information can be gathered to inform this task. Ruth will follow up with Bob Burton and the Curriculum Council for clarification. She will also contact Sam Stern, in the new School of Education to identify a resource that could advise the BCC regarding writing outcomes for the Baccalaureate Core.

**BCC Category for Review 2003-2004**
The BCC agreed to continue the work of the Committee to review one category of the Baccalaureate Core this year. Ruth will check on the Baccalaureate Core category that might fit best for this year given the plan to also draft Outcomes for the Core.

**Mentoring new BCC members**
As courses are forwarded to the BCC for review, Ruth will match new BCC members with continuing members for course review.

**Items for the Agenda November 10, 2003:**
HST 350, 351 -Review for Cultural Diversity approval
Extended Campus
Baccalaureate Core "Outcomes"
Identify Baccalaureate Core Category for review, 2003-2004

**The next meeting will convene in Kerr 110.**
Respectfully submitted by Joanne Sorte, BCC
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 13, 2003 Minutes

Members Present: Ed Jensen, David McMurray, Joanne Sorte, Patti Watkins, Ruth Vondracek
Ex-Officio: Vicki Tolar Burton, Robert Burton

Please note that meeting room has been changed to Kerr 110 for Fall term.

Actions:
- RUS 440/441/442 - Not approved as WIC courses.
  The Committee agreed that it did not support split level, i.e. 300/400 level, WIC courses. It suggests that one course, specifically RUS 442 might be offered as a stand alone WIC course, to be offered separately from RUS 342.


Overview for 2003-2004 Activities
The Committee welcomed its two new members, Patti Watkins and David McMurray.

Bob Burton proposed that the Committee focus its efforts this year on transforming the Bac Core requirements into outcome-based statements. The Committee discussed whether it would undertake this activity rather than assess one of the Bac Core category of courses as has been done in past years.

The Committee raised questions about how this would be accomplished considering its standard workload; whether this would change the role that the Bac Core Committee has taken in the past; and how this would be presented to the Faculty Senate. This item will be discussed further in future meetings.

BCC courses changed to online delivery
During the June 2, 2003 meeting the Committee recommended that Bac Core courses to be delivered online should be reviewed by the Committee. At that time no procedural recommendations were made.

The Committee continued the discussion during the present meeting. Members felt that in order to understand ongoing changes in the University and pedagogy it should review all courses to be delivered online. Whether this fits within the Committee’s charter was also discussed. It was noted that the online courses already undergo review outside of Bac Core. Bac Core needs to develop a clear process for review if it wants to ensure that the intent of the Bac Core curriculum is carried over to online or other alternative delivery methods.

Courses changed to online delivery during Summer term, such as SOC 312, were approved, because no process had been developed. Representatives from Extended Campus will be invited to the November 10, 2003 meeting to discuss their existing process for changing courses to online delivery.

Committee Openings
The Committee currently has two openings that it will seek to fill.

Minutes submitted by: Ruth Vondracek, Committee Chair
Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 2, 2003
Minutes

Members present: Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Ann Marie VanDerZanden, Joe Kerkvliet, Joanne Sorte, Vicki Tolar Burton, Ed Jensen, and Janet Lee

Approved: AREC 252, ES 351, ENG 110 and ENG 125

WIC business:
- Kate Field presented Bioresource Research's proposal for using a thesis as part of the WIC requirement. They have a well-structured program and it was approved by the committee.
- Physics was given an extension until November 1 to have their WIC thesis course approved.

New courses approved:
- AREC 252
- ES 351
- Changes to ENG 110 and 125 were denied for further information. This was given by email and the course was approved by the committee by email on June 9.

Our review of Bac Core Cultural Diversity courses was completed with the following courses approved:
- ENG 210
- ES 241, 242, 243
- ES 101
- GEO 105
- JPN 331, 332, 333
- PHL 371
- ES 231
- GEO 328
- GEO 325

A directive has gone out from the Provost's Office that more baccalaureate core courses should be available online or from the community colleges. The committee feels that online proposals should be sent to the committee, even if the course was previously approved, so that the committee can be assured the goals of the baccalaureate core are being maintained.

Submitted by Mary Burke
May 12, 2003 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Members present: Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte, Ruth Vondracek, Joe Kerkvliet, Janet Lee, Ann Marie VanDerZanden

Mary B. reported to Vickie Nunnamaker that Ruth is considering chairing BCC committee depending on appointment to another committee.

ANTH 311: approved

ANTH 315: No answers were given to the BCC questions; Mary to follow up to get answers; deferred.

CHN 331, 332, 333: approved

ENG 211: More information had been requested, and received regarding interrelationships/questions; approved.

ENG 212: response adequate; approved

ENG 360: Due to faculty turnover/on leave, ENG has requested a 1 yr extension so they can better address the questions we asked as part of the review. Mary will ask them to address the questions/complete the review when a new faculty member is hired.

ES 452/552: new course for DPD; approved.

EXSS 475: new course for DPD; approved.

FW 350: Mary sent follow-up email from FW to Ed. Ed will review and get comments to committee, so committee can respond via email.

GEO 105: no responses to the BCC questions; Mary to follow up; deferred.

GEO 327: approved

JPN 331, 332, 333: used the same narrative for all 3 courses; lacking specific details in all areas. Request they resubmit with details specific to the 3 courses; and more detail in critical thinking.

NFM 315: request to replace NFM 310 with NFM 235; approved

PHL 160: approved

PHL 312: approved

PHL 371: Mary to follow up and ask for more detail to critical thinking question and demonstrate interrelationships/connections with other subject areas.

RUS 231, 232, 233: approved

Meeting Adjourned: 3:15 pm
March 31, 2003 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 31, 2003 Minutes

Attending: Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Ann Marie VanDerZanden, Joe Kerkvliet, and Joanne Sorte

Spring term dates for BCC meetings will be:
April 14 & 28, May 12 (NO meeting May 26th), June 2

Review of Bac Core Cultural Diversity Courses
Mary reported that all departments/faculty have been contacted to submit renewal information. Returns to date have been low and information is incomplete in many that have been submitted. Mary will request assistance from Madge in Academic Programs to collate the requested enrollment history information requested for each CD course.

The following course materials were reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 210</td>
<td>Request additional information addressing CD criteria #2-6; explain how the course addresses critical thinking and how this is done. If a writing assignment is used, please explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 316</td>
<td>Course narrative is sufficient; postpone decision until enrollment figures are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 313/413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 318</td>
<td>Request more detail in the narrative describing how the course meets the Cultural Diversity criteria and critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mary will forward additional course summary materials to the committee to review in advance of the next meeting.

Minutes summarized by Joanne Sorte
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 10, 2003
Minutes

Approvals: ENG 240; SOC 481

Members present: Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, Joanne Sorte, Anne Marie VanDerZanden, Ruth Vondracek

Approval of Minutes: Committee approved minutes from February 24, 2002.

Meeting Change: Committee agreed to meet March 17, rather than March 24, in order to finalize outstanding course approvals before Spring term.

The Committee approved the following courses:

ENG 240 - Native American Literature
SOC 481 - Society and Natural Resources (3) Tracking Number: 03-C653

Actions taken on Course Proposals:
The following courses are on hold pending further information:
AREC 253
FW 350 -
WSE 470 X - The WSE 470X proposal was discussed and referred back for additional information including: removal of "X" course number designation (in process); additional description or samples of the critical issues to be discussed; outline of assigned reading list.

To be discussed next week:
AREC 253
FW 350
WSE 470 X
GS 111
COM 432

Discussion Items:
The Committee reviewed Professor Jensen’s text on critical thinking that will be incorporated into the Course Review Checklist. The purpose of the text is to clarify the information needed by the Committee in reviewing proposals. Professor Jensen will make the changes suggested by the Committee and resubmit the text.

During the March 17, 2003 meeting the Committee will review the outstanding courses for approval. In addition, Professor Burke will assign the cultural diversity course materials she has received to date. The Committee will complete the review of these courses by end of Spring term.

Respectfully submitted, Ruth Vondracek
January 27, 2003 Minutes

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Appointments: HSTS 415, 417, and 425 as WIC; LBCC ENG 220 as DPD Deferred for further information: LBCC ENG 240 and FW 350

Members Present: Mary Burke, Chair; Ed Jensen, Joe Kerkvliet, Janet Lee, Ann Marie VanDerZanden, Ruth Vondracek

1. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from January 13, 2003.

2. Actions Taken on Course Proposals:

   WIC Approvals:
   - HSTS 415. Theory of Evolution and Foundation of Modern Biology (3). The Committee was concerned with the amount of time allowed for the TA to review papers. The course will be reviewed next year.
   - HSTS 417. History of Medicine (3). This course was approved with similar concerns as HSTS 415.
   - HSTS 425. History of the Life Sciences (3).

   Approved for DPD:
   - ENG 220. Topics in Difference, Power, and Discrimination (3)

   Deferred:
   - ENG 240. Needs to define critical, no syllabus, what is meant by critical thinking and examples, needs specific readings and assignments
   - FW 350. Endangered Species, Society and Sustainability (3). Questions to be answered include texts, how to write based on what has been written, Mary will contact Dan Edge for answers.

Discussion Items: The committee discussed its concern with the lack of support for Baccalaureate Core curriculum, resulting in lower standards to meet qualifications or the need for more support for departments. The Committee will review DPD sometime in the future. Cultural Diversity will be the Category for Review this year.
Approved: ANTH 481 syn (STS) and PHIL 344 syn (contemporary global issues)

Members present: Mary Burke, Joe Kerkvliet, Janet Lee, Joanne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden, and Ruth Vondracek.

Ex-Officio members present: Vicki Tolar Burton, Jin Xing.

Visitors: Madge Patterson, Bob Burton.

The minutes from the last meeting were approved unanimously.

Jin Xing discussed the DPD program and his ideas to broaden the scope of the program, encourage courses from colleges other than CLA, to make DPD university-wide, and to promote interdisciplinary programs. He proposed that a full review of DPD courses by this committee be postponed until he has time to get to know courses, chairs, community college officials, etc.

A discussion followed. Community college issues were discussed with regard to any future DPD review. It was mentioned that there is a need to attract community college instructors to the DPD seminars. Vicki Tolar Burton will meet with Jin Xing to describe the review process as she experienced it during the WIC review. Jin Xing indicated he would like to get the DPD Board going before a review.

It was decided that a DPD review would be postponed until a future date, probably sometime in the future.

Vicki Tolar Burton reported her review of HSTS 415, 417, and 425. She recommended approval of each of these courses as WIC courses. She stated that these classes were sorely needed by general science majors, who have few alternatives for fulfilling WIC requirements.

A discussion followed in which several members expressed concern that the class materials may suggest that the classes do not meet the WIC guidelines. Bob Burton suggested the committee has a choice of approving these courses, as is, or not approving and leaving many students without the WIC experience. It was decided that each course will be reviewed by two committee members, who will report their findings and recommendations to the committee at the next meeting.

The committee unanimously recommended approval of Anthropology 481 as a synthesis (science, technology, and society) course (#02C520).

The committee unanimously recommended approval of Philosophy 344 as a synthesis (contemporary global issues) course (#02C415).

Mary Burke introduced materials for two community college courses. These courses will be discussed at the next meeting.

Mary Burke stated that we must decide what part of the BAC core to review this year. Ineligible areas include western culture, WIC, biological science, and physical science. Committee members will provide their recommendations at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 9, 2002 Minutes

Approved: HSTS 419 - WIC; EXSS 312 - WC and SI, MT. Hood CC BI 110 - sci

1. Minutes of 11/25/02 approved.

2. WIC business
   a. HSTS 419 approved.
   b. Discussion of problems of keeping WIC courses to 20 students considering our increasing enrollment. The end of the year report from this committee should indicate the number of WIC courses that are in compliance. The committee also needs to examine how we can help departments meet these guidelines.
   c. Vicki inquired how widely the WIC thesis guidelines should be advertised. The committee felt it should go onto both the WIC website and the WIC newsletter. It should also be included in the annual report of the committee and be forwarded to the 2007 committee.

3. EXSS 312 was approved as fulfilling the Western Culture and the Social Institutions requirements.

4. BI 110 submitted by Mt. Hood Community College was returned. The submitter will be asked to return a syllabus that includes a course outline, readings, course expectations and objectives. Course procedures including grading of the course must be included. The committee felt strongly that community colleges submitting new bac core proposals should meet the same criteria as OSU bac core courses.

Submitted by Mary Burke
Approved: Eng 385 - WIC
Reinstatement: FST 423. - WIC
Removal: HSTS 418 - WIC

Members present: Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Joe Kerkvliet, Janet Lee, Anne Marie VanDerZanden, Ruth Vondracek; Ex-officio Vicki Tolar Burton; Liaison Academic Programs, Bob Burton

Discussion Items
1. Becky Johnson contacted Mary Burke for clarification of the changes we suggested in the Enrollment 2007 Design Team. Nancy Rosenberger also contacted Mary Burke about the Committee's recommendation to explain the approval or acceptance of the changes recommended by the OSU 2007 Curricular Issues proposal is determined by the Bac Core, and that no change can take place without our approval. Approaches to how we should respond to the OSU 2007 issues included: inviting members from the Committees to clarify specific points; select two of the recommendations as meritorious and suggest that those go forward; wait until January 15 to winnow out those proposals that may not go forward; or respond to all questions at this time. We decided that our action at this time will be for Mary Burke will respond to Becky Johnson with a copy to Nancy Rosenberger thanking her for accepting the Baccalaureate Core charge.

2. How and when to provide updates on definitional changes, such as broadening the concept of what meet the laboratory requirement. Two suggestions were made 1) to provide a website. Bob Burton offered to provide support for developing a website, if the Committee supplied the content. 2) Continue to identify definitional changes in the annual review. Questions revolved around the advantages and disadvantages of more narrowly defining requirements.

Actions Taken On Course Proposals:
1. Approved as Writing Intensive Course: Eng 385 Studies in American Literature (3).

2. Reinstatement as Writing Intensive Course. FST 423. Food Analysis (5). Concern expressed about lack of clear differentiation between graduate/undergraduate grading


4. Returned for Clarification: EXSS 312 Sociocultural Dimensions of Physical Activity (3).

Other Action Items:
1. The minutes of the November 11, 2002 meeting were approved.

2. Mary Burke will respond to Becky Johnson with a copy to Nancy Rosenberger thanking her for accepting the Baccalaureate Core charge.

The committee adjourned at 3:35 PM

Minutes taken by Ruth Vondracek

1. **WIC issues**
   1. Vicki Tolar Burton asked for clarification concerning general numbered courses on a variety of topics that are taught by more than one instructor. The committee agreed that one complete set of course materials for the course should be submitted. In addition, a proposal must indicate the faculty member responsible for making sure all syllabi are readily available and kept on file as well as making sure all criteria are met every time this course is taught.
   2. Vicki Tolar Burton reported on her very productive meeting regarding theses meeting the WIC requirement. BRR and Physics met with her and made suggestions for editing the "Proposed Guidelines for Thesis as a Writing Intensive Course." The committee was supportive of these changes.

2. **EXSS 312** has been proposed as a Perspectives course for both the "Social Processes and Institutions" and "Western Culture" areas. This proposal has been postponed for discussion at the next meeting.

3. **Response to Enrollment Report:** Mary Burke reported that Bob Bontrager had emailed Nan Scott, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, implying that the Baccalaureate Core Committee was willing to "move forward with openness" concerning his plan. Mary made it clear that she had not said this and passed around a draft statement that stated that the committee is opposed to moving the curricular approval process from Academic Programs to Enrollment Management. She received suggestions for editing and will send this out to as an email to the appropriate parties.

4. **Discussion of CIPT Executive Summary draft document.** The committee discussed the 9 points listed under section [IV] on baccalaureate core issues. In addition it was noted that, although the document included the statement "referred to Baccalaureate Core Committee," it had not formally been sent to the committee and was only brought to our attention through its discussion at Faculty Senate.
   1. **suggestion to increase inquiry-based learning in environments other than traditional laboratory classes:** The committee agreed on the importance of hands-on inquiry-based learning environments as a necessary aspect of Science Perspectives courses and was in favor of ways to encourage a broadening of the definition of laboratory to include non-traditional inquiry-based learning environments.
   2. **prepare students as credible communicators in their field - add on 1-credit courses etc.** The committee felt that it was important to maintain the integrity of the WIC requirement and that "add-on" courses might provide a weakening of this. However, the committee is flexible and open to new ways of meeting requirements so long as these proposals are pedagogically sound and do address and meet the guidelines. The development of guidelines for the thesis as a WIC course is an example of this.
   3. **Prepare students for a global future. (a) through a study abroad waiver option:** while the committee agreed with the need to encourage students to participate in study-abroad programs, it was thought by most that the "right to waive" and the notion of "block transfer" was problematic. There is inconclusive evidence that any individual study abroad program should automatically bring with it the right to waive DPD or Synthesis requirements. (b) accept second-
year language as fulfilling cultural diversity or western culture requirements. Rather than an automatic waiver, it is noted that all faculty teaching such courses might be encouraged to propose their course as a Western Culture or Cultural Diversity course.

4. revamp the Synthesis section of the baccalaureate core. While there was objection to the notion of "revamping" this aspect of the core, the committee was open to ways to encourage interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary sequencing of courses. It was noted that the logistics of this might prove difficult and perhaps impractical; nonetheless, the committee agreed with the vision presented.

5. add a keystone course to encourage awareness of social problems. Again, the committee thought this a good idea although logistics were not discussed and little time was left for discussion.

6. add capstone courses in all majors constructed around problem-solving experiences. Good idea, although the suggestion does not imply the ways this might influence the baccalaureate core. The committee did not have time to sufficiently address this issue.

7. encourage the development of interdisciplinary bacc core courses. Just as the committee responded to item (4), the notion of interdisciplinarity was supported by the committee.

8. encourage teamwork skills. The committee agreed with this principle of teamwork, although did not discuss ways it might be proposed.

9. hold annual meetings for faculty who teach bacc core courses. The committee felt this was a good suggestion.

Minutes taken by Janet Lee
Approved: CSS 330 approved for synthesis - Contemporary Global Issues

Attendees: Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Ruth Vondracek, Janet Lee, JoAnne Sorte, Ann Marie VanDerZanden; Guest: Vicki Tolar Burton

1. Minutes of 10/14/02 approved.

2. Mary reported on the meeting she had with Bob Bontrager and stated he is willing to change section C.1.b. of the Enrollment Management Report and delete current curricular codification systems, standard curricular definitions and appropriate fit. Bontrager noted some of the rationale for having his group take over these responsibilities is that then the AP office would have more opportunity to do other items.

Committee discussion followed. The bottom line is that Bontrager wants support from the BCC for this proposal. The BCC does not support the report and the BCC will to draft a statement describing our position. Mary will draft a statement on the committee's behalf and circulate it for our review. The key point of the statement being to keep review, implementation, etc., of curriculum under the direction of Academic Programs because academic programs need to be managed by academic faculty not administrative staff.

3. WIC Matters - proposed thesis guidelines
Vicki met with the WIC Advisory Committee & Writing Advisory Board and based on these meetings developed and distributed to the BCC a list with 10 items that will provide guidelines for using an undergrad thesis to fulfill the WIC requirement.

The BCC suggested the guidelines be divided into required vs. recommended points, and additional verbiage added to set the stage for how the guidelines could be used on a departmental level. It was also clarified that if a department submits a proposal for allowing the thesis to fulfill a WIC requirement, the department will need to submit the standard WIC proposal. It would then go through the BCC approval process.

4. CSS 330 approved for Bac Core offering.

5. Mary asked all committee members to review EXSS312. Mary will contact Brad Chapman to have him resubmit the proposal and delineate how the class meets three different BCC requirements they are proposing by submitting three separate justifications for each of the bac core categories.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.
Respectfully submitted,
Ann Marie VanDerZanden
October 14, 2002 Minutes

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Members Attending: Mary Burke, Ann Marie VanDerZanden, Ed Jensen, Joanne Sorte Ex-officio attending: Vicki Tolar Burton, Bob Burton

1. WIC matters: Vicki has offered to meet with HSTS faculty regarding the Bac Core review of their WIC courses in order to clarify issues before their documents are submitted for Bac Core Committee review. The WIC Advisory Team will be meeting soon to discuss the possibility of using the senior thesis to replace the required WIC course for some departments. Vicki is working with the requesting departments to encourage involvement in the WIC training by faculty and/or to explore ways the comprehensive WIC components could be included in the senior thesis approach.

2. Discussion of the Enrollment 2007 Design Team Report: Committee members agreed that BCC response to the draft is most fitting regarding section "C.1.b" (page 6). WE will request the Bob Bontrager attend the next meeting of the BCC to outline his vision of this section, and the proposed interface with the BCC. Committee members are asked to review the report in advance of the next meeting.

3. Courses from community colleges desiring bac core status: The committee declined to review the requests and agreed to send the proposals back because they had not indicated which requirement they wanted to fulfill. Courses with the same number as our courses are automatically accepted for bac core.

4. What do we review this year? To be determined.

TO DO’s:
Mary - invite B. Bontrager to the next meeting; contact absent committee members
Members - review Enrollment 2007 Design Team Report draft and explanatory response by Bob Burton.

Submitted by: J. Sorte
Note Taker: Ed Jensen

**Present:** Janet Lee, Ed Jensen, Mary Burke, Ruth Vondracek, Joanne Sorte, Bob Burton (ex officio), Vicki Tolar Burton (ex officio)

**Action Items:**
1. Change number of EXSS 481 to EXSS 381 (WIC). **APPROVED.**
2. Change number of GEO 201 to 202 and GEO 202 to 201 (BAC). **APPROVED.**
3. Remove HDFS 460 as prerequisite to HDFS 461 (WIC). **APPROVED.**
4. AIHM 481: change prerequisite from AIHM 383 to AIHM 385 (WIC). **APPROVED.**

**Discussion Items:**
1. Can Physics Dept. use individual senior theses to meet WIC requirement?
   a. BCC should develop a clear set of guidelines regarding how individual theses can meet WIC requirements. Once that is done, and transmitted to Physics (and others), BCC will be in a better position to answer this question.

2. Accepting BAC courses from other universities and from OR community colleges.
   a. If course numbers are the same as OSU numbers, we'll automatically accept for BAC requirement (without any additional review).
   b. For new articulation agreements, DPD will be treated separately.

3. Whose responsibility is it to make the campus (faculty and students) more aware of the value of BCC courses?
   a. Apparently it's the BCC's

4. Tasks for the coming year:
   a. Which category of courses should we review?

5. OSU 2007 has raised questions about whether BCC should report to Registrar or Academic Affairs. BCC will develop and share an opinion.

Corrections or additions to these minutes should be submitted to Ed.Jensen@orst.edu.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 1, 2002 Minutes

Members present: Avery, Burke, Janet Lee, John Lee, Peebler, Peters, Vranas, VanDerZanden

1. Actions Taken On Course Proposals:


   i. Approved for continuation of Perspectives Science Designation FOR 240 FOREST BIOLOGY (4) effective June 16, 2002. Major change.


2. Other Action Items:

   a. The minutes of the March 4, 2002 meeting were approved.

   b. Spring term meetings will be alternate Mondays from 2:00-3:30 PM beginning April 1, 2002. We will not meet on Memorial Day so June 3, 2002 is scheduled as a replacement meeting.

3. Five-Year Review of Perspectives Science/Lab Courses (continued):

   a. FOR 240: Approved for continuation. Approval letter to department will recommend that the department advertise this course better to the campus community. Currently the enrollment is predominately from the College of Forestry students. The course should be of interest to a broader group and is accessible to a broader group.
b. CH 122 & 123 Pending: John Lee and Mary Burke will write a letter to the Chemistry department, concerning more specifics on courses for review.

c. BOT 101: Pending, and requesting more information on the course before approval considered.

d. PH 104: Pending initial BCC review.

e. PH 201-202-203: Pending initial BCC review.

f. BIO 101-103: Pending initial BCC review.

g. BIO 211-213: Pending initial BCC review.

4. LBCC: ENG 240: Pending, needs further review.

5. BCC will review the baccalaureate core mission and goals and coordinate our activities with the CIPT committee that is reviewing curriculum issues as part of OSU 2007.

The committee adjourned at 3:35 PM

Minutes taken by Darlene Vranas
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 4, 2002 Minutes

Members present: Avery, Burke, Jensen, Janet Lee, John Lee, Peebler, Peters, Vranas, VanDerZanden

1. Actions Taken On Course Proposals:

   a. Approved HORT 311, PLANT PROPAGATION, (Tracking #01-C061) change in prerequisite for existing WIC course; minor change.

   b. Approved MB 330, DISEASE AND SOCIETY, (Tracking #02-C157) as a DPD course; major change.

   c. Approved RUS 340, 19TH CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE IN TRANSLATION, (Tracking #02-C229) as a Literature and the Arts course; major change.

   d. Approved RUS 341, 20TH CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE IN TRANSLATION, (Tracking #02-C230) as a Literature and the Arts course; major change.

   e. Approved RUS 342, 20TH CENTURY RUSSIAN DRAMA IN TRANSLATION, (Tracking #02-C231) as a Literature and the Arts course; major change.


2. Other Action Items:

   a. The minutes of the February 18, 2002 meeting were approved.

   b. Spring term meetings will be alternate Mondays from 2:00-3:30 PM beginning April 1, 2002. We will not meet on Memorial Day so June 3, 2002 is scheduled as a replacement meeting.

3. Five-Year Review of Perspectives Science/Lab Courses:

   a. Final BCC actions concerning approval or denial of continued Perspectives Science/Lab designation for all the courses currently under review will be made after the BCC has reviewed all the courses. Departments will be contacted and invited to supply additional information if the BCC initial review of a course is unfavorable.

   b. CH 122/23, CH 221/22/23; CH 201/02; CH 224H/25H/26H: requested continued approval as Physical Science Perspective courses.

   c. CH 201/02 are 3 credit courses and do not meet category criterion that they be at least 4 credit requirement. The request for continuation as a Perspectives Science/Lab course was denied.

   d. CH 122/23, CH 221/22/23, CH 224H/25H/26H: The same justification was used for all courses and sequences. Although the justification was a good one, the Committee suspects that each sequence serves different audiences and probably has somewhat different objectives. As a result, the Committee recommended returning the request to the Chemistry Department, asking them for a separate justification for each sequence, and asking them to describe how each individual
course meets all the specific criteria for Perspectives Science/Lab courses (since courses could, conceivably, be taken independently).

e. MB 230: requested approval as a Biological Science Perspective course. This request is approved, with the recommendation that a note be included in the course syllabus pertaining to Critical Thinking (Jensen will recommend wording to BCC prior to next meeting).

The committee adjourned at 3:35 PM

Minutes taken by Ed Jensen
February 18, 2002 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Members present: Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Kurt Peters, Anne Marie VanDerZanden, John Lee, Lisa Ede, Darlene Vranas, and Stephanie Peebler.

1. Actions Taken On Course Proposals:
   a. Approved COMM 422, SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION THEORY AND RESEARCH, for continued WIC designation; major change.
   b. Approved GEO 305, LIVING WITH ACTIVE CASCADE VOLCANOES, (Tracking #02-C194) as a Synthesis Science Technology and Society course; major change.
   c. Approved NFM 232, NUTRITION AND LIFETIME FITNESS, (Tracking #02-C178) as a Skills Fitness course; major change.
   d. Approved HSTS/FW 470, LANDSCAPE OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN, (Tracking #01-C110, #01-C109) as cross-listed Synthesis Science Technology and Society course; major change.
   e. Approved BI 315, MOLECULAR BIOLOGY LABORATORY, (Tracking #02-C199) as a new WIC course; major change.

2. Other Action Items:
   a. The minutes of the February 4, 2002 meeting were approved.
   b. Winter term meetings will be alternate Mondays from 2:00-3:30 PM beginning January 7, 2002.

3. Discussion related to the action items:
   a. COMM 422: Department clarified how the 2000 words of polished writing was in fact being done. This answered the last question the BCC had regarding continued WIC status for the course. BCC approval was unanimous.
   b. GEO 305: BCC approval was unanimous.
   c. NFM 232: The BCC was impressed with this proposal for a skills-fitness course. It is proposed to satisfy the 2-credit lecture component of the fitness requirement. The lead reviewer noted that in addition to meeting all the criteria for a skills-fitness course this course might be more attractive to more mature students. The course includes practical information about fitness in food management and physical exercise management. NFM 232 is only the second lecture component that will be available to students to satisfy this baccalaureate core requirement. The BCC encourages further submissions in this area to provide more choice for students. BCC approval was unanimous.
   d. BI 315: The committee had concerns about the lack of opportunity to revise polished work in response to feedback. The BCC authorized its chair to seek Biology's agreement to a modification of their proposal that will include the opportunity for revision of one of the six lab reports. If the
BCC proposal is acceptable to Biology, the BCC will approve this course for WIC designation. The BCC proposal was accepted.

4. Other discussion of new and continuing items:

   a. It was noted that the Academic Regulations Committee was proceeding with a recommendation to the Faculty Senate to require a C- or better in any course used to satisfy a baccalaureate core requirement. The BCC expressed reservations about this proposal to the committee chair. The BCC still has reservations about the actual result of approving this change, which may be grade inflation rather than the intended outcome of better performance by students.

The committee adjourned at 3:35 PM

Minutes taken by John Lee
February 4, 2002 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Members present: Bonnie Avery, Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Anne Marie VanDerZanden, John Lee, Janet Lee, Lisa Ede, Tracy Anne Robinson, Darlene West, and Stephanie Peebler.
Visitor: Vreneli Farber

1. Actions Taken On Course Proposals:
   a. Approved NFM 419, HUMAN NUTRITION LABORATORY, for continued WIC designation; major change.
   b. Approved ECE 441-443, ENGINEERING DESIGN PROJECT, for continued WIC designation; major change.
   c. Approved (LBCC course) PH 104, DISCRIPITVE ASTRONOMY, for the Perspectives Science Requirement for a lab-science course; major change.

2. Other Action Items:
   a. The minutes of the January 7, 2002 meeting were approved.
   b. Winter term meetings will be alternate Mondays from 2:00-3:30 PM beginning January 7, 2002.

3. Discussion related to the action items:
   a. NFM 419: A category II proposal has been submitted to change the course from 2 credits to 3 credits and the word count and distinctions between formal and informal writing have been explained. Lead reviewer Jensen and Ede recommended approval of this course based upon the changes. BCC approval was unanimous.
   b. ECE 441-443: The committee finally received the WIC review materials. Missing information concerning word count and multiple instructors has been submitted and lead reviewer VanDerZanden and Ede recommended approval based upon these changes. BCC approval was unanimous.
   c. PH 104 (LBCC Astronomy Course): Review materials on this course, including extensive lab worksheets, had been sent to the Physics department at OSU, reviewed, and approved by them as meeting the criteria of the Perspectives Science criteria. The BCC concurred.

4. Other discussion of new and continuing items:
   a. Darlene West was welcomed as a new student member of the BCC.
   b. COMM 422: The WIC review of this course is still pending. Lead reviewer Kurt Peters was absent and the BCC still has received no clarification that one essay will be revised.
   c. WIC Review: Jensen raised the issue of the difference between WIC courses that give students the opportunity and requirement to write and those that actually teach students to become better
and more creative writers. Ede spoke about the variations across WIC classes and the mission of the WIC directive and its opportunities and constraints. John Lee will draft a letter to academic affairs and to be shared with faculty as a follow-up to our WIC review advocating the requirements of WIC and underlining the need to provide resources to continue the high level of WIC offerings. It is to be emphasized that faculty need the ongoing professional development opportunities provided by the WIC program to maintain this high level.

d. John Lee gave the URL link for COB-AA on-line curriculum website that tracks all baccalaureate core courses in process.

e. Guest Vreneli Farber (Foreign Languages) joined the group. She hopes to propose a sequence of classes (Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Russian Literature and Twentieth Century Russian Drama) at the 400 level that would be candidates for the Perspectives Category "Literature and Arts." Currently this category requires lower division offerings. Farber explained that these courses meet the spirit of the requirement in having no perquisites and being open to all as well as broadening and raising the level and range of offerings. The committee agreed that this was a reasonable request and would be willing to accept her proposal. Farber also said that she would like to offer at least one of these courses as a WIC course in addition to a Literature and Arts course. John Lee will check on the feasibility of this.

f. Update on review of Perspectives area, Science category courses: Lead reviewers will be receiving courses for review. The BCC will discuss as many of the course review materials as possible at its next meeting.

g. LBCC/OSU articulation courses: ENG 220 is still pending. Lee will follow up on requested additional information.

h. Skills/Fitness Requirement: The new fitness criteria opens up opportunities for more departments to offer such a course. The 2 credit focus on nutrition and health education could ostensibly be taught in any department although the 1 credit physical activity course might not be so easily taught outside of HHP. There is currently a proposal of NFM 232 under review. Darlene West said she felt HHP 231 was limited in not addressing the skills and needs of non-traditional students and should be diversified. The committee supported the inclusion of new material in HHP 231 as well as other supporting the inclusion of new offerings beyond HHP 231 to meet the fitness requirement.

The committee adjourned at 3:35 PM

Minutes taken by Janet Lee
Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 7, 2002
Minutes

Members present: Bonnie Avery, Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, John Lee, Stephany Peebler, Kurt Peters, Ann Marie VanDerZanden, and Janet Lee. Also attending: Susan Shaw, DPD Director

1. Actions Taken On Course Proposals:

   a. Approved WS 420: HATE, RESISTANCE AND RECONCILIATION, as a new DPD course; major change. (This course does not yet have a tracking #.)

   b. Approved COMM 459, CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF RHETORIC, for continued WIC designation; major change.

2. Other Action Items:

   a. Minutes for November 26, 2001 were reviewed and unanimously approved.

   b. Winter term meetings will be alternate Mondays from 2:00-3:30 PM beginning January 7, 2002. We will not meet on Monday January 21 due to MLK activities.

3. Discussion related to the action items:

   a. WS 420: The committee asked that items 2 and 9 of the DPD justification on critical thinking and interactive learning be expanded so the full document can serve as a model for others. Susan Shaw agreed to do this.

   b. COMM 459: the instructor has agreed to include the citing of references in the syllabus and to provide a copy of the revised syllabus to the WIC Director. The course now satisfies all the WIC guidelines.

4. Other discussion of new and continuing items:

   a. Eng 220 (LBCC), Literature of American Minorities, which has been submitted by LBCC for DPD, will be reviewed in February. There was good documentation submitted but the old DPD criteria were used. John Lee will ask Linda Spain to respond to the new criteria and to include the syllabus of one version of the course.

   b. COMM 422: No clarification has been received that one essay will be revised; so approval for continued WIC designation is still pending.

   c. ECE 441-443: Review for continued WIC designation is pending the receipt of information requested.

   d. BCC Fitness Requirement and HHP 231: Darlene West, a student, wants to meet with the committee concerning a proposal for a COCC course to meet the fitness skills requirement. She has also been encouraged to apply through ASOSU to be a member of the BCC. The committee realizes that the difficulty with this Baccalaureate Core category is that only one course currently meets the requirement. There is concern on the committee that this is an individual appeal rather than a proposal from an academic unit to accept a course in the fitness category. The committee
could meet with the student to determine if the proposed course meets the criteria for this category but the committee has no authority to approve or deny the request of an individual student. John Lee will explain to the student that the approval deliberations needs to go to her individual adviser, then the College Head adviser, and finally to the student appeals committee (if needed) in order to resolve whether the COCC courses will be accepted as satisfying the fitness skills requirement in her particular case. If the course is going to be considered for approval in the fitness category, such a proposal must come from the academic unit at COCC that offers the course.

e. The committee has a request from the President of the Faculty Senate to gather input about how the baccalaureate core is or is not serving students at OSU. There is no enthusiasm on the committee to take up a broad study or even how to do it at this time. The committee thought it would be useful to look back at the original intent of the baccalaureate core and the recent accreditation review of the core to see if that rationale still is relevant.

f. All information on the review of Science courses has been sent out. The committee will proceed by the same method as the review of the WIC courses.

g. Liberal studies needs to develop WIC courses. Gary Tiedeman, at the request and invitation of the Dean of Liberal Arts, has agreed to work on one such course, which could serve as a model for others. The committee agreed to expedite the BCC review procedures so the new course he is developing can be taught this spring.

The next meeting of the committee will be Monday February 4 at 2 PM.
The committee adjourned at 3:30 PM.
Note Taker: Mary Burke
Members present: Bonnie Avery, Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, John Lee, Stephanie Peebler, Kurt Peters, Ann Marie VanDerZanden, and Janet Lee.
Also attending: Lisa Ede, WIC Director and Tracy Ann Robinson, WIC GTA.

1. **Actions Taken On Course Proposals:**

1. **Approved** PHL 407, SEMINAR, for continued WIC designation; major change.

2. **Approved** ENG 445, STUDIES IN NONFICTION, for continued WIC designation; major change.

3. **Approved** ANTH 370: FAMILY, GENDER, AND GENERATION, for continued WIC designation; major change.

4. **Approved** ME 451: MECHANICAL LABORATORY, for continued WIC designation; major change.

5. **Approved** PSY 430: ANIMAL BEHAVIOR, for continued WIC designation; major change.

6. **Approved** FE450/451: FOREST OPERATIONS DESIGN I & II (tracking #01-B032) as a new WIC course; major change.

7. **Approved** BB317 & BIO 317, SCIENTIFIC THEORY AND PRACTICE, (tracking #01-B031) as a new WIC cross-listed course; major change.

2. **Other Action Items:**

1. Minutes for November 12, 2001 were reviewed and unanimously approved after minor corrections.

2. **Winter term meetings** will be Mondays from 2:00-3:30 p.m. The first meeting of the term will be January 7th.

3. **Discussion related to the action items:**
   (a) PHL407 was approved with the proviso that new versions of this seminar (topics) course will require approval by the department chair and WIC director as described for BI 388 below. The BCC will expect similar arrangements for other blanket numbered courses. John will work with Lisa to make sure this agreement is acceptable to the department head before these minutes are approved.
   (b) The other courses were approved after minor discussion upon the recommendation of the lead reviewer.
   (c) Consideration of COMM422 and ECE441-443 were deferred pending receipt of additional information.
   (d) COMM459 denied for continued WIC pending response from instructor to BCC concerns (checklist to be sent to instructor).

4. **BI 388 Update:** John reported that Mike Mix, Biology Department Chair, said that the control on new versions of BI 388, agreed on when BI 388 was approved last year, was that both the Biology Chair and the WIC Director must both approve new versions of this topic course. Review will be based on the course syllabus for the new version and/or (if needed) additional information explaining how the WIC guidelines will be met.
5. **AA support for the BCC:** John contacted Madge Patterson and she is working with the COB IS group to develop webpages, informational databases, and easy-to-use queries that will help the BCC better evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of the baccalaureate core program.

6. **Articulation with community colleges:** John reported that there are several community college courses that need to be articulated for baccalaureate core transfer equivalency. As usual, the documentation provided is insufficient for making a good decision. Bob Burton supports making a form available on-line for the Community Colleges to complete explaining why a course proposed for a particular baccalaureate core area actually meets the requirements for that area. John also noted that the DPD Taskforce wanted President Risser to renegotiate the AAOT so it does not include DPP classes, but President Risser declined to do that.

7. **Review of Perspectives Science courses:** The committee reviewed the draft documents for review of Perspectives Science courses. A number of comments were made on each of the documents to be included in the packet. John will make the changes and send another copy of the documents to the committee via campus mail before he sends them to the appropriate department chairs/heads in early January.

The committee adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Note Taker: Ann Marie VanDerZanden
Also attending: Lisa Ede WIC Director and Joe Kerkvliet, Chair of Academic Regulations Committee.

The members welcomed OSU student, Stephany Peebler, who joins the Baccalaureate Core Committee as of this meeting. Stephany is in the Natural Resources Program.

1. **Actions Taken On Course Proposals:**

   1. **Approved** HDFS 461, INDIVIDUAL AND FAMILY POLICIES AND PROGRAMS II, for continued WIC designation; major change.
   2. **Approved** COMM 456, RHETORIC: 500 BC TO 500 AD, for continued WIC designation; major change.
   3. **Approved** COMM 458, RHETORIC: 500 AD TO 1900, for continued WIC designation; major change.
   4. **Approved** AG 421, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT, for continued WIC designation; major change.
   5. **Approved**, at the request of the department of Music, dropping the WIC designation from MUS 324, HISTORY OF WESTERN MUSIC.

2. **Other Action Items:**

   1. Minutes for October 29, 2001 were reviewed and unanimously approved after minor corrections.
   2. The four courses above were approved for continued WIC designation, without further discussion, on recommendation of lead reviewer: Ann Marie VanDerZanden (HDFS 461), Bonnie Avery (COMM 456), Mary Burke (COMM 458), and John Lee (AG 421) Lisa Ede also helped review each of these courses.
   3. **Deferred WIC reviews**: After an initial discussion, the following course reviews were deferred until 11-29-01: COMM 422 (Peters lead), COMM 459 (Janet Lee lead), ANTH 370 (Janet Lee lead), and PSY 430 (Jensen lead)
   4. **Discussion of WIC review of ME 451 (Jensen lead)**: After a lengthy discussion, action was deferred pending further discussion with the department. While group writing constitutes 35% of the student grade, individual writing only accounts for an additional 18% (25% is the minimum required by the WIC criteria). This is of concern to the committee as is the lack of required revision in individual writing. The committee suggests writing a letter to the course instructor requesting the first lab/writing assignment include required revision and suggesting student writing groups include peer review in their group writing. After getting a response from the department we will revisit this course.

5. **Discussion of minimum grading scheme for Baccalaureate Core Courses**: Joe Kerkvliet, Chair of Academic Regulations Committee, invited committee opinions regarding the apparent discrepancy in minimum standards for those taking baccalaureate core courses for a letter grade (where D- is the lowest passing grade) versus those opting for the S/U credit option (where C- is the lowest passing
grade). Committee opinion was not unanimous though there was concern that the integrity of the Baccalaureate Core may be in question if a D- grade constitutes passing, particularly when students have a range of choice in course selection within a category.

Joe will ask Barbara Balz for data regarding number of students that receive a D- to C- in a Baccalaureate Core course and the number of students opting to S/U Baccalaureate Core courses. He will get back to the Committee if the Academic Regulations Committee decides to pursue this with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

7. **Shortcomings in implementation of the new DPD academic program**: The discussion above raised the Committee's attention to the fact that the current Schedule of Classes for Winter Term 2002, and perhaps other documents, do not yet accurately reflect the decision to move the DPD Category out of the lower division Perspectives Category. This change was made when the Faculty Senate approved the DPD report and revised guidelines in Spring 2000. John will look into making sure the appropriate changes are made.

8. John Lee reported briefly on the status of WIC Review, which is nearing completion.

9. **Discussion of BI 388 (Special Topics in Biology)**: A specific version and syllabus of BI 388 was approved earlier in 2001. Now, it appears that essentially different courses will be given for WIC credit under BI 388. The committee is concerned about how to ensure that the new topics courses given under BI 388 will indeed meet the WIC criteria. Should the committee review each new syllabus? John will communicate with Mike Mix about syllabi for new offerings so we can begin to resolve this issue. The committee is aware of the acute need for WIC courses for the Biology Program, but we also must be certain that the WIC guidelines are met by all versions of BI 388.

10. John reports having spoken with Madge Patterson of Academic Affairs concerning available support. She is working on software that will address our needs. She will be in touch with us when she has a specific proposal.

11. Draft documents for review of lab science courses will be ready for discussion at our next meeting.

The committee adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Noteaker: Bonnie Avery
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 29, 2001
Minutes
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Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 15, 2001
Minutes

Members present:
Bonnie Avery, Mary Burke, Ed Jensen, Janet Lee, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Ann Marie VanDerZanden

1. Actions Taken On Course Proposals:
   1. Approved H 150, Environmental Health and Safety, for Social Processes and Institutions. Tracking # 01-B024; major change.
   2. Approved LING 251, Languages of Oregon, for DPD. Tracking # 01-B011; major change.
   3. Approved AIHM 270, Appearance, Power, and Society, for DPD. Tracking # 01-B022; minor change.
   4. Approved SPAN 240, Mexican Women Writers, for Literature and the Arts. Tracking # 01-B027; major change.

2. Other Action Items:
   1. Minutes of the BCC meeting of 10-1-01 were approved as distributed.
   2. The BCC, as part of its on-going periodic review of baccalaureate core courses, decided to review the Physical and Biological Sciences Lab Courses approved more than five years ago for the Science Perspectives category.

3. Prior Actions: A summary of BCC WIC reviews actions taken through September 2001. These actions need to be recorded on the appropriate web page of approved baccalaureate core courses with new major action approval date.

   Continuation of WIC status was approved June 2001 for the courses:
   At departmental request drop WIC designation June 2001 for the courses:
   RHP 484, PS 479, PS 414, NE 484, MUS 326, MTH 473, HORT 351, H 482, H 430, GEO 464, GEO 411, FW 482, BOT 342
   At departmental request drop WIC designation June 2002 for the courses:
   HSTS 415, HSTS 417, HSTS 418, HSTS 419, HSTS 425
   Continuation of WIC status was approved September 2001 for the courses:
   BA 469, ENG 452, GER 411, HORT 311, HORT 407, PSY 470
   At departmental request drop WIC designation September 2001 for the courses:
   HORT 41

4. In connection with 2(b), Lee will notify Deans Bloomer and Thies of the College of Science of the
impending review, which will start at the beginning of Winter Term 2001.

5. Susan Shaw will meet with the BCC at our next meeting to discuss the status of DPD courses, including the quality and quantity of existing DPD courses.

6. Lisa Ede will be invited to the next BCC meeting to discuss with the committee pending WIC review materials for BI 306 and COMM 418.

7. John Lee will send a message to the Head Advisors list about the new Fitness Criteria approved last year by the Faculty Senate. The message will encourage Head Advisors to spread the word and assist encouraging new course submissions for the Fitness Category.

8. The BCC reaffirms its position that all courses taught at the Cascade Campus of OSU and that are to be used to satisfy baccalaureate core requirements as part of an OSU degree must undergo the same review process as courses offered on the Corvallis Campus.

9. John Lee will continue the discussion with Academic Affairs about adding a field to the official Approved Baccalaureate Core Course list on the web for the date that the course was originally approved or last reviewed by the BCC during its periodic reviews of baccalaureate core courses.

10. John Lee will continue the discussion with the Registrar and/or Academic Affairs about adding a line to the official graduation audit forms that states which course was used by a student to satisfy the WIC requirement of the core.

The committee adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
Note Taker: John Lee

1. **Review of course proposals:** No course proposals were reviewed. Four courses were identified as pending: AIHM 270 (change to existing), LING 251 (new DPD), SPAN 240 (Perspectives, Lit & Art) and H 150 (Perspectives, Social Processes & Institutions). Copies of the proposals for LING 251, SPAN 240 and H 150 need to be sent to the full Committee.

2. **Update on WIC Review:** Approximately 30 courses were identified as lacking some component of the WIC requirements; the departments were given a checklist and the opportunity to remedy the deficiencies. John Lee and Vicki Tolar Burton reviewed responses and made decisions as authorized by the Committee prior to adjournment in June. The following responses were received during the summer and acted on in the following manner:
   a. HST 407 - approved
   b. BA 469 - approved
   c. FOR 460 - approved
   d. GEO 462 - currently being reviewed
   e. COMM 469 - review of this course had been deferred due to instructor’s sabbatical. The instructor has returned, and had questions about the flexibility of the guidelines and the level of reporting required. John Lee will respond.
   f. Physics (thesis courses): After initial difficulties in resolving some of the issues surrounding this denial, Physics is making progress in redesigning their WIC offerings. Since this is a more complex revision, the department has two years to complete the revision.

3. **2001-2002 Charges and Concerns:** The Committee reviewed and discussed the issues that will need to be addressed this year:
   a. Current BCC standing rules have two issues which may need to be addressed this year:
      i. The rules do not currently include the Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs as an Ex- officio member of the Committee.
      ii. The rules are vague about the review process. The Committee may need to draft a description to be included in the standing rules.
   b. Follow-up review of WIC courses will need to address those courses overlooked due to Banner reporting and those courses which resubmitted materials to respond to notification of deficiencies.
   c. The Committee will need to continue to work with community colleges in evaluating transfer courses. Several issues need to be addressed and resolved in this review process:
i. Standardization across colleges in what courses are accepted for fulfilling BacCore requirements

ii. Mechanisms need to be developed to ensure that BacCore Committee receives a content syllabus as part of every review of community college courses.

d. WIC courses may not be consistently tracked across all departments or colleges on graduation audit forms. The Committee needs to discuss alternatives to resolving this issue.

e. The Committee will need to determine which category of BacCore courses will be reviewed this year. Since last year's review was substantial with efforts carrying over into this year, John Lee proposed that Committee members consider Physical/Biological Sciences. This category has only about 30 courses spread over a few departments.

f. The Committee will need to evaluate whether there is a sufficient number of DPD courses available to meet the demands.

4. **Report from Academic Affairs:** Bob Burton, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs, was present to share the projects and goals of his work and how that would affect the BCC:

a. Dual Enrollment: Dr. Risser's goal is to have a dual enrollment program with every community college in the state. This affects the BCC primarily in evaluation of how to determine which community college courses are equivalent to OSU BacCore courses, and which courses may fulfill the BacCore requirements.

b. Assessment, monitoring and improvement processes were addressed in the Accreditation report. The BacCore may be involved with this issue due to the annual review of a BacCore category which serves as a method of monitoring and assessment.

c. The Accreditation report also indicated some advising issues on campus. Specifically, this may affect the BCC in the manner in which BacCore courses are presented to advisors.

d. The President wants to improve retention by 4%, an issue which is unlikely to directly affect the BacCore Committee.

The committee adjourned at 3:15 p.m.
Members Present: Bonnie Avery, John Dilles, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Christine Snow
Support Staff: Ginger Craig

1. Minutes for May 29, 2001 were reviewed and unanimously approved with the following changes:
   a. Date should be May 29, 2001
   b. Delete reference to WIC in item 4, approval of courses
   c. Remove BI 371 from list of courses deficient in meeting WIC standards (item 6)

2. Approval of new courses: HHP 231, 241-248 and 251 were unanimously approved to satisfy the BCC Fitness category, with the contingency that the following language be included in the catalog description of HHP 231:
"To fulfill the BacCore requirement for fitness, a 1-credit approved BCC activity course is required in addition to the lecture; usually taken simultaneously".

3. Approval of new WIC course:
   a. IE 366. WORK DESIGN AND OPERATIONS MEASUREMENT (4). (01-B010) was unanimously approved.

4. Approval of minor changes to Baccalaureate Courses:
   a. ANTH 451 (Difference, Power and Discrimination): department is adding another option for prerequisite, increasing access. Unanimously approved.
   b. ANTH 487 (Contemporary Global Issues): department is adding another option for prerequisite, increasing access. Unanimously approved.

5. J. Lee proposed that the Committee grant J. Lee and V. Tolar Burton the authority to review and approve minor changes to WIC courses which may have been overlooked during changes in the curriculum tracking process. Committee approved the proposal.

The committee adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
May 29, 2001 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

May 29, 2001
Minutes

Support Staff: Ginger Craig

1. Minutes for May 15, 2001 were reviewed and unanimously approved.

2. An e-mail message from Madge Patterson concerning design of new curriculum proposal tracking software was discussed. The Committee will forward three suggestions to be included in this new system:

   a. The system would ideally be able to produce a report detailing BCC courses, the initial approval date, and a list of types of changes and dates of changes. This list would be best utilized if it could also be filtered by BCC category.
   b. The system should be able to generate a list of BacCore courses by category by year of course approval, preferably with the option for user-selected year.
   c. For purposes of scheduled BacCore course reviews, it would be nice if the system could generate enrollment figures for BCC courses.

3. The committee discussed WIC courses which were not reviewed due to the fact that Banner does not differentiate between full reviews and minor changes; courses not reviewed are HORT 351, ME 351, PHL 407, COMM 418, COMM 430, GEO 463, ART 301 and BI 306. Several alternatives were discussed, and the Committee decided to draft a letter to affected departments stating that these courses will be reviewed next fall, but give them the opportunity to complete the review now or over the summer.

4. Approval of new BCC courses:

   a. ANTH 208/LING 208. WESTERN CULTURE STUDY ABROAD (3). (tracking #00-B005 and #00-B006) was approved unanimously for Western Culture.
   b. ANTH 209/LING 209. CULTURAL DIVERSITY STUDY ABROAD (3). (tracking #00-B007 and #00-B008) was approved unanimously for Cultural Diversity.

5. The Committee considered all WIC review courses not previously acted on. BI 371 and SPAN 438 were approved.

6. Initial review of WIC courses has been completed, and the following courses have been deemed deficient in meeting WIC standards: AG 421, ANTH 370, BA 469, BRR 403, COMM 422, COMM 456, COMM 458, COMM 464, CSS/HORT 480, ECE 441-443, ENG 445, ENG 452, ENG 480, FOR 460, FST 423, GEO 462, GER 411, HDFS 461, HORT 311, HORT 418, HST 407, MUS 324, NFM 419, PH 401/403, PSY 430, PSY 470 and RNG 403. Denial letters stating course deficiencies are to be mailed May 30, 2001; departments will be given until November 1, 2001 to respond and correct deficiencies.

7. Exercise and Sport Science has submitted a number of proposals which should be acted on as soon as
possible. If these proposals are distributed to Committee members by Friday, June 1, the Committee will meet on June 5 to discuss and approve these courses.

8. R. Jarvis raised the issue that completion of WIC courses is poorly tracked on graduation audit. The Committee agrees that the Registrar's office should be contacted to resolve this matter. V. Tolar Burton noted that this would also be a good opportunity to ensure that WIC exemptions are tracked.

9. V. Tolar Burton raised the issue of the Cascades Campus offering courses which are WIC approved at other locations as WIC approved OSU courses. This issue of the integrity of the curriculum process should be looked at next year.

The committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
May 15, 2001 Minutes

Support Staff: Ginger Craig

1. Minutes for May 1, 2001 were reviewed and unanimously approved.

2. The Committee reviewed the draft cover letter, checklist and word count form for WIC courses not meeting requirements. Revisions were discussed to make the letter tactful, but clearly state that action is required to continue the WIC designation. The committee also added a statement to emphasize that all WIC elements should be visible in the syllabus given to students.

3. The committee reviewed information summarizing the BCC WIC course reviews. The following courses were approved: BB 493, BI 333, CS 361, ENG 431, FW 481, MUS 325, NFM 46, PS 419, and PSY 440.

4. The timeline and process for removal of WIC designation from Senior Thesis courses was discussed. The committee reaffirmed its decision that proposals for replacement courses will need to be received by November 1, 2002 and that removal of WIC designation from Senior Thesis courses will occur at the end of Summer term, 2003. A different letter for denial of WIC status will need to be drafted for these courses.

5. Action on Seminar courses with WIC designation was discussed. The primary objective is to ensure that each subject meets WIC requirements. The Committee decided that appropriate action would be to deny continued WIC status but provide the opportunity for the departments to correct the deficiencies by doing a syllabus insert to be used with all sections stating what the WIC guidelines are and how they will be met. The History department will be informed which of the seven submitted syllabi for HST 407 did not meet WIC requirements so that they can make appropriate changes.

6. The Committee decided that denial letters could be sent out. Copies of all denial checklists should be kept.

The committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
May 1, 2001 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 1, 2001
Minutes

Members Present: Bonnie Avery, John Dilles, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Christine Snow
Support Staff: Ginger Craig

1. Minutes for April 17, 2001 were reviewed. John Lee noted that WR 411 should be included on the list of approved courses. John Lee also noted that ENG 407 and AMS 407 are the same course; Bob Jarvis and Vicki Tolar Burton had previously approved ENG 407, and Kurt Peters concurred with that approval applying to AMS 407. The minutes were approved with the addition of WR 411.

2. The Committee reviewed the April 17 discussion of the WIC requirements that: 1) students receive feedback on a draft and then revise, and 2) the course includes an informal (ungraded or minimally graded) writing assignment. ACTION: For courses currently lacking one or both of these requirements, the department will be contacted to provide a revised syllabus which includes the missing requirements. The course will then be considered and approved based upon a satisfactory response.

3. The Committee discussed timelines for resubmission of WIC courses not approved in their current format. Considering factors such as catalog deadlines, availability of assistance from the WIC Coordinator, and nine-month appointments, the Committee decided that courses must be resubmitted for approval no later than November 1, 2001. If the courses are resubmitted late, the WIC status will be removed for the 2002/2003 General Catalog. However, the department will have the opportunity to include approved late submissions in the Web version of the Catalog, as well as advertising the course within their department.

4. Review of HST 407 SEMINAR highlighted the issue of WIC courses where the topic can differ each term. Seven different syllabi were submitted for this course. Only two of these seven fully met requirements of a WIC course. The Committee discussed several options to ensure that when topics vary in a WIC course, the WIC requirements are still fully satisfied. The final decision was that the department should submit a generic syllabus for the course which delineates how the WIC requirements will be met. This generic syllabus should be part of any syllabus used with a particular version of HST 407. This format will be used for other WIC seminar courses.

5. The Committee unanimously agreed that Senior Thesis courses do not meet WIC requirements. Those departments whose sole WIC offering is a Senior Thesis course will be given two years to change their curriculum. At the end of the two year period, the WIC status will be removed unless an extension has been requested and approved.

6. John Lee raised the issue that when minor changes are proposed in WIC courses (i.e. title prerequisites, course number), the Committee does not review the entire course but just the change. However, the review date on the Web listing located at http://www.orst.edu/Dept/admindb/bcc/bccwic.htm#WIC is changed. The Committee would like to leave the review date unchanged when minor changes are made. G. Craig will look into options and report back to the Committee.

7. Approval of new Baccalaureate Core courses:

   a. HSTS 422. HISTORICAL STUDIES OF SCIENCE AND POLITICS (3). (tracking #00-B0319) was approved unanimously for Synthesis: Science, Technology & Society.

   b. PS 204. INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS (4). (tracking #01-B0009) was
approved unanimously for Perspectives: Social Processes & Institutions.

The committee adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
Members Present: Christine Snow, Janet Lee, John Lee, and Vicki Tolar Burton

1. John passed out scheduling cards for committee members to fill out in order to find a time when all might meet.

2. The minutes of the April 5, 2001 meeting were approved.

3. John passed out information summarizing the BCC WIC course review with reviewers' and Vicki's comments and recommendations. The committee focused on recommendations for approval by both the lead reviewer and by Vicki Tolar Burton. The following courses have been approved to date: AREC 461, FW 497, CSS 315, MTH 338, MTH 333, GEO 427, CH 463, BOT/BI 489, AIHM 370, IE 497-498, CHE 414, FP 411-2-3, H 476, EXSS 481, H440, SOC416, WR 411, WR 493, WR 495, ENG 407/AMS 407, FR 439, TA 332, PSY 480.

4. An issue for discussion concerned the process by which departments will be notified and requested to send clarification or more information concerning some courses. It is important to streamline this process as much as possible. We will focus on the courses that only require a short memo and move on to ones that require more complicated communications.

5. Committee members discussed the process to be followed with courses that are denied WIC approval. It was recommended that departments be told that the course can not be approved in its current form and that they are given a certain period of time to redo the course and resubmit it for WIC approval.

6. The following question was considered: "Can a sequence of short papers meet the WIC requirement that students receive feedback on a draft and then revise?" The group agreed that while this might be an effective method in some cases, instructors of classes that do not meet this requirement will be asked to require students to revise at least one of the early papers they have written in a course.

7. The following question was considered: "Can a WIC course be recertified without informal (ungraded or minimally graded) writing?" The committee agreed that a WIC course not be recertified if it does not include informal writing. Instructors of classes that do not meet this requirement will be asked to respond by email to the request and explain how they will add this component to the course. A satisfactory email response will then be attached to the syllabus and the course will be approved.

8. The following question was considered: "Can a senior thesis or independent writing project be recertified as a WIC course?" The committee agreed that since WIC requirements involve writing as part of a classroom experience, these courses no longer qualify as WIC courses. Departments affected by this should have at least 2 years to make changes in their curriculum. It is requested that all these recommendations listed above be endorsed by the rest of the BCC committee at our next meeting.

The committee adjourned at 2.50 PM.

Minutes taken and written by Janet Lee
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 5, 2001
Minutes

Members Present: Bonnie Avery, John Lee, John Dilles, Christine Snow, and Vicki Tolar Burton

1. Minutes of 3/19/01 were approved.

2. The committee welcomes the suggestion that Ginger Craig from UAP attend BCC meetings and record the minutes. John Lee has passed this information along to Bob Burton, the newly appointed Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs.

3. Bob Burton will attend a conference about articulation issues on April 25, 2001. John Lee will discuss the BCC concerns regarding baccalaureate core status of transfer courses with Bob. Such input may be useful for the April meeting.

4. Most of today’s meeting centered on a discussion of several of the proposals for continued WIC certification, as part of the BCC review of WIC courses approved before Jan. 1, 1996. Here are issues that the BCC must resolve before proceeding with the recertification process:

   * Can a WIC course be recertified if it has no ungraded writing? (Ungraded writing does not include the revision of a major paper.)

   * Can a sequence of short papers meet the WIC requirement that students receive feedback on a draft (usually of a major paper) and have an opportunity to revise it? (At least three proposals we have received use this alternative method and say it is more effective than revising one major paper. Vicki Tolar Burton reports that there is some national discussion in support of this alternative approach.)

   * Can a senior thesis or independent writing project be recertified as a WIC? (The preliminary agreement of the BCC seems to be that such writing experiences may be very valuable but they are not WIC classes. It was noted that preceding a senior thesis with a WIC should result in a better senior thesis experience. We have two or three such proposals pending.)

5. John Lee will distribute under separate cover a BCC working document summarizing comments and concerns about a few problematic proposals currently under review.

6. The BCC needs to find a new meeting time for Spring Term 2001. This will be arranged through e-mail correspondence. The preliminary consensus was that a Tuesday or Thursday meeting day would be best.

7. In cases where the BCC does not recommend WIC recertification, the committee will extend current WIC approval from 1 to 3 years depending on the situation. (For example, replacement of a current senior thesis WIC (which may be the only WIC in the department) requires developing a full new course that meshes well with the departmental degree requirements, whereas some unsuccessful proposals may need only to add a missing WIC component such as informal writing.)

8. In cases where WICs are not recertified, we should offer the assistance of the WIC director as a source for help and revision that leads to recertification.
April 5, 2001 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 19, 2001
Minutes

Members Present: John Lee (Chair), Bonnie Avery, John Dilles, Bob Jarvis, Janet Lee, Kurt Peters, Christine Snow, Vicki Tolar Burton

Handouts:
--Update on distribution of WIC Review Course Packets to committee members (as yet, no paperwork received for BRR 403, FST 423, RNG 403).
--Update on "BCC Action on WIC Review" and problematic courses.
--WIC Course Review summaries (sent via email) from Dilles, Jarvis, Snow, John Lee.
--Draft letter requesting clarification on word counts, etc.

Meeting Notes:

1. Minutes of March 5, 2001, approved unanimously.

2. Follow-up (Janet Lee): Marcus Borg has replied with a new syllabus for PHL 170 addressing the content question the committee raised fall term.
   Action: PHL 170 [tracking #:00-B035] is approved as a Western Culture/Perspectives BacCore Offering.

3. Spring Term committee will meet weekly on Thursdays, 1-2pm, beginning 4/5/01

4. WIC Review Discussion:

   * Reviewed draft letter for requesting clarification on specific WIC courses. John Lee notes that it would be best to send only one request for additional information when needed. When a phone call is sufficient to find this information, committee members will contact appropriate faculty and note questions and need for additional clarification in their WIC Review summaries which can be requested in a single letter sent by John on behalf of the committee.

   * Word count: Vicki notes that the official guidelines for WIC courses are in the Curricular Procedures Handbook. These are on the WWW at:
     http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/026_Writing_Intensive_Courses-Guidelines.htm

   * Vicki also notes that "Ungraded" and/or "Informally graded" writing as discussed in Criterion 1 of these guidelines is intended to refer to "writing-to-learn" exercises discussed/taught in the WIC seminar. Drafts of complete formal papers even if informally graded do not fit in this definition. There was some discussion of the role of drafts as they relate to the 5000 word minimum total writing and how instructors estimate their course meets this minimum.

   * Several committee members have been given more than one syllabus for a course. We should request a copy of the syllabus use by each instructor noted as teaching courses under review to know they are in keeping with the spirit of the WIC criteria. John Lee suggests that in signing off on these reviews as submitted, it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to oversee WIC courses are taught in a manner consistent with the intent of the Baccalaureate Core. Highlighting this responsibility in our replies to Departments after the WIC review is complete may be needed.
* There was some discussion as to how the narrative in these reviews should be interpreted when in conflict with the syllabus or when the syllabus was lacking writing content specifics information. John will circulate narratives which the primary reviews deem particularly problematic. The committee will look at these during our first meeting in April.

* Related to this, some narratives raise questions related to the need for additional WIC courses for majors such as Liberal Studies -- both to serve the needs of these students and to allow smaller departments to offer WIC courses which require discipline specific knowledge beyond the scope of the non-majors in the course.

5. Next meeting will be April 5th, for those of us who have not already done so, please circulate (via email) summary comments about each WIC course for which you are the primary reviewer. Feel free to contact instructors for simple clarifications, or contact John Lee if more documentation is needed in written form, so that a single request can be sent by the committee in writing to gather it.

--B. Avery
Notetaker.
Members Present: Bonnie Avery, John Lee, Bob Jarvis, John Dilles, Christine Snow, and Janet Lee

1. Minutes of 1/29/01 and 2/19/01 were approved.

2. John Lee distributed packets of courses for WIC review to committee members and reiterated the need for ongoing communication with Vicki Tolar Burton concerning problems.

3. The Math department letter requesting a change in the list of courses satisfying the Math requirement of the Baccalaureate Core was discussed and approved without comment.

4. Vicki Tolar Burton had suggested a WIC review for Phil 407. It was first approved in 1992, although the committee approved a technical change in 1997. It was agreed that John Lee would talk with Peter List and suggest, although not require, the review.

5. The rest of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the review of community college courses for Baccalaureate Core approval. The following issues emerged in the discussion:

   * It is important to recognize that the committee is not being asked to review bacc core courses but approve transfer courses as equivalencies.

   * If the Baccalaureate Core Committee does not approve courses, these courses will be approved elsewhere on an ad hoc basis or by the administration - how will that affect students? What happens when the committee disapproves a course? How is it tracked, if at all? What if the committee is overruled by the administration? At what point, and in what ways, should Faculty Senate be involved in these discussions?

   * Is there a tracking system and expiration dates associated with these courses? What guidelines for evaluating courses should be used given that the committee will most likely be working with inadequate information?

   * What are the long-term implications for this process in light of the streamlining of transfers through the AAOT program? What about advanced placement courses completed by incoming first-year students? How might we develop a fair and appropriate process without jeopardizing student access?

The committee agreed to request a content syllabus as part of every review of a community college course. This is the minimal information necessary for review. In addition, a tracking system should be initiated in order to process any course. The committee will develop new criteria (most likely a subset of the existing criteria) by which to evaluate incoming community college courses. These issues will be presented to the Faculty Senate in our end of the year report.

The next meeting will be in two weeks time at noon on Monday, March 19, 2001.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.55 pm.
Minutes prepared by Janet Lee
Minutes

Members Present: Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Janet Lee, Christine Snow, Vicki Tolar Burton

1. Minutes of 2/12/01 were approved.

2. BI 388 Special Topics in Biology (tracking # 01-B001) was approved unanimously for WIC.

3. John Lee appointed lead reviewers for WIC courses and distributed the remaining WIC documents. Current approaches for approval are:
   - Vicki will send emails to lead reviewers after her review.
   - If both Vicki and the lead reviewer/s agree, and no materials are missing or unclear, the course will be approved.

4. The committee unanimously-approved dropping WIC credit for HSTS 415, 417, 418, 419, 425 effective Fall 2002.

5. The committee unanimously-approved a 1-yr extension of a WIC course review for COMM 459 Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric because the faculty member who is currently on sabbatical. John Lee will send a letter to Speech Communications confirming the requested extension and stating that COMM 459 will lose WIC status effective Spring Term 2002 if review documents are not received by the BCC during Fall Term 2001.

6. Letters will be sent to the 11 non-responders in the current WIC review stating that their responses are due no later than March 16, 2001. If no responses are received by that date, courses will be de-WICd effective June 15, 2001.

7. Next meeting was scheduled for 3/5/01 at 12 pm.

8. Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.

Minutes prepared by CM Snow.
February 12, 2001 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 12, 2001
Minutes

Members Present: John Lee, Kurt Peters, Bob Jarvis, Bonnie Avery, Christine Snow, John Dilles, Janet Lee, Vicki Tolar Burton; Guests Leslie Burns, Michael Mix

Leslie Burns described the history and process of reviewing Community College courses for Bac Core status. The review processes is for determining the equivalency of CC courses for fulfilling Bac Core requirements for transfer students. The process is initiated internally rather than at the request of CCs. Formerly the review was conducted by College Head Advisors. Involving the BCC provides consistency and faculty review. Discussion of the issues of parity with review of OSU courses will continue at the next meeting, and beyond

BI 388 Special Topics in Biology, tracking # 01-B001, a proposed WIC course was reviewed by Vicki Tolar Burton and Michael Mix. After some discussion, the decision about approving this course was delayed until next meeting.

Z 453, Scientific Writing and Behavioral Observations, tracking # 00-B025, was approved as a WIC course.

Vicki Tolar Burton distributed a form intended to streamline the process for reviewing WIC courses.

Next meeting is schedule for Monday, 19 February 2001 from 1200 - 1300.

Meeting adjourned at 1310.

Notetaker: Bob Jarvis
Members Present: Bonnie Avery, John Dilles, Bob Jarvis, Janet Lee, John Lee (Chair), Kurt Peters, Christine Snow


2. Updates by Chair Lee.

   Next meeting Monday, Feb. 12, 12:00-12:50 p.m.

   Committee members should review the BI 388 proposal, discuss by e-mail, and be prepared to discuss on Feb. 12 meeting.

   WIC reviews will be handled by the committee as with other review items. One committee member will serve as "lead reviewer" in charge of each WIC file. Vicki Tolar Burton plans to review all files, but BCC will initiate reviews.

3. Consideration of Portland Community College courses submitted for Bac Core transfer status at OSU. Much discussion centering on concern that currently submitted course proposal materials are commonly not at same level of completeness nor generally in OSU’s Bac Core format so that the BCC is not able to assess the proposals at the same level as OSU courses. Chair Lee will look into writing a letter to Academic Affairs or the appropriate OSU administrative officer(s) to express the BCC’s concerns.

   Action: No action taken on PCC courses, pending response from administration.

4. Discussed HSTS 440 The History of Psychotherapy (tracking # 00-B028) for Bac Core course in category "Synthesis: Science, Technology, & Society"

   Action: Approved Unanimously.

5. Adjourned, 12:48 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday February 12, 2001 in MU Council Room from 12 to 12:50 PM.

Minutes prepared by John Dilles
February 22, 2001 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 22, 2001
Minutes

Members Present: Bonnie Avery, John Dillis, Bob Jarvis, Janet Lee, John Lee (Chair), Christine Snow

Lee will have copies of the BI 388 proposal sent to the committee. Vicki Tolar Burton will report on this WIC proposal at our next meeting 1/29/00.

Lee will discuss with Tolar Burton the procedures for evaluating the WIC review materials that will begin arriving on February 1. Questions of sharing the workload will be addressed. The BCC thought it would be helpful to have an initial screen of proposals into two (perhaps three) categories such as obvious renewals, proposals that are solid but need some attention, and more problematic proposals (perhaps those where renewal is in doubt).

Action on Course Proposals:

AREC 461 Agricultural and Food Policy Issues WIC (00-B036)

This is a proposal to add a new prerequisite that can be used in place of an existing prerequisite. The proposed change makes the course more broadly accessible and is supported by the WIC Director.

Action: Approved

FOR 485 Consensus and Natural Resources for STS (00-B031)

This is a proposal to add Forestry to a currently approved STS cross-listed course. This course is team-taught by faculty from the cross-listed departments and was carefully reviewed by the BCC within the past two year.

Action: Approved

PHL 170 The Idea of God for WC (00-B035)

This is a proposal for a new WC course. There was considerable discussion about the point raised by the CLA Curriculum Committee about a "cross-cultural" versus a western cultural primary focus for the course. Our understanding from the correspondence attached to the proposal is that the primary focus is in fact on western culture but that the proposed syllabus does not accurately reflect that emphasis. The BCC is favorably inclined to approve the course pending receipt of a revised syllabus that clarifies the true focus of the course. Lee and Lee will follow up.

Action: Deferred pending receipt of a revised syllabus.

GS 108 Introduction to Oceanography (Southwestern Oregon CC) Perspectives/Physical Science

The materials provided are insufficient for action. Dillis will try to obtain a content syllabus for the corresponding course at OSU to share with the SOCC instructor.
Lee will call the SOCC instructor and request a content outline adequate for the BCC to judge whether the course meets the criteria for a physical science perspectives course. If possible Lee will get a written response to the criteria. 

Action: Deferred.

Next Meeting: Monday January 29, 2001 in MU Council Room from 12 to 12:50 PM.
November 20, 2000 Minutes

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Members Present: Bonnie Avery, Janet Lee, John Lee (Chair), Kurt Peters; Vicki Tolar Burton representing WIC

Minutes from 11/6/00
Action: Approved as distributed.

The Committee revised the draft documents for the WIC course review. It was decided that the review packets should be distributed this term and that review materials will be due back on January 29, 2001. Distribution of the materials will be handled by the Curriculum Coordinator to assist with prompt delivery to the faculty. Review materials will be returned to the Curriculum Coordinator for Academic Programs.

Lee will find the web resource that lists all baccalaureate core courses and their approval dates in order to determine which WIC courses are subject to review; that is, which WIC courses were approved before January 1, 1996.

It was agreed that only three copies of the each final proposal should be made by Academic Affairs, instead of a full set of copies for each committee member as was done for WC last year. Lee will keep one copy, the WIC Director another, and the committee member responsible for initial review of a particular course will get the third copy. We will conduct the review by the lead reviewer method, just as we review new baccalaureate core course proposals. The full committee will review problematic courses.

One full set of review documents will be saved and given to the Valley Library to assist in identifying faculty whose students may benefit from a library tour.

The Baccalaureate Core Bylaws were distributed with proposed changes to item #4. Assuming the committee is comfortable with the changes, which will be determined by email correspondence this term, the proposed changes will be forwarded to the Committee on Committees. Lee will send copies of distributed materials to members not present.

We will not meet in two week on December 4, 2000, unless an emergency arises.

We will continue to meet during Winter Term 2001 from 12 noon until 2 PM on (alternate) Mondays, barring conflicts not yet known. So, save this time slot for Baccalaureate Core Committee meetings, if not already previously committed. First meeting of 2001 is on Monday January 22.
November 6, 2000 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 6, 2000
Minutes

Members Present: Christine Snow, Bonnie Avery, Janet Lee, John Lee (Chair), Kurt Peters; Vicki Tolar Burton representing WIC

Minutes from 10/23/00
Action: Approved as distributed.

AREC 434 (WIC) (00-B021) reviewed by Tolar Burton for Committee and approval recommended. Review by Snow recommended approval. Approved unanimously by Committee.

ECON 463 (WIC) (00-B016) Tolar Burton explained need for "express" consideration, and cited prior WIC involvement in proposal re: recommendation for Committee approval. Review by John Lee postponed, and awaiting e-mail response by Committee to Lee review. Approved, pending e-mail confirmation to Chair John Lee by Committee members. There was no decent to the e-mail review so this course is approved unanimously by the committee.

ANTH 251 (DPD) (00-B024) Avery gave review for the Committee. DPD seen by reviewer as addressed "very well" by proposed course. The proposal passed with an unanimous vote.

Z 414 (WIC) (00-B023) Reviewed by Janet Lee, with comments on WIC requirements from Tolar Burton. The Committee expressed concern regarding relative values in course grading based on variable writing format requirements. Committee voted approval, pending John Lee's call to proposer to clarify grading requirements. Clarification has been obtained, virtually the entire grade is based on student writing. The course is approved by the committee.

Actions: Extensive discussion of BCC-WIC review cover letter. Tolar Burton passed out and commented on "Instructions For WIC Preparation," followed by discussion of a focus on what information was really sought by this review. Graduate v. Undergraduate, freshman v. Others, and a major concern for WIC accountability in the sections of large classes, were main issues. A suggestion for student input was made. Snow suggested a review of the BCC cover letter re: the department enrollment form and checklist. General confusion was expressed by Committee re: the departmental enrollment form; all agreed there should be work done to improve the form. Committee tabled discussion to reconsider in two weeks.

Meeting adjourned by Chair Lee at 1:40.

The next meeting is November 20, 2000 from 12 - 2:00 PM, place MU 209
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 23, 2000 Minutes

Attendees: Bonnie Avery, John Dilles, Bob Jarvis, Janet Lee, John Lee, Kurt Peters

1. Minutes from 10/9/00
Action: Approved as distributed.

2. Review of BCC procedures for review of new courses.
Action: We agreed to continue the lead reviewer method use last year. Everyone will look over proposals before the meeting. John will assign an individual to each course proposal who will review the proposal in greater depth, and offer an overview and any concerns she/he may have to the full group for discussion as needed. Action on individual proposals taken by the group may be to approve, to deny, or to defer action until additional information is available to approve or deny the request.

3. Courses for consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>BacCore Category</th>
<th>Tracking No.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HST 104</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>00 B009</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 105</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>00 B010</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 106</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>00 B011</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW 340</td>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>00 B015</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(John Lee will ask for additional information addressing BCC criteria.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 420</td>
<td>STS</td>
<td>00 B022</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 401</td>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>00 B018</td>
<td>Approved removal from WIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 101</td>
<td>Perspectives:PhysSci</td>
<td>(LBCC)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 102</td>
<td>Perspectives:PhysSci</td>
<td>(LBCC)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 103</td>
<td>Perspectives:PhysSci</td>
<td>(LBCC)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Preparation for 5 year review of WIC courses: Bob Jarvis brought samples of the draft cover letter, instructions, and forms he developed for the Western Cultures review last Spring. Vickie Tolar-Burton recommends using the enrollment information for the WIC review this year.

Actions:
--Bob will meet with Vickie, to review this material.
--Committee members should review materials and respond to Bob by Wednesday (10/25) with their input/changes. Bob will be out of town Nov 1-7.
--John Lee will ask Christina Richards for a copy of the actual letter sent out for the Western Cultures review as it may differ slightly from our draft.

The next meeting is November 6, 2000 from 12 - 2:00 PM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 9, 2000 Minutes


1. It was decided to review the WIC courses in the Baccalaureate Core during this academic year. Remember to read carefully the WIC guidelines and other information on WIC courses related to baccalaureate core. It was estimated that about 100 WIC courses will be submitted for review. There are about 700 students in programs not affiliated with a single department, for example the pre-professional programs in science, the biology B.S. program, and pharmacy and about 450 Liberal Studies B.A. and B.S. majors. These students need WIC courses but do not have official home departments. There may be special problems regarding providing appropriate WICS for these students. Also we will have to deal with the fact that many WIC courses may not meet the class size guidelines for a WIC course.

2. Bob Jarvis will share with Vicki Tolar Burton the materials used by the committee last year to collect information during the review of WC courses. Bob and Vicki will begin to develop materials to send out for this year's review of WIC courses. Expect some preliminary materials and further discussion at our October 23 meeting. The goal is to get out review materials to departments during the second half of November. Then we could expect materials to be returned to the committee by early February and we could begin our review of those materials in mid February.

3. Leslie Burns commended the committee on its review of WC courses last year. That process went smoothly from the point of view of Academic Affairs. Next, Leslie presented two items to the committee and sought its endorsement for each:

   - The committee endorsed the proposal for a new direct transfer A.S. Degree from LBCC. Students completing this degree would complete virtually the same lower division baccalaureate core requirements as do OSU students and would enter OSU with junior standing and all lower division baccalaureate core requirements satisfied.

   - The committee endorsed proposed changes in Academic Regulation 2 related to direct transfer degrees, such as the LBCC degree above, with the proviso that the sentence in part (a) of the regulations relating to Synthesis and WIC courses be modified to read: "In addition, they must complete the upper division Synthesis and WIC areas of the Core."
4. Leslie mentioned that a similar direct transfer degree is under discussion with PCC and that there may be similar agreements with other Oregon community colleges in the future.

5. The Committee concurs with the editorial change made by the EC regarding our proposal of Spring Term 2000 to revise the Fitness Course Criteria of the Baccalaureate Core. It is expected that these proposed changes will come before the Faculty Senate in the near future.

6. Information on the current Standing Rules of the committee and the committee's proposal to the EC for changes to the Rules was distributed. There was a brief discussion. Christine Snow will check with Vicki Tolar Burton regarding possible rewording of the proposed changes to address concerns about the Writing Advisory Board.

7. The next meeting is October 23, 2000 from 12 - 2:00 PM. The first item of business will be HST 104, 105, 106 (know last spring as 111, 112, 113). You have last springs correspondence related to this course.
June 8, 2000 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

June 8, 2000
Minutes

Present: Jarvis, Lee, Reddy, Scanlan (Chr.), Snow Absent: Avery, Peters

1. Minutes of the meetings of May 11 and 25 were approved with some small revisions in the minutes of May 11, item 2.

2. The committee discussed the proposal to revise the present criterion 1 for courses in the Perspectives categories. The goal was to more accurately address the committee's concerns about course accessibility for a wide-range of students than is provided by the current restriction to lower-division courses. The committee agreed on the following revisions.

New Perspectives Criterion 1:
be at least three credits

New Perspectives Criterion 2:
be a 100, 200, or 300 level course structured so that it is accessible to lower-division students across a range of majors and colleges.

(renumber current criterion 2 to 3, 3 to 4, etc.)

The proposed changes will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for Senate action.

3. ES 334 Asian American Literature (99-B017) was approved for Perspectives: Literature and the Arts.

4. The committee discussed the suggestion from Leslie Burns that the Director of Undergraduate Academic Programs serve as a nonvoting ex-officio member of the Bac Core Committee. There was general agreement that this is appropriate. The Chair will recommend to the Executive Committee that this provision be incorporated in the Standing Rules revision.

5. The following action was taken on community college courses:
   Chemeketa C.C. - HST 199B Modern Japanese History APPROVED for Perspectives: Cultural Diversity

   Lane C.C. - ES 101 Introduction to Ethnic Studies I DENIED for Perspectives: Cultural Diversity because the course does not focus on specific cultural groups. APPROVED for Perspectives: DPD

   Lane C. C. - ES 102 Introduction to Ethnic Studies II APPROVED for Perspectives: DPD

6. Christine Snow reported that Tony Wilcox of HHP had agreed with changes suggested by the BCC to the revised Fitness criteria. The revised criteria will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for action.

7. The Chair thanks all of the committee members for their thoughtfulness
and hard work over the past year.

submitted by Michael Scanlan
May 25, 2000 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 25, 2000 Minutes

Members attending: Scanlan (Chr), Reddy, Snow, Peters, Avery, Lee, Tolar-Burton Member absent: Jarvis

1. Amendments to/approval of minutes from 5/11/00 meeting will be delayed to include concerns expressed by Bob Jarvis (email 5/15) regarding HST 111, 112, 113 and implicit guidelines committee members are using to evaluate "primary focus" as it relates to Cultural Diversity criteria.

2. There is a question from Leslie Burns concerning the course description and prerequisite changes (for publication in the General Catalog). The committee noted that adding new prerequisites could affect the accessibility of a course to a broad range of students. For that reason, we suggest these changes be submitted for review by the Bac Core Committee. The committee did not see a need to review proposals to remove prerequisites and/or to change the language of the course description.

3. Scanlan noted BA 465/Hort 490/H490 reviewed at length last year was adding a cross listing in Engineering. The Committee agreed this change did not warrant a further review by this committee.

4. ART 469 (00-B008) was approved as an addition to the WIC course selection.

5. Vickie Tolar Burton suggested the committee consider undertaking a review of the WIC section of the Baccalaureate Core next year.

6. The committee reviewed the redraft of the Fitness criteria. Changes will be forwarded to Tony Wilcox.

7. ENG 201, 202, 203 (5 year review): The supplemental information provided by the English Department, answers the committee's questions regarding the breadth of this series of courses in relation to the criteria for Western Cultures. While the specialist may find the relevance of a course self-evident, the committee notes it can only act on the information it receives. In this case we regret the omission of a more detailed course syllabus.

8. The committee completed its review of those Western Culture courses taught by Foreign Languages at the 300 level in languages other than English. The enrollment summaries prepared by Bob Jarvis and supplemental information provided by the Foreign Language Department affirm the accessibility of these courses to lower division students and non-majors. The committee will address what it considers to be the spirit of the "lower division" criteria at our next meeting and suggest revised wording.

9. Next meeting will be 6/8/00 in MU204. We will be reviewing the remaining Community College course proposals and criterion 1 of the Perspectives category.
May 11, 2000 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 11, 2000
Minutes

Attendees: Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, and Christine Snow

1. Minutes of 4/27/00 meeting were approved.

2. Discussion of HST 111, 112, 113 for Cultural Diversity. Roughly half (five of ten weeks) of each of 111 and 112 are devoted to western culture and as much as 80% of 113 may be devoted to western culture. It is not clear the course is focused primarily on CD. Most other courses already approved for CD seemed to be more narrowly focused on CD. Some discussion of western culture is needed and appropriate for comparative purposes. The question is how much. The committee discussed the issue of whether a certain percentage of a course must be devoted to nonwestern culture for it to count as CD. There was no agreement reached on this. A danger with too much study of western culture in a CD course is that the CD aspects could be trivialized. We have the common situation where a course cuts across two Bac Core categories. Deferred for more information.

3. Initial discussion of the draft of the new fitness criteria: Lecture and lab can be separate courses in the new proposal. This is done mainly for more choice and to enable other colleges/departments such as EXSS, Public Health, Nutrition, etc to offer lecture courses that would satisfy the new criteria. Choice was a major concern for students and some advisors. A possible drawback is that students won't tie together principles learned in the lecture to the lab activities. Criterion 7 needs to be clarified. It needs to be clear how a lab activity differs from a PAC.

4. Eng 201, 202, 203 Shakespeare as Western Culture. It is not clear from the materials submitted that this course has WC as an important element. We are seeking more information from the English Department.

5. Next meeting May 25, 2000 at 11:00 to 12:30
April 27, 2000 Minutes
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Attendees: Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, Christine Snow

Agenda/Notes:

1. Minutes of April 13, 2000 meeting were approved.

2. Discussion on 300-level courses in the perspectives category. Questions were raised about accessibility and potential for migration of courses to the 300 level. A draft revision to the criteria was discussed. No action was taken.

3. Geog 105 (Chemeketa Comm. College) was approved for the Physical Science category

4. Fitness Course Criteria Revision by Tony Wilcox was handed out and will be discussed at the next meeting.

5. Michael Scanlan will contact the English and Foreign Language Departments about Western Culture courses under review that were flagged at the last meeting.

Next meeting: May 11 at 11am

Notetaker: Satish Reddy
April 13, 2000 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Attendees: Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Mike Scanlan (chr), Christine Snow

1. Minutes of March 30 meeting approved.

2. Information Notes:
   * Mike met with Faculty Senate Executive Committee this morning (4/13) to discuss the committee's HHP 231 report. Follow-up: Exec Committee will ask Tony Wilcox to draft a set of criteria for a Fitness for Health BacCore Category which would allow for a menu of courses. This draft will be sent to this committee for review and response and taken to the Faculty Senate for approval in the Fall (2000).
   * Mike indicated that, acting on behalf of the committee, he approved a request that "departmental permission" be added to the prerequisites for HDFS 461 (This is an existing WIC course). The committee agrees this change is not a problem.
   * Mike noted that we have received a reply from Bob Lillie concerning our denial of GEO 307 for STS. He intends to resubmit the course at a future date after further development to highlight its social content.

3. New:
   * H 210: US Health Care System was approved as Social Processes and Institutions (Perspectives) offering.

4. Five Year Review: Western Culture

   Committee members discussed a number of types of problems which were identified in conducting the review of Western Culture courses five or more years old. These included treatment of courses that are 300-level, that are taught in a foreign (non-English) language, that are dual-listed as both Western culture and Lit. & Arts. Mike will synthesize a list of these issues and affected Western Culture courses for further consideration by the committee at its next meeting.

5. Mike/Committee members will draft a statement to address concerns we have had related to interpreting the Baccalaureate Criteria and how we might resolve questions of evolving interpretation as they affect courses undergoing the five year review.

6. Committee members will review the DPD Task Force Report before the next meeting prior to its formal presentation to the Faculty Senate on May 5. Mike will contact us by e-mail if we need to act on it earlier than 4/27.

7. Mike passed out a draft of a letter (on behalf of the committee) encouraging faculty teaching Bac Core courses to attend one of the upcoming workshop sessions on writing student learning outcomes in May. Committee members will send editorial suggestions to Mike.

8. Committee members should look over the BCC Exit Strategy and let Mike know of any remaining issues the committee needs to address between now and the end of the term.
Meeting adjourned 12:25. Next meeting will be April 27, 11:00 AM.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 30, 2000
Minutes

Attendees: Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Mike Scanlan Absent: Christine Snow

1. Minutes of March 15 meeting were approved

2. The following actions were taken:

* RHP 482 and NE 482 - Proposed for changes in number, credits, description, prerequisites and crosslisting. After much discussion about what the committee was reviewing, a consensus was reached that we were judging only the effect of the proposed changes on the WIC status of these previously approved WIC courses. The determination of whether the courses meet the current WIC criteria will be judged during the 5 year review. The proposed changes were approved.

* PSY 470 - Proposed change in credits with addition of a lab. Approved proposed changes as not adversely affecting the WIC status of the course.

* GEO 307 - Proposed for STS. Committee discussion indicated the course was heavy on science, but light on society and technology. The STS criteria call for a balance and integration of the three components. Additionally, the prerequisite of a geology course restricts the broad availability of the course to students across the campus. Request denied.

* TA 330, 331 - Request to drop as WIC courses. According to Vicki Tolar Burton, there are sufficient WIC courses available in TA. Request approved.

* ES 334 - Proposed for Cultural Diversity. BCC had previously requested justification for offering the course at the 300 level. The response indicated that the instructor did not understand the nature of the requested justification. Returned for clarification.

* The chair offered plans for completing the 5 year review of Western Culture courses. Each committee member will review 7 (Mike gets 8) courses. Reviews will begin at the next meeting and will focus on courses identified by lead reviewers as needing full committee review. A list of courses with assigned reviewers was passed out.

* Learning Outcomes Workshop - Following discussions with Robby Robson and Bob Burton, Mike proposed that the BCC send a letter to instructors of BC courses informing them of the workshop and urging them to attend. The explicit statement of learning outcomes is particularly relevant to the BC criteria. Mike will draft a letter for review at the next meeting.

* The meeting schedule for the term will be alternate Thursdays at 1100. The next meeting is 13 April.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. Notes by Bob Jarvis
Members Present: Avery, Jarvis, Reddy, Scanlan, Snow  
Members Absent: Lee, Peters  

The minutes from the meeting of March 6 were approved.

The entire meeting was devoted to review, editing, and correction of the report for the Executive Committee on the Fitness Requirement of the Bac Core.

The Chair records that the members of the committee did an excellent job on this difficult task. The Chair thanks them all for their diligence. In particular, John Lee and Bonnie Avery made extensive contributions to the drafting and revision of the report. A special contribution was made by Christine Snow of HHP. Her expertise on HHP 231 was a valuable resource to the committee in our discussions.

Thank you all.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 6, 2000 Minutes


Agenda/Notes:

1. Minutes of February 28, 2000 meeting approved

2. RHP/NE 482 not reviewed since some committee members did not receive the proposal

3. PSY 470 not reviewed since some committee members did not receive the proposal

4. Chemeketa CC ENG 269 Environmental Literature: APPROVED for Literature & Arts

5. Linn-Benton CC ANS 121 Introduction to Animal Science: NOT APPROVED for Biological Science category, since the course contains little fundamental science


7. Linn-Benton CC HUM 101 Prehistory to Middle Ages: APPROVED for Western Culture, but NOT APPROVED for Cultural Diversity.

8. Linn-Benton CC HUM 102 Renaissance Through the Enlightenment: APPROVED for Western Culture, but NOT APPROVED for Literature & Arts.

9. Linn-Benton CC HUM 103 The Romantic Era to Contemporary Society: Approved for Western Culture, but NOT APPROVED for Literature & Arts.

10. Educational Effectiveness Workshop (Student Learning Outcomes, etc)

- Discussion on how BacCore Committee can participate in Workshop.

- Suggested that planners of the workshop include a session on writing learning outcomes and their assessment which meet the Bac Core criteria, particularly the "emphasize critical thinking, criterion.

- Further discussion with Robby Robson will take place

Next Meeting: Wednesday March 15 at 3pm.

Notetaker: Satish Reddy
Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 28, 2000
Minutes

Members Present: Chair Scanlan, Avery, Snow, Lee, Peters, Jarvis and Reddy.

Meeting called to order by Chair Scanlan.

Minutes of 2/21 meeting approved.

Chair proposed a tentative agenda for finishing all pending tasks by end of the Winter Term. This includes meeting on Monday 3/6 at 4:00 pm in MU 204

A discussion of HHP 231 followed with all committee members participating: Snow gave a review of lab plans for 2000-01; Chair gave a review of "Student Choice" issues; Jarvis suggested that the requirement of "Fitness" be more generalized.

Reddy summarized the Committee's feelings that not enough pertinent information has yet been developed regarding HHP 231 for proper action to ensue.

No further work on HHP 231 will be done on 3/6.

A report on the Fitness Requirement will be finalized at a committee meeting in Finals Week.

Chair Scanlan will send out assignments for 3/6.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm
February 21, 2000 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 21, 2000
Minutes

Members Present: Michael Scanlan (Chair), Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Satish Reddy, Christine Snow, and Bob Burton, ex officio.

1. Meeting called to order at 4:00 and the minutes of 2/7/00 were approved.

2. Bob Burton, liaison from the Executive Committee, brought three agenda items to the committee: 1) The change in the standing rules for the BCC that were sent to the EC last year were too late for approval. 2) Since there is a review of the BCC by the Committee on Committees (COC), the standing rule changes will be addressed by the COC and forwarded to the Faculty Senate. This will also be a time to address other issues/concerns of the BCC. 3) The EC awaits the BCC report on HHP 231. It is concerned that during the accreditation process next year this course is an area of vulnerability for OSU.

3. Course proposal: BI-235 from Mt. Hood Community College was approved for Perspectives Biological Science

4. Discussion of HHP 231 regarding criteria and the course itself. Michael Scanlan had prepared a draft of issues relating to the course. The BCC will add more information to the draft and attempt to finalize it at the next meeting.

5. Next meeting was scheduled for 2/28/00 at 4:00 pm.

6. Meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.

Minutes prepared by CM Snow.
February 7, 2000 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Members Present: John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, and Bonnie Avery

1. Minutes of 1/24/00 meeting were approved.

2. Scanlan will meet with the Head Advisors to gather input concerning HHP 231. Some things to check on are student attitude toward the course, the desirability of choice in satisfying the health requirement, and the method of testing out of the course. Basically the idea is just to see what opinions and information the Head Advisors may have for us.

3. Scanlan will begin a draft of a report on HHP 231.

4. AIHM 481 approved for WIC

5. GEOG 105 from Chemeketa CC. Committee requested more information via Leslie Burns.

6. GEOG 106 and 107 not approved for baccalaureate core credit as Cultural Diversity.

7. DPD Task Force Report - Lee reported on the progress of the task force and provided draft versions of the proposed criteria and narrative. It was tentatively agreed that the committee would endorse the new criteria and narrative.

8. CSS 205 was approved as satisfying the biological science requirement of the baccalaureate core. CSS 205 was already approved as satisfying the physical sciences requirement. It was noted in the discussion that, although most courses are approved for only one area, the criteria for the perspectives area in science do not preclude that a course may be appropriate for both areas. In particular, it was noted that there are no separate criteria for physical and biological science categories. The intent of the criteria seems to be that a student get a range of science exposure. The dual character of CSS 205 seems to meet that intent.

10. Next meeting will be Mon. 2/21/00.
Members Present: Scanlan, Avery, Peters, Reddy, Scanlan, Lee, Jarvis
Guests: Gordon Matzke (Geosciences), President, Faculty Senate; Dave Myrold (Crop and Soil Science)

1. Minutes of BCC meeting of 1/10/00 were approved.

2. Discussion led by Chair Scanlan of a possible reconsideration of the policies of the Baccalaureate Core Committee for web posting in the curricular procedures pages.

3. Presentation by Dave Myrold regarding the need to double list CSS 205. Discussion focused on issues of divergence in biological science, physical science, and synthesis courses. Dave Myrold presented the committee a consumers guide version of the CSS 205 course syllabus to consider. Further discussion was tabled to next meeting.

4. A review and discussion of FCS 201 (tabled 1/10) as a DPD course and already approved by Susan Shaw, was led by Avery. FCS 201 was approved as DPD.

5. ENSC/BOT 479 (approved for WIC 1/10; STS tabled to 1/24) was discussed and approved for STS.

6. ES 216 as DPD discussion led by Lee and approved.

7. ES 243 (CD) discussion led by Jarvis and approved for addition of DPD.

8. Chair Scanlan led review and discussion of HHP 231 and presentation on 1/10 by HHP Chair Tony Wilcox. Discussion touched on the role of the Undergraduate Student Senate about the issue (Scanlan), questions of the need for a single or multiple course offering (Jarvis), and history and observations of HHP 231 (Matzke). Chair Scanlan will contact advisors for additional input to the Baccalaureate Core Committee report to the Faculty Senate on HHP 231, generally targeted for completion by end of Winter term 2000.

9. Chair Scanlan briefly commented on the no reply to date from Communications Department on the WIC status of COMM 432.

10. Next meeting is 2/7 at 4:00 pm, MU #205

11. Meeting adjourned at 5:30.
Members Present: Avery, Peters, Reddy, Scanlan
Guest: Anthony Wilcox, HHP

1. Minutes of BCC meeting of 12/6/99 were approved.

2. Committee members reviewed the cover letter and other material to be sent to departments for the review of Western Culture courses. Two minor corrections were made. The letter will be sent out later in the week by UAP to affected departments.

3. Discussion with Anthony Wilcox about HHP 231. Prof. Wilcox is the coordinator for HHP 231. He presented the committee with an overview and the rationale for the HHP 231 course, along with informational material such as student assessment scores. He also responded to questions by the members present. Because a number of members were absent, he has provided copies of his overview and informational material for them.

4. Prerequisite changes for AREC 433 (Contemporary Global Issues) were approved. (99-B037)

5. FCS 201 was reviewed as a DPD course. Since not all members had gotten the course material, final consideration was postponed to the next meeting.

6. The chair presented material relevant to the double status of ENSC/BOT 479 as both STS and WIC. Since a number of the members who were concerned about this were not present, final consideration was postponed until the next meeting.

7. Meeting adjourned at 10:40.

submitted by Michael Scanlan
December 6, 1999 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

December 6, 1999 Minutes

Present: Bonnie Avery, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, and Christine Snow

Agenda/Notes:


2. Consider BOT/ENSC 479 for both STS and WIC (Snow):
   After some discussion, the committee would like further information about how accessible this course (a capstone for majors in Environmental Science) would be for the majority of the student body.

Actions:

As an STS course: Postpone decision until Scanlon can investigate and report back on:

- to number of students campus wide with the prerequisite (one year of Chemistry or one year of biology);
- number of WIC/STS combined courses with prerequisites;
- whether students in the major can take this for both WIC and STS credit fulfillment in which case the purpose of the Baccore requirement to broaden the outlook of the major is in question.

As a WIC course: Seems to be a strong WIC course and currently there are not many WIC courses offered via to students in Distance Education: Approved.


Action: Approved.

4. Consider ES445 (Scanlan): Some discussion of title and clarification on use of use of "science" offered by Peters. Prerequisites (ES101 and ES201) are not necessary and will be removed.

Action: Approved without prerequisites required.

5. Update on HHP 231 review: Enrollment and petition/challenge information from the Registrar's office was sent to the committee last week. Snow noted that the course evaluation survey results have been given to Christina Richards who will make them available to the Committee for review. Scanlan will be contacting the ASOSU Senate on behalf of the committee. He notes that our timeframe requires a response and recommendation to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee by the end of Winter Term. Lee suggests considering using the new list-serv for Faculty Senate members to solicit guided feedback.

6. Committee meetings will continue on alternate Mondays from 9:30-11am Winter term beginning January 10, 2000, unless Jarvis is unable to accommodate this time slot.

(Notetaker: Avery)
Present: Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, Susan Shaw, Christine Snow

Agenda/Notes:

0. Minutes of 11/15/99 meeting: approved with minor revision

1. Discussion of the Discrimination, Power, and Difference (DPD) criteria:

   - Susan Shaw was present at the beginning of the meeting to get feedback on the proposed DPD criteria.

   - Bob Jarvis asked why the criteria focus on discrimination in the United States. Answer: since the bulk of OSU students are Americans the goal of the DPD requirement is to force students to confront discrimination "at home", as opposed to elsewhere in the world.

   - There were questions about criteria 8 and 9 relating to interactive pedagogies and course numbering. In addition, there were questions on enrollment caps in the courses.

   - Suggestions were made for revisions to the DPD narrative.

   - Questions were asked about the next steps in the process.

2. Discussion of Bob Jarvis' suggested drafts for:

   - Cover letter to Department Heads
   - Instructions for 5 year Review of Bac Core Courses
   - Enrollment Information

Further revisions were suggested.

3. Review Procedure for HHP 231

   - Christine Snow is getting student evaluations from the department
   - Michael Scanlan is getting info from the registrar on enrollment and number of students testing out.

   - Questions was raised on whether Bac Core committee should undertake survey and the form of survey. Suggested that information be gathered first before proceeding.
4. Courses Requests Chemeketa Com Coll. HST 228: approved for Western Culture category Chemeketa Com. Coll. CHLA 203: approved for Cultural Diversity category

OSU ENSC/BOT 479: This course is proposed as both a Science, Technology, and Society (STS) course and a WIC course. It is to be offered online. Christine Snow brought up a concern that it may not be appropriate to place the course in both categories, since WIC courses in a particular field are taken principally by students majoring in that field, whereas STS courses are intended for a wider audience. John Lee echoed this concern. Scanlan pointed out that a number of existing STS and CGI courses are also WIC courses.

No action was taken.


Notetaker: Satish Reddy
November 15, 1999 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 15, 1999 Minutes

Present: Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, and Christine Snow

Agenda/Notes:

1. Minutes of 11/1/99 meeting: approved with minor revisions.

2. Discussion of review procedure for HHP 231: reviewed the student concerns raised in Gordon Matzke letter to the Committee and the reply sent by Tony Wilcox. Many of the issues raised relate back to the lack of choice available for meeting the Fitness requirement and the resultant large class size. The committee agreed to gather further information about student reaction to HHP 231 in the following ways:
   --Scanlan will locate the information gathered in student focus groups last year;
   --Snow will locate the course evaluation forms for the past two years and summarize the responses to the open ended questions concerning course content;
   --Scanlan will find out from the Registrar how many students have tested out of the course in recent years.
   --Scanlan will invite Wilcox to meet with the Committee Winter term and decide what further information we might need to gather before making a recommendation to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

3. Review/discussion of Jarvis' suggested drafts for:
   --Cover letter to Department Head;
   --Instructions for 5 year Review of Bac Core Courses;
   --Enrollment Information

Jarvis will incorporate the editorial changes suggested by the committee to the three drafts and bring them to the next meeting.

4. Course Review:

   a. BIOE 459 for WIC. Discussion lead by Kurt Peters.
      Action: BIOE 459 was approved

   b. Chemeketa Community College: HST 228 (Bonnie), CHLA 203 (Satish);
      and BOT/ENSC 479 (Christine) will be discussed at the next meeting.

5. Next Meeting November 29, 1999

(Notetaker: Avery)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 1, 1999
Minutes

Present: Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Michael Scanlan, and Christine Snow

Agenda/Notes:

1. Minutes of 10/18/99 meeting were approved.

2. Refinement of policy concerning 300-level Perspective courses was deferred until our next meeting.

3. We are charged with reviewing the HHP baccalaureate core requirement this year. Mike Scanlan will summarize our charge and give some background at the next meeting.

4. Periodic Review of Baccalaureate Core Courses: We discussed the information provided by Bob Jarvis about the size of the review job and key issues to address. Courses approved more than 5 years ago should be reviewed. It was decided that courses should be review by category - all WC courses one year, all CD courses the next, and so on. This seemed manageable with perhaps 20 to 40 courses being reviewed each year.

The review format should be roughly as follows: (a) A cover letter is sent explaining why a review is needed and outlining the process. There should be a check-off indicating whether the department wishes to offer the course in the future. (b) A form is developed that lists each criterion for the category and give space for a short response. Total response length should be limited and a syllabus should be requested. (c) The form should have a "data section" with a table that can be filled in giving term taught, total enrollment, and enrollment by class rank and by college, for the last three times the class was taught.

The review process should begin Winter Term 2000, if possible.

5. Three courses from Southwestern Oregon Community College were approved for Cultural Diversity: (1) Humanities 204 "World Mythology and Religion: Archetypal and Shamanic Mythologies", (2) Humanities 205 "World Mythology and Religion: India and Far East, and (3) Humanities 206 "World Mythology and Religion: Middle East and Western.

6. One course, GS 101, from Lane Community College was not approved. GS 101 is primarily a field-trip base class and it was difficult to evaluate the academic depth and the extent to which the baccalaureate core requirements for the biological sciences were met. The committee would reconsider the course if more content information were provided. The instructor should provide lab packets and exams so we can better judge the level of work required in the course.

7. CSS 205 Soils Sustainable Ecosystems was approved for Perspectives under physical sciences and was not approved for biological sciences. The course is more focused on the physical aspects of soils and deals with some biological implications. In a general discussion, the committee reaffirmed its belief that the intent of the Perspectives physical sciences and biological sciences categories is that courses in either category should be primarily focused in that category.

8. The next committee meeting will be Mon. Nov. 15 at 9:30.
October 18, 1999 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University


1. Reviewed and approved minutes of October 4, 1999 meeting.

2. Discussion of proposed revision of DPD criteria from DPD Task Force with John Lee and Susan Shaw

   Discussion re: item #8 "may not be a survey or topics course." And item #4 "discrimination arises from socially constructed meanings attributed to difference."

   Discussion of lower vs. upper division issues for DPD courses, including possible use of class standing prerequisite; synthesis vs. perspective issues.

   The possibility of pulling DPD out as a category by itself was discussed. Question raised, "why?" category by itself.

   John Lee will convey the BCC's concerns to the DPD Task force.

3. The committee discussed Perspectives guidelines re: upper/lower division:

   a. De facto: there is a mix on books. b. To enforce or not (as lower division).
   c. Discussion of accessibility to all students.
   d. It was agreed that there should be no 400 level in Perspectives.
   - The alternative of a "ban" vs. "compelling" reasons was discussed
   - The committee consensus was to allow 300 level Perspectives with compelling justification.
   e. There was need expressed to make "public" the BCC's guidelines.
   f. Scanlan will review procedures for this with Faculty Senate Exec. Committee
   g. Vote at next meeting.
   h. Christine will make up ideas for a Compelling Reasons Policy.

4. Approved HST 320 (99-B008) for change from 3 to 4 credits.

5. Reviewed Bob's "courses to be reviewed" matrix-will discuss at next meeting.

6. Next meeting November 1 at 9:30 a.m.
Present: Michael Scanlan, Chair, Bonnie Avery, Bob Jarvis, John Lee, Kurt Peters, Satish Reddy, Christine Snow, Susan Shaw, ex officio

Agenda/Notes:

1. Meeting called to order at 9:30 am. and members were introduced.

2. Susan Shaw, the new DPD director, provided an overview of the new DPD Task Force.

3. Mike Scanlan, BCC Chair, summarized committee responsibilities, policies and procedures. Difficulties with policy issues regarding 200 & 300 level courses in perspective and 3 Vs 4 credits were brought to the attention of committee members.

4. Course proposals:
   - ES 233 (99-B021): approved for Perspectives: Cultural Diversity
   - CH 462 (99-B014): provisionally approved for WIC, pending final review by members before Fri. Oct. 8
   - COMM 432 (99-B015): approved for having WIC designation dropped
   - HST 320 (99-B008): postponed until next meeting
   - ES 334 (99-B017): sent back for justification of need for 300-level Perspectives course

5. There was discussion of allowing 300-level Perspectives courses to be continued at the next meeting.

6. Mike Scanlan suggested giving responsibility for single BCC course proposals to individual committee members who would then carefully review and report recommendations to the committee. Members favored this suggestion.

7. Bob Jarvis volunteered to begin an implementation proposal for the 5-year review of baccalaureate core classes.

8. Meeting adjourned at 10:40 am.

Minutes prepared by CM Snow.
May 19, 1999 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

May 19, 1999 Minutes

Present: John Lee, Shannon Smith, Anita Grunder, Mike Scanlan, Christine Snow and in the last 15 minutes, Ken Williamson and Joan Gross.

Agenda/Notes:

1. passed motion to approve minutes of May 5, 1999.

2. a. 99CCBC046 (GEOG 299) submitted by Chemeketa Community College- approval for Western Culture pending a more complete reading list.

b. 99CCBC041 (ENG 299) approved for Literature and Arts.

3. a. A motion was passed to formalize the existing rule as published in the curricular procedures handbook, namely, that perspectives courses shall be lower division. The decision was reached because it is in keeping with the intent of the baccalaureate core as a general education requirement and because the results of the 1999 faculty survey regarding the core show strong support for the lower division status.

b. The committee reconsidered the issue of DPD and its status as a Perspectives requirement. The committee decided to leave the Perspectives status unchanged with the acknowledgement that the committee retracts its decision to allow DPD an exception in this regard. The decision was reached for three main reasons. First, the 1999 faculty survey of the core strongly supports DPD as a Perspectives course and as a lower division offering. Second, the status of DPD, such as the issues of course offerings and levels, will be reviewed next year by a DPD Task Force. Thus policy changes now would likely be changed again next academic year. Third, with the change in the university funding model, the lower and upper division distinctions gain new importance, making a Perspectives category with special dispensation a target for controversy. We defer to the Task Force to consider these issues.

4. Ken Williamson joined the meeting at 2:45.

a. He agreed to drop Math 252 and Physics 212 as requirements for 99 B001 (ENGR 350) In view of this change, the committee approved the course for STS.

b. He sought committee participation in the proposed DPD Task Force.

Meeting adjourned 2:55
1. Approved minutes of April 28, 1999.

2. a. Revisited 99B002, 003, 004- the course BA465 was ostensibly approved by the BCC in June of 98. The committee recommends finding the minutes of the meeting at which the proposal was approved, as the June 10 date listed on the routing sheet does not seem to coincide with a meeting time.

b. The committee revisited the rejected course ENGR-350. The committee will find out how many students are likely to qualify for the class in the course of their majors. If the number is as great as suggested by Williamson, then the suitability of the course for the BacCore will be reconsidered.

3. Memo to the Committee on committees regarding changes in standing rules was approved. The text of the memo is below.

4. The committee voted to initiate a 5-year expiration policy for BC courses that are not reviewed. The policy will be included in the burgeoning draft of committee policies and process.

5. Other items as possible- such as survey results and how to include faculty response into the BC.

---

**Memo to Committee on Committees:**

To: James Raab, Chair, Committee on Committees and Vickie Nunnemaker.

From: Anita Grunder (Chair of BCC) and the Baccalaureate Core Committee

Re: Revision of standing rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee has reviewed the Standing Rules in light of the considerations outlined by you in your memo of February 17, 1999.

We believe responsibility for recruiting student representatives should continue to reside with the ASOSU.

We suggest no change in the voting membership, but recommend that the WIC and DPD directors be added in an ex-officio capacity so that they will be included on all mailings and apprised of BCC activities. To that effect we are submitting to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a summary of recommended changes to the standing rules. These are summarized on the attached copy of the existing standing rules.

We also recommend that item A5 be eliminated from the standing rules, because the diverse composition of the committee makes this "watch-dog" clause redundant.

We also recommend simplification of rule A4, as per attached rules.

The new funding model does affect the Baccalaureate Core, mainly in that we anticipate substantial pressure to increase the numbering level of courses, particularly 200 to 300 level. We are considering the issue, but it will play out in the core guidelines rather than in the standing rules.

We see no conflict between the standing rules and the desire to increase enrollment and provide a compelling
learning experience, nor with any process of program review.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 28, 1999 Minutes

Present: John Lee, Shannon Smith, Anita Grunder, Bob Jarvis, Mike Scanlan, Christine Snow

Agenda/Notes:

1. The committee approved a motion to add the WIC and DPD directors to the committee membership in an ex-officio capacity. The proposed text revision to the standing rules is to be added at the end of the first paragraph. It is: "The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director are ex-officio (nonvoting) members of the baccalaureate core committee." This text will be included in a revised set of the standing rules to be submitted to the faculty senate executive committee.

2. Approved minutes of April 21, 1999.


   The committee questions the appropriateness of the existing BA465 for CGI status as it addresses methodology, not global issues. No additional arguments were made in addition to the original submittal to justify the cross listing. The committee will consider the proposals after reviewing the original BA 465 proposal and after the curriculum council has approved the course, particularly the unconventional numbering of cross-listed courses.

4. Item A4 of the standing rules is recommended to be reduced and to read as follows: "All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the English Department's Writing Coordinator."

5. The committee explored establishing a policy of a 5-year lifespan for approved baccalaureate core courses. To renew bac core status, each course must be reviewed by the committee. The committee will recommend such a policy, provided a fair and effective implementation procedure can be established.

Meeting adjourned 2:55 p.m.
Present: John Lee, Shannon Smith, Anita Grunder, Bob Jarvis, Hsiou-Lien Chen, Mike Scanlan

Agenda/Notes:

1. Approved minutes of March 31, 1999.

2. Considered the following course proposals:

   a. 98B036 HSTS494 for CGI. Additional information was submitted as per request of 10/15/98. The proposal was rejected for Contemporary Global Issues. The focus of the course is the history of Japan. The course addresses Japan with aspects of global issues woven in, rather than focusing on global issues with Japan as an example. If the course is to be reconsidered for Bac Core, it needs to have a more outward focus. Also, the committee suggests considering a title change to reflect the outward, global emphasis.

   b. 99 B001 ENGR 350 for STS. The committee acknowledges receiving Ken Williamson's arguments in favor of the high level of prerequisites for the course. The arguments presented make it clear that the intended audience is engineering students, not general university students, and so the course lacks the accessibility appropriate to a general education requirement. The course was rejected.

3. The committee reviewed the standing rules and recommends that item A5 be eliminated, as it is not implemented and the multi-college complexion of the committee serves the intended function.

   Item A4 is probably also defunct; Mike Scanlan will inquire into the relevace of the rule.

The committee recommends that a separate page of policies and procedures be included in the curricular procedures handbook. Among items to include on such a page are:

   a. The lifespan of a proposal submitted to the Baccalaureate Core Committee is 6 months from time of first consideration of the proposal by the committee. If committee requests for additional information are not answered in 6 months, the proposal is considered dead.

   b. Periodic review of the content of the baccalaureate core is done by requesting complete proposals for all resubmittals of existing baccalaureate courses if they include substantive changes such as changes in content, course description, prerequisites, or level.

   c. Courses that have been in the core for five or more years are subject to review. The committee may request a copy of the course materials and an explanation of how the course meets the baccalaureate criteria.

   d. In order to retain the spirit of general education requirements and to keep the credit hours in the baccalaureate core contained, the committee encourages 3-credit, lower division courses for the perspectives requirements. Upper division and (or) 4-credit courses require compelling documentation in order to be approved.
e. Courses submitted for WIC or DPD should be routed to the appropriate program director or review board for comment and recommendation before being submitted to the Bacc core Committee.

Meeting adjourned 2:50 p.m.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 7, 1999
Minutes

Present: Jarvis, Scanlan, Snow
Absent: Chen, Grunder, Lee, Smith

1. Due to the absence of Chair Anita Grunder, Michael Scanlan served as Chair for the meeting.

2. Due to the absence of the majority of the committee, Scanlan declared this meeting a committee work session. As such, the approval of the minutes of March 31, 1999 was not voted on.

3. Modifications to the Standing Rules for the Baccalaureate Core Comm. were discussed. This included the following topics.

   a) The addition of the DPD director to the committee as a (non-voting) ex-officio member was considered. Those present agreed that although the DPD director should be integrated into the work of the committee that affected the DPD area (in the way that the WIC director is currently integrated for WIC courses) ex-officio membership is probably not necessary or appropriate.

   b) 1) The committee policy as to review of courses that have been approved for the Bac Core in past years was discussed. Those present noted that the current Standing Rules state, "The BCC will periodically review courses accepted for general education to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria." They observed that this was not currently done by the committee, except in the present informal policy of allowing full review of currently accepted courses for which changes are requested. Dr. Jarvis proposed that the committee consider implementing a policy of systematic review of existing core courses to determine their present conformity to BCC criteria. Those present decided to warmly commend this proposal to the rest of the committee for their consideration.

   2) Those present also considered the question of whether the current BCC policy setting a time limit of six months for consideration of a proposal after the committee has requested additional information from a proposer should be incorporated into the Standing Rules. It was agreed that the Standing Rules were an inappropriate location for this procedural material. Dr. Snow suggested that this policy of a time limit for additional information be incorporated into the request form for BCC courses. Those present also warmly commend this suggestion to the other members.

   In a more general review of the Standing Rules it was determined that rules A4 and A5 are either non-functioning, out-of-date, or both. It was determined that the committee should discuss more fully how affected constituencies should be kept informed of Bac Core course proposals and BCC actions. In particular the question was raised of how adequate information posting on the Web is as a notification method.

4. In view of the current indisposition of the Chair (however predictable), it was decided to provisionally schedule the next meeting for two weeks time (April 21, 2 PM).

BEST WISHES ANITA, from the BCC.
Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.
March 31, 1999 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Present: John Lee, Shannon Smith, Anita Grunder, Bob Jarvis, Hsiou-Lien Chen, Christine Snow, Joan Gross, Mike Scanlan

1. Approved minutes of March 17, 1999, as modified by Grunder and Gross.

2. Consider the following course proposals:
   a. 99B007 Econ 428 for WIC; recommended for acceptance by Vicki Collins, Approved
   b. 99B011 HSTS 423 for STS, Approved
   c.99B001 ENGR 350, Not approved. The high level of prerequisites for the course excludes nearly all students but engineering students and some physical science students and is not in the spirit of general education requirements. The course content seems of appropriate scope to be of wider interest and the committee recommends reconfiguring the course to make it more widely accessible if Baccore status is desired.
   d. Mt. Hood Comm. College ENG 214; Asian American Literature, approved for DPD.

3. The justification section of DPD criteria for the curricular procedures handbook was considered and the following wording was approved for recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

   Systems of power have been sustained in the United States in part through ignorance of the complex ways in which class, gender, race and other forms of institutionalized bias overlap and reinforce each other. A more informed understanding of the often subtle yet powerful structure of these biases and of their implications is essential in a multicultural society. DPD classes typically encourage students to examine their beliefs concerning difference, power, and discrimination through a variety of pedagogical techniques, especially those that promote student interaction.

4. The committee briefly visited the topic of HHP231, the Lifetime fitness requirement of the Baccalaureate core. Christine Snow agreed to furnish materials on course content for committee consideration.

Meeting adjourned 3:00 p.m.
March 17, 1999 Minutes

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Present: Anita Grunder, John Lee, Mike Scanlan, Bob Jarvis, Christine Snow, Joan Gross, Bob Burton

1. Approved minutes of March 10, 1999

2. Revision of DPD criteria - After much discussion the following proposed criteria were adopted and will be duly submitted to the faculty senate for consideration.

   1. Be at least 3 credits. Both upper and lower division.
      The baccalaureate core committee is committed to maintaining a range of lower division courses for perspectives requirements, including DPD.

   2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking.

   3. Provide the historical background so students can critically examine contemporary issues of difference, power, and discrimination across socio-political systems in the United States.

   4. Concentrate on two or more types of discrimination (such as discrimination according to ethnicity, class, gender, age, sex, sexual orientation, appearance, belief, etc.).

   5. Study the origins, operation, and consequences of discrimination, including structural and institutional discrimination.

3. The justification for the DPD requirement will be examined at the next meeting.

4. Standing rules for the committee, and the fitness requirement will be addressed at the next meeting.

5. Meeting adjourned at 9:56 a.m.
March 10, 1999 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 10, 1999
Minutes

Present: Anita Grunder, John Lee, Mike Scanlan, Shannon Smith, Joan Gross

1. Approved minutes of February 10, 1999

2. Proposals:
   a. 98B059 WR411/511 change in approved WIC course, approved by BCC
   b. 99B001 ENGR 350 for ScienceTechnology and Society The committee would like clarification on the necessity of PH212 and MTH252 as prerequisites for the course. The high level of prerequisites will make the course inaccessible to a wide range of students, which is somewhat in conflict with the purpose of general education requirements.
   c. 99B005 AG 492 course dropped, ScienceTechnology and Society - acknowledged by BCC
   d. 99B008 HST 320 for Cultural Diversity The committee requests a full baccalaureate core proposal in which the criteria of the Cultural Diversity category are addressed. In order to keep the baccalaureate core courses current, all proposals with substantive changes to existing courses are subject to full review. Perspectives courses in the core are intended to be lower division and 3 credits are the typical level of approval, in order to allow students some free elective credits. The committee would therefore like clarification on why both the 300-level and 4 credits are necessary.
   e. 99B009 PHL 380, change in title, approved by BCC
   f. 99B010 WS499, dropped- approved by BCC
   g. 99CCBC019 Central Oregon Community College WS102, approved for Literature and Arts.

3. Joan Gross distributed results of the the BCC part of the survey she conducted and some recommendations on the form of the DPD criteria and program. The DPD criteria will be reviewed at the next meeting.

4. Anita Grunder reported that the committee on committees has asked the BCC to review its Standing Rules in light of the new funding model. Said rules and the Baccalaureate Core parts of the Curricular Procedures Handbook will be reviewed at the next meeting, scheduled for March 17, 1999.

Meeting adjourned 9:30 a.m.
February 10, 1999 Minutes

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Present: Hsiou-Lien Chen, Anita Grunder, John Lee, Mike Scanlan, Shannon Smith, Joan Gross

1. Approved minutes of February 3, 1999

2. Review of course proposals

   Chemeketa Community College
   - 99CCBC009 WR111 approved for Writing III/Speech
   - 99CCBC008 WR100 rejected for Writing III/Speech. The course centers on theory and not skills. If reconsideration is desired, the committee needs to see supporting materials that address the writing or speech component.
   - 99CCBC 006 MUS 161 approved for Literature and Arts
   - 99CCBC005 GEO207 rejected for Western Culture. The course appears to have little cultural content.
   - 99CCBC003 BI 143 approved for Biological Science with Lab
   - 99CCBC001 ANTH 214 approved for Cultural Diversity

   OSU
   - 98B060 WR495/595 approved for WIC

3. Joan Gross presented the DPD Program Evaluation she has assembled. After discussion, recommendations on page 4 and 5 of her report were put to the committee for consideration. The committee will review the recommendations and make modifications to the Faculty-Advisor Questionnaire to clarify points raised by the DPD recommendations.

Meeting adjourned 9:55 a.m.
Present: Christine Snow, Anita Grunder, John Lee, Mike Scanlan, Shannon Smith, Joan Gross and Leslie Burns

1. Approved minutes of January 20, 1999

2. Action Items: CCBC018 WS101 approved for Difference Power and Discrimination. CCBC019 WS102 rejected for Difference Power and Discrimination, but would reconsider former rejection for Literature and Arts if an outline of lecture topics were provided. Existing support materials include mainly course mechanics and little on content.

3. Leslie Burns summarized the intent and history of the AA-OT degree (Associate of Arts-Oregon Transfer). The degree was devised by the joint articulation commission of which Provost Arnold was a member. The principle is to have Community College to University transfers be seamless for students. In Fall 98, 1022 students came in as transfer students, of which 168 had the AA-OT. The AA-OT counts for completion of lower division bac core. The committee concluded that the number of students completing the bac core with the AA-OT is worth monitoring, but that the numbers are too small to be a large concern. Concern centered on the ways that the AA-OT is not actually equivalent to the Bac Core, mainly because it lacks specific categories. The Washington equivalent, WA-AAS, will likely be accepted for transfer of lower division bac core in the future.

4. Discussion of the Faculty and Advisor Questionnaire resulted in some changes. These will be made by Anita and circulated to the committee for further consideration.

Meeting adjourned 9:55 a.m.
Present: Chen, Grunder, Lee, Scanlan, Smith, Gross

1. BCC minutes of January 13, 1999 approved.

2. Review course proposals

**Chemeketa Community College**

a. 98CCBC033 ANTH 227 approved for Cultural Diversity  
b. 98CCBC010 ENG 257 approved for Cultural Diversity  
c. 98CCBC034 ENG 258 approved for Literature and Arts

**Central Oregon Community College**

d. CCBC014 ANTH226 approved for Cultural Diversity  
e. CCBC020 ANTH231 approved for Cultural Diversity  
f. CCBC020 ANTH232 approved for Cultural Diversity  
g. CCBC022 HST207W rejected for Western Culture because the course covers too narrow a subject and too short a time.  
h. CCBC021 HST218 approved for Cultural Diversity  
i. CCBC018 WS 101 rejected for Social Processes and Institutions, possibly to be considered for Difference Power and Discrimination. Proposal is to be forwarded to DPD.  
j. CCBC019 WS 102 rejected for Literature and Arts, possibly to be considered for Difference Power and Discrimination. Proposal is to be forwarded to DPD.

3. Linda Johnson, Head Advisor of HHP had inquired about the possibility of including the courses Z331 and Z341 (human anatomy and physiology lecture and lab respectively) as one of the biological sciences in the Perspectives section of the baccalaureate core. The committee will contact Tom Roberts, coordinator of the course sequence and pursue the question of giving the combined courses Z331/341 and Z332/342 bac core status.

4. The committee discussed formulation of the faculty and advisor survey to be included in the BC evaluation.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.
Members present: Chen, Grunder, Lee, Scanlan, Smith, Snow

1. Minutes for meeting of December 3 were unanimously approved.

2. Request 98-B051, HDFS 446, Families and Poverty unanimously APPROVED for Contemporary Global Issues (Synthesis)

3. Request 98-B054, ENG 355/356, Continental European Literature unanimously APPROVED for Literature and the Arts (Perspectives)

4. Request 98-B055, ENG 355/356, Continental European Literature unanimously REJECTED for Western Culture (Perspectives)

   Reasons for rejection:
   1. The readings in the course were limited to literary works which do not provide the breadth of material appropriate to the Western Culture category.
   2. It is the policy of the BCC to approve the same course in more than one category only with extraordinary justification.

5. The committee conducted a lengthy discussion of how to respond to the charge from the Faculty Senate to participate in the evaluation of the Baccalaureate Core in connection with the upcoming university accreditation review. The chair will prepare an outline of a review document based on the this discussion and will present it to the committee. The committee will coordinate with other units of the university, such as the Office of Undergraduate Affairs, to gather material for this report.

Minutes by Michael Scanlan
Baccalaureate Core Committee

November 19, 1998
Minutes

Present: Anita Grunder, Robert Jarvis, John Lee, Michael Scanlan, Shannon Smith, Christine Snow, Joan Gross

1) Minutes of 11/12/98 BCC meeting were approved.

2) BCC Proposals considered:
   a) Joan Gross recommended approving all four DPD submissions.
      BCC Committee approved the following for DPD:
      98B046 ES 221, 98B048 ES 223, 98B056 ES 232
      BCC Committee rejected 98B045 ES 456/556 due primarily to its graduate level emphasis. The instructor is encouraged to resubmit to increase accessibility to all undergraduate students. The committee is particularly concerned about the graduate seminar emphasis.
   b) 98B058 ES 232 was rejected for Cultural Diversity. In general, the committee is not in favor of accepting a course for more than one area in the Baccalaureate Core unless that course is of exceptional scope and provides strong justification for cross-placement.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 am.
November 12, 1998 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Baccalaureate Core Committee

**November 12, 1998 Minutes**

**Present:** Hsiou-Lien Chen, Anita Grunder, Robert Jarvis, John Lee, Michael Scanlan, Shannon Smith, Christine Snow

1) Minutes of 10/22/98 BCC meeting were approved.

2) BCC Proposals:

   a) ANS, FW, HORT, PS, SOC 485/585 (B108, B109, B110)
      - APPROVED for BCC Science, Technology, and Society

   b) RUS 331, 332, 333 (98-B041 & 98-B042)
      - REJECTED for course number change from 200 level to 300 level. Since the current BCC guidelines require Perspective courses to be lower division, the BCC committee requested a further proposal to explain how the upper division courses will meet the BCC requirements.

   c) ECON 340 (98-B049)
      - APPROVED for BCC Contemporary Global Issues

   d) HST 425/525 (98-B001)
      - APPROVED for BCC Contemporary Global Issues

   e) Central Oregon Community College Proposals
      - REJECTED. BCC committee requested that proposals submitted by the community colleges should use the format for Baccalaureate Core Request Form and follow the BCC guidelines which are available at OSU web site: [http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm](http://osu.orst.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/023_BCC-TA147.htm)

   f) Discussion on the recommendations for BCC evaluations.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:50 am

1. Minutes for October 15, 1998 were approved with minor modifications.

2. Topic for future action: It was decided that the Mathematics Skills descriptions and requirements of the baccalaureate core should be reviewed and revised sometime this year.

3. ATS 320 was requested as a baccalaureate core course in four areas. The following actions were taken:

   98-B037 Mathematics Skills DENIED: The use of mathematics in this course seems no different from many other science and engineering courses that are not in the core. Indeed, math skill development is not the primary focus of the course, which is "the presentation of physical, chemical, and biological processes influencing climate change...."

   98-B038 Physical Science DENIED: Perspectives courses must be lower division and this course is not a lab course.

   98-B039 Science, Technology, and Society MORE INFORMATION REQUESTED: This looks like it should be a nice STS course. The committee requests more information about how critical thinking is assured (measured) in the study of societal issues related to the course, as opposed to mathematical issues. Also, Item 6 in the list of criteria for STS courses (provide a perspective on the scientific or technological approach to understanding and manipulating the world by relating that perspective to its social context) should be explicitly addressed.

   98-B040 Contemporary Global Issues DENIED: The proposal did not address the six criteria that a CGI course must satisfy.

4. Action on Community College Requests:

   98CCBC008 MUS 205: accept as elective credit. If BCC credit is desired the proposers could submit a proposal under Literature and Arts. Such a proposal must contain a complete syllabus and address the baccalaureate core criteria for that area. The proposers can access the criteria from the OSU Academic Affairs web site.

   98CCBC009 ANTH 201: accept as elective credit. If BCC credit is desired the proposers could submit a proposal under Social Processes and Institutions. Such a proposal must contain a complete syllabus and address the baccalaureate core criteria for that area. The proposers can access the criteria from the OSU Academic Affairs web site.

   98CCBC010 ENG 257: accept as elective credit. If BCC credit is desired the proposers could submit a proposal under Cultural Diversity. Such a proposal must contain a complete syllabus (only a partial one was attached) and address the baccalaureate core criteria for that area. The proposers can access the criteria from the OSU Academic Affairs web site.

5. Leslie Burns will meet with the committee Winter Term 1999 to discuss Oregon transfer degrees.
6. The committee began a discussion of effective ways to evaluate the baccalaureate core. Joan Gross summarized the methods she was using to evaluate DPD and ways that evaluation might also assist the baccalaureate core evaluations. She provided us with a copy of her survey instrument. She said that Alan Greer suggested we work through undergraduate affairs and Phil Brown (7-3434) to discuss survey possibilities.

7. Meeting adjourned 10 AM.
October 15, 1998 Minutes, Baccalaureate Core Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University


1. Approval of minutes of meeting of Oct. 8.

2. Discussion:
WIC courses lack auditing mechanism. They are inadequately recorded on university graduate audit or other university records. Will discuss further.

3. FW 485 Update:
Received memo from Ray William requesting clarification of BC's request for full proposal on 97B108/109/110. Committee will reply:

   1. Department may submit proposal to double list course as CGI and STS for consideration.

   2. FW should submit standard proposal with SYS designator as per normal routine for approving changes in B-C courses.

   3. Course would have come up for review in any case. Committee will wait on Curriculum Council's verdict re: SYS designator.

4. History Course on Holocaust:
Faculty member has been reminded that deadline is approaching.

5. Dating B C Courses
Christina Richards will look into adding approval dates to listings.

6. Other:
John Lee is in liason with Nutrition re pre-proposal for possible B-C course.

7. Previous B-C Evaluation (1994) will be circulated to committee.

8. DPD:
Joan Gross presented existing criteria DPD has been employing. DPD was designed to span the curriculum. Joan Gross argued for approval of upper division (UD) courses. Also noted need for Focus on US to be included in explicit criteria. Discussion followed re Perspectives courses and UD classification. Further discussion deferred.

Questions regarding BC completion to be included in draft of DPD survey.

9. Proposals

   98B021: FREN 270 WC APPROVED

   98B032 AS 411/412 CGI

   412: REJECTED
   - Unclear why 412 should be a BC course if 411 is a prereq.
411: REJECTED
- Not widely accessible to diverse range of students
- Appears aimed almost exclusively at AF ROTC, contrary to spirit of BC
- Does not appear to meet criteria of global orientation; seems very US-specific

98B036 HST 494/594 CGI: REQUEST FURTHER INFORMATION

- Clarify and expand discussion of criteria # 3 and 4
- Must address critical thinking
Baccalaureate Core Committee

October 8, 1998 Minutes

Present: Christine Snow, Bob Jarvis, John, Lee, Hsiou-Lien Chen, Shannon Smith, Joan Gross, and Anita Grunder

1. After introduction of committee members, Joan Gross, the new DPD coordinator expressed that she would like to be present when DPD and DPD proposals are considered. It was agreed that she will provide the committee, via the chair, a copy of her guidelines for DPD course development and the committee will work to resolve differences between the criteria in the Curricular Procedures Handbook and those distributed by the DPD office. The understanding is that DPD proposals will be forwarded simultaneously to BCC and DPD, but that BCC will await the DPD recommendation before taking action.

2. In addition to the usual baccore course evaluations, the principle issues for the consideration by the BCC in academic year 97-98 [Jarvis, Robert L] 98-99 are:

   a) Evaluation of the effectivenes of the baccalaureate core, with a view toward the scheduled accreditation review of OSU in 2001. As a point of departure, the chair will retrieve the report on baccore evaluation that was produced about 4 years ago. Leslie Burns will speak to the committee in Winter term about proposed evaluation of the critical thinking component of the core.

   b) BCC will clarify the issue of the increasing number of requests for 4 credit courses in the core.

   c) After consultation with Leslie Burns, Winter term, BCC will consider the inconsistencies between the AA-OT and proposed AS-OT degrees (Associate of Arts and Associate of Science, - Oregon Transfer) and the actual Community College courses approved for the bac core.

   d) BCC will develop a policy on the re-evaluation of existing Bac Core course.

3. Actions taken by BCC:

   a) Motion approved to change the word series to the word sequence in the WIC criterion 5 in the Curricular Procedures handbook, as requested by Vicki Collins. The chair will find out how sequences of courses to be taken to satisfy WIC are identified to students.

   b) John Lee presented a request for guidance put to him by Connie Georgiou, James Ridlington, and Rosemary Wander regarding development of a nutrition course to satisfy the biological lab science core requirement. The committee charged John with conveying to them that there is no objection in principle, that the most stringent review regarding lab science is likely to come from the curriculum council, where the proposal must be approved before BCC, and that BCC would be glad to entertain a brief pre-proposal.

   c) BCC suggests that the web listing of courses that satisfy the bac core include the term and year in which the baccore status became effective. This is in response to a request by Charles Langford to Leslie Burns to clarify the when which courses became effective. The chair will confer with Christina Richards on implementation.

   d) Baccore proposals 97-B108/109/110 (FW-485, ANS-485, and SOC-485) require additional
information before they can be considered for approval. BCC requests that the proposals be submitted with a Baccore cover sheet, a section explaining how the Bac Core criteria are met (as laid out in the curricular procedures handbook), and relevant syllabus, grading criteria, reading lists and so on. In effect, the courses are being considered anew, even though the course presently exists as a Bac Core course. This is in keeping with the committees charge to evaluate the existing core courses. The chair will contact submitters of the proposals with the recommendation.

9:55, Meeting adjourned.
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Synthesis Category Review Final Report - 2012-2013
Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC)

Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Marion Rossi (co-chair), Uta Hussong-Christian, Michael Lerner, Joe Zaworski, Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Rebecca Olson, Lori Kayes, Linda Bruslind, Melinda Manore, Ken Winograd, Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director, Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation, ex-officio), Michelle Bothwell (DPD Director, ex-officio)

The BCC spent much of 2012-2013 engaging in the 2012 Synthesis Category Review. Per the Seven-Year Category Review Cycle established by the BCC last year, the Synthesis Categories were in Cycle Year 1 in 2013-2014. The following report summarizes that activity and the decisions made by the BCC.

Review Process (ultimately evolved into two phases)

Phase I

- Units were asked to submit materials for category review via webform to the Office of Academic Program, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA). Materials included responses to prompts on the webform and syllabi. APAA also worked with Institutional Research (IR) to provide demographic data on each course. The Phase I deadline was at the end of June 2012.

- Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment, collected and collated information over the summer and created a secure SharePoint site where BCC members could access materials. She also actively reached out to units with courses that had Incomplete Files. Some of those units complied with sending information prior to fall term, and some did not.*

- Courses with Complete Files (e.g. files that had demographic info, a completed webform, and at least one syllabus) were divided equally and assigned to individual BCC members for review.

- Courses not offered in 2011-2012 were exempt from a recertification decision and were flagged for an Extensive Follow-up in Cycle Year 3 (2014-15).

- Review rubrics were created where BCC members could comment on how well the course was meeting category criteria and, more importantly, whether there was evidence of student learning relative to the BC Category Learning Outcomes (CLO) in the course.

- Courses in Phase I were either recertified or flagged for follow-up as we needed additional information to make our decision (These are labeled “Deficient Phase I” courses.**
The BCC held debrief sessions where our members could gather and offer feedback from the process. We also used this time to define parameters for a web questionnaire that we could use to secure additional information from those courses whose initial file was lacking in detail and specifics.

**Phase II**

- Units with recertified courses were notified in February 2013.
- *Synthesis courses with Incomplete Files (missing webform, syllabus, or both) at the time of our initial review in fall 2012 were shifted to Phase II. In February 2013, we sent the offering units a request for the missing information, with a notice that non-compliance would mean decertification. They were given an April 1 deadline.
- **Units with Complete Files that were flagged as Deficient Phase I were notified in February 2013. They were provided with a link to a web survey where we requested additional information about the curriculum, student learning in the course relative to the Bacc Core CLO’s, and an assessment plan for the future. The deadline for submission of this additional information was April 15, and they, too, received notice that non-compliance would mean decertification.
- The BCC reviewed these Phase II courses (the Deficient Phase I files and the Incomplete Files) in late April, early May. All were recertified, but some were flagged for an extensive follow-up in Cycle Year 3 (2014-15). This list will reside in the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation and will be included in the BCC annual report.

**Synthesis Category Review Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Classification</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>Extensive Follow-Up in Cycle Year 3 (2014-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not offered in 2011-2012</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete File Courses (Phase II)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11 (out of the initial 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recertified Courses (Phase I)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recertified Courses (Exemplary – Phase I)</td>
<td>6 (ART 367, PHL 444H, PS 476, SOC 454, 456, 480)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficient Phase I Courses (Phase I and II)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (out of the initial 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses whose units requested their removal from the Bacc Core (either because the course had been discontinued or it no longer fit the Category)</td>
<td>6 (AREC 461, ECON 340, H 320, HDFS 471, PHAR 312, WS 450)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Research Summary Data of Note (Provided by IR and APAA)**

- Approximately 4,000 students per term in Synthesis courses
- Courses taught by Asst/Assoc/Prof: 27%
Courses taught by Instructor/Senior Instructor: 45%
Courses taught by GTA/No Rank: 24%
Courses are at 83%-91% of their max capacity

**BCC Conclusions about the Process and Synthesis Courses**

- There was full acknowledgement by the BCC of the accelerated nature of the pilot process and admiration for units/faculty with Synthesis courses that followed through in this first go around with the “new” Category Review.
- The BCC is hopeful that the outcomes and assessment process will become more institutionalized as we make our way through the Category Review cycle. For example, a baseline expectation is that Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes be listed distinctly and clearly identified on a Bacc Core course syllabus. *A third of the syllabi submitted for the Synthesis Category Review were missing the Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes.* It will take time to get everyone on board. Category Review helps with those compliance numbers.
- Some discrepancies between what we thought we were asking for and what units thought we were asking for pointed towards a need for changes in how we ask for information on our webform. *(See Action Items Below)*
- The idea of thinking about their Bacc Core classes from Bacc Core Programmatic level (e.g., as part of a Bacc Core category with responsibility to that category), as opposed to simply a part of the unit curriculum, was foreign to many units. For example, it was evident that some faculty, while very comfortable with content, were struggling with implementing an intentional pedagogical approach to help students cultivate a competency in synthesizing complex information by utilizing the content of the course. Consultation and conversation often helped reframe and re-contextualize the way the unit approached their course, and it was vital to have Stefani Dawn and Vicki Tolar Burton at our disposal to conduct professional development workshops and be available for individual consultations to units and faculty teaching Bacc Core courses. *(See Action Items Below)*
- Of course, achievement of all Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes varied across courses, but the BCC particularly noted variance in the presence of assignments (or lack thereof) that address Outcome #3 in both categories, and it is the outcome that proved to be the most challenging for units to integrate into their courses. This is the outcome in both categories that addresses writing:
  - Articulate in writing a critical perspective on contemporary global issues using evidence as support. (CGI)
  - Articulate in writing a critical perspective on issues involving science, technology, and society using evidence as support. (STS)
This noticeable variance corresponded with concerns articulated in the Review of Writing Report produced by the 2011-2012 Ad Hoc Committee convened by the Executive Committee. *(See Action Items Below and see [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/BCCWritingReport.pdf](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/BCCWritingReport.pdf) for the Review of Writing Report)*
~ **BCC Action Items**

- Stefani Dawn has already helped us to implement these changes in the reporting tool that will be used in the 2013 review. We used this in Phase II for some Incomplete File courses (i.e., those from units who had not submitted an initial webform).

- The BCC should continue to co-sponsor Category Review workshops with the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation and connect individuals with that office for assessment consultations.

- While there are rationale statements for each individual Bacc Core category, Category Review brought to light the need for broader rationale statements to explain the purpose behind having Skills, Perspectives and Synthesis sections of the Bacc Core (DPD and WIC are stand alone and, thus, are defined by their category rationale). For example, a rationale for Synthesis might define and explore how courses in the category will help students to cultivate skills in synthesizing information gleaned through multiple disciplinary lenses.

- The BCC should request that the Center for Teaching and Learning offer a faculty learning community on pedagogies for teaching synthesis processes and approaches as well as critical thinking and using multiple disciplinary approaches to examine problems.

- The disparity in attentiveness of Outcome #3 and the challenges units face with integrating an appropriate level of writing in their Synthesis classes (as uncovered by this Category Review Process and the Review of Writing Report) prompted the BCC to work with the Writing Advisory Board to draft the explanatory statements (see the example below), which will be added to the official Bacc Core Category Outcomes, Criteria, and Rationale document in the near future (see [http://oregonstate.edu/main/baccalaureate-core/learning-outcomes-criteria-rationale](http://oregonstate.edu/main/baccalaureate-core/learning-outcomes-criteria-rationale)).

---

**Evidence based writing is an essential component of the Synthesis categories and the exclusively “upper-division” general education academic experience they offer to students. The Baccalaureate Core Committee and the Writing Advisory Board recommend the following to Schools/Departments/Faculty offering Synthesis courses to help students achieve the writing-related criteria and outcome in Contemporary Global Issues/Science, Technology, and Society:**

- A course capacity of 70 students. If enrollment is over 70, then break-outs (recitations) or GTAs should be used to ensure that students receive adequate and timely writing feedback.

- *At a minimum,* the course should include a single out-of-class written assignment with a minimum of 1250 words, plus references that develops and sustains a critical perspective using evidence as support and a multidisciplinary approach. The assignment should include at least two outside sources.

---

**Communication Plan and Additional Items of Interest**

- Phase II decisions communicated to units at the end of the academic year.
This report will be distributed to all faculty, department/school heads, and Associate Deans with affiliation to courses in Synthesis.

It should also be noted that the Office of APAA facilitated a volunteer pilot in spring 2012 where units with Synthesis courses could gather indirect assessment via the Electronic Student Evaluation of Teaching (ESET) to gain insight on student perception of Bacc Core CLO achievement. The BCC did not use this data as part of Category Review, but specific results were shared with participating units. Data of interest to complement the findings in our report:

- 42% of the courses that were taught in the Spring 2012 participated in the volunteer pilot
- 80% of the responding students indicated they were taking the course to satisfy a Bacc Core requirement (n=497)
- When asked to rate their ability to ...(outcome): median was a 4 out of 6 (very poor, poor, fair, good, very good, excellent).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Designator</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>2012 Category Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>COMM IN INTNL CONFLICT &amp; DISP</td>
<td>Reviewed-Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>STUDIES IN SCIENTIFIC CNTRVS</td>
<td>Reviewed-Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY AND CHANGE</td>
<td>Reviewed-Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>HIST STUDIES SCIENCE &amp; POLIT</td>
<td>Reviewed-Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>HISTORY/ TWENTIETH-CENT SCI</td>
<td>Reviewed-Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>ARCHAEOLOGY DOMESTICATION &amp; U</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>MINORITY CULTURES OF CHINA</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>ANTHRO OF INTERNL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>BUSINESS AND ASIAN CULTURE</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>380H</td>
<td>CULTURES IN CONFLICT</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL ECOLOGY</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ENGS</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>COMPARATIVE LIT: COLONIALISM</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ENGS</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>COMPARATIVE LIT: POSTCOLONIALISM</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ENGS</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S VOICES</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>NATIVE AMER SCI &amp; TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEOAS</td>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>300H</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY FOR COMMON GOOD</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>386H</td>
<td>MODERN IRAN: REV &amp; AFTERMATH</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>425H</td>
<td>THE HOLOCAUST IN ITS HISTORY</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>HISTORY OF SCIENCE</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>HISTORY OF SCIENCE</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>SCIENCE AND SOCIETY</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>HISTORY OF THE LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>ECOLOGY AND HISTORY: COLUMBIA</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>PHL</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>PACIFISM, JUST WAR, AND TERRORISM</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>PHL</td>
<td>325H</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC REASONING</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>PHL</td>
<td>344H</td>
<td>PACIFISM, JUST WAR, AND TERRORISM</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>FORESTS, WOOD &amp; CIVILIZATION</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO EVOLUTION</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>HUMAN ECOLOGY</td>
<td>Not Offered in 2011-12- Provisionally Certified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Associate Deans, Unit Heads and Directors  
From: Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi, Baccalaureate Core Committee Co-Chairs  
Date: November 12, 2012  
Re: 2013 Baccalaureate Core Category Review  

Greetings from the two of us on behalf of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC). We hope your academic year is off to a great start. We’re writing to notify you that courses in your college/unit are part of the 2013 BCC Category Review process. A hard copy of this notice will be forwarded to you in the coming days. In this memo, you’ll find:

- Background on the Category Review process  
- Baccalaureate Core categories up for review in 2013  
- An explanation of what data/materials should be collected  
- A listing of resources available to support the units in the Category Review process

Please review and share this information with those in your unit affiliated with courses included in the 2013 BCC Category Review.

**Background**

Many of you are aware that a primary function of the BCC is to engage in periodic review of the categories that make up our Baccalaureate Core curriculum. Last year, the BCC reinstated Category Review, with particular attention to student learning and achievement of the Category Learning Outcomes in Baccalaureate Core courses. Since fall term 2011, all instructors of Baccalaureate Core courses have been required to include the appropriate official Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes (verbatim) on their syllabi and assess these outcomes each time the course is taught. The purpose of category review is to reinforce the overall quality of the Bacc Core, promote consistency across course sections and Bacc Core categories, and to determine which courses should retain Bacc Core status.

Each category is reviewed once every seven years, with the individual WIC courses spread out across the cycle. We worked in conjunction with the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation to set up a webform mechanism that units with courses up for review can submit information relevant to the category review (input and reflection on data collected on student achievement of learning outcomes, syllabus/syllabi for the course, etc.). Last year, units with courses in the Synthesis categories were asked to assess student achievement of Category Learning Outcomes and submit review information via the webform at the end of spring term. These materials serve as the basis for the Synthesis Category Review, currently in progress by the BCC.

**2013 Category Review**

Courses in the following Baccalaureate Core categories will be part of the 2013 Category Review process:

**SKILLS: Mathematics**  
**SKILLS: Speech**  
**SKILLS: Fitness**
WIC: College of Agricultural Sciences, College of Business, College of Public Health and Human Sciences
(See Table 1 for a complete list of courses that are part of these categories.) (Link Table 1 on pages 4 & 5 as a PDF to ‘Table 1’ in the prior line)

Over the course of this academic year, units who offer courses in these categories should:

- Assess student achievement of Category Learning Outcomes for courses in these respective categories. See http://oregonstate.edu/main/baccalaureate-core/learning-outcomes for the specific outcomes
- Collect this evidence and reflect on it to identify successes and room for improvement
- Report on findings via the webform on the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation website. This webform will go active sometime in winter term 2013, but the final reporting deadline will not be until the end of spring term 2013. At the end of this message, you will find a sample of the webform used last year (See Table 2). (Link Table 2 on pages 6, 7, & 8 as a PDF to ‘Table 2’ in the prior line) There will be changes to the form based upon recommendations by the Baccalaureate Core Committee after we complete the Synthesis Category Review, but we provide this template for your reference.
- Collect syllabi to submit along with information on the webform. If syllabi differ between instructors/sections, then a syllabus needs to be submitted for each instructor/section. If the syllabi are the same, then only one is needed.

The Baccalaureate Core Committee recognizes that assessment of student learning relative to the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes is still developing for the OSU campus. We have organized several resources to aid your unit in this process:

- Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation, has posted examples of support tools, including tracking tools and templates, that units can use to help organize information relevant to this process. This can be found at http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment/baccalaureate-core-assessment/support-tools-and-workshop
- Stefani and Vicki Tolar Burton, director of Baccalaureate Core implementation, are available for individual consultation to help units understand and engage in the collection of information for the Category Review process. If you want to schedule a consultation specifically for your unit, please contact Stefani at 7-0919 or Stefani.dawn@oregonstate.edu.
- Unit leadership and faculty who teach courses in these categories will be invited to workshops offered in winter term. The workshops serve to review the Category Review process and allow for collective conversation and clarification around assessment of student learning in Baccalaureate Core classes. Last year, many units found it beneficial to send teams of folks associated with a particular course or courses in the unit up for review. It inspired good collective thinking on the best ways to approach assessment of student learning in their core classes. We’re in the process of establishing
workshop days and times for these winter term. Stay tuned for a targeted notice of when and where these will happen.

Thank you for all the hard work you do to support quality undergraduate general education at OSU.
Table 1: 2013 Baccalaureate Core Category Review: Categories and Courses

**Skills: Fitness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designator &amp; Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHS 231</td>
<td>Lifetime Fitness for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 241</td>
<td>Lifetime Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 242</td>
<td>Cardio Conditioning Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 243</td>
<td>Resistance Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 244</td>
<td>Weight Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 245</td>
<td>Running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 246</td>
<td>Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 247</td>
<td>Aquatic Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS 248</td>
<td>Yoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Physical Activities Course (PAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills: Mathematics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designator &amp; Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTH 105</td>
<td>Introduction to Contemporary Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 111</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 112</td>
<td>Elementary Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 211</td>
<td>Foundations of Elementary Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 241</td>
<td>Calculus for Management &amp; Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 245</td>
<td>Math for Management, Life &amp; Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 251</td>
<td>Differential Calculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 251H</td>
<td>Differential Calculus (Honors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills: Speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designator &amp; Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMM 111</td>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 111H</td>
<td>Public Speaking (Honors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 114</td>
<td>Argument &amp; Critical Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 114H</td>
<td>Argument &amp; Critical Discourse (Honors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 218</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 218H</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication (Honors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WIC: College of Agricultural Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designator &amp; Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 421</td>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS 420</td>
<td>Ethical Issues in Animal Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREC 434</td>
<td>Environmental &amp; Resource Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT 323</td>
<td>Flowering Plants of the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROP 325</td>
<td>Ag &amp; Environmental Predicaments: A Case Study Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 315</td>
<td>Nutrient Management &amp; Cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 325</td>
<td>Ag &amp; Environmental Predicaments: A Case Study Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FST 424</td>
<td>Food Formulation Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FST 425</td>
<td>Food Systems Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW 435</td>
<td>Wildlife in Agricultural Ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW 444</td>
<td>Problem Analysis &amp; Resolution in Fisheries &amp; Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW 454</td>
<td>Fishery Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW 497</td>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORT 318</td>
<td>Applied Ecology of Managed Ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOIL 325</td>
<td>Ag &amp; Environmental Predicaments: A Case Study Approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WIC: College of Business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designator &amp; Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA 353</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHE 370</td>
<td>Textile &amp; Apparel Market Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Designator &amp; Number</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHE 481</td>
<td>Professional Practice in Housing &amp; Interior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD 412</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues in Graphic Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIC: College of Public Health and Human Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXSS 375</td>
<td>Pharmacology in Athletic Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXSS 381</td>
<td>Analysis of Critical Issues in EXSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXSS 455</td>
<td>Pharmacology in Athletic Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 434</td>
<td>Health Care Law and Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 476</td>
<td>Planning and Evaluating Health Promotion Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 430</td>
<td>Student Teaching in Early Childhood Development &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 461</td>
<td>Program Development &amp; Proposal Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 416</td>
<td>Cultural Aspects of Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 439</td>
<td>Communications in Dietetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Sample of Category Review Webform (an updated 2013 webform will be available soon on the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation website):

Baccalaureate Core Category Review Course Form Template
Per recommendations adopted by the Faculty Senate in June of 2010, OSU now has defined learning outcomes for each Baccalaureate Core Category. Many schools and departments are already engaged in assessing student learning in their courses as part of their program level assessment. This form is intended for units to describe how the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes are being measured in their individual Baccalaureate Core Courses.

The Baccalaureate Core Committee will use information submitted on this form as part of its category review process. Please respond to the best of your ability.

Department: *
Enter Department Name or abbreviated designator (e.g. Biology or BI): If the class is crosslisted in multiple departments, list all departments involved (e.g. Biology/Forest Science/Toxicology or BI/FS/TOX)

Course number: *
Enter the three digit course number (e.g. 301)

Course Name: *
Enter course name (e.g. Human Impacts on Ecosystems)

Baccalaureate Core Category -- Choose the Bacc Core Category for this particular course. If the course falls into multiple categories, please complete a distinct form for each category.: *

☐ Writing I
☐ Writing II
☐ Speech
☐ Mathematics
☐ Lifetime Fitness
☐ Physical Science
☐ Biological Science
☐ Western Culture
☐ Cultural Diversity
☐ Literature and the Arts
☐ Social Processes and Institutions
☐ Difference, Power, and Discrimination
☐ Contemporary Global Issues
☐ Science, Technology, and Society
☐ Writing Intensive Course

Do you want this course to continue to be a part of this Baccalaureate Core Category?: *
☐ Yes
☐ No
If yes, please continue. If no, skip ahead to the end of the form, enter a contact name and email, and click the submit button. The Baccalaureate Core Committee will initiate the removal of this course from this particular category.

Prerequisites:
Please enter any prerequisites or restrictions on the class (e.g. Sophomore level and above)
If the course has prerequisites or restrictions, are they enforced or recommended? Prerequisite/Restriction is:

☐ Enforced
☐ Recommended

Please visit this site: http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core. Copy and paste the specific relevant Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes in this box:

Was this course offered in the 2011-2012 school year?:

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, please continue on and complete the respond to the rest of the questions on the form. If no, skip ahead to the end of the form, enter a contact name and email, and click the submit button. Please take steps to ensure that when the course is offered again, it is compliant with syllabus requirements for Baccalaureate Core Courses (see http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/academic-programs/curriculum/curricular-policies-and-procedures#116), and that units/instructors implement processes to assess the appropriate Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes in the course.

Measures - In the box below, please provide specific examples of how students in this course demonstrate achievement of each of the relevant Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes (e.g. course activities, assignments, examinations, etc.):

Process - In the box below, please discuss the process the instructor(s) and/or department use to consider the extent to which students in the course achieved these Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes:

Process - Please indicate what evidence (if any) relative to Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes that you archive at the department level:

☐ No evidence has been archived
☐ Artifacts of Student Learning (Writing Samples, Examinations, Projects)
☐ Syllabi
☐ Sample Assignments
☐ Minutes from instructor/department meetings regarding the course
☐ Indirect Survey Results (Assessments of student perceptions of learning)
☐ Other (please indicate specifics in the box below)

If you indicated "other" in the list above, please provide details here:
Conclusions - How are students in this course doing with respect to achieving each relevant Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcome? Discuss identified successes and opportunities for improvement.

Plans - In the box below, please share any developments or changes that have occurred or will occur as a result of Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes measurement:

Syllabi - see instructions below the box. Please upload pdf's of the syllabus or syllabi if there are multiple sections of the course. One syllabus per instructor, per course, per year is sufficient. If the same syllabus is used across all sections of the course, then only one syllabus per course is necessary.

Submitted by: *
Please enter your name

E-mail Address: *
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To: Rebecca Warner, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
    Susie Brubaker-Cole, Associate Provost for Academic Success & Engagement
    Kevin Gable, Faculty Senate President
    W. Dan Edge, Faculty Senate President-Elect
    Robert Mason, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison to the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC)

From: Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi, BCC Co-Chairs and the entire BCC

Date: June 21, 2013

Re: Writing in the Baccalaureate Core

One of the recommendations stemming from the *Vitalization of General Education at Oregon State University* report adopted by the Faculty Senate in June of 2010* was for a systematic review of writing across the Baccalaureate Core. This process occurred during the 2011-2012 academic year at the urging of that year’s Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The result was the *Final Report from the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core* submitted to the Transitional Director for the Implementation of the Baccalaureate Core, the Baccalaureate Core Committee, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in Spring of 2012.**

During the past academic year the current Baccalaureate Core Committee has continued to consider the challenges and recommendations made by the committee within the context of its role as faculty steward of general education at OSU. Without re-hashing and repeating the extensive content of the original report, we offer the following as our recommendations for further focus, consideration, and investment as the university looks to improve its general education program as a whole and our program(s) in particular.

RESOURCE NEUTRAL (more or less)

- Clarify expectations for writing in Bacc Core Synthesis Category Courses. (Undertaken; adopted explanatory matter to be added to the Baccalaureate Core Learning Outcomes, Criteria, and Rationale document. See below***.)
- Align Writing II courses expectations and experiences so that students and faculty share a common understanding of projected skill sets and outcomes upon successful course completion. The School of Writing, Literature and Film (WLF) has initiated this process and will attend to it more fully in 2013-14. WLF has also initiated a process to create an information packet on Writing II courses to be...
shared with academic advisors to help them guide students to the appropriate Writing II course for their interests and disciplinary needs.

- Further consideration of curricular changes and linking of existing courses (and possible new ones) to writing, research, literacy expectations, i.e., developing/building new models with the resources we already have.

**RESOURCE DEPENDENT**

- Develop a “Writing Advocate” model. An advocate/expert designated (and compensated) in each academic unit or college to be the expert in and advocate for all things writing-related in that unit. Also, to address and mitigate concerns in the report regarding information literacy development, OSU Libraries personnel have proposed that we consider supplementing the Writing Advocates with one or more Librarian Information Literacy Advocates. These advocates, housed in the library could collaborate/consult with the Writing Advocates to help in developing robust evidence-based writing assignments.

- Provide resources to help/force non-compliant units to meet enrollment caps in Writing Intensive Courses (WIC). Develop an enforcement mechanism with some teeth while not rewarding those academic units who have historically ignored policies despite having adequate resources to accommodate them.

- Direct resources into faculty development and providing information for faculty to help with course design, expectations, methodologies, etc. Invest in a culture that invests in and celebrates writing.

*http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/other/bcr/reports/VitalizationofGeneralEducationatOregonStateUniversityMembers.pdf*


***EXPLANATORY ADDENDUM: Writing in Synthesis Courses (Outcome #3) – to be added to this document – http://oregonstate.edu/main/baccalaureate-core/learning-outcomes-criteria-rationale:***

Evidence based writing is an essential component of the Synthesis categories and the exclusively “upper-division” general education academic experience they offer to students. The Baccalaureate Core Committee and the Writing Advisory Board recommend the following to Schools/Departments/Faculty offering Synthesis courses to help students achieve the writing –related criteria and outcome in Contemporary Global Issues/Science, Technology, and Society:

- A course capacity of 70 students. If enrollment is over 70, then break-outs (recitations) or GTAs should be used to ensure that students receive adequate and timely writing feedback.
At a minimum, the course should include a single out-of-class written assignment with a minimum of 1250 words plus references that develops and sustains a critical perspective using evidence as support and a multidisciplinary approach. The assignment should include at least 2 outside sources.

cç: Bill Bogley, Stefani Dawn, Vicki Tolar Burton
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To: Rebecca Warner, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
   Susie Brubaker-Cole, Associate Provost for Academic Success and Engagement
   Kevin Gable, Faculty Senate President
   W. Dan Edge, Faculty Senate President-Elect
   Robert Mason, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison to the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC)

From: Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi, BCC Co-Chairs and the entire BCC

Date: June 10, 2013

Re: Baccalaureate Core Leadership

The end of the 2012-13 academic year culminates an amazing three year period for attention and effort towards General Education at Oregon State University. On the heels of the Ad Hoc Baccalaureate Core Task Force, which produced the Vitalization of General Education at OSU report in 2010 (see http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/other/bcr/reports/), a dedicated team of OSU faculty (including the BCC) has drafted and implemented Category Learning Outcomes (CLO) for the distinct Baccalaureate Core Categories and worked closely with representatives from Academic Affairs to cultivate attentiveness to undergraduate student learning relative to these outcomes. This team has:

- Codified the progressive nature of our core by implementing first and second year skills requirements for speech, mathematics, and writing.
- Improved the new and change course proposals process for potential Baccalaureate Core courses by revising the Bacc Core Curricular Proposal System questions to focus on how students will achieve the relevant CLO in the course.
- Launched a re-envisioned Category Review process built upon a platform of shared governance whereby the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) helps the Baccalaureate Core Committee gather information from OSU academic units on courses in selected Baccalaureate Core categories.
- Initiated, with this Category Review process, an assessment process on a seven-year cycle that, in the aggregate, will help OSU attend to the efficacy of the Baccalaureate Core as a whole as well as meet the concern of our accreditors, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, that we shore up our assessment of student learning in our general education curriculum.

A key player in the realization of all these improvements and processes has been Vicki Tolar Burton, the Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation. Vicki’s appointment in 2010 was made in service of helping OSU to implement the salient recommendations in the aforementioned Vitalization report. Needless to say, Vicki has been most productive in her time in the position, exemplified by the Vitalization recommendations having come to fruition. With the “implementation” complete, it makes sense that Vicki’s position in its current form sunset. However, the collective efforts of the last three years to vitalize the Baccalaureate Core have illuminated to those involved (especially those of us on the BCC) the need for a permanent Director of Baccalaureate Core. The intent of this memo is to advocate for such a position.
More than anything, the findings of the *Vitalization* report and collaborative efforts of the last three years have highlighted the need for OSU to think about the Baccalaureate Core not just as an element of undergraduate education but also as a program. And while there is no question that the faculty oversight of the Baccalaureate Core in the form of the BCC is imperative, relying solely on a volunteer committee with transient membership and leadership to administer a program is not sustainable. A report to the OSU 2007 strategic planning leadership by the 2002 Baccalaureate Core Committee itemized a number of suggestions for improving the Baccalaureate Core. As noted in the Vitalization report, the absence of an administrative stakeholder resulted in no action being taken on any of those widely discussed improvements. Some were addressed in Vitalization under the leadership of the transitional director over the past two years. Here is an accounting of some the important Bacc Core impacts beyond the capacity of the BCC, its co-chairs, and the Faculty Senate leadership that go towards maintaining program excellence:

- Marketing and reminders involving the Bacc Core (e.g. directed communication prior to the start of each term with information/reminders about Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes and syllabus requirements).
- Regular content maintenance and enhancement of the Baccalaureate Core web site that was initiated by Vicki.
- Group and individual consultation with OSU faculty on integrating Category Learning Outcomes into Bacc Core courses and developing manageable plans for assessing them.

In many respects, these past few years have been much about the adjustment and development of processes to meet the institutional and regional expectations for a stronger general education curriculum. Having a leadership team of the BCC co-chairs, Vicki in her role, and the Assistant Director of Assessment (Stefani Dawn from APAA) to shoulder the burden of change and implementation has been ideal. That the current co-chairs are cycling off the committee at the end of year and that the transitional director position is ending highlights other long term advantages of having a permanent director:

- A permanent director would provide continuity and institutional memory to support the BCC (which sees partial change in membership annually) in its functions.
- A permanent director in an ex-officio role could offer insight and guidance on the Course and Category Review functions of the BCC, and consult with the co-chairs when Executive Committee provides other charges to the BCC.
- A permanent director could be the keeper of the bigger picture in terms of the Bacc Core as program and could shepherd long term program enhancements that carry over from year-to-year amidst changes in the BCC leadership and membership.
- A permanent director could attend to the nuanced faculty and unit needs in terms consultation and development around their Bacc Core courses and their assessment of student learning in those courses.
- A permanent director could work directly with the Assistant Director of Assessment to coordinate the Category Review process and organize materials in way that streamlines the workload of the BCC and put them in prime position to complete its essential function – quality control on new and existing courses in the Baccalaureate Core. The two could also assure that OSU is well-positioned to meet any new or continuing demands of our accrediting body relative to the general education component of our undergraduate degrees.
- A permanent director could liaison between the BCC and initiatives where the Bacc Core as a program is at play in our relationships with other community college and university partners (e.g. Degree Partnership Program, Transfer Articulation Agreements, Dual Degree Partnerships with International Institutions).
- A permanent director might be jointly situated in the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation and the Center for Teaching and Learning given the responsibility to assessment, accreditation, and faculty consultation and development in course improvement and innovation.
Precedence for such ex-officio support of a Faculty Senate committee exists in other areas of the university. The Registrar’s Office has an ex-officio representative on the Academic Standing Committee and the Academic Requirements Committee, supports those committees administratively, and communicates decisions on their behalf. Even within the Baccalaureate Core itself, we have two categories, Difference, Power, and Discrimination and Writing Intensive Curriculum, which are constituted as programs and have faculty administrative leadership to oversee existing courses and support the development of new courses.

Finally, we’re aware that the university has turned its attention towards initiatives that will enhance the First Year Experience. Given that undergraduate students are engaging with Baccalaureate Core from the point of matriculation, the Baccalaureate Core is an essential component of the First Year Experience. Baccalaureate Core classes contribute heavily to an undergraduate student’s first foray into building the competency necessary to realize OSU’s Learning Goals for Graduates. A dedicated Director of Baccalaureate Core could contribute greatly to the conversations around curricular components of the First Year Experience and could liaison between the BCC and the important First Year Experience initiatives that will be on the table in the coming years.

We want to reiterate that we believe that ownership of the Baccalaureate Core should always reside with the faculty. Creating this position is not about offloading any existing responsibilities of the BCC, but rather enhancing our capacity to make informed and accurate decisions about our core curriculum. The BCC greatly appreciates your leadership and support of the Baccalaureate Core at OSU. We believe in its critical role in undergraduate education and feel strongly that having a Director of Baccalaureate Core will not only help OSU to maintain the developments and progress made the last three years but also stimulate innovation and shepherd the Baccalaureate Core to the next level of excellence.

cc: Bill Bogley, Stefani Dawn, Vicki Tolar Burton
Appendix A

Baccalaureate Core Committee
2011-2012 Curriculum Review Process

All BCC members are a part of the Curriculum Proposal System and will automatically receive system notification when there are courses awaiting review by the BCC. Here is the agreed-upon process we will use to address these course reviews:

1. The BCC co-chairs will assign each course proposal to an individual BCC member for review, who will, in turn, offer commentary and recommendations when the course is discussed at a BCC meeting. BCC members are welcome and encouraged to look at all pending proposals, if they wish.

2. When assigning a review, the BCC co-chairs will send a review cover sheet to the BCC member in charge of the review. The BCC member will then go into the Curriculum Proposal System to consider the materials submitted on behalf of the course. For the time being, reviewers will be responsible for all information on the cover sheet. Hopefully, we will soon have a qualified student worker who can assess the more perfunctory sections of the course proposal.

3. BCC members do not need to enter commentary in the Curriculum Proposal System. The BCC chairs will designate a portion of selected meetings for discussion of course reviews. Agendas for these particular meetings will be established in advance, and proposals up for discussion will have their proposal numbers listed on the agenda.

4. Reviewers will present comments/recommendations/issues with the course proposal. Reviewers should also highlight exceptionally strong proposals. The BCC will discuss, and the co-chairs will enter the decision of the committee into the system and serve as correspondent on behalf of the committee in follow-up discussions with proposers.
Baccalaureate Core Committee (Bill Bogley and Kerry Kincanon, Co-chairs)

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate student attainment of category learning outcomes. This work depends on the availability of data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC will solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

4. All submissions that deal with writing skills WRI and WRII must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which consists of the English Department's Composition and Professional Writing Coordinators, and the Writing Center Coordinator, and is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

5. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses which are deemed by the BCC to meet these criteria and address the category learning outcomes can be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to approval by the Curriculum Council.

6. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

B. BCC Category Reviews

1. The BCC will periodically request and review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses meeting these criteria will be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to prior approval by the Curriculum
Council: institutional data in order to evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:

a. adequate access to courses within the category;

b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning;

c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes; and

d. continued satisfaction of category criteria by individual courses.

2. The BCC will periodically review courses accepted for general education to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses.

3. The BCC shall consist of two subcommittees, each with one-half of the committee membership and in proportion to its overall representation, for the purposes of general and categorical reviews. Each subcommittee will review separate categories as part of the periodical review.

4. In order for courses to be accepted for or denied from inclusion by a BCC subcommittee, each course must receive the approval of two-thirds of the voting members.

5. The BCC has the authority to deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the appropriate criteria.

3. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

Rationale: The Committee on Committees recommended changes to Items A.1 (relative to solicitation of course) and A.4 (relative to the composition of the Writing Advisory Board) and we have adopted those changes exactly. The committee also specified the scope of the Advisory Board in its consideration of course proposals involving writing, limiting its considerations to proposals in WRI and WRII. The committee concluded that the writing components in WIC courses are already subject to review by the WIC Director and that Synthesis courses, which also have a required writing component, are more clearly rooted in their disciplines.

The Committee on Committee also recommended deletion of items B.3 and B.4 (both concerning BCC operations relative to category review). In light of the EC charge relating to student learning outcomes and category review, the BCC has concluded that additional clarity and specificity is needed in the standing rules relative to this BCC function. To meet this need, we re-titled Section B of the standing rules to refer specifically to category review. Thus Section A refers exclusively to proposals for courses to be added to the Core. As a result, item B.1 from the current rules was re-cast and moved to Section A.5 inasmuch as it pertains to proposals seeking to add courses to the Core. Item A.6, relating to quorum and voting standards, was added to ensure that business will be completed in a timely manner. These standards comply with default standards used by the Faculty Senate.

Section B is re-titled “Category Reviews,” which is the primary means by which the BCC oversees the overall cohesiveness and effectiveness of the Core. B.1 specifies the obligation of the BCC to conduct category review and to incorporate evidence of student learning into the process. Item B also specifies
interactions with institutional administrative actors for the purpose of data-gathering. We have also added a sentence to the preamble of the standing rules indicating the expectation that the BCC will have access to “data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee.” This aspect of shared governance and institutional support for the Core is embedded within the “vitalization agenda” for the Core that was adopted by the Faculty Senate in June 2010. Finally, Item B.2 asserts BCC authority and obligation to work with departments to ensure that courses meet the standards and needs of the Core and Item B.3 details quorum and voting standards for category review processes.

Committee on Committees Review: Approve
Faculty Senate approved April 12, 2012
The educational mission begins and ends with students.
### 7-Year Category Review Calendar

Below is a draft timeline for the Baccalaureate Core category review. The review of the WIC courses is still being planned and the Baccalaureate Core Committee is still accepting input into the calendar. If you have questions or comments about the calendar, please contact the Baccalaureate Core Committee co-chairs, Bill Bogley at Bill.Bogley@oregonstate.edu or Kerry Kincanon at Kerry.Kincanon@oregonstate.edu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term Activities</th>
<th>Categories to be Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Spring 2012 - Complete webforms&lt;br&gt; Fall 2012 - Review occurs</td>
<td>• Contemporary Global Issues&lt;br&gt; • Science, Technology and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect data on learning outcomes (Fall 2012 and Spring 2013)&lt;br&gt; End of Spring 2013 - Complete webforms&lt;br&gt; Fall 2013 - Review occurs</td>
<td>• Speech&lt;br&gt; • Mathematics&lt;br&gt; • Fitness&lt;br&gt; • WIC: College of Agricultural Sciences; College of Business; School of Public Health and Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>End of Spring 2014 - Complete webforms&lt;br&gt; Fall 2014 - Review occurs</td>
<td>• Difference, Power and Discrimination&lt;br&gt; • WIC: College of Engineering; International Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>End of Spring 2015 - Complete webforms&lt;br&gt; Fall 2015 - Review occurs</td>
<td>• Western Culture&lt;br&gt; • Cultural Diversity&lt;br&gt; • WIC: College of Liberal Arts - WLF, Psych, Arts/Comm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>End of Spring 2016 - Complete webforms&lt;br&gt; Fall 2016 - Review occurs</td>
<td>• Literature and the Arts&lt;br&gt; • Social Processes and Institutions&lt;br&gt; • WIC: College of Liberal Arts - LCS, History/PHL, Public Policy, American Studies, Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Courses and Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>End of Spring 2017 - Complete webforms Fall 2017 - Review occurs</td>
<td>Writing I, Writing II, WIC: College of Science; College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences; BRR; ENC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>End of Spring 2018 - Complete webforms Fall 2018 - Review occurs</td>
<td>Physical Science, Biological Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>End of Spring 2019 - Complete webforms Fall 2019 - Review occurs</td>
<td>Contemporary Global Issues, Science, Technology and Society, WIC: College of Forestry; College of Education; College of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

**Snapshot of Assessment Activity by Cycle Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 7</strong></td>
<td>Units gather assessment data on Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes and submit webform by the end of spring term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td>BCC completes category review and coordinates with Academic Affairs on providing feedback and necessary curriculum development to units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching in the category provided the opportunity to participate in faculty development related to General Education and Learning Outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3</strong></td>
<td>Units complete a brief interim report on activities related to Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 4</strong></td>
<td>No Scheduled Activities or reports; units should continue to monitor learning outcomes compliance and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 5</strong></td>
<td>No Scheduled Activities or reports; units should continue to monitor learning outcomes compliance and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 6</strong></td>
<td>Units provided the opportunity to prepare for Year 7 assessment data-gathering by participating in Assessment Development Workshops. Units are encouraged to start gathering representative course syllabi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*We're starting the pilot of this assessment plan with a combination of Year 6, the "Assessment Development" year, and Year 7, the "Data Gathering" year.*
## Appendix D

### BCC Tasks by Category Review Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BCC Category Review Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Establish new Category Review Process; Prepare for Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Category Review for Synthesis; Coordinate with Academic Affairs to provide feedback and necessary curriculum development to Units offering Synthesis Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Category Review for Speech, Mathematics, Fitness, and CAS, COB, COED, PHHS WIC; Coordinate with Academic Affairs to provide feedback and necessary curriculum development to Units offering Speech, Mathematics, Fitness, and CAS, COB, COED, PHHS WIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Category Review for DPD and COENGR, COF WIC; Coordinate with Academic Affairs to provide feedback and necessary curriculum development to Units offering DPD and COENGR, COF WIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Category Review for Western Culture, Cultural Diversity, and CLA WIC. Coordinate with Academic Affairs to provide feedback and necessary curriculum development to Units offering Western Culture, Cultural Diversity, and CLA WIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Category Review for Literature &amp; the Arts, Social Processes &amp; Institutions, and COS, Pharm, COAS, International Degree WIC; Coordinate with Academic Affairs to provide feedback and necessary curriculum development to Units offering Literature &amp; the Arts, Social Processes &amp; Institutions, and COS, Pharm, COAS, International Degree WIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>Category Review for Writing 1, Writing II, and Honors WIC; Coordinate with Academic Affairs to provide feedback and necessary curriculum development to Units offering Writing 1, Writing II, and Honors WIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>Category Review for Physical Science and Biological Science; Coordinate with Academic Affairs to provide feedback and necessary curriculum development to Units offering Physical Science and Biological Science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes by Category

Students taking a course in the designated category will:

**Skills**

**Writing I**

1. Be able to use multiple writing strategies in order to explore, clarify, and effectively communicate ideas to appropriate audiences.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of language, form, and style.
3. Incorporate critical thinking at all steps in their writing process.

**Writing II**

1. Apply multiple theories, concepts, and techniques for creating and evaluating written communication.
2. Write effectively for diverse audiences within a specific area or discipline using appropriate standards and conventions.
3. Apply critical thinking to writing and writing process, including revision.

**Speech**

1. Demonstrate ethical and competent communication.
2. Articulate theories of communication and/or rhetoric.
3. Apply critical thinking to communication and/or rhetoric.

**Mathematics**

1. Identify situations that can be modeled mathematically.
2. Calculate and/or estimate the relevant variables and relations in a mathematical setting.
3. Critique the applicability of a mathematical approach or the validity of a mathematical conclusion.

**Fitness**

1. Identify and explain scientific principles and concepts of physical fitness, nutrition, and positive health behaviors.
2. Develop a personally appropriate fitness and health program, including, for example, realistic physical activity, behavior-change strategies, stress management, and nutrition.
**Perspectives**

**Biological and Physical Sciences**
1. Recognize and apply concepts and theories of basic physical or biological sciences.
2. Apply scientific methodology and demonstrate the ability to draw conclusions based on observation, analysis, and synthesis.
3. Demonstrate connections with other subject areas.

**Cultural Diversity**
1. Identify and analyze characteristics of a cultural tradition outside of European/American culture.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of how perspectives can change depending on cultural or historical contexts.
3. Describe aspects of Non-Western culture that influence or contribute to global cultural, scientific, or social processes.

**Literature and the Arts**
1. Recognize literary and artistic forms/styles, techniques, and the cultural/historical contexts in which they evolve.
2. Analyze how literature/the arts reflect, shape, and influence culture.
3. Reflect critically on the characteristics and effects of literary and artistic works.

**Social Processes and Institutions**
1. Use theoretical frameworks to interpret the role of the individual within social process and institutions.
2. Analyze current social issues and place them in historical context(s).
3. Critique the nature, value, and limitations of the basic methods of the social sciences.

**Western Culture**
1. Identify significant events, developments, and/or ideas in the Western cultural experience and context.
2. Interpret the influence of philosophical, historical, and/or artistic phenomena in relation to contemporary Western culture.
3. Analyze aspects of Western culture in relation to broader cultural, scientific, or social processes.
Synthesis

Contemporary Global Issues

1. Analyze the origins, historical contexts, and implications of contemporary global issues.
2. Explain the complex nature and interdependence of contemporary global issues using a multi-disciplinary approach.
3. Articulate in writing a critical perspective on contemporary global issues using evidence as support.

Science, Technology, and Society

1. Analyze relationships among science, technology, and society using critical perspectives or examples from historical, political, or economic disciplines.
2. Analyze the role of science and technology in shaping diverse fields of study over time.
3. Articulate in writing a critical perspective on issues involving science, technology, and society using evidence as support.

Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD)

1. Explain how difference is socially constructed.
2. Using historical and contemporary examples, describe how perceived differences, combined with unequal distribution of power across economic, social, and political institutions, result in discrimination.
3. Analyze ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States.

Writing Intensive Courses (WIC)

1. Develop and articulate content knowledge and critical thinking in the discipline through frequent practice of informal and formal writing.
2. Demonstrate knowledge/understanding of audience expectations, genres, and conventions appropriate to communicating in the discipline.
3. Demonstrate the ability to compose a document of at least 2000 words through multiple aspects of writing, including brainstorming, drafting, using sources appropriately, and revising comprehensively after receiving feedback on a draft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baccalaureate Core Categories</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Life-Long Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Be able to use multiple writing strategies in order to explore, clarify, and effectively communication ideas to appropriate audiences.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate an understanding of language, form and style.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incorporate critical thinking at all steps in their writing process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Apply multiple theories, concepts, and techniques for creating and evaluating written communication.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Write effectively for diverse audiences within a specific area or discipline using appropriate standards and conventions.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Apply critical thinking to writing and writing process, including revision.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate ethical and competent communication.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Articulate theories of communication and/ or rhetoric.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Apply critical thinking to communication and/ or rhetoric.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify Situations that can be modeled mathematically.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Calculate and/or estimate the relevant variable and relations in a mathematical setting.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critique the applicability of a mathematical approach or the validity of a mathematical conclusion.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fitness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify and explain scientific principles and concepts of physical fitness, nutrition, and positive health behaviors.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop a personally appropriate fitness and health program, including, for example, realistic physical activity, behavior-change strategies, stress management, and nutrition.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Core Categories</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Pluralism</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Life-Long Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and Physical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognize and apply concepts and theories of basic physical or biological sciences.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apply scientific methodology and demonstrate the ability to draw conclusions based on observation, analysis, and synthesis.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrate connections with other subject areas.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify and analyze characteristics of a cultural tradition outside of European/American culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate an understanding of how perspectives can change depending on cultural or historical contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Describe aspects of Non-Western culture that influence or contribute to global cultural, scientific, or social processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognize literary and artistic forms/styles, techniques, and the cultural/historical contexts in which they evolve.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analyze how literature/the arts reflect, shape and influence culture.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reflect critically on the characteristics and effects of literary and artistic works.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Processes and Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Use theoretical frameworks to interpret the role of the individual within social processes and institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analyze current social issues and place them in historical context(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critique the nature, value and limitations of the basic methods of the social sciences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify significant events, developments, and/or ideas in the Western cultural experience and context.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpret the influence of philosophical, historical, and/or artistic phenomena in relation to contemporary Western Culture.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analyze aspects of Western culture in relation to broader cultural, scientific or social processes.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Learning Goals for Graduates

#### Baccalaureate Core Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synthesis</th>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Life-Long Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contemporary Global Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;1. Analyze the origins, historical contexts, and implications of contemporary global issues.</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;2. Explain the complex nature and interdependence of contemporary global issues using a multi-disciplinary approach.</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;3. Articulate in writing a critical perspective on contemporary global issues using evidence as support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science, Technology, and Society</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;1. Analyze relationships among science, technology, and society using critical perspectives or examples from historical, political or economic disciplines.</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;2. Analyze the role of science and technology in shaping diverse fields of study over time.</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;3. Articulate in writing a critical perspective on issues involving science, technology, and society using evidence as support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Learning Goals for Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baccalaureate Core Categories</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Life-Long Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference, Power, Discrimination</td>
<td>1. Explain how difference is socially constructed.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Using historical and contemporary examples, describe how perceived differences, combined with unequal distribution of power across economic, social, and political institutions, result in discrimination.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Analyze ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Learning Goals for Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baccalaureate Core Categories</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Life-Long Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive Curriculum</td>
<td>1. Develop and articulate content knowledge and critical thinking in the discipline through frequent practice of informal and formal writing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Demonstrate knowledge/understanding of audience expectations, genres, and conventions appropriate to communicating in the discipline.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Demonstrate the ability to compose a docent of at least 2000 words through multiple aspects of writing, including brainstorming, drafting, using sources appropriately, and revising comprehensively after receiving feedback on draft.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BCC TEMPLATE SYLLABUS

Course Name: XXX
Course Number: XXX
Course Credits: XXX

(Include number of hours course meets per week/term in lecture, recitation, laboratory, etc.)

Course Catalog Description: (Insert university catalog description)

Prerequisites XXXX (respond with None, if there are no prerequisites)
Co-requisites (delete this heading if there are no co-requisites)

Baccalaureate Core (BC) Syllabus Requirements:
Indicate that the course is an approved BC course
Indicate the category of the core (Difference, Power and Discrimination, etc.)
Include BC learning outcomes for the category (see website for listing) and these may be embedded into the class outcomes.
Describe for the student how critical thinking skills related to the subject matter are incorporated into the instructional methods and acquired by students
Describe how critical thinking will be measured or assessed in the course

Measurable Student Learning Outcomes: see Student Learning Outcomes (http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/policies/O_outcome.html) for a definition and instructions. (For 4XX/5XX courses, list appropriate distinctions in outcomes between the 4XX and 5XX versions of the course.)

Course Content: concise outline of topics and/or activities with tentative scheduling, including evaluations

Evaluation of Student Performance: (provide information as to how the student’s performance in the course will be evaluated and how the final determination of the grade of the course is determined).

Learning Resources (list the textbooks, lab manuals, etc...indicate if required or optional)

Statement Regarding Students with Disabilities
"Accommodations are collaborative efforts between students, faculty and Disability Access Services (DAS). Students with accommodations approved through DAS are responsible for contacting the faculty member in charge of the course prior to or during the first week of the term to discuss accommodations. Students who believe they are eligible for accommodations but who have not yet obtained approval through DAS should contact DAS immediately at 737-4098."

Link to Statement of Expectations for Student Conduct http://oregonstate.edu/admin/stucon/achon.htm

Diversity Statement:
The College of Health and Human Sciences strives to create an affirming climate for all students including underrepresented and marginalized individuals and groups. Diversity encompasses differences in age, color, ethnicity, national origin, gender, physical or mental ability, religion, socioeconomic background, veteran status, sexual orientation, and marginalized groups. We believe diversity is the synergy, connection, acceptance, and mutual learning fostered by the interaction of different human characteristics.

Religious Holiday Statement
Oregon State University strives to respect all religious practices. If you have religious holidays that are in conflict with any of the requirements of this class, please see me immediately so that we can make alternative arrangements.
Chairs and Heads, please forward to teaching faculty and advisors.

Dear Deans, Chairs, Heads, and Faculty,

This year the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) has been working to implement changes to the Baccalaureate Core (Bacc Core) approved by the Faculty Senate in June 2010. One of the charges was to establish student learning outcomes for each category of the Baccalaureate Core. Using existing category criteria and rationale statements, the BCC has drafted the learning outcomes and revised them based on feedback from representative faculty teaching in each category. The category learning outcomes have now been approved by the BCC. To further implementation of the learning outcomes:

- Instructors of Bacc Core courses need to include these learning outcomes in their syllabi beginning Fall 2011. Teachers can, of course, include additional learning outcomes specific to their course. A course in two categories has learning outcomes for both.
- Bacc Core faculty should also make sure that their syllabus indicates clearly to students which category of the Core is satisfied by taking the particular course.
- Faculty are reminded that every course in the Bacc Core needs to include and assess critical thinking as it applies in that discipline.

The learning outcomes for each category are available here: http://oregonstate.edu/ctla/baccalaureate-core

A list of all Baccalaureate Core courses and their categories is available here: http://catalog.oregonstate.edu/bcc.aspx

Please help us get the word out to your faculty about the new outcomes.

If you have questions about the learning outcomes, please contact Vicki Tolar Burton, Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation, at vicki.tolarburton@oregonstate.edu

Thanks for your help.

Mary Cluskey and Victor Hsu
Co-Chairs, Baccalaureate Core Committee of the Faculty Senate
Learning Outcomes of OSU Baccalaureate Core Curriculum

Through successful completion of the approved Baccalaureate Core courses or approved alternative activities, students will:

1) demonstrate critical thinking;
2) demonstrate oral and written communication skills across disciplines and within their major disciplines; and
3) engage with and perform analysis and interpretation of:
   a) university-level mathematics;
   b) principles of health and fitness;
   c) significant literary, artistic and scientific works;
   d) variability and bias in ideas and data sets;
   e) significant global problems using a multi-disciplinary approach;
   f) origins and operations of social discrimination;
   g) the nature, value, and limitations of scientific methods;
   h) the societal dimensions of science and technology, and their evolving relationships in addressing shared problems; and
   i) the evolving roles and achievements of civilizations and cultures.
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BACKGROUND
In an effort to meet the standards established by Oregon State University’s accrediting
body, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), the
Baccalaureate Core Committee of the Faculty Senate was asked to craft learning
outcomes from the criteria and rationale statements of the Baccalaureate Core. As an
institution OSU is required to assess student learning at several levels—assessment at the
course and program levels is moving forward, assessment of University-wide academic
advising continues, and we need to push ahead to assessing the Baccalaureate Core.
Learning outcomes are the foundation of assessment; they capture the most important
factors of a program, the essence of what we hope students will take away. These student
learning outcomes will guide the methods we use to gather data and later the discussions
of the results. Assessment of the general education component of a degree at Oregon
State will show us if we are achieving the outcomes and illuminate what improvements,
if any, are needed. This assessment will help with alignment throughout the University
experience from the beginning, through the discipline, and finally an OSU graduate. This
request comes from the Office of Academic Programs and Academic Assessment and the
University Assessment Council.1

APPROACH AND METHODS
Our approach to generating the learning outcomes envisioned a pyramiding scheme,
whereby the “essences” of the criteria and rationale for each of the categories of the Bacc
Core are aggregated up the hierarchy of the curriculum’s system and distilling to a short
list of overall learning outcomes. This vision was based in part on our understanding and
assumptions that there are redundancies or patent similarities among these “essences” of
the Bacc Core categories. Learning Outcomes were synthesized from the existing
Rationale and Criteria (see Appendix A) using the taxonomy of cognitive skills as
classified by Bloom2. The resulting list was discussed and revised through several
versions during the Winter and Spring 2007 terms by the Bacc Core committee. In a step-
by-step manner, our method is presented as follows.

In practice, the learning outcomes were created by extracting the text for a single
category in the Rational and Criteria (Fig. 1). Each statement (sentence, list item) was
separated as a line, and then a verb appropriate to the level of Bloom’s Taxonomy was

1 This introductory paragraph was prepared by Susie Leslie, OSU Academic Programs and Academic Assessment.
2 Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals; pp. 201-207; B. S. Bloom (Ed.) Susan
Fauer Company, Inc. 1956.
placed at the beginning of each line based on its subject matter. This step required consideration of the appropriate level and action word/verb. At least one of the cognitive domains of the taxonomy is represented in the amended statements. The order of statements was then sorted to match the taxonomy’s six levels from Knowledge (lowest) to Evaluation (highest). The level is shown in parentheses at the end of each statement, e.g., (K) for knowledge (Fig. 2).

**CURRENT CRITERIA AND RATIONALE**

Science, Technology, and Society courses shall:

1. Be upper division and at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Emphasize the interactions of science and/or technology and society (in general, or through significant examples of that interaction);
4. Place the subject in historical context;
5. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas;
6. Provide a perspective on the scientific or technological approach to understanding and manipulating the world by relating that perspective to its social context;
7. Use a multidisciplinary approach and be suitable for students from diverse fields; and
8. Include written composition.

Given the immense impact that science and technology have had on all facets of modern civilization, a disciplined study of the interaction of science and technology with society is a necessary part of general education. Students should understand the political and economic dimensions of scientific or technological change, the nature of the scientific enterprise and its relationship to technology, and the complexity of major revolutions in science and technology. (Students are encouraged to complete their baccalaureate core perspective requirements before taking the Science, Technology, and Society course.)

Figure 1. Current criteria and rationale statement for the STS category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science, Technology, and Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe specific relations between science and/or technology and society, and place this in historical context. (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distinguish interrelationships or connections among/between different subjects’ view of the immense impact that science and technology have had on all facets of modern civilization. (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Examine and illustrate a perspective on the scientific or technological approach to understanding and manipulating the world by relating that perspective to its social context. (Ap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analyze a problem from a multidisciplinary approach and recognize the views on this problem from diverse fields. (An)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Compose a body of written work that demonstrates understanding of the political and economic dimensions of scientific or technological change, the nature of the scientific enterprise and its relationship to technology, and the complexity of major revolutions in science and technology. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assess the general interactions of science and/or technology and society. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Demonstrate critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Derived learning outcomes for the STS category.
The structure of higher categories of the Bacc Core – Skills, Perspectives, DPD and Synthesis – was used as an intermediate level of aggregation. In this stage, statements were sorted according to their cognitive skill level. Statements of similar level, e.g., all (K) statements, were combined and simplified. At the end of this stage, there were at least seven learning outcomes for each of the higher categories. This process was repeated in the next stage for aggregation to a single list for the entire Bacc Core. This list, initially ca. 20 statements in length, was shortened to a dozen (or short list) on the basis of skill level. The final short list was discussed and reorganized over the course of three committee meetings to arrive at the Learning Outcomes of OSU Baccalaureate Core Curriculum (see below).

Learning Outcomes of OSU Baccalaureate Core Curriculum

Through successful completion of the approved Baccalaureate Core courses or approved alternative activities, students will:

1) demonstrate critical thinking;
2) demonstrate oral and written communication skills across disciplines and within their major disciplines; and
3) engage with and perform analysis and interpretation of:
   a) university-level mathematics;
   b) principles of health and fitness;
   c) significant literary, artistic and scientific works;
   d) variability and bias in ideas and data sets;
   e) significant global problems using a multi-disciplinary approach;
   f) origins and operations of social discrimination;
   g) the nature, value, and limitations of scientific methods;
   h) the societal dimensions of science and technology, and their evolving relationships in addressing shared problems; and
   i) the evolving roles and achievements of civilizations and cultures.
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Appendix A

Title: Rationale and Criteria of the Baccalaureate Core Curriculum at Oregon State University.

Source and Date: OSU Faculty Senate website of the Bacc Core Committee, November 2006
SKILLS

Writing I
Criteria and Rationale
Writing I courses shall:
1. Be lower division and at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Focus on the writing process, invention strategies, drafting and revision techniques, and the forms and conventions of writing;
4. Emphasize the ability to analyze content and reader response;
5. Require significant student practice coupled with evaluation;
6. Encourage appreciation and understanding of language, form and style; and
7. Develop increasingly sophisticated and efficient writing strategies.

Effective writing is essential both in education and professional pursuits. Furthermore, writing provides considerable pleasure throughout life as a means of exploring and clarifying ideas and communicating with others. Writing is challenging as well as rewarding. Effective writing in a variety of situations requires well-planned instruction and continued practice.

Writing II and Writing III/Speech
Criteria and Rationale
Writing II and Writing III/Speech courses shall:
1. Be at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Focus on relevant theory, concepts, and techniques for understanding the form of communication involved and for improving skills;
4. Provide concepts and guidelines for determining effective communication within a specific area or discipline, including conventions of that field;
5. Require significant student practice or performance coupled with evaluation; and
6. Encourage appreciation and understanding of language, form, and style.

The Writing II and Writing III/Speech area provides supervised practice in communication skills and extends the focus to professional communication concerns. To accommodate the needs of various undergraduate programs and diverse interests of students, a variety of writing and speech options should be offered.

Mathematics
Criteria and Rationale
The Bacc Core requirement in mathematics may be met by one of the following:

a. A satisfactory score on an appropriate placement test; or
b. Mathematics 105 or any higher-numbered mathematics course that meets the following criteria.

Mathematics courses shall:
1. Be at least 3 credits; 
2. Develop problem solving strategies; and 
3. Include at least one significant mathematical model.

Everyone needs to manipulate numbers, evaluate variability and bias in data (as in advertising claims), and interpret data presented both in numerical and graphical form. Mathematics provides the basis for understanding and analyzing problems of this kind. Mathematics requires careful organization and precise reasoning. It helps develop and strengthen critical thinking skills.

Fitness
Criteria and Rationale
Fitness courses shall:
1. Be lower division and consist of a lecture component of at least 2 credits and an activity-based component of at least 1 credit (these components are graded independently and can be taken in different terms)
2. Emphasize critical thinking in approaches to principles of health and fitness;
3. Provide information and experiences in the safe and effective means to initiate and maintain healthful behavior change and a physically active lifestyle
4. Have a fitness lecture component that will:
   a. Focus on an understanding of the scientific principles of physical fitness and positive health behaviors;
   b. Expose students to concepts related to physical fitness and health, such as stress management, nutrition, and risk avoidance behaviors;
   c. Provide practice in the development of personal fitness and health programming;
5. Have a fitness activity component that will:
   a. Provide techniques and opportunities to assess, evaluate, and practice physical fitness and associated health behaviors;
   b. Lead to the development of an appropriate fitness program based on assessments and in-class experiences in physical activity

Physical fitness and positive health behaviors are recognized as central to wellness. Students should understand the relationship between diseases and behavior. In order to achieve wellness, students need to assume personal responsibility for a physically active and healthy lifestyle.

PERSPECTIVES
Science
Criteria and Rationale
Science courses shall:
1. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
2. Focus on the meaning of the fundamental concepts and theories that broadly characterize basic (rather than applied) physical or biological science;
3. Illustrate, demonstrate, and analyze natural phenomena and systems;
4. Provide historical perspectives and context on the evolution of major theories and ideas;
5. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas; and
6. Examine the nature, value, and limitations of scientific methods and the interaction of science with society.

Science seeks to develop a fundamental description and understanding of the natural world, from elementary particles to the cosmos, including the realm of living systems. Students should have opportunity to explore the insights of science, to view science as a human achievement, and to participate in scientific inquiry. This experience includes the challenge of drawing conclusions based on observation, analysis, and synthesis. To ensure a broad perspective, the science requirement consists of two parts: physical science (including earth science) and biological science.

Western Culture
Criteria and Rationale
Western Culture courses shall:
1. Be lower division and at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Focus on a broad subject area and time period;
4. Study, from a historical perspective, the origins and evolution of important features of Western culture;
5. Examine events, movements, ideas or artistic achievements of Western culture in a broad context, including the significance they have for contemporary U.S. culture and institutions; and
6. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas.

Knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of Western culture are essential to a liberal education. Contemporary U.S. society in all its institutional, social, and cultural complexity is largely a product of Western culture. Understanding of Western culture and knowledge of its origin and evolution enable students to develop greater awareness of its past, present, and future.

Cultural Diversity
Criteria and Rationale
Cultural Diversity courses shall:
1. Be at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Focus on a broad subject area and time period;
4. Study, from a historical perspective, the origins, evolution, and/or contemporary state of civilizations and cultures that are either non-Western in origin or have evolved within Western culture in opposition to or in forms clearly distinct from the tradition;
5. Promote a culturally diverse perspective; and
6. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas.

Knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of diverse cultures are essential parts of a liberal education. Not only is the world a multicultural one, but most of its cultures contrast sharply with traditional Western culture. The U.S. is itself a multicultural society. Awareness of the contrasts and similarities between other cultures and traditional Western culture enables students to develop a greater understanding of both.

**Literature and the Arts**

**Criteria and Rationale**

Literature and the Arts courses shall:
1. Be lower division and at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Place the subject(s) in historical context;
4. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas;
5. Focus primarily on literature or the arts;
6. Actively engage students in significant works of literature or art;
7. Explore the conventions and techniques of the form(s) under consideration;
8. Address the role of literature or art in society; and
9. Encourage appreciation and understanding of the form(s) under consideration.

Literature and the other arts provide examples of ways individuals find pattern and meaning in their experience. Study of these art forms gives students expertise and sophistication not only in recognizing the methods by which pattern and meaning are found, but also in critiquing those methods. Through literature and the arts, students engage their own and other cultures, examine their values, and discover sources of lifelong pleasure.

**Social Processes and Institutions**

**Criteria and Rationale**

Social Processes and Institutions courses shall:
1. Be lower division and at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Place the subject(s) in historical context;
4. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas;
5. Focus on methods, concepts, and theories for understanding the structure and change of major social institutions, and for understanding individual behavior as part of a social dynamic;
6. Examine the nature, value, and limitations of the basic methods of the social sciences, and discuss the interaction of the social sciences and society; and
7. Provide a perspective on the evolution of the theories and ideas emphasized in the course.
Human beings are inevitably social, influencing and being influenced by social groups. The social sciences study social institutions and processes and deal with the human behaviors and values that form and change them, and are essential for an understanding of contemporary society.

DIFFERENCE, POWER AND DISCRIMINATION
Criteria and Rationale
Difference, Power and Discrimination courses shall:
1. Be at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Have as their central focus the study of the unequal distribution of power within the framework of particular disciplines and course content;
4. Focus primarily on the United States, although global contexts are encouraged;
5. Provide illustrations of ways in which structural, institutional, and ideological discrimination arise from socially defined meanings attributed to difference;
6. Provide historical and contemporary examples of difference, power, and discrimination across cultural, economic, social, and political institutions in the United States;
7. Provide illustrations of ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States;
8. Provide a multidisciplinary perspective on issues of difference, power, and discrimination;
9. Incorporate interactive learning activities (e.g., ungraded, in-class writing exercise; classroom discussion; peer-review of written material; web-based discussion group);
and
10. Be regularly numbered departmental offerings rather than x99 or blanket number courses.

The unequal distribution of social, economic, and political power in the United States and in other countries is sustained through a variety of individual beliefs and institutional practices. These beliefs and practices have tended to obscure the origins and operations of social discrimination such that this unequal power distribution is often viewed as the natural order. The DPD requirement engages students in the intellectual examination of the complexity of the structures, systems, and ideologies that sustain discrimination and the unequal distribution of power and resources in society. Such examination will enhance meaningful democratic participation in our diverse university community and our increasingly multicultural U.S. society.

SYNTHESIS
Contemporary Global Issues
Criteria and Rationale
Contemporary Global Issues courses shall:
1. Be upper division and at least 3 credits;
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
3. Focus, from a historical perspective, on the origin and nature of critical issues and problems that have global significance;
4. Emphasize the interdependence of the global community;
5. Use a multidisciplinary approach and be suitable for students from diverse fields; and
6. Include written composition.

Our world has become increasingly interdependent. Social, economic, political, environmental, and other issues and problems originating in one part of the world often have far-reaching ramifications in other parts of the world. These issues and problems not only transcend geographical boundaries but also cross academic disciplines. Therefore, if students are to acquire understanding of and to discover effective responses to such issues and problems, they must acquire both global and multidisciplinary perspectives. (Students are encouraged to complete their baccalaureate core perspective requirements before taking the Contemporary Global Issues course.)

Science, Technology, and Society
Criteria and Rationale
Science, Technology, and Society courses shall:
9. Be upper division and at least 3 credits;
10. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
11. Emphasize the interactions of science and/or technology and society (in general, or through significant examples of that interaction);
12. Place the subject in historical context;
13. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas;
14. Provide a perspective on the scientific or technological approach to understanding and manipulating the world by relating that perspective to its social context;
15. Use a multidisciplinary approach and be suitable for students from diverse fields; and
16. Include written composition.

Given the immense impact that science and technology have had on all facets of modern civilization, a disciplined study of the interaction of science and technology with society is a necessary part of general education. Students should understand the political and economic dimensions of scientific or technological change, the nature of the scientific enterprise and its relationship to technology, and the complexity of major revolutions in science and technology. (Students are encouraged to complete their baccalaureate core perspective requirements before taking the Science, Technology, and Society course.)
Dear Colleagues of the CIPT4. We appreciated the opportunity to meet with you last week to begin discussion and collaboration on general education issues at OSU. The BCC found the meeting very valuable. We have received your May 16, 2002 memo that highlights issues identified for further discussion by your committee. In e-mail correspondence, Polly said it would be helpful to have a reply from the BCC before your meeting on May 24.

Our reply is organized in three parts:

I. General Observations and Discussion

1. It is our overall impression that neither the BCC nor the CIPT4 is aware of any campus-wide information that suggests that the current baccalaureate core program is seriously flawed or in need of a systemic overhaul (a la the CRC process of 1988-1989).

2. Both committees agree that there are areas (perhaps not always the same areas) within the current baccalaureate core where more flexibility in interpretation of the core criteria or modification of some criteria merit study.

3. Regarding Items 1 and 2, the BCC unequivocally affirms its commitment to the Baccalaureate Core Program and its goals, even as we seek information about the core's effectiveness and how it might be improved.

4. The BCC is still trying to understand its role, charge, and authority and the role, charge, and authority of CIPT4 in the review of the undergraduate experience at OSU. What is the goal? Is it to identify issues that other committees are to study beginning this summer or fall? Or, is either (or both) of the committee(s) charged to propose specific changes, if warranted? If the latter, then to whom and with what next steps? Where is the ultimate decision power? With the Faculty Senate?

5. Whether minor or major changes in the undergraduate experience are ultimately the goal, how will the pulse of the campus be taken? If the endgame is one of minor tune-ups of that experience, then taking of the pulse could be somewhat cursory. If major changes are contemplated, then how and who will coordinate and evaluate the extensive campus-wide meetings and discussions that should accompany such change?

6. The formation of lists of issues may be a good way to start our collaboration and the broader university discussions to follow, but the BCC is concerned that such lists could lead to a rather piecemeal approach focused on specific concerns and open the real danger that the discussion of individual issues will not take proper account of the overall educational goals and philosophy of the baccalaureate core. We don't want to lose sight of the forest for the trees.

7. The faculty should be making recommendations and decisions concerning curriculum and the undergraduate experience based upon sound academic and intellectual motives and not on financial ones. Financial considerations are important and will have effect. In the end, if OSU must modify programs for financial rather than academic reasons, then OSU should expressly state that this is the case and that the university cannot afford to provide its students the desired academic experience in the affected area.
II. Discussion Topics Identified by (at least one) BCC Member (and a few comments)

1. WIC -- How can we not afford it?

A university education has two essential components - acquisition of knowledge and the ability to effectively use and communicate that knowledge. The WIC requirement is a capstone experience that merges these two essential components and does so in the student's major area. While the question, "Can we afford WIC?" is based on economic considerations and is a reasonable question, the BCC believes that we must prepare our upper division students for written communication in their disciplines. We are open to exploring ways to address economic issues regarding WIC. We hope that those with economic concerns will also be open to considering the vital role of writing in an OSU education.

2. Modify the Perspectives Science requirement to allow field labs. In general, consider a more flexible interpretation of the requirement.

Note: The BCC Chair raised the issue of changing or eliminating the lab requirement at a meeting of the COS Curriculum Committee last fall and invited it to suggest such a change if it wished to. No proposal was forthcoming from the COS.

3. HHP 231 and the Fitness requirement of the baccalaureate core.

This course and this requirement have been contentious issues with students, faculty, and advisors ever since the baccalaureate core was adopted. The BCC submitted a report to the Faculty Senate about two years ago and the Senate changed the Skills Fitness requirements but the background discontent has not diminished.

4. A grammar writing class should be added to the core.

Input from one of our student members.

5. Perspective courses are required to be lower division, but the point of this requirement is broad accessibility of the course. This requirement could be revisited.

6. Synthesis courses are required to be upper division, but again this requirement could be overly restrictive.

III. CIPT4 Topic List with annotated BCC Comments

1. Science - Do we need three lab science classes to assure scientific literacy? Can this requirement be more inclusive? Could it include one non-lab science? Could the definition of lab be expanded to include field experiences? Could we encourage multidisciplinary science classes?

This item is of interest to both committees and we should decide how we want to proceed regarding follow up. We may want to ask: What do our peer institutions think? The lab issue could be addressed by the BCC submitting a report and recommendation to the Faculty Senate much as was done with the recent Skills Fitness report. That process was started with a request from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

2. WIC - Can we afford it? How do we provide a WIC experience for students in multidisciplinary majors (general science or liberal studies)? Could the Honors College or International Degree thesis be WICed?

Can we afford it? Does afford refer to class size and/or do you have other things in mind?

There is clearly a need for further discussion here; see II.1. There seems to be much misinformation abroad about WIC. It is the impression of the BCC chair that faculty (departmental chairs?) seem to interpret the WIC guidelines as much less flexible than is the case in practice when individual faculty members work with the BCC and WIC director.
to develop courses that meet departmental needs as well as satisfy the WIC guidelines.

The multidisciplinary issue: Liberal Studies now has a WIC seminar, effective Spring Term 2002. Gary Tiedeman, Chair of Sociology, designed it and development of the seminar was encouraged and supported by CLA seed money. The BCC, WIC director, and the Curriculum Council helped expedite the process. This will help with the crunch of LS students needing WIC courses. So, CLA is actively working on the WIC issue for LS students. The only major WIC availability problem known to the BCC is in the COS for General Science majors. A few new biology WIC courses have been approved this year, but the COS has relied on CLA through History of Science WICs to serve General Science majors in the COS. (This was an artifact of the move of the History of Science to CLA.) HSTS will no longer provide these WIC courses for the COS effective June 16, 2002. The COS does have a problem because resources indirectly supplied to it by CLA in the past will no longer be available. This is a resource allocation issue.

How do we provide a WIC experience for students in multidisciplinary majors (general science or liberal studies)? The current agreement is that a student whose major is interdisciplinary (ENV Science, LS, American Studies, etc.) can take his/her WIC in any department related to the student's degree. The judgment of which department and which course is left to the discretion of the student's advisor. Up until now, General Science students have mostly taken History of Science courses for their WICs, but some take other WICs. There are now several WIC choices in Pharmacy; so PrePharm students could take those.

The foregoing describes how we now provide a WIC experience for multidisciplinary majors. Is that the question you wanted answered or did you intend to raise another question namely why WIC needs to be in the student's major and whether there is a "spirit" of that requirement that could better apply to multi/interdisciplinary majors?

The International Degree thesis is an approved WIC already. An approach was worked out that would meet all WIC criteria. This has been in place since about 1996.

The Honors College has not proposed the Honors thesis for WIC consideration. As with the International Degree, every effort would be made to try and design an experience that met both the Honors College needs and the WIC criteria.

3. International perspective - The original Bacc Core included an international component which seems to have gotten lost. Should we reintroduce that? Should we require that students spend a term abroad?

The BCC certainly agrees that the core should have an international perspective, and if it is lost, it should be found.

We can not require that students spend a term abroad to get an international perspective -- non-traditional students with families and children are hardly in a position to do that, nor are students who have to work and can not afford to do that or afford to give up a job that might not be waiting for them after a term away.

DPD and Cultural Diversity do contain international criteria, perhaps more is needed.

4. Teamwork - There is a need for students to learn to work on teams. How can we encourage/require that? Can the Center for Teaching and Learning provide professional development for faculty?

The BCC agrees that a teamwork experience is important but does not, at least now, see this as a BCC issue. Perhaps we are missing something? Teamwork seems like a requirement that OSU could require within each major at the upper division level. Presumably the teamwork experience could occur in a variety of major courses where classes are smaller and a teamwork experience would be more meaningful and manageable.
5. Assessment - Is this a good idea? Who would do it?

The OSU 2001 Accreditation Review member who interviewed the BCC chair asked if OSU was measuring student outcomes related to the baccalaureate core. The BCC chair said no and that he saw no way the BCC could do such an assessment. The Review member agreed, but said OSU needed to do something. It is not clear to the BCC that it is a good idea to undertake such an assessment because nobody knows how to do it. A first step might be to ask: How do our peer institutions handle this? Who would do it? The question is what would they do, then who.

6. HHP 231 - Students continue to complain that it is like high school. Is there a plan to evaluate the new options to see if it is working better?

This item is of interest to both committees and we should decide how we want to proceed regarding follow up. There is no plan in place to review the recently revised Skills Fitness requirement, but such a recommendation could emerge from our discussions. Is the question HHP 231 (the course) or the appropriateness of a Fitness requirement? If the Fitness requirement is in question, the Faculty Senate needs to bite the bullet and make a decision.

7. Information Literacy - (this came up at our meeting) should this be a thread that runs through all Bacc Core classes? Should it be part of WR II and/or III?

Isn't this just a natural part of getting a degree from OSU?

On the other hand: A study the WIC director did several years ago showed that nearly half of our students have had no formal training in library or internet use. Of those who have had library training, most received it from high school librarians. Of those who have had internet training, most received it from another student. So information literacy is not just an automatic part of an OSU education. Teachers assume it, but many students don't have it. They make it up as they go along.

Should this be a thread that runs through all Bacc Core classes? If this is discussed, it should be done so with input from librarians (preferably more than one). The places where it would be most effectively realized are places where students have projects or papers (WR121, Synthesis, WIC)

Should it be part of WR II and/or III? As of this year it is part of WR121 (two sessions for each section) but it is a huge drain on librarian time at a time when the library is understaffed and looking at further cuts. There is a small group in the library involved with assessment for information literacy on campus. We believe they are testing students this term. This is not specifically for measuring WR121 but to get baseline information for future activities.

There is now a library satellite group with which CIPT4 can consult (Co-chair is Loretta Rielly 7-2642).
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Overview

Purpose: Evaluate the effectiveness of writing within the Baccalaureate Core.

Problems Identified
1. Curriculum and Communication
   - Curriculum needs to be more uniform.
   - Information about expectations and results needs to be better communicated.
2. Resources and Management
   - Class sizes need to be better tracked and managed.
   - There are not enough extended writing assignments (i.e. more than 4 pages).
3. Student Support
   - Low-achieving students need more support.
   - Students overall need more practice with writing.

Sources of Information
- National Survey of Student Engagement Consortium for the Study of Writing in College
- Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core
- OSU faculty survey and focus group data
- Comparative institutional data

Results of Analysis

Strengths
- Faculty priorities are aligned with national expectations for writing.
- The current writing curriculum within the Bacc Core has several strengths.

Weaknesses
- Undergraduate writing at OSU needs improvement.
- The major areas of complaint about student writing are behavioral issues (e.g. lack of engagement, academic dishonesty, etc).
- Writing assignments within Bacc Core courses are not sufficient.
- Faculty are not taking advantage of tools related to the writing process.

Suggestions for Improvement
- Make sure that curriculum is uniform across sections and give advisors more information.
- Establish clearer expectations for writing in Synthesis courses.
- Introduce a model of Faculty Writing Advocates.
- Offer training on writing pedagogies to departmental units.
- Pilot a “stretch model” 100-level writing class for students with additional needs.
- Add and Information Literacy course to the Baccalaureate Core.

Potential Benefits
- Establish clearer, more uniform curriculum.
- Create means of managing the newly aligned curriculum.
- Maintain ongoing awareness of the importance of writing (i.e. build a culture of writing).
- Improve students’ written communication skills and their success as graduates.
Executive Summary

This report on the effectiveness of writing curriculum within the Baccalaureate Core at Oregon State University has been prepared by the Committee for the Review of Writing within the Baccalaureate Core, which was appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to assess writing components within the Baccalaureate Core. It is being submitted to Dr. Vicki Tolar Burton, Transitional Director for the Implementation of the Baccalaureate Core, the Baccalaureate Core Committee, and the Faculty Senior Executive Committee.

The review of writing in the Baccalaureate Core derives from a charge made by the Vitalization Report of the Baccalaureate Committee adopted by the OSU Faculty Senate on June 10, 2010.

The purpose of this report is to present and analyze findings on the status of writing components within the current Baccalaureate Core structure. These findings constitute data that was drawn explicitly for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of writing within the Baccalaureate Core. This data includes a review of current syllabi, survey and focus group responses from faculty, and comparative program data from peer institutions. Recommendations based on this data and the committee’s subsequent analysis are presented here as a means of suggesting potential changes to the structure and management of writing components within the Baccalaureate Core so as to improve undergraduate students’ experiences and faculty satisfaction related to writing.

The committee found that, although writing at OSU is not yet in a dire situation, we are not where we want to be, neither in terms of internal expectations, nor with respect to peer institutions. Moreover, recent trends are moving us away from our goals, such that attention and action are necessary. Based on the data gathered for this report, we believe that action should be taken to improve the following key areas:

- Faculty, Student, and University Involvement
- Clarity of Expectations
- Quality of Assignments
- Effective Ongoing Evaluation of Students

Most importantly, we believe that a culture of writing must be developed at OSU. This goal—which will be important to the ongoing success and reputations of OSU graduates—will require participation at the local classroom level, as well as ongoing commitment from the Baccalaureate Core Committee and top levels of university administration.

This report was prepared by the Committee for the Review of Writing within the Baccalaureate Core during AY 2011-2012. This committee was chaired by Dr. Susan Meyers, Director of Writing. Members included Dennis Bennett, Writing Center Assistant Director; Dr. David Bernell, Assistant Professor of Political Science; Tracy Ann Robinson, CoE Communication Collaboratory Director; Dr. Marion Rossi, Associate Professor of Theater; and Dr. Holly Swisher, Associate Professor of Math.
Introduction

The research for this report was conducted in response to a recommendation published in the *Vitalization of General Education at Oregon State University, the Final Report of the Baccalaureate Core Ad Hoc Review Committee* adopted by the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University on June 10, 2010. This document recommended that writing within the Baccalaureate Core Curriculum at Oregon State University be reviewed in more depth in order to assess the effectiveness of the current curriculum. As a result, the Committee for the Review of Writing within the Baccalaureate Core was established by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in fall of 2011 in order to review writing curriculum components within the Baccalaureate Core.

The committee had at its disposal two pre-existing documents from which to draw data. The first document, the *National Survey of Student Engagement Consortium for the Study of Writing in College: 2010 Oregon State University Findings*, was compiled by Dr. Rebecca A. Sanderson, Director of Student Affairs Research and Evaluation at Oregon State University. The second document, *Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core*, was compiled by a team of research assistants directed by Dr. Vicki Tolar Burton, Transitional Director for Implementation of the Baccalaureate Core at Oregon State University. In addition, the Committee for the Review of Writing within the Baccalaureate Core gathered three sources of new data: a survey of faculty at Oregon State University, a focus group of faculty at Oregon State University, and a review of writing programs and core curriculum at peer institutions.

The above data was applied toward an analysis of the effectiveness of existing writing curriculum within OSU’s Baccalaureate Core. At present, the Baccalaureate Core includes four components that require writing instruction and assignments related to writing:

I. Writing I: The course *WR 121: English Composition* is an introductory writing class that is required class for all OSU students.

II. Writing II: Students choose a second writing course from among a list of electives at the 200-level.

III. WIC (Writing Intensive Curriculum): All students take a WIC class in their major area.

IV. Synthesis: Students take two courses in this area, each of which is required to include a writing component.

Requirement #1: Writing I (WR 121)

All OSU students must satisfy the Writing I requirement either by taking WR 121 at OSU or transferring in the equivalent credit. WR I as defined by the Baccalaureate Core Guidelines and Rationale, which indicate that Writing I courses shall:

1. Be lower division and at least 3 credits.
2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking.
3. Focus on the writing process, invention strategies, drafting and revision techniques, and the forms and conventions of writing.
4. Emphasize the ability to analyze content and reader response.
5. Require significant student practice coupled with evaluation.
6. Encourage appreciation and understanding of language, form and style.
7. Develop increasingly sophisticated and efficient writing strategies.

The following is a list of the ways in which students may satisfy the Writing I requirement:

1. Take and pass WR 121 at OSU with a final grade of C- or better.
2. Successfully pass WR 121 at another college or university in the Oregon University System or through Oregon’s College Now program.
3. Transfer in an equivalent approved first-year composition course from another college or university.
4. Obtain a score of 3 or better on the AP Language & Literature or Language & Composition exam.
5. Earn an International Baccalaureate high school degree.
6. Take and successfully pass OSU’s WR 121 waiver exam.

Approximately 60% of students satisfy the Writing I requirement by taking WR 121 at OSU, while the remaining 40% of students transfer in credit for WR 121 earned elsewhere. A student transferring to OSU must have completed and passed a course that meets the requirements for Writing I. However, many courses that transfer in as meeting the WR I Bacc Core requirement have not been deemed equivalent to WR 121 and only come with LDT Lower Division Transfer Credit. This situation has proved frustrating for some students who erroneously believe that are not obliged to take WR 121 because they have satisfied the Writing I requirement.

Students who have studied writing in the past and do not wish to take WR 121 may take a waiver exam in order to attempt to pass out of WR 121. The exam is designed for transfer students whose prior writing courses have not been deemed equivalent to WR 121. About 10-12 students annually attempt the exam, and 90% pass because of the Part I sample requirement and careful advising. Anecdotal evidence is that students who pass the waiver exam are successful in later writing classes.

In keeping with state practices that universities not offer remedial writing courses, admitted students are expected to take WR 121. Therefore, OSU does not offer WR 115, which is a basic writing course offered at community colleges throughout Oregon. However, the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP) offers special sections of both WR 115 and WR 121 for students in their program. The EOP program is designed to support students from minority and/or first-generation college backgrounds who require additional academic support during their initial stages at OSU.

In most cases, entering OSU students do successfully pass WR 121. A review of the past two academic years indicates that approximately 90% of WR 121 students received grades of C- or higher during their first time taking the course. Although earlier requirements listed D- as a passing grade for WR 121, beginning in AY 2012 (Summer 2011), the passing grade in WR 121 is C- (which is also the minimum passing grade statewide for WR 121). Using that benchmark, approximately 10% of WR 121 students typically fall below C- grade level and thus must re-take the course. During 2011, a study was conducted to determine the principal causes of low
achievement in WR 121. The results (Appendix 1) suggest that reasons for low achievement are related to student behavioral patterns, rather than skills. However, there was some suggestion that more attention may need to be paid to ensure fair opportunity for success for students with disabilities.

Currently, all sections of WR 121 are under the jurisdiction of a Director of Writing who oversees standard syllabi, assignments, and textbooks. All sections of WR 121—including Ecampus, INTO, and EOP—are overseen by the Director of Writing, who is housed in the English Department (proposed School of Writing, Literature and Film).

**Requirement #2: Writing II**

Once students have successfully satisfied the Writing I requirement, they must take one course in the Writing II category:

- HC 199: Honors Writing
- PHL 121: Reasoning and Writing
- WR 201: Writing for Media
- WR 214: Writing in Business
- WR 222: English Composition II: Argumentation
- WR 224: Introduction to Writing Fiction
- WR 241: Introduction to Poetry Writing
- WR 323: English Composition III: Writing with Style
- WR 324: Short Story Writing
- WR 327: Technical Writing
- WR 330: Understanding Grammar
- WR 341: Poetry Writing
- WR 362: Science Writing

Students enroll in the Writing II course of their choosing. In some cases, specific programs or colleges require students to take a certain Writing II course. For example, WR 327: Technical Writing is required for many students within the College of Engineering. Currently, there is no set means of advising students into specific courses.

**Requirement #3: WIC**

WIC courses must be taken in the student’s major. These courses are designed to offer students an advanced level of writing instruction in the area of their major.

Each department offering an undergraduate major is expected to offer at least one WIC course for its majors, in as many sections as needed for access. Many departments offer more than one WIC choice. When proposing a new WIC course, the WIC syllabus is developed by a faculty member in the department and reviewed by the WIC director and the BCC. It must be approved by both as meeting WIC criteria to move forward in the approval system.
WIC is the only category of writing courses for which faculty receive support and guidance in developing courses. The support might be individual consulting or the five week WIC faculty seminar offered annually. Over 400 OSU faculty have participated in the faculty seminar since its inception in 1991. WIC as a Bacc Core category was last reviewed in 2000-2001, at which time 96 different WIC courses were reviewed.

WIC courses are varied in type. Departments have worked with the BCC and the WIC director to meet department needs for their majors. Some practices that lie outside the normal upper division course in the major are:

- Engineering: WIC courses are typically capstone project courses and may extend over more than one term.
- The College of Science (COS) has nearly 1,000 General Science majors with no home department and thus no obvious location for WIC to be taken. Many of these are Pre-Med or Pre-professional for other health professions. These students have historically been advised to take a History of Science WIC course.
- The College of Business offers only one WIC course, BA 353, for the whole college, rather than WIC courses in the majors.
- Three programs—Physics, Bioresource Research (BRR), and the International Degree—use the thesis option to satisfy their WIC requirement.

Students with two majors must satisfy the WIC requirement in each major. A process has been laid out by the BCC through which students whose two majors are closely related may apply for one WIC to satisfy both major requirements.

**Requirement #4: Synthesis**

Students must take two Synthesis courses—one each in the areas of CGI and STS—which must both be outside of their major. Synthesis courses are required to include “written composition.” The new Synthesis outcomes require the written composition to make an argument about a relevant topic and support it with evidence. The writing component of Synthesis courses is designed to give students additional practice with writing at the upper-division level, as well as to teach them about genre expectations beyond their major area.
Methodology

This report combines data from the principal sources that are significant to undergraduate writing in a core curriculum like Oregon State University’s Baccalaureate Core:

- student experiences
- faculty perspectives
- institutional operations
- programs at peer institutions

Data covering these four areas was gathered in a variety of ways:

- national survey of students
- survey of student success rates in Baccalaureate Core writing courses at Oregon State University
- survey of syllabi within Baccalaureate Core courses at Oregon State University
- survey of faculty perspectives on student writing within Baccalaureate Core courses at Oregon State University
- faculty focus groups on writing within Baccalaureate Core courses at Oregon State University
- review of writing program and core curriculum models at peer institutions

These data sources are represented in two pre-existing reports, as well as new data generated for the purpose of the present report:

1. National Survey of Student Engagement Consortium for the Study of Writing in College: 2010 Oregon State University Findings, was compiled by Dr. Rebecca A. Sanderson, Director of Student Affairs Research and Evaluation at Oregon State University.
2. Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core, was compiled by a team of research assistants directed by Dr. Vicki Tolar Burton, Transitional Director for Implementation of the Baccalaureate Core at Oregon State University.
3. New data gathered via a faculty survey and faculty focus groups at Oregon State University, as well as a review of writing program and core curriculum models at peer institutions.

The following sections outline the specific methodologies involved in gathering and processing data for each of these sources.

Data Source #1: National Survey of Student Engagement Consortium for the Study of Writing in College: 2010 Oregon State University Findings

This report, completed in April 2011, was prepared by Dr. Rebecca A. Sanderson, Director of Student Affairs Research and Evaluation, drawing on data gathered through the Consortium for the Study of Writing in College that is part of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE survey is designed to assess students’ engagement with key components of traditional undergraduate education programs. The survey design draws on research which indicates that increased student engagement leads to increased learning. Data for the NSSE is
drawn by surveying first-year and senior students in order to capture information related to students’ engagement at the beginning of their college years, as well as change over time. Recently, the national Council of Writing Program Administrators designed an additional component to the NSSE survey: the Consortium for the Study of Writing in College. Universities that administer the NSSE survey on their campuses may opt to augment data collection to include this additional component on students’ experiences with writing. Oregon State University participated in the NSSE Consortium for the Study of Writing in College for the first time in 2010.

During winter and spring terms in 2010, all OSU first-year and senior students were administered the NSSE survey, including the writing consortium component, through their ONID email addresses. The web-based tool was made available to all enrolled students, and the survey was reissued a second time in order to encourage full participation. In total, 3,545 first-year students and 4,230 senior students responded to the general NSSE survey. All of these students were invited to take the additional writing consortium survey, which held 27 questions. A total of 447 first-year students and 771 senior students responded to the additional survey.

The NSSE survey and its related writing consortium survey are administered by the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University—Bloomington. Results were sent to OSU and were further processed by the Office of Student Affairs Research and Evaluation. In order to produce meaningful data comparisons, the composite results from the NSSE writing consortium was divided out such that OSU was compared to peer institutions.

Data Source #2 Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core

This report was compiled by a team of research assistants under the direction of Dr. Vicki Tolar Burton, Transitional Director for Implementation of the Baccalaureate Core at Oregon State University. The purpose of this report was to assemble base-line information related to writing curriculum within the Baccalaureate Core so as to better facilitate the work of the Committee for the Review of Writing within the Baccalaureate Core. The report contains data drawn from two key sources: syllabi from Baccalaureate Core courses and instructor reports on low achievement in WR 121.

Syllabi from Baccalaureate Core Courses

Because a valid review of the effectiveness of the writing components in OSU’s Baccalaureate Core Curriculum depends in part on surveying writing assignments as they are currently being employed, a sample of syllabi were drawn from the following groups of courses:

- Writing II
- WIC
- Synthesis
Syllabi were collected via email invitations sent directly to the instructors and/or course directors who either teach or oversee these courses. In all, a total of 90 syllabi were sampled. An effort was made to represent all colleges, both on campus and Ecampus where possible, large and small classes, and to cover a large number of undergraduates served. This sampling allows looking across the Bacc Core categories at assignment genres and writing process, with attention to how class size and delivery (on site and online) might relate to the amount and types of writing assigned.

For WR I, the English departmental WR 121 syllabus was reviewed. For WR II, sections from all courses were sampled. For Synthesis courses, an effort was made to select STS and CGI courses within each college that, when aggregated as a sample, would reflect the overall proportion of enrollment by college in the total population of STS courses. Coverage in the sample was approximately 60% of this total population (2,371 out of 4,000 students), based on enrollment Winter and Spring terms 2011. WIC courses were sampled using a similar enrollment-weighted sample.

It is important to note that not all sections of a course use the same syllabus and assignments, so this selection is only a snapshot of parts of the Baccalaureate Core.

Syllabi and writing assignments from WR I and WR II and from selected sections from courses in the Synthesis categories of Contemporary Global Issues and Science, Technology and Society were requested. From these course materials, data were extracted and charted into matrix tables by pertinent aspects relevant to the Bacc Core criteria and to best practices in the teaching of writing. WIC data for courses were taken from syllabi in the WIC files and online system.

Where it was not clear if a common syllabus and outcomes were used across a WR II course, we sought more information from the faculty member who supervises that part of the WR II curriculum.

Best practices tracked in the study were drawn from those used in standard assessments of writing, including the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the NSSE Writing Consortium. For each category of courses noted above, the following data points and best practices were examined and tracked in syllabi:

1. Genres of writing assigned and number of each type of paper assigned (Are types of writing assigned appropriate to the level of the course?)
2. Length in pages (Experience with longer writing assignments is shown in research to correlate with development of higher order thinking as students are pushed to develop topics in more depth.)
3. Whether revision is required, optional, or not allowed (Revising writing is shown to improve the quality of writing and is a common requirement in many workplaces and in graduate study.)
4. Whether students receive instructor feedback on their writing (Receiving explicit feedback on strengths and weaknesses of writing and having to respond to that feedback through revision is important to improvement in writing skills.)
5. Types of reading assigned (This was looked at because the Vitalization Report asked for attention to reading.)
6. How grading is explained to students (rubrics? guidelines? neither?). (Research shows that students are most likely to produce high quality writing appropriate to the assignment if criteria are explained ahead of time.)
7. Whether students use a writing handbook (hard copy, online, or WIC Departmental Writing Guides [http://wic.oregonstate.edu/departmental-writing-guides]). (While not essential, most writers find it helpful to have a reference guide.)
8. Whether critical thinking outcomes are explicit on the syllabus (Critical thinking is required in all Bacc Core courses.)

Information about Low-Achieving Students in WR 121

One significant question related to the effectiveness of writing within the Baccalaureate Core relates to student success. Specifically, it was reasonable to ask why some students do not pass OSU’s foundational writing course, WR 121:

- Are these students underprepared?
- Should they be placed into another writing course prior to WR 121?
- What would help them succeed, such that they are able to pass WR 121 and continue on through the rest of OSU’s Baccalaureate Core writing requirements?

A survey of WR 121 instructors was conducted in order to determine the causes of low student achievement in WR 121(Appendix 1). For the purpose of the survey, “low performance” was defined as a final course grade below a C-, which is the minimum passing grade in the class. Students who earn below a C- final grade must retake the course.

Twenty-four WR 121 instructors responded to the survey, reporting on their experiences with students with respect to 120 total sections taught between Fall 2009 and Winter 2011. During this period, 350 students earned below a C- in WR 121. This total represented approximately 11.67% of the students who enrolled in the course during these five terms.

Materials for the survey were crafted following a brainstorming session in which all current WR 121 instructors were invited to join together in order to discuss their experiences and to consider possible reasons that students fail to reach a C- grade in WR 121. Following this session, the topics developed during this brainstorm were organized into four general areas: affective issues, behavioral issues, skills/abilities issues, and external pressures. WR 121 instructors were then surveyed online and asked to indicate approximately how many of their low-achieving students had experienced one or more of the issues listed in these areas.

Date Source #3: New Data

Three new types of data were collected in the process of conducting research and analysis for this report. First, a survey of OSU faculty was conducted in order to seek information about faculty’s perspectives on student writing in Baccalaureate Core courses. Thereafter, faculty focus
groups were conducted in order to deepen the information gathered in the faculty survey. In addition, information from peer institutions was gathered in order to explore their offerings in the area of core curriculum writing classes.

Faculty Survey

During early Spring 2012, a survey was sent to all faculty with teaching FTE. Faculty were asked to indicate whether or not they teach Baccalaureate Core courses. If so, they were invited to continue with the survey; if not, the survey was discontinued. Therefore, only data from faculty teaching within the Baccalaureate Core was gathered. A total of 185 faculty completed the survey.

Survey questions were based off of a large composite of possible questions that were designed by an expert in faculty survey design. The committee considered the full corpus of available questions and selected a brief range of questions that covered the areas of desired information:

- Faculty’s priorities with respect to student writing
- Characteristics of writing assignments that are currently given in Baccalaureate Core courses
- Faculty’s perceptions of the status of undergraduate writing at OSU
- Related possible improvements that could be made in the area of faculty development and support

The survey was kept open for a period of two weeks, and a reminder email was issued. After the survey was closed, OSU’s office of Institutional Review processed the data and delivered it to the committee in aggregate form. The committee analyzed the data with respect to the following areas:

- Faculty expectations of undergraduate writing
- Faculty satisfaction with undergraduate writing
- Faculty practices related to undergraduate writing instruction

Faculty Focus Groups

After initial patterns were traced out in the survey data, two focus group sessions were held in order to revisit the topics addressed in the survey so as to deepen that data. Two groups of three faculty each participated in the focus groups. Two sessions were held instead of one in order to accommodate participants’ schedules. Participating faculty were selected by members of the Committee for the Review of Writing within the Baccalaureate Core in an effort to represent disciplines from across campus. The focus group was split into two sessions so as to accommodate faculty schedules.

The focus group sessions drew on the original list of potential survey questions, thereby allowing the committee to gather more and deeper information without issuing an exhaustive survey. The focus group sessions were administered by Dr. Susan Meyers, and they were recorded and transcribed by Dr. Meyers’ intern, Beth Fleisher.
Focus group data was analyzed alongside the survey data in order to temper and complicate the results of the initial survey data.

Programs at Peer Institutions

In order to gather information about potential additions and/or alterations to the writing components within the writing components of the Baccalaureate Core, information was systematically gathered from the web sites of peer institutions. Particular focus was placed on learning communities and writing classes for students who require extra assistance. This information helped the committee consider possible alternatives or additions to Bacc Core writing classes and components that could help to improve OSU students’ experiences and learning gains. This information was examined with an eye toward fit and feasibility with respect to existing OSU programs.
**Findings**

*Data Source #1: NSSE Writing Consortium Survey*

The NSSE writing consortium indicated that OSU students experience less overall training in writing than do students at peer institutions. These comparisons were made based on students’ responses to a series of questions related to writing assignments. Students themselves indicated how frequently they engaged in various activities related to different writing genres and/or different aspects of the writing process. In most categories, including the following example categories, OSU students were lower:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>OSU (mean)</th>
<th>Carnegie Peers (mean)</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainstormed (listed ideas, mapped concepts, prepared an outline, etc.) to develop your ideas before you started drafting your assignment</td>
<td>First-Year: 3.18 Seniors: 2.99</td>
<td>First-Year: 3.47 Seniors: 3.30</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-Year: 2.95 Seniors: 2.76</td>
<td>First-Year: 3.28 Seniors: 2.96</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received feedback from your instructor about a draft before turning in your final draft</td>
<td>First-Year: 3.34 Seniors: 3.41</td>
<td>First-Year: 3.53 Seniors: 3.61</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze or evaluate something you read, such as an article, books, or on-line publications</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.77 Seniors: 2.57</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.92 Seniors: 2.72</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argue a position using evidence and reasoning</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.53 Seniors: 2.16</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.98 Seniors: 2.23</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote papers that were between 5 and 19 pages</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.06 Seniors: 2.50</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.23 Seniors: 2.47</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table uses the following measures: 1 = no assignments, 2 = few assignments, 3 = some assignments, 4 = most assignments, 5 = all assignments

In some categories, such as the examples below, OSU students were approximately the same as students at peer institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>OSU (mean)</th>
<th>Carnegie Peers (mean)</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used an online tutoring service to get help with your writing assignment before you turned it in</td>
<td>First-Year: 1.53 Seniors: 1.24</td>
<td>First-Year: 1.66 Seniors: 1.39</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofread your final draft for errors before turning it in</td>
<td>First-Year: 4.15 Seniors: 4.42</td>
<td>First-Year: 4.30 Seniors: 4.36</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized something you read, such as articles, books, or on-line publications</td>
<td>First-Year: 3.07 Seniors: 3.01</td>
<td>First-Year: 3.09 Seniors: 3.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described your methods or findings related to data you collected in lab or field work, a survey project, etc.</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.78 Seniors: 2.85</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.69 Seniors: 2.84</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table uses the following measures: 1 = no assignments, 2 = few assignments, 3 = some assignments, 4 = most assignments, 5 = all assignment
The categories in which OSU students were higher were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>OSU (mean)</th>
<th>Carnegie Peers (mean)</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explained in writing the meaning of statistical data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year: 2.51 Seniors: 2.73</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.33 Seniors: 2.58</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote in the style and format of a specific field (engineering, history, psychology, etc.)</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.73 Seniors: 3.25</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.63 Seniors: 3.32</td>
<td>.08 -.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included drawings, tables, photos, screen shots, or other visual content into your written assignment</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.52 Seniors: 3.03</td>
<td>First-Year: 2.21 Seniors: 2.82</td>
<td>.27 .18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table uses the following measures: 1 = no assignments, 2 = few assignments, 3 = some assignments, 4 = most assignments, 5 = all assignments

Date Source #2: Low-achieving students in WR 121

Instructors of WR 121 reported a large variety of reasons for students’ low performance in WR 121. These reasons can be broken down into four general categories:

- Affective Issues (17%)
- Behavioral Issues (50%)
- Skills/Abilities (17%)
- External Pressures (16%)

Half of all instances of an influence on low performance related to a student’s behavior patterns (i.e. attendance, failure to follow/complete the assignment, time management, failure to do the reading, failure to go to the Writing Center).

Data Source #3: Syllabi

Writing I and Writing II

As noted above, all sections of WR 121 use a common syllabus, outcomes, assignments, and grading rubrics. The writing assignments build in complexity and length. Students in all sections receive feedback from instructors and peers, and revision is required. A handbook, *Easy Writer*, is required. In addition to meeting WR I guidelines, WR 121 at OSU is explicitly congruent with national outcomes established by the Council of Writing Program Administrators and with the statewide outcomes of the Oregon Writing and English Advisory Committee (used across community colleges and public universities in Oregon). WR 121 is taught primarily by GTAs but also by instructors. GTAs receive pre-service training and participate in a one-term practicum during their first term of teaching the course.

The following observations can be made about WR II courses, based on syllabus analysis of all WR II courses taught over two terms in 2011 (Appendix 2) and discussions with course coordinators:

- The genres of writing in WR II vary widely based on the type of writing focused upon. The most frequent genres assigned are field-specific: essay, article, report, short story,
There are not consistent course learning outcomes, including across sections of the same course. As of Fall 2011, all WR II courses now include standard category outcomes on the syllabus, but they are general in order to function for a wide array of courses.

Both WR 214 (9 sections Fall 2011) and WR 222 (18 sections Fall 2011) use a standard textbook. There is guidance regarding assignments for these courses as well, though instructors are able to make minor adaptations.

WR 327 remains the most diverse course in terms of variations across sections, though it is much more standardized as of this academic year (2011-12). WR 327 is the most frequently selected WR II course (21 sections Fall 2011). Faculty teaching WR 327 may select from an approved set of writing assignments, thus there is some variation across sections. A shared curriculum is being used by all sections of WR 327, beginning Fall 2011 and promises to improve consistency across sections of this popular course.

Creative writing courses for fiction (WR 224 and WR 324) and poetry (WR 241 and WR 341) are taught by instructors and MFA graduate students. Graduate students take a one-term practicum on teaching fiction or poetry. A model syllabus is given to teachers, but they are not required to follow it. Teachers identify their own outcomes and design their own syllabi.

Other WR II courses may only be offered in one or two sections per year. WR 330, Understanding English Grammar, is offered once a year on campus and some terms online. WR 362 Science Writing is a new course that is being offered both on campus and online, but in only a few sections per year.

All courses assign the type of writing appropriate to the course. In addition, 82% assign oral presentations, 73% assign research reports of some type, and 73% assign summaries.

Regarding length of papers, no WR II courses assigned papers ten pages or longer.

Just over half of WR II courses assigned at least one paper over 5 pages, and nearly half rely on shorter 1 to 4 page papers.

Revision is required in 91% of WR II courses reviewed.

Students receive feedback from peers (100%) and from the instructor (91%).

About three-quarters of courses include a rubric or grading guidelines.

About two-thirds use a writing handbook or guide.

Only 45% of WR II syllabi mentioned critical thinking.

### Overview of Writing II Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of courses examined</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% assigning at least one paper 10 pp. or longer</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with at least one paper over 5 pages</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with required revision</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with required peer review</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with instructor feedback on writing mentioned</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in which either a rubric or grading guideline appear in syllabus</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% using a writing handbook or department writing guide</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with outcomes that specify critical thinking</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Four Most Frequent Genres

1. Essays/Articles/Reports/Stories/Poems/White Papers | 100%
2. Oral Presentations | 82%
3. Research Reports | 73%
4. Summary | 73%
Writing Intensive Courses

Comparative data on WIC syllabi can be found in Appendix 3.

- The most frequent genres used in WIC courses are “professional,” meaning genres associated with work in a particular field or profession. Examples would be a grant proposal, project proposal, lab report, design project, and journal article. In the College of Business WIC course, “professional” refers not to writing in a particular field of business (accounting, finance, etc.) but to documents used to find a job. Professional assignments are used in 74% of WIC courses reviewed, which in congruent with the requirement that students be introduced to writing in the genres of the discipline or field.
- Though the use of informal writing to learn course content is a required element of a WIC course, one third of syllabi reviewed did not include that element.
- The majority of WIC courses reviewed rely on papers of 6 to 10 pages. Eight to ten pages is congruent with the requirement for at least 2000 words of polished writing revised after feedback.
- 26% of WIC courses surveyed assign no papers over five pages in length. Some rely on papers as short as two or three pages.
- 39% assign a paper of ten pages or longer.
- With revision a required element of a WIC course, 87% of syllabi indicate students are required to revise. Thirteen percent do not require revision.
- Students in most WIC courses do get feedback on their writing, with 70% receiving peer review and 91% receiving instructor feedback. Only one course reviewed does not specify that students will get instructor feedback.
- Nearly two-thirds of WIC courses include a rubric or grading guidelines in the syllabus.
- Fewer than 25% mention using a writing handbook, online handbook, or department writing guide.
- 74% specifically include critical thinking, a required element in all Bacc Core courses. About one quarter of the syllabi reviewed do not mention critical thinking.
- The average class size for WIC courses reviewed is 25.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of WIC Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of courses examined</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average class size by college</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% using informal writing-to-learn course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% assigning at least one paper 10 pp. or longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with at least one paper over 5 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with required revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with required peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with instructor feedback on writing mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in which either a rubric or grading guideline appear in syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% using a writing handbook or department writing guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with outcomes that specify critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with well articulated writing outcomes for the discipline (3 ranking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four Most Frequent Genres
1. Professional 74%
2. Writing-To-Learn 65%
3. Research 52%
4T. Essay 35%
4T. Summary 35%

Writing in Contemporary Global Issues (Synthesis) Courses

The following observations can be made based on syllabus data available in Appendix 4.

- The types of writing vary across courses with the most common genres being essay, discussion board, research paper, and in-class exam.
- Only 38% of CGI courses require at least one paper over 5 pages in length.
- Students in CGI courses receive little feedback on their writing.
- Only 15% of CGI courses require revision. These instances are in two colleges.
- Most CGI students appear to receive no instructor feedback on writing.
- 35% use a writing handbook or department writing guide.
- Only 62% specifically include critical thinking in the syllabus, though it is required for all BC courses. Thus nearly 40% of CGI syllabi do not mention critical thinking as part of the course.

Some of these characteristics may be related to class size, with the average CGI class size being 55.
Overview of BacCore CGI Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of courses examined</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average class size by college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>57  n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>40  n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>60  n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>42  n=13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>76  n=4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- % assigning at least one paper 10 pp. or longer: 12%
- % with at least one paper over 5 pages: 38%
- % with required revision: 15%
- % with required peer review: 15%
- % with instructor feedback on writing mentioned: 12%
- % in which either a rubric or grading guideline appear in syllabus: 12%
- % using a writing handbook or department writing guide: 35%
- % with outcomes that specify critical thinking: 62%

Four Most Frequent Genres

1. Essay 58%
2. Discussion Board 42%
3T. Research 35%
3T. In-Class Exam 35%

Writing in Science, Technology, and Society (Synthesis) Courses

The following observations can be made based on syllabi reviewed. Information is available in Appendix 5.

- The types of writing vary across STS courses, with the most common genres assigned being essay, research paper, discussion board, and exam.
- Only 1 STS course of the 19 courses reviewed assigns a paper of over 10 pages in length.
- 53% of STS courses assign a paper over five pages in length.
- Students in STS courses receive little feedback on their writing, either from peers or the instructor.
- Only 11% of courses require revision.
- 37% appear to use writing guides or rubrics for evaluation.
- 37% use a writing handbook or department writing guide.
- Though critical thinking is required of all Bacc Core courses, only 58% of STS syllabi mention critical thinking. So over 40% appear not to include critical thinking.

Some of these characteristics may be related to class size in the category, the average size of courses reviewed being 68 students. The STS matrix (Appendix 5) breaks out these details by course and college.
Overview of BacCore STS Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of courses examined</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average class size by college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>71  n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>46  n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>68  n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>88  n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% assigning at least one paper 10 pp. or longer</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with at least one paper over 5 pages</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with required revision</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with required peer review</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with instructor feedback on writing mentioned</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in which either a rubric or grading guideline appear in syllabus</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% using a writing handbook or department writing guide</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with outcomes that specify critical thinking</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four Most Frequent Genres

1. Essay 58%
2. Research 53%
3. In-Class Exam 42%
4. Discussion Board 37%

Data Source #4: Faculty Survey

The faculty survey (Appendix 6) contained questions of both a quantitative and qualitative nature. The quantitative portion of the data revealed the following patterns:

- The highest numbers of responses came from tenured professors or full-time instructors. Tenure-track faculty returned responses at a lower rate. As a result, 45% of those responding to the survey indicated that they have more than ten years of experience giving writing assignments in undergraduate courses.
- 97% of respondents said that they assign writing in their courses. However, only 35% of respondents said that they teach skills related to writing in their undergraduate courses.

In undergraduate classes that you teach, do you give assignments that involve writing?

Responses to this question: 183
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 99%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you formally teach writing in any of your undergraduate courses?

Responses to this question: 182
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 99%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Although the survey was designed for faculty who teach within the Baccalaureate Core, 71% of the respondents indicated that they teach less than one Synthesis class per year, and 73% of respondents indicated that they teach less than one WIC class per year.

• 48% of faculty reported that they typically assign 2-4 writing assignments per course, with 36% indicating that they assign 5 of more assignments per term, and 15% assigning one per term.

• 41% of these writing assignments are 3-4 pages and 29% are 1-2 pages. Only 7% of assignments are 7-10 pages long, and only 3% are over 10 pages long.

**How many writing assignments do you typically give in the undergraduate courses you teach?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to this question:</th>
<th>181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184):</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one per term</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One per term</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 per term</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more per term</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is the average length of writing assignments in the undergraduate courses you teach?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to this question:</th>
<th>179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184):</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 pages</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 pages</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 pages</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 pages</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 pages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The majority of faculty indicate they do typically require students to revise their papers, and they likewise indicate that they offer students feedback on their writing. However, only 35% of faculty require peer review at least one time during the term, and only 33% require students to visit the Writing Center at least once per term.
How often do you use the following practices for writing assignments in your undergraduate classes?

**Required revision of student writing**

Responses to this question: 180

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 98%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor feedback for the purpose of revision**

Responses to this question: 180

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 98%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer review for the purpose of revision**

Responses to this question: 179

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 97%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Require students to use the writing center**

Responses to this question: 179

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 97%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• While faculty report that they do offer feedback on student writing, 70% of this feedback occurs in classes outside of the Baccalaureate Core.
• Faculty priorities with respect to writing focus most heavily on critical thinking, clear content, and organization.
• Faculty complaints about student writing included concerns about student laziness, casual tone in writing, and/or honesty. Faculty also voiced concerns about the potential negative impact that new technologies have on writing.

The qualitative portion of the data indicated these additional patterns:
• Awareness of students’ need for practical, marketable skills.
• Students’ need for more information about plagiarism.
• Students’ need for more practice related to writing.
• The importance of making expectations clear.
• Students’ need for knowledge transfer.
• A general sense that the current curriculum is reasonably sound, but that it needs not structural support from the university.
• The potential utility of additive workshops for students.
• As per professional development for faculty, the idea of a departmental “writing advocate/liaison” was often cited as a popular possibility. The WIC model of workshops was also often cited as a useful model.
• Faculty indicated that online resources would be helpful.
• Faculty indicated a need for help with evaluation, especially in terms of efficiency.

Data Source #5: Faculty Focus Groups

Following collection of data from the faculty survey, two focus group sessions were held in order to probe the patterns that appeared in the survey data (See Appendix 7). During the focus group sessions, the following additional patterns and details arose:
• Faculty participants in the focus group sessions were more tempered than survey participants were in their estimation of student writing. While much survey data was negative with respect to students’ abilities and performance, focus group responses indicated that students’ performance is adequate, though not strong.
• Focus group responses indicate that faculty draw on the following sources for information about how to teach writing in their classes: OSU webpage (for information about requirements), personal experiences in education, WIC workshops. The respondents did not indicate that they receive information about writing requirements and strategies from their home departments.
• Participants indicated that requirements in WIC classes are fairly clear. However, the writing component of Synthesis classes is unclear and/or unknown.
• Participants emphasized the importance of making expectations clear.
• Participants emphasized the importance of students’ knowledge transfer.
• Some class sizes are quite large. One participant indicated that his unit is currently in “survival mode” and cannot address strong writing pedagogies. Another participant
indicated that WIC classes need to be better tracked, as some of them include 40+ students.

- Participants commented on the lack of clarity with respect to responsibility. Whose responsibility is the effectiveness of student writing? Is this a Bacc Core responsibility, or a responsibility of the majors?
- New faculty need some form of input about their classes, especially with respect to writing components.

_Data Source #6: Comparative Information from Peer Institutions_

Because it was recognized that some students may need additional support, particularly with early levels of writing classes, a survey of student support models at peer institutions was conducted. Initially, it was hoped that a variety of viable models—particularly those that mesh directly with existing writing programs—would be apparent. This was not the case. Ample data on first-year learning communities and general student support models was available. With respect to writing classes and/or programs, the most promising model the emerged is the “stretch class” model. Stretch classes adapt the general curriculum of a first-year writing class and “stretch” it over additional time and/or contact hours. For example, several universities in California are currently piloting and/or adopting a model in which students take a class that is equivalent to WR 121, though the class meets for two academic terms, rather than one. In another version of this kind of curriculum, the University of Arizona’s “plus” model adds additional contact hours to students’ first-year writing class, such that they complete the class during one academic semester, although they spend more hours on their writing class than do students in traditional sections. In either model, the additional time allows students to progress more slowly and carefully through the curriculum so as to master the material more fully. For students who are new to academic contexts and/or struggle with writing, this additional time can be quite beneficial. In addition, the stretch model has the benefit of maintaining student work at a traditional college level, rather than placing them in a remedial class before allowing them to move on to a standard first-year writing class. For more information on California schools using a stretch model, see Appendix 8.
Analysis

Based on the above data, the following conclusions were drawn:

I. Undergraduate writing at OSU needs improvement.

As indicated by the data in the NSSE writing consortium report, as well as the faculty survey and focus group sessions, we are not where we would like to be. Peer institutions are out-performing us, at least nominally, and faculty are not fully satisfied with students’ performance related to writing. The status of things is not yet in crisis, but we need to take action in order to improve the situation. These improvements can be made by building on the current strengths within the program.

II. The current writing curriculum within the Bacc Core has several strengths.

The committee recognizes several strengths within the Bacc Core’s current structure and management. These areas place the Bacc Core commensurate with national recommendations:

- The Baccalaureate Core currently includes a total of five courses that include required writing components.
- These five courses are embedded at lower- and upper-division levels, so as to help foster students’ writing development throughout their entire college experience.
- Because these courses are distributed both within and outside of students’ major areas, students learn about discipline-specific and general skills related to writing.
- The first writing course that students take, WR 121: English Composition, focuses explicitly on the writing process. This course has uniform curriculum that is carefully tracked across sections.
- The selection of Writing II classes that are available to students share common outcomes, though they offer a variety of focus areas, so as to meet all students’ needs. The common outcomes that unify these courses has recently been updated.
- Faculty teaching WIC courses receive specific training. The expectations for WIC courses are established and tracked by a WIC Director.
- Synthesis courses, which also include a required writing component, accomplish a variety of curricular objectives and introduce students to a variety of topics and perspectives as an advanced level of study.

III. The structure of writing components within the Baccalaureate Core does have some challenges and limitations.

According to the committee, the following areas represent tensions and limitations within the existing structure of the Baccalaureate Core:

- Some students may need additional support, beyond what is offered in the traditional sequence of classes.
Particularly for Writing II and Synthesis courses, the nature of expectations related to writing is not clear to either students or professors. These courses exhibit some tension between content and skills.

Although expectations are clearer in WIC classes, not all classes are meeting expectations.

Many Synthesis courses include very little writing, although these classes require a Bacc Core writing component.

IV. Faculty priorities are aligned with national expectations for writing.

Survey data and focus group data reveal that the areas that faculty emphasize most are those that are endorsed and practiced nationally: critical thinking, content, and clear organization.

V. Faculty are not taking advantage of tools related to the writing process.

Although faculty report that they offer students feedback on their writing and that they require students to revise, they do not take advantage of nationally recognized tools that can aid in the writing process. Specifically, peer review and the Writing Center are under utilized.

VI. Writing assignments in Baccalaureate Core courses are not sufficient.

Data from the faculty survey indicates that attention to writing occurs in courses outside of the Baccalaureate Core. When faculty do assign writing, they do not teach components related to the writing process, so as to aid students’ development of those assignments. In addition, the writing assignments themselves are brief. These brief assignments are being utilized despite faculty’s awareness that students need more practice with respect to writing.

VII. The major areas of complaint about student writing are behavioral issues. In the faculty survey, students were cited as lazy, overly casual, and given to dishonesty (e.g. plagiarism). These issues may be more appropriately categorized as issues related to learning how function in college. While such issues should be addressed in all lower-division courses, they are not necessarily specific to writing classes in the Bacc Core.

Based on these patterns, we have identified the following areas of need:

4. Communication and Curriculum:

There is a need for more uniformity, and better facilitation of information:

- Students need to be able to transfer knowledge/skills from one class to the next.
- Instructor expectations need to be made clear to students.
- Courses, such as WR II, need to be made more uniform.
• Curriculum and outcomes need to be more uniform.
• Advisors need to have sufficient information about course content and outcomes.
• Faculty do not have sufficient information about Synthesis requirements.
• Faculty need more information about best practices of teaching writing.
• Faculty need to information/models about how to assess student work effectively/efficiently.

5. Resources and Management:

• Class sizes need to be kept to recommended levels (e.g. WIC courses).
• Large classes need to be better tracked.
  o Some sections are 40+.
  o Some departments are in self-described “survival mode.”
• There are not enough extended writing assignments (e.g. more than 4 pages). This problem is especially prevalent in Synthesis courses.

6. Student Support:

• Low-achieving students need more support.
• Students need to better understand plagiarism.
• Students need to be challenged, and they need more practice with writing.
Recommendations

Based on the needs outlined above, the committee recommends focusing improvement efforts on four general areas:

- Faculty, Student, and University Involvement
- Clarity of Expectations
- Quality of Assignments
- Effective Evaluation of Student Work

The suite of recommendations presented below attends to these various areas. In some cases, these recommended areas for improvement require behavioral shifts, and in other cases they would require additional resources, as in the case of adapting or augmenting programmatic offerings. An effort has been made to balance the recommendations presented between local-level opportunities for improvements without the additional investment of financial resources, as well as innovative opportunities to improve undergraduate writing at OSU through the development of programs requiring a modest additional investment. Because current conditions are not dire, we have not presented a single solution. Rather, we are offering a number of possibilities which we believe would be viable and beneficial in order to reorient OSU undergraduates’ experiences and outcomes related to writing. Regardless of the specific combination of recommendations that are selected for adoption, we continue to believe that the most crucial foundational element is to build a *culture of writing* at OSU: a goal that requires the sustained commitment from all levels of the university, including students, faculty, and administration.

I. Faculty, Student, and University Involvement

Because developing students’ abilities in writing is a multi-level, multi-faceted endeavor, we believe that there needs to be more of a *culture of writing* developed on the OSU campus. Involvement—from students, faculty, and university administration—is crucial to this process. Successful involvement at these levels will likely include the following components:

1. **Students**—particularly those with special needs related to writing—need to be able to effectively seek and utilize resources.
2. **Faculty** need adequate information about expectations related to writing classes, support to meet those expectations, and guidance to design courses accordingly.
3. **University administration** can aid this work by publically highlighting the importance of writing at OSU, and by supporting the BCC and its constituents in the management and improvement of writing-related courses. While the BCC holds oversight responsibilities for the Bacc Core, university administration can help to facilitate this work via activities such as the following:
   - President Ray could mention the importance of writing in his annual address and/or related public announcements.
   - Central administration could voice its commitment to ensuring that capped courses (e.g. WIC) maintain the required class size requirements.
   - Additional resources could be devoted to pilot programs such as the *Writing Advocate* model traced out below.
• Resources could likewise be provided in order to help the BCC require that departments meet the cap requirements in WIC courses.

We believe that the new efforts to improve assessment of Bacc Core courses are valuable, and we believe that the new model for gathering information about Synthesis courses, for example, should include attention to the kinds and amount of writing that is being assigned in these courses. The appointment of a director for implementation of the Bacc Core is a positive development, and is probably an ongoing need. As assessments of Bacc Core curricular components move forward, we recommend continued backing—via both public endorsements and resources—from the university’s central administration. The success of undergraduate writing at OSU depends on demonstrated commitment from all levels of the university.

II. Clarity of Expectations

Reports from faculty indicated that clear expectations are crucial to students’ success. Therefore, expectations should be made clear to students themselves, and faculty should likewise have a clear sense of the writing components that are required in Baccalaureate Core courses. We recommend improving clarity in the following areas:

1. **Synthesis Courses:** Currently, faculty are unclear about the writing components that are required in Synthesis courses. It may be that faculty are not aware that Synthesis courses are a part of the overall writing curriculum within the Baccalaureate Core. Therefore, we recommend the following actions:
   - Establish clearer expectations for the writing requirements in Synthesis courses. One possibility is to add a required word count for the argumentative paper that students writing as part of the new outcomes for Synthesis courses. If a word count is adopted, we would recommend that the paper should be at least 5 pages, or 1250 words.
   - Require revision within Synthesis courses. Currently, revision is not required. However, the NSSE consortium data suggests that OSU students need more practice with revision.
   - Increase the information literacy components within Synthesis courses. Information literacy skills are essential to all students’ success at OSU and beyond, and it is appropriate that upper-division courses with writing components also include practice with information literacy.
   - Embed these new requirements into the new online assessment of Synthesis courses. Doing so will remind faculty of the requirements and allow university administration to track classes that either do or do not follow these regulations.

2. **Uniform Curriculum:** In some cases, such as Writing II courses, there are many sections of a course offered, although not all sections utilize the same outcomes, assignments, or course content. These courses should be brought into more clear alignment so that students and faculty know what to expect, both with respect to students’ experiences in the courses themselves, as well as their projected skill set once they successfully complete these courses.
3. **Guided Advising:** In addition to improving the uniformity and transparency of curriculum in Writing II courses, information about these courses should be made available to advisors across campus. Advisors working with first-year and sophomore students need to be able to advise students correctly about which 200-level writing class will best suit their needs. We suggest creating a list of updated course descriptions, including outcomes, and forwarding it to all advisors toward the beginning of spring term each year, such that advisors will be able to draw on that information for the purposes of students’ course planning during the following year.

4. **Departmental Communication:** In addition to improving infrastructure in these ways, we believe that it is important for all departments to have a means of accessing information about Baccalaureate Core writing requirements (including updates) and of vetting related ideas with respect to the parameters of the discipline treated in each department. Therefore, we suggest that OSU develop a system of Faculty Writing Advocates: a group of representatives from each department who will be trained on updates and best practices related to writing components within the Baccalaureate Core. The Faculty Writing Advocates would serve as leaders within their department, as well as touchstones for university administrators who wish to access information about the way that writing is being taught within a given unit. The Faculty Writing Advocate model was popular in the faculty survey that we issued, and we believe that it would be a beneficial means of improving undergraduate writing at OSU, both within and beyond the Baccalaureate Core. It should be noted, though, that the breadth and success of this model would depend on some form of material investment. In order for departmental Writing Advocates to remain involved in their work in an effective and sustained way, they would need to be compensated in some way.

To date, actions taken in order to improve clarity of expectations regarding writing in the Baccalaureate Core including the following items:

1. New outcomes for Writing II courses have been established, and all courses are now using them. Key courses such as WR 327: Technical Writing, the highest enrolling WR II course, has been reviewed in order to create better alignment. WR 327 now has a list of shared outcomes and assignments that are specific to the course (Appendix 9).

2. Earlier confusion about WR 121 transfer credits has been resolved. Previously, students were able to transfer in credits from other institutions that satisfied the Writing I category but were not deemed equivalent to WR 121. These students became frustrated when they learned that they must take WR 121, even though they had satisfied the Writing I requirement. Through sustained conversation with the English Department throughout the course of this year, The Office of the Registrar has developed a new system by which to evaluate incoming transfer credits. Moving forward, students will only be given credit for satisfying the Writing I requirement if the course they took is deemed equivalent to WR 121.
III. Quality of Assignments

Multiple aspects of the data gathered for this report indicate that 1) students need more practice with writing, and 2) faculty do not have sufficient models for designing quality writing assignments. These issues surface in both the quantity and quality of student writing that is currently being produced.

First, the length of assignments is insufficient:
- The NSSE writing consortium data indicates that OSU students write less than do students at peer institutions.
- Syllabi gathered in the Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report indicated that assignments for some courses in areas such as Synthesis courses are brief (see Appendices 4 and 5)
- Faculty survey responses indicate that 70% of assignments are less than 5 pages long.

In partial response to this issue, we recommend that requirements be established for writing assignments in Synthesis classes. In particular, it would be wise to include a requirement related to length, so as to ensure that students are getting experience writing longer papers (i.e. over 4 pages) at the advanced level. In addition, a class cap would ideally be placed on Synthesis courses so as to facilitate increased attentiveness to writing. Because teaching writing is labor intensive and students benefit from instructor feedback and revision, classes that include writing should be kept as small as possible. While Synthesis courses may not have as low as cap as do WR 121, Writing II, and WIC courses, we do believe that a reasonable cap should be determined, so as to facilitate the addition of a minimum length requirement for writing assignments.

Second, the quality of assignments is lacking because key components of the writing process (e.g. peer review and revision) are not being utilized in most writing assignments:
- The NSSE writing consortium data indicates that OSU students engage in peer review and writing center visits at levels below that of their students at peer institutions. According to this data, most assignments do not include a peer review component of any kind.
- Syllabi gathered in the Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report indicated that, out of 45 Synthesis classes surveyed, only 6 required peer review and only 6 required revision.
- Faculty survey responses indicated that 45% of assignments require revision, although only 35% require peer review and 33% require a visit to the Writing Center.

In order to improve writing assignments throughout the Baccalaureate Core—including both the quantity and quality of student writing produced—we recommend additional support for faculty development in the area of assignment design. Both the faculty survey and faculty focus group data emphasized the success and the WIC model. However, we believe that faculty development in WIC classes is not sufficient. In addition, we recommend that one or more of the following models be adopted:
- Faculty Writing Advocates: Trained faculty in each department would serve as leaders to build a “culture of writing” in each unit. These Writing Advocates would be available to mentor new faculty, consult on assignment design, etc.
• **New Faculty Mentoring:** Consultation sessions for new faculty could be offered—through the Center for Teaching and Learning or elsewhere—on best practices related to the development of writing assignments.

• **Faculty Pairs** could be established within each unit, such that faculty could consult with each other on their assignment design.

• **Departmental Professional Development:** Writing consultations within each department could be scheduled. Similar to WIC workshops, these sessions could train faculty on the best practices of designing writing assignments. However, these workshops could be targeted at an entire department, as opposed to individual or workshop training through the regular WIC seminars.

Whichever of these models is adopted, the goal would be to improve writing assignments throughout all levels of the Baccalaureate Core curriculum. Writing assignments in all of the writing classes in the Baccalaureate Core should include best practices of the writing process (e.g. planning, drafting, feedback, revision) and should be sufficiently long for a student to develop a sustained series of thoughts and/or arguments.

IV. Effective Evaluation of Student Work

It is likewise crucial to accurately and thoroughly evaluate student work. This process relates both to identifying students who need additional support and to adequately assessing student work overall.

**Student Support**

Identifying students who need additional assistance with writing is a challenge because both because faculty/academic departments are not able to diagnose learning disabilities (i.e. one of the more commonly reported challenges that students face in courses like WR 121, see Appendix 1) and because placement systems for writing are complicated and imperfect measures. However, we do recognize and suggest some areas for improvement:

1. **DAS Coordination:** Writing instructors can be in closer communication with DAS, so as to better serve students who have and/or may have learning disabilities that make learning to write difficult. Closer communication with DAS would mean that it would be possible to track students who do have registered learning disabilities that impact writing, and it would mean that instructors could develop multi-modal classroom approaches that would support varieties of learners, including students who may have undiagnosed learning disabilities.

2. **Stretch Model Pilot:** A stretch-class model for WR 121 could be piloted. Stretch classes have been successfully employed at a variety of campuses around the nation. Such classes “stretch” the standard curriculum for a first-year writing class over 1) two academic terms, or 2) more contact hours during one academic term. In either case, students who struggle with writing have more time to develop their skills. We believe that such a model is worth piloting, as it may prove beneficial to low-achieving WR 121
students, INTO students, etc. We recommend recruiting students via advisors and allowing students to self-select this option, if they believe that they would benefit from such support. If numerical identifying information is desired, students’ writing scores on the SAT could be used as a determining factor in recruitment efforts.

3. **Student Reference Resources:** For more general student needs, we suggest that a suite of online writing resources could be developed and made available to students. Such a suite of resources could be developed according to one of the following methods:

   - Brief writing handouts posted on the Writing Center website. Such handouts should particularly include information on what constitutes plagiarism, as faculty believe that students are not sufficiently educated on this topic.
   - A common online writing reference, adopted by all OSU students for their collegiate career. For instance, the textbook company Bedford/St. Martin’s, which currently supplies the print reference books utilized in WR 121 and several of the Writing II courses, has an online writing reference that students can purchase for 4 years. This product, *Writer’s Help*, supplies students with a searchable database of reference materials related to writing, editing, and citations. Exercises are also included.

4. **Additional Information Literacy Training within the Baccalaureate Core:** While we recognize that it may not be possible to add an additional course to the Baccalaureate Core at this time (e.g., pro-school tracks have a particularly difficult time adding credits to students’ course of study), we do believe that many students need additional time devoted to practicing research protocols and techniques. We suggest the following two options as possibilities for increasing the presence of information literacy within the Baccalaureate Core curriculum. We recognize that each of these possibilities represents the potential need for additional resources, particularly with respect to supporting librarians’ possible time and involvement in these endeavors.

   - Similar to the Faculty Writing Advocate model recommended above, it may be possible to develop a system of Librarian Literacy Advocates: a model which would make use of the librarians’ existing college/departmental liaison model and highlight the resources and skills that the librarians bring to collaborations with faculty in designing research-oriented writing/project assignments.
   - In addition to faculty support, we believe that the eventual addition of a course focused explicitly on research would greatly aid entering OSU students. While WR 121 currently introduces students to issues related to academic writing, including some amount of research skills, students’ overall skills and awareness of the research process is lacking, and WR 121 cannot include more of this material without losing necessary materials that relate specifically to college writing. Therefore, we believe that the Baccalaureate Core should, over time, consider the addition of an introductory research class. This course could be required or elective. If and when such a course is developed, efforts should be made to coordinate with the library, and sufficient resources would need to be devoted to this project in order to ensure that the model is truly feasible.
Assessing Student Work

More consistency is necessary in the area of faculty assessment of student writing. While many units have departmental writing guides, the focus group data indicated that these usage of these documents are would be improved if they included rubric(s) focused on disciplinary genres and departmental outcomes. As these documents are updated over time, we recommend that each unit develop a common rubric to be used in the scoring of student writing. These rubrics would provide faculty with the 4 or 5 most important things to consider when evaluating student writing, particularly as they relate to the genre expectations within the discipline treated by that department. In addition, we believe that the process of developing these rubrics would be beneficial to each department as a whole, as they would provide an opportunity for faculty to discuss which aspects of student writing they value most. Ideally, these discussions would be facilitated by a campus leader who is trained in faculty development and best practices related to writing.

Actions Completed

In order to better serve students who struggle with writing, the WR121 program is increasing communication with DAS. Leadership of the two programs have met in order to discuss patterns in both student bodies. As a result, WR 121 staff are now being regularly trained on issues related to learning disabilities and their impact on writing. As a result, instructors are better able to support students with diagnosed learning disabilities, as well as to design classroom activities that serve a variety of student learning styles.

Ongoing Questions

While we have identified the areas within the Baccalaureate Core’s writing curriculum that need the most attention, and we have developed a suite of options for attending to these needs, there remain several key questions about how to support these changes:

- How can new programs and/or programmatic components be developed? For instance, how might we fund a program of Faculty Writing Advocates, an Information Literacy course, or a pilot stretch course for first-year writing curriculum?
- How can we ensure that updated outcomes are communicated effectively across campus?
- How can we ensure that all participants remain accountable to these changes in outcomes and course requirements?
- How can we monitor the effectiveness of writing within the Baccalaureate Core in a more ongoing way?
Appendix 1: WR 121 Low-Achieving Student Survey

Overview: This survey was conducted in order to better determine the causes of low student performance in WR 121. “Low performance” is defined as a final course grade below a C-.

Purpose: The information gathered in this survey is intended to inform both program development for WR 121 and to help WR 121 and the greater OSU community better serve at-risk students.

Participants: Twenty-four WR 121 instructors responded to the survey, reporting on their experiences with students with respect to 120 total sections taught between Fall 2009 and Winter 2011. During this period, 350 students earned below a C- in WR 121. This total represents approximately 11.67% of the students who enrolled in the course during these five terms.

Process: Materials for this survey were crafted following a brainstorming session in which all current WR 121 instructors were invited to join together in order to discuss their experiences and to consider possible reasons that students fail to reach a C- grade in WR 121. Following this session, the topics developed during this brainstorm were organized into four general areas: affective issues, behavioral issues, skills/abilities issues, and external pressures. WR 121 instructors were then surveyed online and asked to indicate approximately how many of their low-achieving students had experienced one or more of the issues listed in these areas. The following data represents their composite responses.

**A Note about the Data:** Because many students who earned less than a C- grade in WR 121 are negatively impacted by a variety of interrelated issues, instructors were asked to indicate an overall count for how many students had been impacted by a certain issue. Therefore, the total counts below indicate the number of instances that an issue was visible to an instructor. These totals do not correspond with overall numbers of students. (During the five terms surveyed, a total of 350 students earned less than a C- in WR 121.) Therefore, the data below should be used only to detect patterns in WR 121 students’ experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Issues</th>
<th>Total: 242</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Alienation/Discouragement</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety/Feeling Overwhelmed</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Maturity</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Issues</th>
<th>Total: 696</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to read/follow the assignment</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t turn work in</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not doing the reading</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to complete the ILP</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t go to the Writing Center</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills/Abilities Issues</td>
<td>Total: 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underprepared</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Barrier</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Pressures</th>
<th>Total: 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working outside of school</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family commitment</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t drop WR 121 b/c of financial aid</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Syllabi from Writing II Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Writing Guides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WR 121</td>
<td>Essays/Articles/Reports/Poems/White papers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>poss</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 201</td>
<td>Research Reports</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 214</td>
<td>In-Class Exam</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 222</td>
<td>Take Home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 224-324</td>
<td>Oral Presentations</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 241-341</td>
<td>Reading Journal</td>
<td>1 to 10?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 323</td>
<td>Discussion Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 327</td>
<td>Research Board</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>poss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 330</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>poss</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 362</td>
<td>In-Class Exam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 121</td>
<td>In-Class Exam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC 199</td>
<td>Research Board</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 3: Syllabi from WIC Courses

| Courses           | S11+12 Enrollment | Essay | Research | Summary | In-Class Exam | Take Home | Blog | Disc Board | Writing/Oral Presentations | 1 pg | 2-5 pp | 6-9 pp | 10 pp+ | Required Revision | Optional Revision | Required Peer Review | Optional Peer Review | No Revision | Instructor Feedback | Required Text | Suggested Text | Or Reserve | Course Packet | Journals | Rubric | Guidelines | Or Syllabus | WIC | Habit/Online | Critical Thinking | Writing Guides | Outcomes |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---------------|-----------|------|------------|--------------------------|------|--------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|----------|---------------|------------|------|------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| **Agricultural Sciences** |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| ANS 420           | 50                | X     | X        | X       | S4/W2         |           |      |            |                           | R1  | X      | X      | X      |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | X                |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| AREC 434          | 9                 | X     | X        | X       |               |           |      |            |                           | R1  | X      | X      | X      |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | Req              |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| CSS 325           | 14                | X     | X        | X       | R1            | P5/R1     | R1   | X          |                           | X   | X      | X      | X      |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | ASA Guide        |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| FW 454            | 24                | X     | X        | X       | S10           | E5/I2     | P2   | X          |                           | X   | X      | X      | X      |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **Business**      |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| BA 353            | 308               | X     |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           | 4P  | 4P     |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | A Writer's Reference/Easy Writer |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **Engineering**   |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| BIOE 490          | 15                | X     | X        | P3       | 3P            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| ECE 443           | 85                | X     | X        |          | S1            | P1        | W2/P1| X          |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | Elements of Style |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| IE 497            | 24                | X     | X        | W1       | P3/W4         |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **Forestry**      |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| FOR 460           | 28                | X     |          | E1/6/W1/P1| E3/P1        |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **HHS**           |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| DHE 370           | 83                | X     | X        | W1       | P1            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | A Writer's Reference/AIH Style |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| HDFS 461          | 97                | X     |          | P1       | X            | X        | X    | X          |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| NUTR 439          | 17                | X     | X        | P1/E1    | R1            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **Liberal Arts**  |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| ANTH 370          | 82                | X     | X        | X        | E2/W15        | E4/S2/W2  | R1   | X          |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| ENG 313           | 25                | X     | X        | X        | E4            | R2        | X    | X          |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | Harbrace/MLA     |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| HSTS 417          | 120               | X     | X        | S15      | E3            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| NMC 301           | 87                | X     | X        | X        | E3/P13        |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| SOC 315           | 55                | X     | X        | X        | R            | X        | X    | X          |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             | Departmental Guide: Soc |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| WS 460            | 29                | X     | X        | X        | S            | E1/R1    | X    | X          |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **Science**       |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| CH 464            | 8                 | X     |          | P2       | P7            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| GEO 323           | 34                | X     | X        | X        | R1            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| GEO 409           | 42                | X     | X        | P2       | R1            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **Interdisciplinary** |               |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| BRR 403           | 9                 | X     | X        | P1       | R1            |           |      |            |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| **Education**     |                   |       |          |         |               |           |      |            |                           |     |        |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |
| TCE 340           | 56                | X     | X        | X        | W7            | P2        | R1   | X          |                           | X   | X      |        |        |                  |                 |                      |                      |             |                  |              |           |               |            |      |            |              |                |        |

*Note: Outcomes: X = X, 1 = 1, 2 = 2, 3 = 3, X+ = X+.*
## Appendix 4: Syllabi from Synthesis CGI Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREC 351</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 330</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW 325</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR 365</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D6</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 312</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 312</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 312</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 312</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 447</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>J3</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 380</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 380</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E10</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 380</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 340</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 340</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 416E</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 317</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 317</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 386E</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D11</td>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 386H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 390</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 443</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 450</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI 301</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Opt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI 349</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 300</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 349</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5: Syllabi from Synthesis STS Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges Courses</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Writing Guides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS 315</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREC 352</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 395</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS 435</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW 470</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>E1 R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D10</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 380</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>D10</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 330</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 367</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D10</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 481</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E7 D3</td>
<td>S1 E4</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 444</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>D10</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 481</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4 R1 I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 340E</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4 R1 I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I1 D13</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4 R1 I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Faculty Survey Results

The OSU Office of Institutional Research administered the Baccalaureate Core Committee Survey on Undergraduate Student Writing on behalf of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The OSU BSG online survey tool was utilized to collect survey data. The online survey was live from April 2 (the first day of spring term) to April 20, 2012. Respondents were solicited via email on April 2, 2012 using the OSU Faculty Inform lists, resulting in 184 total respondents.

Q1. In undergraduate classes that you teach, do you give assignments that involve writing?
Responses to this question: 183
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 99%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Do you formally teach writing in any of your undergraduate courses?
Responses to this question: 182
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 99%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3. What is your faculty status at OSU? (See Figure 1)
Responses to this question: 184
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a tenured faculty</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a tenure-track faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a fixed term or adjunct instructor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I primarily have a non-instructional position (professional, research)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Respondent’s Faculty Status

Q4. How many years of experience do you have giving writing assignments in undergraduate courses?
Responses to this question: 182
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 99%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What general discipline(s) do you primarily teach in? Please provide up to three disciplines using the drop down menus: (See Figure 2)

Faculty Reporting Multiple Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reporting only 1 discipline</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reporting only 2 disciplines</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reporting 3 disciplines</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Reporting at least 1 discipline 180
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 98%

Figure 2. Reported Faculty Disciplines
**Q5. Discipline 1**
Responses to this question: 180
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 98%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (Default)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Environmental Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Human Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Communication</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise &amp; Sports Science/Nutrition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Science/Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Area Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences and Mathematics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q6. Discipline 2**
Responses to this question: 46
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 25%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (Default)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Environmental Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Human Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise &amp; Sports Science/Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Science/Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Area Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences and Mathematics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q7. Discipline 3**

Responses to this question: 10

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (Default)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Environmental Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Human Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise &amp; Sports Science/Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Science/Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Area Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences and Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q8. How frequently do you teach Synthesis courses in the Baccalaureate Core?**

[check one]

Responses to this question: 182

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 99%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one class per year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One class per year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more classes per year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How frequently do you teach Writing Intensive Courses (WIC) in the Baccalaureate Core?** (Computed using the responses to questions 14-18.)

Responses to this question: 184

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one class per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One class per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more classes per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None 134 73%
Responded to using a practice for writing assignments in a WIC class 50 27%

Q9. What aspects of student writing do you value the most? [Choose top 5 from the list below] (See Figure 3)
Responses to this question: 915
Individual Responses to this question: 183
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 99%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate to the assignment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of insight into the subject matter</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong, accurate content</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and organization</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good transitions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting introduction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate to the assigned audience</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully documented</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciseness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective sentence fluency</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few errors in grammar or usage</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective layout</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. Other-Text Responses
Why would we only choose 5 when they are all important?
Tied together with strong, accurate content, I expect my students to be able to support their arguments with references and their own thoughts; this includes elaborating why (e.g., not just "it's important," but rather "it's important for these reasons"). Shows engagement with the assigned material.
Comprehension of word usage.
Heavy emphasis on student analysis and understanding of a diversity of sources.
Appropriate citations (avoiding plagiarism)
Good non-text support (figures and graphs).
Strong argumentation, logical
Why only 5? I needed to check 6.
Persuasive Argument
Use sources in the paper correctly
Having chosen these 5, it is important to say that papers with grammar errors or lack of citation will receive a low grade, but your question asked what I value, and I value good writing.

Critical thinking

Incorporating mathematics into grammatically correct sentences.

Ability to synthesize information. Ability to find resources to support thoughts.

We ask for formatting that would be acceptable for journals.

I value all of these. Students do not know how to write, organize or reference documents appropriately for the audience they are writing for.

Coherent support of claims with evidence

---

**Figure 3. Aspects of Student Writing Reported as Valued**

- Other
- Effective layout
- Few errors in grammar or usage
- Effective sentence fluency
- Conciseness
- Fully documented
- Appropriate to the assigned...
- Interesting introduction
- Good transitions
- Clarity and organization
- Strong, accurate content
- Depth of insight into the subject...
- Appropriate to the assignment

---
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Q10. What is your overall sense of undergraduate writing at OSU?
Responses to this question: 156
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 85%
See Writing Bacc Core Survey open ended responses.docx for a full list of responses

Q11. How many writing assignments do you typically give in the undergraduate courses you teach?
Responses to this question: 181
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 98%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one per term</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One per term</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 per term</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more per term</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12. What is the average length of writing assignments in the undergraduate courses you teach?
Responses to this question: 179
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 97%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 pages</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 pages</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 pages</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 pages</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 pages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. How often do you use the following practices for writing assignments in your undergraduate classes?

Required revision of student writing
Responses to this question: 180
% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 98%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor feedback for the purpose of revision
Responses to this question: 180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184):</th>
<th>98%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answers</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer review for the purpose of revision**

Responses to this question: 179

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 97%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refer students to the writing center**

Responses to this question: 178

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 97%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Require students to use the writing center**

Responses to this question: 179

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 97%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for at least one assignment per term.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for more than one assignment per term.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q14. I employ these practices in: Required revision of student writing (please select all that apply)**

Responses to this question: 130

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 71%
### Q15. I employ these practices in: Instructor feedback for the purposes of revision (please select all that apply)

Responses to this question: 138

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Courses</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Courses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My other courses (not WIC or Synthesis)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis &amp; WIC (^1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Classes (^1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q16. I employ these practices in: Peer review for the purpose of revision (please select all that apply)

Responses to this question: 106

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 58%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Courses</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Courses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My other courses (not WIC or Synthesis)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis &amp; WIC (^1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Classes (^1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q17. I employ these practices in: Refer Students to the Writing Center (please select all that apply)

Responses to this question: 135

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184): 73%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Courses</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Courses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My other courses (not WIC or Synthesis)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18. I employ these practices in: Refer Students to the Writing Center (please select all that apply)

Responses to this question:

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Courses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My other courses (not WIC or Synthesis)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis &amp; WIC(^1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Classes(^1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19. If OSU were to provide additional professional development to help faculty who teach writing in their undergraduate classes, what would you find helpful (e.g. workshops offered in your department, writing liaison faculty in each department, CTL workshops, etc.)?

Responses to this question:

% of Total Survey Respondents (N=184):

106 58%

See Writing Bacc Core Survey open ended responses.docx for a full list of responses

Notes

1. Variable calculated using the individual responses regarding use of writing practices in Synthesis Courses, WIC Courses, and My other Course
Cross Tabulations for selected Questions & WIC" count(N) indicates the number of individuals who selected both the "Synthesis Courses" and "WIC Courses" options. The "All Classes" count (N) indicates the number of individuals who selected the "Synthesis Courses", "WIC Courses" and "My other courses (Not WIC or Synthesis)" options.
Cross Tabulations for selected Questions

Faculty Status by Years of Experience

Q4. How many years of experience do you have giving writing assignments in undergraduate courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>Over 10 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a Tenured/Tenured-track Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a fixed term or adjunct instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I primarily have a non-instructional position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Samples from Faculty Focus Group Sessions

Two faculty focus group sessions were held: one each on 4/25 and 4/26 for 2 hours. Three faculty members participated in each session, representing disciplines in science, engineering, humanities, and social science. The sessions were taped and transcribed. The following sections are samples from the transcriptions.

How do you feel about OSU students’ writing?

You know, a lot of the things we see are decently written and they’ve gone out and looked for appropriate references for things that are, something that would really have some arguments about for data and so forth. But then there’s always a cadre of people – and it could be a third, it could be maybe as high as 50% -- who have no clue about references, about making any kind of an authoritative citation. So many citations are something they read on the Web and they have no idea whether it’s right or it’s wrong. Sometimes it’s very nice, it’s things that you probably believe, government agencies and stuff like this, but other times it’s, you know, you can tell it’s some crazy blogger, or somebody’s just saying something, and okay, that’s kind of nice, and so forth. But, you know, in a way I can’t blame the students also, because in their society they’re exposed to so much that’s strange, I mean. As a scientist I’m constantly wincing when we’re talking about various subjects and there seems to be views that aren’t sustainable, that are held by some fraction of the population.

One thing that I find troubling about the course I teach is that we have a significant technical component, as well, so people can focus on numerical problems on risk, environmental, and stuff like this. And it’s possible to pass the class without doing much writing. You’ll get a much lower grade, and some fraction of the students always choose that. I’m amazed. They would just say, well, I think I can get a C if I just do the technical part well, and I fought through a couple of these essays, and a term paper? Let’s just drop it, it’s too much trouble. . . . They don’t do it at all. They take the grade penalty, which might be one or two letter grades, and just say, eh, it’s okay. I’m assuming – I don’t know, but I’m assuming they’re taking these classes S/U.

How do you get information about strategies for teaching writing, expectations in writing classes, etc?

Personal. This class – there are only a few schools that offer a class like this, and I was sort of bequeathed this from somebody at the University of Maryland and some folks have copied our class, but it’s just internally directed. The question choice – we try to make the shorter essays to be, you know, whatever’s going on in politics, environmental risk assessment, and so forth type questions that are current, so there’s usually two or three that are, you know, sort of drawn from news: stuff about cap and trade, for example, something like that.

Well, initially, it was like I read somewhere that the Synthesis class was supposed to include writing, so that was the extent of that, but I’m also serving on the Bacc Core Committee, on the Faculty of the Bacc Core Committee, so I’ve been fairly intimately involved in all the
conversations about assessment and also the Ad Hoc Report that, you know, we all orchestrate from, and the recommendations of that report.

I searched the website [when I was a new faculty member], where I happened to find out the information that my course was supposed to include writing. I mean, I would have done that anyway.

**What is your approach to teaching a Synthesis course as opposed to a WIC course?**

Oh, they’re very different. Absolutely. The Synthesis course it’s a fairly large class, 180 students, so that affects some of the writing assignments that I can give. F#1 said something like ten writing assignments – I would love to be able to do that, but I only have an undergraduate TA. So, what they do is they have these what I call content reviews for the course from when it first starts and when it ends with general questions that are frankly quite directly derived from the Bacc Core Outcomes. I quoted that assignment with the Bacc Core category outcomes in mind, asking them to write about what do they know about the topic at this point. That’s like the first question. The second question has to do with, it’s one of the outcomes directly, and it is how do they think science and technology affects them – design – because the course is History of Design. So, how do they think that, so it’s a great question, you know, basically assessing where they are starting at with their starting knowledge. And then I give them the same questions at the end of the course and I can assess the difference, you know, what did they learn during the course. So, those pre questions they get a chance to generate something, you know, I’m not determining a topic in advance. That’s kind of a little break and it’s nice thing to be able to do. The rest of the writing is pretty structured and directed. I have two quizzes, each one of which has a short essay question. From that, they do watch a video and then their group paper, a three-page response paper on the video that then the assignment is very directed, very specific, with essay questions for them to answer about the content of the film that they watch. And then I also ask them to bring in an object of design that they are interested in and relate that to the film and the course material and the questions that I have on the handout. So, it’s both very directed and structured assignment, but it also gives them a chance to have – what I wanted them to do is to think about the issues of the course in their lives and how they direct their course content and from there, some critical questions that we ask them there, and then write about that. The object, the design, the strong design of their life to the film and then produce that in a paper about that. . . So, that’s the Synthesis course, that’s what I do for writing in that course. In the WIC course, of course, it is very, very, very extensive what I do with writing there. I’ve kind of designed as a Capstone Course, even though it is not one officially. We might be changing that, we might be actually making it a two-course sequence, because it would make a lot more sense, but currently it covers methods and theory of art history, and it also covers the writing of a research paper and the document academic presentation at the end of the course. So, we do work on things, you know, we critique writing, we critique articles they’re bringing in. Not that maybe was crappy writing, but that’s a really good idea, actually.
To what extent do you have conversations in your department about how to teach writing?

It’s not any conversation with colleagues, because everyone’s doing their own thing, at least in my department. There’ve been some recent emails, like the one that went out yesterday about evaluating Bacc Core and the emails from the chair coming back with what’s this stuff? Somebody please take care of this for me, and so forth. So, I don’t think there’s a lot of initiative. The main WIC component is handled by our labs, senior lab instructors, and more or less the department says okay, this lady is paid to do this and, you know.

I think there’s still a lot of isolation that we’re just struggling to cover the technical material in our courses, and I think a lot of us perceive adding writing components as being...not undesirable, but just of a lower priority than covering the technical content. There are exceptions in our faculty, certainly, but.

Okay, I don’t know if there’s explicit dialogue, but I do feel like we take our writing pretty seriously. We have another one of my colleagues has actually written a textbook for us, Writing Becomes Designers, so I know that she’s taking this very seriously and she’s thought a lot about it, and how to integrate the writing into the discipline, you know. We try to do that in a specific way. But I don’t know that we have actual dialogue about how writing works. But there is very much a feeling of this culture in my department. And I just saw an email about the Cultural Writing Awards that the chair sent out, basically saying that we need to nominate students for this, and you know, matching money’s not a problem.

I should, I need to qualify something that I said. I might have made it sound like my colleagues don’t think writing is important. That’s not true. They, they clearly do, because we’re mostly tenure track faculty and they recognize the importance of writing in their careers and in the careers of their especially their graduate students. But a lot of it is a question of time. So, do I have time – do I have the qualifications, really, to review, to grade, to evaluate writing, and the time and skills to do that. And, so, I think if you don’t think you have time or skills to evaluate writing in your curriculum, in your course, then maybe you avoid those conversations.

How do you think we could support faculty, so they might talk about things more?

I think if there’s going to be some kind of a workshop or some sort of a mandatory thing that takes time, something has to make place for that, and I don’t know, I think that’s different in every case, but the university keeps stacking these little, good things on top of all the good things that we already do, and so the good things that we already do are gonna suffer in order to do the good things that we’ve gotta do, that the university says.

With the most vulnerable person in the department, or the most kind of, you know, good hearted person gets sort of, you know, drafted into this position, which is an important and good thing to do, but then what’s going to suffer? It’s most likely the person’s research, because you can’t take it out of your teaching.
I have to interject that for Chemistry right now we’re in more of a survival mode. There are fifteen tenure-track faculty in Chemistry; we teach 4,500 students a quarter through General Chemistry. So, we have a lot of hired guns that we bring in one quarter at a time. The provost knows this is bad. We’re hiring seven people this year, seven people next year, if we can. Of course, it’s very difficult to hire that many people in a single year. But we’re all, you know — I’m teaching five classes this quarter. So, it’s — you know, we’re in this survival mode, so we’re not terribly interested in anything that — I mean, we do all the research and do all the usual things, but in the survival mode right now, trying to figure out where these bodies, how we’re gonna get them in.

Well, all lower-division classes in Chemistry are taught by fixed-term instructors. They never see a tenure-track faculty member until they become a junior or senior graduate student. But we’re hiring tenure-track faculty for the most part. We want to hire 7 tenure-track faculty. We’ve had like 3 acceptances. We’re struggling to get the rest. We do hire still — because there’s a turnover — for the fixed-term people. There’s some turnover and some desire — the university enrollment’s going like this [indicates increase], then we’ve got to have people taking care of the labs and stuff like this. But there is this sort of stuff of unfunded mandates are kind of ohhhh, that’s a nice idea.

I think that having a communication person in the school — you know, whatever it is — to provide support, to provide access to resources, is a good thing. [The question is] time, it’s having time to think about it. So, you know, I’m gonna be bold and say, you know, a one-course release time a year just to focus on how to integrate writing better into the course work. Particularly, Bacc Core. We don’t actually teach that many Bacc Core courses. In the current fiscal model, is somehow you figure a tie to eCampus, because of the tuition and it occurs to the departments that are cognizant of that. I don’t know, I’m just thinking off the top of your head, but if there’s some way — eCampus is an unusual entity now. Everyone’s thinking of developing this and the administration isn’t clear that they want all of this to happen that way, because in the long term, eCampus is being subsidized by the rest of the campus, but right now many of the places in the university want a new graduate program and eCampus is the way you fund it.

I think we would really benefit from having somebody who understands the way in which writing functions, for example. I teach Art History, so, you know, for me it’s very different than for example for Fine Arts faculty. Writing is gonna be very different for practicing artists than it is for an art historian. So I think for us, you know, if there is going to be somebody whose advocating for writing, it would have to be somebody who really understands how writing functions in these bigger disciplines, as opposed to, you know, even a general CLM seems like a huge entity, with very different models of academic practice so, you know, it would really need — to be beneficial, it would need to be somebody who already understands how people are writing in their disciplines.
Appendix 8: Institutions Using Stretch Classes

California Campuses with Approved Stretch Programs in Pilot Phase
Sacramento (full implementation in Fall 2013)
Los Angeles (full implementation in Fall 2013)
Stanislaus (full implementation in Fall 2013)
Long Beach (pilot to begin in Fall 2012)
Humboldt (pilot to begin in Fall 2012)

Campuses with Stretch Program Proposals in Development
Pomona (proposal in committee, implementation scheduled for Fall 2012)
East Bay (anticipated pilot in Fall 2013)
San Jose (proposal in committee, with pilot scheduled for Fall 2013)
Bakersfield (just started working on Stretch planning)

Campuses with Stretch + Directed Self-Placement (DSP)
Fresno
Channel Islands
San Francisco
Humboldt (pilot DSP to begin in Fall 2013)
San Bernardino (DSP pilot to begin Fall 2012)
Stanislaus (implementing DSP in Fall 2012)
Sacramento (DSP Proposal in Committee)
Chico ((DSP pilot to begin Fall 2012)
Los Angeles (DSP pilot to begin Fall 2012, may or may not be linked to Stretch)

Campuses with Neither Stretch nor DSP
San Diego
Monterey Bay
Dominguez Hills
Appendix 8: Shared Outcomes for WR 327

Course Objectives

Technical Writing (WR 327) will prepare you to produce instructive, informative, and persuasive documents aimed at well-defined and achievable outcomes. Technical documents are precise, concise, logically organized, and based on factual information. The purpose and target audience of each document determine the style that an author chooses, including document layout, vocabulary, sentence and paragraph structure, and visuals. To this end, this course will teach processes for analyzing “writing contexts” and producing effective, clean, and reader-centered documents in an efficient manner. You can expect to gather, read, and present the technical content of your field to various audiences in attractive, error-free copy, as well as to learn strategies for presenting that content orally.

Outcomes
Successful students in WR 327 demonstrate their ability in technical writing in the following areas:

**Rhetorical Knowledge**: Awareness of the importance of audience and purpose to the production of effective documents, as demonstrated by reading, analyzing, and composing written and visual texts.

**Conventions**: Understanding of technical and workplace conventions, as demonstrated through the clean and clear design, style, and layout of written and oral materials.

**Information Literacy**: Ability to gather and apply researched information that is appropriate to your field, as demonstrated by using technological tools to find information, reading and analyzing documents, and citing sources correctly.

Assignments

1. **Informational Writing**: Assignment(s) in this course will require students to gather information via primary and/or secondary research and to apply that information in a common technical writing genre so as to inform readers about a given topic. Examples include instructions, manuals, reports, literature reviews, etc. These assignments will reinforce students’ information literacy skills and application of technical writing conventions.

2. **Persuasive Writing**: Assignment(s) in this course will require students to create and support an argument or recommendation related to a technical or workplace context. Examples include researched proposals, responses to RFPs, paper topic proposals, usability report recommendations, etc. These assignments will deepen students’ rhetorical awareness and savvy, as well as given them further practice with technical writing conventions.
3. **Oral Communication**: Assignment(s) in this course will require students to create and present documents and/or visual presentations orally in class. The oral communication portion of this course may relate directly to another assignment or may be an assignment of its own accord. This assignment will give students practice with the conventions of oral presentations.
Appendix 9: Shared Outcomes for WR 327
Course Objectives

Technical Writing (WR 327) will prepare you to produce instructive, informative, and persuasive documents aimed at well-defined and achievable outcomes. Technical documents are precise, concise, logically organized, and based on factual information. The purpose and target audience of each document determine the style that an author chooses, including document layout, vocabulary, sentence and paragraph structure, and visuals. To this end, this course will teach processes for analyzing “writing contexts” and producing effective, clean, and reader-centered documents in an efficient manner. You can expect to gather, read, and present the technical content of your field to various audiences in attractive, error-free copy, as well as to learn strategies for presenting that content orally.

Outcomes
Successful students in WR 327 demonstrate their ability in technical writing in the following areas:

**Rhetorical Knowledge**: Awareness of the importance of audience and purpose to the production of effective documents, as demonstrated by reading, analyzing, and composing written and visual texts.

**Conventions**: Understanding of technical and workplace conventions, as demonstrated through the clean and clear design, style, and layout of written and oral materials.

**Information Literacy**: Ability to gather and apply researched information that is appropriate to your field, as demonstrated by using technological tools to find information, reading and analyzing documents, and citing sources correctly.

Assignments
1. **Informational Writing**: Assignment(s) in this course will require students to gather information via primary and/or secondary research and to apply that information in a common technical writing genre so as to inform readers about a given topic. Examples include instructions, manuals, reports, literature reviews, etc. These assignments will reinforce students’ information literacy skills and application of technical writing conventions.

2. **Persuasive Writing**: Assignment(s) in this course will require students to create and support an argument or recommendation related to a technical or workplace context. Examples include researched proposals, responses to RFPs, paper topic proposals, usability report recommendations, etc. These assignments will deepen students’ rhetorical awareness and savvy, as well as given them further practice with technical writing conventions.

3. **Oral Communication**: Assignment(s) in this course will require students to create and present documents and/or visual presentations orally in class. The oral communication portion of this course may relate directly to another assignment or may be an assignment of its own accord. This assignment will give students practice with the conventions of oral presentations.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Report of OSU Baccalaureate Core Committee on Baccalaureate Core Fitness Requirement for Executive Committee of OSU Faculty Senate

March 17, 2000

Background

In the Fall of 1999, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate directed the Bac Core Committee to review the status of the fitness requirement. In particular, the Executive Committee wanted the Bac Core Committee to consider a variety of concerns about the requirement and HHP 231 that had been expressed by students and faculty over the years. The specific concerns will be detailed and addressed below.

Since initiation of the university Baccalaureate Core Requirements for graduation a fitness requirement has been included (Appendix 1). Prior to the initiation of the Bac Core, students had fulfilled a general education health requirement by taking PAC courses. In the Bac Core there has only been a single course offering that students can take to meet the requirement. This is HHP 231: Lifetime Fitness for Health.

By their nature, concerns raised about this course were anecdotal. The committee was unable to determine the extent to which negative sentiments were widespread. We do know that there is significant dissatisfaction among some faculty members. The level and extent of student dissatisfaction is less clear. For example, when the committee contacted the ASOSU Undergraduate Senate, the Senate was content to wait for our report and did not give the impression that concerns about HHP 231 were a pressing issue. The ideal way to address our charge would have been with a properly conducted survey of student and faculty opinion. The committee did not have the time or resources to conduct such a survey, given the time-line assigned for submission of this report. (A poorly conducted "quickie" survey the committee judged to be not worth the effort involved.) The committee is acutely aware that its judgments about the fitness requirement made under these circumstances involve a great deal of uncertainty. We have made efforts to carefully scrutinize the various anecdotal reports we have received, but recognize that these may overemphasize the nature or extent of various concerns about the fitness requirement.

We have discovered that a significant number of common concerns about HHP 231 seem to be based on misinformation or lack of information.

The committee did try to educate itself about the current nature of HHP 231 and sought comment from a range of campus sources. The committee has:

- reviewed the HHP 231 course material
- received a presentation by Dr. Anthony Wilcox, the current course director, on the nature and rationale for the current course structure. (Appendix 3) The material in Appendix 2 also addresses a number of the concerns that have been expressed about the course, e.g. administration of the course waiver exam,
the appropriateness of the course content, and the importance of fitness education for student health,
now and in the future.
–reviewed information provided by the Registrar, Barbara Balz, about the petitioning/waiver process
for students who seek to test out of the course. (Appendix 5)
–sought and received comments from head advisors.

This report will be provided to the Undergraduate Student Senate in order to allow them to formulate a
student response to areas of concern about the fitness requirement.

Current structure of HHP 231

The current course used by students to fulfill the Bac Core fitness requirement is HHP 231. Students attend
one-hour lectures in Milam auditorium twice a week. They also enroll in two-hour lab sections that meet
once a week. The lectures cover such topics as exercise benefits, appropriate exercise routines, exercise
injury problems, beneficial diet, psychological health, stress management, weight management, alcohol and
drug use, AIDS and STDs. The laboratory sessions provide an experiential and practice aspect to complement
the lectures. These include such things as individual assessments of students' aerobic fitness, muscular
strength, current diet, stress factors, etc. Students also give oral presentations of group (or individual)
research projects in the labs. A student's grade in HHP 231 is determined by a combination of scores on assignments
connected with the labs, a midterm and a final exam. The course points are divided approximately evenly
between exams and lab assignments.

The original course proposal for HHP 231 from 1989 described its purpose as follows,

*The purpose of the Lifetime Fitness for Health course is to impart an understanding of the role of
physical activity and other behaviors in maintaining the health and well-being of the human body. The
course is designed to achieve two major goals: to develop an intellectual awareness of the
fundamental concepts and contemporary research in health and physical fitness and to provide
personal experiences in the formulation and implementation of appropriate exercise regimens and
health behaviors.*

Prof. Anthony Wilcox has more recently described the goals of the course to the Baccalaureate Core
Committee as follows,

*...the focus of the HHP 231 course offered the potential for the greatest personal and public benefit. Since
the health benefits resulting from physical activity are manifold and far-reaching, and since there is a
high prevalence of inactivity in the population (60%), the information and skills acquired in this class can have a
great, life-long impact on our students and the society they enter. Such is not the case if the focus in a
course is other than fitness. The HHP 231 course fulfills the criteria for the Fitness course in the
Baccalaureate Core – criteria that was based upon the profoundly positive health benefits achieved through
these fitness and health behaviors.*

These two descriptions indicate that the nature of the current HHP 231 course is appropriately located in the
Skills category of the Bac Core.

Issues Related to the Fitness Requirement

1. Appropriateness of the Fitness requirement in general

Since the time of the original discussions about the Baccalaureate Core in 1989 some faculty have questioned
the appropriateness of having a health or fitness general education requirement at OSU at all. They
felt that it was not comparable in educational centrality to such requirements as math, writing, science,
literature and the arts, etc. This view seemed to hold that while studies in health, conditioning, etc. might be admirable
areas for research and teaching, health and fitness classes are not an appropriate required component of a
The rationale for having general education requirements in college curricula is often expressed in the idea that a college education should have as its goal more than providing the training and the background necessary for a specific field of endeavor. The general education component provides students with a background that will better enable them to lead productive and satisfying lives within Oregon, the United States and the world. In this broader context, it seems appropriate to give students the tools to manage their own physical well-being and health as well as intellectual and aesthetic tools that will enable them to be responsible, productive citizens. Thus, it is the judgment of the Bac Core Committee that a fitness/health requirement is entirely consistent with the goals of the Bac Core. The proper balance between the health and fitness components of the requirement is a topic that needs further examination. See our recommendations (at the end).

This discussion, of course, raises difficult questions about the nature of a general education curriculum, such as that in the Bac Core. The appropriateness or inappropriateness of some area of study for the Bac Core is ultimately a judgment of the entire faculty. The Baccalaureate Core Committee, however, in looking at the overall goals that are both explicit and implicit in the Core requirements feel that a fitness/health requirement is appropriate for the Core.

2. Content/Appropriateness of HHP 231

One concern about HHP 231 that has been persistently expressed by students to advisors and others is that its content is material that they’ve "already had in high school" and that this isn't really college level material. The committee has reviewed the course material for HHP 231, which is available on the web at http://osu.orst.edu/instruction/hhp231/. Our assessment is that the level is appropriate for a lower-division college course. Most importantly, we find that there is a contradiction between the complaint that students already know the material and the relatively low percentage of students who opt to “test out” of the course early or seek to challenge or waive the course via the Registrar, as explained below. It seems logical that if students already know the material and dislike being in the course that they would avail themselves of the opportunities that exist to finish the course early. They don't. We also note (see Appendix 4) that the responses to Question 11 ("As a result of having this instructor, I have learned a significant number of new ideas and/or skills) does not indicate a widespread perception that the course covers "familiar" material.

3. Course Waiver/Petitioning Process

AR 23 and AR 24 provide on a university wide basis for a student to "challenge" an OSU course, take an exam, and (if they pass) receive course credit (AR 23) or to take an exam which allows an otherwise required course to be waived as a requirement, with no course credit granted (AR 24). In each case a student must petition the Academic Requirements Committee and pay a $60 fee to the Registrar's office.

Separately, in response to student perceptions that material in HHP 231 had been covered in high school, the College of Health and Human Performance (HHP) has developed a "Waiver Exam" procedure for HHP 231. (The term "Waiver Exam" is misleading as discussed below.) This was to accommodate, in an administratively feasible way, those students who felt they already understood the material in HHP 231 from high school courses or other sources,. Under this procedure a student registered for HHP 231 is given a single exam that determines their course grade. The "waiver"
exam is administered in the third week of the course and students receive exam results within three weeks after that. Students who pass the "waiver" exam essentially complete the course on a self-study basis without attending labs or lectures.

This means that there are three separate pathways by which students can fulfill or challenge the fitness requirement. Distinguishing among these pathways is confusing for both students and advisors. One source of this confusion is that the HHP instituted "Waiver Exam" is inappropriately termed a course "waiver." In reality it is a mechanism to complete the course via self-study. The provision of a period for self-study of the course material is the principal reason for administering the exam in the third week of the term. The committee finds it entirely appropriate for a unit to have a system that allows students to "test-out" of a course as a result of intensive self-study. We do believe that there is some administrative confusion inherent in the current structure.

The number of students who have opted for one of the pathways available to complete HHP 231 early is relatively small. In the 97-98 school year, enrollments each term were in the high 700's, in the 98-99 school year they were in the mid 800's a term. In Fall 1999 approximately 900 students enrolled in HHP 231. During this period, approximately 6.5% of course enrollment attempted to "test-out" of the course by one of the three paths indicated above. Most of these were students enrolled in the course and using the HHP waiver pathway. HHP statistics show that students taking the waiver exam received C or better on the exam in 79% of cases, during the period from Fall 1997 through Fall 1999. (Appendix 6)

4. Class Size

One (anecdotal) source of student dissatisfaction with HHP 231 stems from the large lecture format for the class, which meets in Milam Auditorium. Evaluations of the course in Summer Terms, when it is taught in small sections with lecture and lab combined with one instructor are uniformly more positive than in the other terms. We understand that HHP is attempting to move all of the lecture material onto the web. This will allow either an elimination of the large lecture format or, at least, allow those students to do so who wish to follow a self-study format for the lecture portion of the course.

5. Student Choice

The committee believes that the concerns mentioned in sections 1-4 above have proved on examination to be either not substantial or of a nature that can be addressed by modifications of the current structures or procedures for HHP 231. The concern that we are addressing under the heading of "student choice" poses a more substantial problem for the current structure of the Baccalaureate Core fitness requirement and HHP 231. Although the reports are anecdotal, the Fitness requirement of the Core is noteworthy for the amount of comment that it has received over the years. To the committee's knowledge no other requirement of the Core has attracted as much concern as this one, albeit sometimes misguided or misinformed. The committee attributes this to the somewhat anomalous position of the Fitness requirement. HHP 231 has sometimes been described as "the only course that every OSU student must take." This one-size-fits-all aspect of HHP 231 is addressed in our recommendations below. We mention here that the unique position of HHP 231 is somewhat over stated. WR 121 is also a unique requirement, although this general education requirement is well nigh universal in university curricula. (MTH 105 is a minimal requirement for fulfilling the Mathematics skills requirement, but other Math
The general student perception is that in all other areas of the Core, as is typical of general education requirements in most universities, the student is presented with a menu of choices for fulfilling a particular requirement. Students expect that choice in the fitness skills area of the Baccalaureate Core. On the other hand, the faculty of HHP have a well thought out instructional rationale for presenting a unitary package of information and experience that is significant for the lives of the majority of students (Appendix 3). Although we recognize that there are reasonable educational rationales for a unitary course, the committee does not believe that they preclude meeting student needs for fitness education in a manner that allows for student choice.

The committee has identified three possible pathways for meeting student expectations for choice in fulfilling the Fitness Requirement.

**Option 1:** Change HHP 231 so that it effectively provides choice.

This option would use the smaller lab sections of HHP 231 to provide specialized pathways through the course for students with diverse fitness focuses, e.g. weight control, strength conditioning, etc. The committee has been informed of plans by HHP to institute some such more specialized options within the HHP 231 course for the 2000-01 school year. Based on the information currently available to the committee, this will include lab sections focused on weight management and stress management. There are also plans to integrate aspect of certain current Physical Activity Courses (PAC) such as aerobic dance, resistance training, jogging, into some lab sections. This will incorporate the information and experience of the lab sections into the specifics of an activity of interest to the student. The committee applauds the HHP faculty for its willingness to innovate to accommodate diverse student needs and interests.

**Option 2:** Change the Baccalaureate Core Fitness criteria to allow a selection of fitness skills courses, as in the Writing II requirement.

The current Bac Core criteria for a fitness course are rather tightly written for a course similar to HHP 231. One way in which more student choice can be offered in the context of a fitness requirement is to rewrite the fitness course criteria so that they have an emphasis which is appropriate for the Skills component of the Bac Core, but allow for a more diverse type of course to satisfy those requirements. A model for this might be the Writing II component of the Bac Core. Writing II is focused on developing writing skills, but the courses that meet the requirements are focused on specific types or aspects of writing, e.g. poetry, technical writing, business writing. Analogous courses in the fitness context might be something like Aerobic Fitness, Fitness for Strength, or Fitness and Weight Management.

**Option 3:** Change the Baccalaureate Core Fitness Criteria to a Perspectives category which would allow courses that emphasize either health or fitness topics.

The Bac Core fitness requirement could be rewritten along the lines of the Perspectives categories. The generality of such requirements would provide for courses with less emphasis on fitness activities and more emphasis on informational content on general health issues. Such changes would make it appropriate for departments outside of HHP, e.g. Nutrition, to offer Fitness/Health Bac Core courses.

**Analysis and Recommendations**
In the committee's judgment the three options outlined above are the practical alternatives for addressing the concern about student choice, which we have identified as the overriding issue connected with the Fitness Requirement. To carefully judge between these options we would have had to have the time and resources to conduct a more extensive investigation of student and faculty attitudes. The committee does believe that such further investigation is desirable before definitive changes are made. However, lacking such resources, the committee does believe that it is incumbent on them to make some recommendation to the Executive based on our own judgment and the information we have been able to gather.

The compelling rationale for a Fitness requirement in the Baccalaureate Core is the potential for each student to begin to develop or to continue to develop good health and fitness practices that are essential for life-long productivity in all aspects of life. The committee has come to the conclusion that this rationale for a Fitness requirement in the Bac Core means it must lead students to incorporate appropriate fitness activities into their lives. Consequently, while health information is an important component of a course fitting the Fitness requirement, an appropriate course cannot be solely informational but also should have a skills component. We believe that Option 3 will not ensure this skills emphasis is in the Core. While the incorporation of specialized lab tracks into HHP 231 is a meaningful response to student, faculty, and advisor concerns and needs, related to choice, these changes alone will not provide adequate choice. Thus we believe that Option 1 will not adequately address these concerns.

As a result, we make the following recommendations to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate:

**Recommendation 1**

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate should ask the 2000-01 Baccalaureate Core Committee to work with HHP and other interested parties to revise the current Baccalaureate Core Fitness Criteria in a manner which will allow a number of courses focusing on both health and fitness skills to fulfill the revised criteria. The committee should consider as a model the criteria for the Writing II component of the Bac Core.

**Recommendation 2**

If the Faculty Senate decides to retain a Baccalaureate Core structure in which HHP 231 is the sole course by which students can fulfill the fitness requirement, then the Registrar's Office, the College of Health and Human Performance, the Academic Requirements Committee, and other interested parties should work to develop an administrative pathway by which students can fulfill the Fitness requirement of the Core through self-study and a test. The focus in these discussions should be on student convenience, and transparency to students and advisors.

Respectfully submitted by Faculty Senate 1999-2000 Baccalaureate Core Committee:

- Michael Scanlan (Philosophy), Chair
- Bonnie Avery (Library)
- Robert Burton (Executive Comm.)
- Vicki Tolar Burton (WIC Director)
- Robert Jarvis (Fisheries and Wildlife)
- John Lee (Mathematics)
- Kurt Peters (Ethnic Studies)
- Satish Reddy (Mathematics)
- Christine Snow (Exercise and Sport Science)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

As described by the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC), the goals of the Baccalaureate Core (OSU’s General Education requirement), are to:

- Strengthen critical thinking and communication skills across disciplines.
- Ensure that all OSU students acquire a basic understanding and appreciation for the physical and biological sciences, humanities and the arts, and the social sciences.
- Strengthen the international dimensions of the University’s curriculum.
- Encourage interdisciplinary interaction among students and faculty.

More generally, as is ubiquitous in the “General Education” component of a liberal education, the Baccalaureate Core is intended to develop a depth of learning in students that leads to a more thoughtful and productive global citizenship. Bloom, et al., developed a taxonomy as a set of standard classifications to reflect the depth of the student learning experience.

1. Knowledge
2. Comprehension
3. Application
4. Analysis
5. Synthesis
6. Evaluation

The higher-numbered classes require an integration of concepts and skills that are objectives of the earlier classes. In terms of Bloom’s Taxonomy, a threshold of this activity from lower to higher level cognitive skills lies in the transition from Application, where concepts are employed to solve problems in new situations to Analysis which includes the breaking down of informational materials into their component parts, and then understanding the individual parts along with the relationships between them. It is one of the functions of the Baccalaureate Core to drive students to the higher classes in the taxonomy.

The Baccalaureate Core is composed of the following main areas of course study, which comprise a total of 48 credits plus a Writing Intensive Course (WIC courses must be at least three credits and a requirement of the major):

- Skills Courses (primarily first year)
- Perspectives Courses (primarily lower division)
- Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) Courses (upper and lower division)
- Synthesis Courses (upper division)
As shown in the figure below, each of the Baccalaureate Core categories has a general rationale as well as specific category criteria that can be found at:

http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/baccore.html

Inspection of the category criteria shows a design that is intended to drive learning to higher cognitive levels. For example, common threads across many of the categories include “Study, from a historical perspective …”, “Demonstrate interrelationships and connections with other subject areas,” and “Emphasize elements of critical thinking”.

An assessment process is in place to ensure students are achieving outcomes consistent with the intent of the Baccalaureate Core. The assessment process is based on evaluations at two levels: individual course assessment and category reviews.

Assessment at the individual course level is schematically illustrated in the figure below. Each course is constructed of individual elements to promote student learning. The effect of these elements is compared to a set of learning outcomes in assessment of the course. This process is typical of that used for all University courses.

On top of the individual course assessment, each category in the Baccalaureate Core undergoes periodic review by the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC). For example, during the 2005-06 academic year, the BCC is reviewing all Contemporary Global Issues courses that
are more than five years old. This additional level of assessment at the individual course level and at the category level is illustrated in the figure below. In this process, the course syllabus and learning outcomes are compared to the category rationale and criteria. Additionally, instructors write a narrative in which they describe specifically how their course addresses the category rationale and meets the category criteria. The purpose is to ensure that Baccalaureate Core criteria
continue to be addressed in these courses. A review rubric is used by the BCC to maintain consistency of evaluation. Only courses that successfully complete the review process retain their category status in the Baccalaureate Core.

The next steps in assessing the quality of the Baccalaureate Core from a learning perspective will require a focused effort at both the course and University levels.

**Improve Categorical Review**

- Develop a procedure for incorporating how individual courses have met stated course learning outcomes.

**Examine the Baccalaureate Core Experience**

- Articulate learning outcomes for the Baccalaureate Core experience.
- Develop an assessment strategy and a structure for continuous improvement to ensure outcomes are being met.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

2003-2004 Course Review

- Cover Letter
- Instructions to Request the Continuation of Baccalaureate Core Category Status
- Request to Continue Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions Designation Checklist/Signature Form
- Enrollment Information Form
- Request for Removal of Baccalaureate Core Status Form
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The higher-numbered classes require an integration of concepts and skills that are objectives of the earlier classes. In terms of Bloom’s Taxonomy, a threshold of this activity from lower to higher level cognitive skills lies in the transition from Application, where concepts are employed to solve problems in new situations to Analysis which includes the breaking down of informational materials into their component parts, and then understanding the individual parts along with the relationships between them. It is one of the functions of the Baccalaureate Core to drive students to the higher classes in the taxonomy.

The Baccalaureate Core is composed of the following main areas of course study, which comprise a total of 48 credits plus a Writing Intensive Course (WIC courses must be at least three credits and a requirement of the major):

- Skills Courses (primarily first year)
- Perspectives Courses (primarily lower division)
- Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) Courses (upper and lower division)
- Synthesis Courses (upper division)
Inspection of the category criteria shows a design that is intended to drive learning to higher cognitive levels. For example, common threads across many of the categories include “Study, from a historical perspective …”, “Demonstrate interrelationships and connections with other subject areas,” and “Emphasize elements of critical thinking”.

An assessment process is in place to ensure students are achieving outcomes consistent with the intent of the Baccalaureate Core. The assessment process is based on evaluations at two levels: individual course assessment and category reviews.

Assessment at the individual course level is schematically illustrated in the figure below. Each course is constructed of individual elements to promote student learning. The effect of these elements is compared to a set of learning outcomes in assessment of the course. This process is typical of that used for all University courses.

On top of the individual course assessment, each category in the Baccalaureate Core undergoes periodic review by the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC). For example, during the 2005-06 academic year, the BCC is reviewing all Contemporary Global Issues
courses that are more than five years old. This additional level of assessment at the individual course level and at the category level is illustrated in the figure below. In this process, the course syllabus and learning outcomes are compared to the category rationale and criteria. Additionally, instructors write a narrative in which they describe specifically how their course addresses the category rationale and meets the category criteria. The purpose is to ensure that Baccalaureate Core criteria.
continue to be addressed in these courses. A review rubric is used by the BCC to maintain consistency of evaluation. Only courses that successfully complete the review process retain their category status in the Baccalaureate Core.

The next steps in assessing the quality of the Baccalaureate Core from a learning perspective will require a focused effort at both the course and University levels.

**Improve Categorical Review**

- Develop a procedure for incorporating how individual courses have met stated course learning outcomes.

**Examine the Baccalaureate Core Experience**

- Articulate learning outcomes for the Baccalaureate Core experience.
- Develop an assessment strategy and a structure for continuous improvement to ensure outcomes are being met.
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You will find the requirements for the AAOT at this Oregon University System website:
http://www.ous.edu/state_board/jbac/files/transferdeg.html

The following statement is from the OSU Office of Admissions website:

**The Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree**

The Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree is accepted at OSU. Completion of an AAOT degree ensures completion of all lower division Baccalaureate Core (general education) requirements and junior standing for registration. It may be more efficient to take courses equivalent with the OSU Baccalaureate Core list, than completing the full AAOT. You may want to use the course transfer tables and the tools mentioned above to see which courses transfer from community colleges.

**AAOT/BCC Comparison**

And this OUS website describes the AAOT revision process that is currently underway.
http://www.ous.edu/state_board/jbac/files/AAOTrevision-all.pdf
# OSU Bacc Core Comparison with AAOT Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>OSU Bacc Core</th>
<th>AAOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>6-9 credits; total of 9 with 3 possible in comm</td>
<td>8 credits; (WR 121, 122, 123, 127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3-4 credits</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Rhetoric</td>
<td>(3 credits); for a total of 9 credits with writing</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>3-12 credits; from 3 different perspective categories (Lit &amp; Arts, Cult Div, West Cult)</td>
<td>10 credits; at least 2 disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>3-12 credits; from 3 perspective categories (Cult Div, Soc Processes, West)</td>
<td>15 credits; at least 2 disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Math/Computer Science</td>
<td>12 credits; one bio, one phys and one additional</td>
<td>15 credits; 3 lab courses of at least 12 credits in bio/physical science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>6 credits</td>
<td>0 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengths
- AAOT systematically requires more courses in each of a limited number of categories; our Perspectives categories disperse concentration of humanities, arts, and social sciences.
- AAOT categories are traditionally recognized divisions within universities (e.g., science, math, arts/humanities, social sciences, writing, etc.)
- AAOT focused solely on lower division courses – helps students get a general education relatively early in career
- AAOT requires communication class, OSU Bacc Core does not
- AAOT designed as a total package, not meant to be unwrapped – appears to be a coherent whole

### Problems
- AAOT is 10 more credits than OSU Bacc Core without WIC, DPD, or synthesis requirements – not a reduction in resources or numbers of credits
- Could potentially narrow the breadth of classes students take; maybe exempt classes in major from serving as bacc core classes?
- AAOT categories don’t appear to recognize the inter- and cross-disciplinary nature of knowledge
- Many Bac Core courses are upper division courses; what would happen if we switched to all lower division Bac Core courses (with few exceptions)? Can departments/colleges handle the shift in numbers?
- Designated OSU DPD courses may be different from equivalently named/numbered courses at Community Colleges
- Students in some majors (engineering, natural and physical sciences, and fine and performing arts) cannot easily accommodate required coursework
Summary of WIC Board Comments Regarding Potential Reduction of the Writing Requirement

-----Original Message-----
From: Tolar Burton, Vicki
Sent: Wed 4/18/2007 2:56 PM
To: Aebi, Cydreaese; Bogley, William; Boston, Kevin; Caughey, Carol; Edge, W. Daniel; Foster, James; Hackleman, David; Higginbotham, Jack F; John W. Lee - Math; Katz, Jonathan; Lajitha, Kate; McMillen, Paula; Morrell, Jeff; Neubaum, Don - COB; Robinson, TracyAnn; Tolar Burton, Vicki; Warner, Rebecca; Wilcox, Anthony; Winograd, Kenneth

Subject: A Quick Reply is Needed

Dear WIC Advisory Board,
I need some quick WIC feedback from you. As you may know, the Bac Core Committee, on which I sit as an ex officio member, has been asked to revise the core requirements in light of many CLA departments moving to 4 hour courses. I just learned that this Friday the Bac Core Committee (BCC) is discussing a model that reduces the writing/communication requirement from three 3-hour courses (one may be Speech Comm rather than Writing) to two 4-hour courses (one of which may be Speech Comm).

Here is my question for you:
In light of the fact that over 40% of OSU students take their first college writing course (WR 121) elsewhere (in high school or at a community college), would students be prepared for upper division WIC courses with only WR 121, taken wherever, plus one other writing or speech course? Your thoughts? Is Writing where the core needs to be cut to handle the increase in hours for some courses? Thanks for your thoughts. They will help me prepare for the discussion Friday. Vicki

From: John Lee [mailto:jwlee@math.oregonstate.edu]

Dear colleagues:
Writing is not where OSU core requirements need to be cut. If we don't graduate students who can communicate effectively, both in writing and verbally, and have something worth saying little has been accomplished.

Whether an WR requirement is the best way to help students achieve these goals is arguable. However, reducing the overall writing requirement will not advance the cause. Writing well is not easy and helping students become better writers is not easy. Both are time and energy intensive. They won't just happen and they aren't happening for many current OSU student (based on my experience). So something is missing in this picture. If the WR requirement is reduced some other serious writing requirement is needed in its place. A revised baccalaureate core should have more serious writing experiences integrated into it rather than less. How to do that effectively should be the question. (Whether OSU has the resources and/or will to do that is another question.) John

From: Edge, W. Daniel
Fisheries and Wildlife
No--Hold the line on the writing! Programs offering the credit-hour bump should be the first to suggest their courses don't need to be in the Bac-Core. Did you hit a nerve? Thanks for asking and good luck. DE

From: Neubaum, Don - COB

Of all the areas to consider cutting, I find it hard to believe writing and communication is the first place to start. Cutting any hours related to communication would be a disservice to our students.
Employers Look for Honesty, Communication Skills in Job Candidates

Qualities of the Ideal Candidate

April 3, 2007 (SmartPros) — What does it take to be the "ideal" job candidate? Employers have a tall order, but communication skills are at the top of their list in what they look for in potential employees, followed by honesty/integrity, according to a report from the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE).

"Communication skills have topped the list for eight years, and honesty and integrity have tied for the top spot for the last three years," said Marilyn Mackes, NACE executive director.

But the ideal candidate needs to be more than an articulate straight arrow, according to NACE’s Job Outlook 2007 survey results. Employers also cited strong interpersonal skills, motivation and initiative, the ability to work well with others, and a strong work ethic as key attributes.

"Certainly, having the requisite skill set to perform the duties of the job is critical, but much of what employers prize can't be taught in the classroom," said Mackes. "As a result, they look for evidence beyond grades that the candidate has these 'soft skills' and attributes. This is one reason why employers look for new college graduates who have gained some kind of relevant work experience, typically performed through an internship or cooperative education program."

In fact, nearly three-quarters of employers responding to the Job Outlook 2007 survey indicated they prefer to hire new college graduates who have gained relevant work experience.

So, is the candidate with killer "soft skills" and relevant work experience a shoo-in for the job? Not if the candidate's grades don't cut it.

Nearly two-thirds of responding employers said they screen new college graduate job candidates on their grade point average (GPA). The biggest group -- 58 percent -- reported that they use a GPA of 3.0 (on a 4-point scale) as their cutoff. "Grades do count," said Mackes.

For more details http://www.naceweb.org/press/display.asp?year=&prid=254

Don Neubaum, Ph.D.

From: Morrell, Jeff
COF
I think our students need as much writing experience as possible. That being said, however, I am frustrated that our seniors come to their WIC experience with little understanding of what constitutes a well written sentence. We assume they obtained this wisdom in high school- but they clearly do not. In the end, I would still hate to see us drop any writing experiences. for our students.

From: Kate Lajtha
Environmental Sciences
Here is my take on things: i do not feel that the writing classes do anything at all to prepare students for science writing. I'd love to see the WR requirements reduced, and have students learn more writing within their majors.  Kate

From: Bogley, Bill
Honors College
It sometimes feels as though the writing pieces of the general ed requirement are like a hiking trail at Silver Falls. The student experiences each component piece (WR I, II, III plus WIC) as if passing through a waterfall. Once through, they shake themselves off and put their writing requirements behind them.

Wouldn't it be something if writing were more fully integrated as an explicit component of each and every course and of every program? Or perhaps within the Bac Core? Then it would no longer be a
matter of students closing their eyes and ducking through the waterfalls, so that they would really have to learn to swim (ie write) in order to get out of OSU alive. A rationale that I have heard in gossip about the 4-credit proposals is that the courses are being augmented with add'l writing requirements. (I haven't seen any of the proposals, of course, so you can decide whether this is a legitimate claim.)

If this is so, however, my two cents is that instead of fighting a rear-guard action to preserve the status quo, you could try to approach this as an opportunity to further enhance writing as an integral part of an OSU education by installing or upgrading writing outcomes within (courses of) the Bac Core. You said quick, so there you go. Good luck. Bill

From: Winograd, Kenneth
College of Education

I basically agree with those who are concerned about cutting back of WR requirements in the bac core. For me, the big issue is that our students in teacher education must be prepared to teach writing to their students in k-12. It is my experience that the best teachers of writing are those who know writing, can write well, have confidence as writers, etc. I tend to find a relationship between the quality of one's teaching of writing and one's identity as a writer. This is relevant even to those who teach elementary students how to write.

A model that reduces the writing requirement to one four-credit hour writing class (along with four hours of speech comm) is a risky proposition in terms of our students' development as writers. John Lee is correct below: Many OSU students, even with the current requirements, are not writing as well we would like. If writing hours are cut, some other structures need to replace this loss.

Certainly, effective writing instruction should be integrated throughout the bacc core, and I realize that efforts have been made over the years to get college teachers to do this. In the absence of a more systematic and interdisciplinary/integrated approach university-wide, I am wary of cutting the existing requirements.

Ken

From: Boston, Kevin
COF

If the bacc core would adopt a stronger writing within their courses -that emphasized critical thinking through writing in these new 4 credit courses instead of the large scantron midterm & final for the graded material. I guess I need to see how the courses are going to change.

I could live without the comm classes go... we do a significant amount of presentation is our degree program so they will get that experience.

It seems the goal of the bacc core should be to have the students be be able to clearly express themselves in written form on a vairety of topics - doesn't matter if it is not in the exact format for my science - I can take care of that in the WIC.

Kevin

From: Foster, James
OSU-Cascades

Hi Vicki:
My thoughts are sort of related to Kate's, in that I agree with what I take to be her view that requiring "generic," WR 121 courses imparts few useable skills. I would distinguish between required writing courses (in either high school or at university), which are not very effective, and requiring writing WITHIN a specific curriculum, such as Political Science, which is demonstrably effective; and I'd draw an analogy to suffusing a curriculum with gender and ethnic studies, compared to "ghettoizing" such studies in discrete courses.

James C. Foster, Professor
From: Hackleman, David  
College of Engineering
A writing course in my opinion includes a bit of education not found in “major-specific” courses. That said, I’m open to change, as long as change results in the retention of basic and fundamental expectations of capability in those that graduate and earn a college degree from OSU. As for whether another educational program can supply an effective writing course and learning experience, I’m certain that they can, yet believe we at OSU should measure the performance of our students through observed results more than pedigree.

My opinion is that this consideration for a change is an opportunity to insist that all graduates from OSU demonstrate a competence in writing through either the successful completion of a significant writing course or demonstration through the completion of a 5,000 word (or greater) paper. The paper should clearly demonstrate their ability to convey information through writing to an audience of college graduates.

Such an expectation requires that we allocate resources (money and people in this case) to confirm the accomplishment if it is not through the class. Hence, it would be a “qualifier” exam and could possibly be performed with a fee to cover the cost of the evaluation process.

Alternatively, one could eliminate the need for the demonstration of writing competence altogether.  
Dr. David Hackleman

From: Katz, Jonathan  
CLA
Vicki: I second Kate.

In the History Department, part of the motivation for going to 4-credits is in fact to include more writing in our courses, especially for majors.

Regarding David’s suggestion of a long exit paper (at least that’s what I took it to be from my cursory glance), I think that’s part of another discussion. At Northern Colorado, where I taught before coming to OS(U), the exit exam -- a blue book affair -- was disastrous.

Meanwhile, I’ve tried to convince my colleagues that we should have a thesis option in history -- but no one wants to take on what is perceived as an "unfunded mandate."
Jonathan G. Katz

From: Wilcox, Anthony  
HHS/NFM
It’s interesting to see this intersection between changing course credits from 3 to 4 and the issue of what is learned from the courses. Somehow, when it comes to a writing course, I’m a bit skeptical that the students will actually do more writing in a 4-credit course as they do in a 3-credit course. They may be able to learn more about writing in 4-credit course with the extra contact hours, but I doubt there will be more assignments. If that’s the case, it weakens the position for exchanging 3 3-credit courses in writing/communications to 2 4-credit courses.

Of course, part of the change to 4-credit courses is to come closer to the course unit of semesters (4.5 credits). What is “normal” for general education writing/communication course requirements at semester schools, 2 or 3? That may be a framework that could be useful for our consideration.
I’m not fully familiar with the Bac Core requirements right now, with respect to a communications course being able to fulfill part of a 3-course requirement in this category. If they must convert to 4 credit courses, then I think writing should be separated from speech, and the requirement should be for 2 writing courses, with one of them being the WIC course. However, the WIC course might not be a 4-credit course, unless they are thinking of mandating that, too, since I doubt that most departments are thinking of converting them to 4 at this moment. Another option would be to mandate 2 writing courses, and one of them “may” be the WIC major course (this is probably heretical to say on this listserv), but as another response noted, there are many resource issues we are facing, and departments delivering WIC courses has been difficult, too.

Anyway, with a quick response, I offer some ideas that are not fully formed.

Tony

From: Caughey, Carol
Design and the Human Environment
Vicki,
In my Dept (DHE) we have spent a great deal of time at our WIC retreat and our faculty meetings discussing how our courses at all levels 100-400 can support the final WIC class.

Not only do we find that the current OSU writing requirements do not adequately prepare our students for the 400-level writing courses in their majors, but we hear of employers' comments that graduates' writing skills in general have deteriorated during the past decade.

We have devoted considerable effort to include writing to learn activities in all classes in DHE as well as to provide developmental activities that lead to an appropriate skill set for success in our WIC classes-- and afterward we hope in the careers of our graduates.

I'm not familiar with efforts such as this in other departments; but even if they are in place, a reduction in writing requirements at the university level will make our work even more difficult.

And greetings from Botswana! - Carol

From: Robinson, TracyAnn
Mechanical Engineering

John pretty much sums up my views on this. The shift to 4 credit classes does present a challenge (though one I'm not convinced is insurmountable) with retaining the existing bac core WR requirement, but it doesn't change the university's goal of graduating students who communicate effectively. Reducing the WR requirement without compensating for that reduction in some other way clearly works against this outcome. So what other options are there? Might, for example, a reduction in the WR requirement for a given department be contingent on systematic and demonstrable infusion of written (and oral/visual/electronic) communication instruction into that department's lower-division curricula? I think this is what Kate was getting at wrt writing in the sciences, and it makes sense for many other disciplines as well. But such an effort would need to be managed and would require department accountability, and as John also points out, whether OSU currently has the resources and/or will to make efforts that require management and accountability is another question.

Tracy Ann
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Annual Report
2012-2013

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi, Baccalaureate Core Committee Co-Chairs
Date: July 15, 2013
Re: 2012-2013 Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) Annual Report

Membership
The BCC membership for 2012-2013 included twelve faculty members from a cross-section of OSU’s colleges and academic programs and ex-officio members representing WIC and DPD. Two available slots on the committee went unfilled, and we did not have any student members this year. A complete and accurate membership list appears below:

Kerry Kincanon, Co-chair '13
Marion Rossi, Co-chair '15
TBA (v. Bogley) '14
Uta Hussong-Christian '13
Michael Lerner '13
TBA (v. Peltomaki) '13
Joe Zaworski '13
Jaga Giebultowicz '14
Trischa Goodnow (v. Sherwood) '14
Rebecca Olson '14
Lori Kayes '15
Linda Bruslind '15
Melinda Manore '15
Ken Winograd '15

Academic Success Center
University Theatre
OSU Libraries
Chemistry
Mechanical, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering
Zoology
School of Arts & Communication
English
Biology
Microbiology
School of Biological and Population Health Sciences
College of Education

Ex-Officios:
WIC Director (Vicki Tolar Burton)
DPD Director (Michelle Bothwell)

Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison – Bob Mason

Meetings
The BCC maintained an active meeting schedule in 2012-13. Our workload for the year was heavily defined by Synthesis Category Review activities. We limited our fall term meeting schedule, so members could focus on completing their assigned Synthesis Category Reviews.

- Fall Term 2012 – One Meeting and Two Category Review Training Sessions (BCC members were asked to attend one training session)
- Winter Term 2013 – Two Category Review Debrief Sessions (BCC members were asked to attend one debrief session) and Two Meetings
- Spring Term 2013 – Five Meetings
Course Approvals
The BCC approved 37 courses for addition to the Baccalaureate Core in AY 2012-2013 (see Table 1). We followed the course review process that was established by the 2011-2012 BCC and is included as an appendix in the 2011-2012 annual report. To date, 32 of these courses have been added to the catalog as part of the Bacc Core, and 5 of the courses are still pending Curriculum Council approval. Additionally, the co-chairs are working this summer with a proposer from the School of Language, Culture, and Society to see through a proposal for ANTH 473 that came in just prior to our final meeting. The proposer was seeking addition of the course to Cultural Diversity, but we think it would fit better in Contemporary Global Issues. The originator is in the process of adjusting the proposal. There is one other course proposal that came to committee after our final meeting. Review of this course will be held until the BCC reconvenes in the fall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing II</td>
<td>WR 240*</td>
<td>*Pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>PAC 121, PAC 304, PAC 320, PAC 321, PAC 325</td>
<td>Physical Activity Courses (PAC) can be used to meet the lab portion of the Fitness Category so, starting this year, all new PAC classes were routed through the BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Culture</td>
<td>GER 321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>PHL 214, PS 343, ES 231*, WGSS 280**</td>
<td>*ES 231 is an existing course in this category that went through a Change Course CAT II to add an additional credit. **WGSS 280 is also a Change Course CAT II that is pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and the Arts</td>
<td>ENG 107, FILM 255, FILM 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>WGSS 496, HST/PHL 210/210H, QS/WGSS 262, QS/WGSS 364, QS/WGSS/ES 431, QS/WGSS 462*</td>
<td>*Pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Global Issues</td>
<td>FOR 476, WGSS 463, HST 488, AREC 352*</td>
<td>*AREC 352 was an existing course approved for Science, Technology, and Society (STS). The unit submitted a Change Course CAT II to shift it from STS to Contemporary Global Issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology, &amp; Society</td>
<td>ATS 320, SUS 304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>PS 300, HDFS 461, PHL 474*, BEE 469, QS/WGSS 472*, WSE 453, MB/BI 385, FW 439, EXSS 455, FE 460*</td>
<td>*Pending Curriculum Council approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AY 2012-2013 BCC Activities
1. The College of Public Health and Human Sciences (PHHS) contacted Vicki Tolar Burton, the Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation, and Kerry Kincanon, BCC co-chair, in the summer of 2012 with a request for the BCC to consider adding a third outcome to the Fitness Category Learning Outcomes. While considering the two existing Fitness outcomes through the lens of impending assessment, PHHS realized that something was missing and that the outcomes did not sufficiently
address the activity component inherent in the criteria of the Fitness category. A delegation from PHHS worked with Vicki to draft a third outcome which reads:

- Through regular and sustained engagement, demonstrate the knowledge, skill, and ability to participate in a selected physical activity for health, fitness, sport, or recreation.

This addition was presented to the BCC in September and the outcome was officially added on September 17, 2012. The addition is reflected in the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes, Criteria and Rationale statement.

2. At the final 2011-2012 BCC meeting, the committee voted to put forward changes to the Category Criteria language for the Perspectives Category. The recommendation was to strike the "Be lower division and at least three credits" statement from the criteria of non-science Perspectives Categories and "Be lower division, at least four credits, and contain a laboratory" from all Science Perspectives categories and to add the following statements to the criteria for all Perspectives categories:

- For the non-science categories:
  Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least three credits and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

- and for the science categories:
  Courses in this Perspectives category shall be at least four credits, contain a lab, and accessible to both lower and upper division students. Prerequisites or class-level restrictions for Perspectives courses must not create unreasonable barriers for students seeking to fulfill these categories.

The co-chairs took these proposed changes before the full senate on October 11, 2012, and they were approved. The changes are reflected in the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes, Criteria and Rationale statement.

3. In September 2012, the Baccalaureate Core Web Site was officially launched. It includes targeted information for various OSU constituents (current students, prospective transfer students, faculty and advisors, etc.) and serves informational and archival purposes relative to the Bacc Core. The site also houses the "Bacc Core Playlists," an innovative tool that provides optional thematic pathways that students can follow as they navigate their way through Bacc Core requirements. Vicki Tolar Burton coordinated the development of the site with Central Web Services, but the BCC played an instrumental role in vetting content last year. This year’s BCC agreed that our committee should review content yearly and make recommendations to Academic Affairs on revisions and adjustments to the site.

4. The BCC conducted Category Review for the Synthesis categories. Information relative to Category Review for Synthesis courses was collected at the end of spring 2012. This information was collated and organized over the summer by Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment in the Office of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) and presented to the BCC at the beginning of the fall 2012. Appendix A is the final report of the Synthesis Category review, including a full description of the process, results, and conclusions. Ultimately all courses were either fully or provisionally recertified for continued inclusion in their respective Synthesis categories. The only exceptions were the handful of courses whose offering units specifically requested that they be removed from the core. Provisionally certified courses will be subject to an extensive follow-up in Category Review cycle year 3 (2015/2016). A list of provisionally certified Synthesis courses can be found in Appendix B.

5. The BCC engaged in communication and activities related to the next Category Review. In the fall of 2013, the BCC will engage in Category Review for the following Skills Categories: Mathematics, Speech, and Fitness, and the WIC courses from the following colleges: Agricultural Sciences, Business, and Public Health and Human Sciences. Appendix C presents the memo we sent in the fall to these participating units regarding upcoming Category Review. Early in spring term, Stefani Dawn coordinated with these units to establish access to the reporting form that they would use to submit materials for the following year. In winter and spring, Stefani and Vicki Tolar Burton offered several workshops to support these units in preparing for Category Review. DPD and College of Engineering WIC faculty were informed of these workshops as well. These two categories will be up for review in the fall of 2014.

6. Given the strong working relationship that has been established with the Office of APAA around matters related to the Bacc Core, the BCC put forward a standing rules change to the Committee on Committees to add an ex-officio from Academic Affairs to be appointed by the Senior Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs. Ideally, this appointee will be the individual in the Office of APAA designated to
support Bacc Core assessment (currently Stefani Dawn). The standing rules change was approved at the June 13, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting.

7. During winter and spring terms, the BCC engaged in a lengthy process to prioritize recommendations from the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report that was completed in 2011-12 by a special review committee convened by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Appendix D is the memo outlining the BCC’s suggestions for where the institution should start in the implementation of report recommendations.

8. A concern identified in the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report was the varying degrees to which students in Synthesis courses were asked to complete evidence-based writing, a key component of the Synthesis category criteria and learning outcomes. This concern was reinforced by what the BCC learned during Category Review. Some of the courses reviewed have successfully integrated evidence-based writing and others not so much. The BCC sought the assistance of the Writing Advisory Board to help create explanatory matter that units could use to guide the creation of writing-based assignments in Synthesis courses. This explanatory matter has been added to the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes, Criteria and Rationale statement. (Both Appendix A and Appendix D also include references to and examples of this explanatory language as the decision to add it emanated from these respective processes).

9. The addition of this explanatory matter prompted the BCC to work with colleagues in the Office of APAA to revise the Bacc Core question sets for the Synthesis categories in the Curricular Proposal System. We also worked with them to revise the final question in all Bacc Core question sets. This question asked proposers to discuss unit level assessment plans for the course. We found proposers were really struggling with the question as written, so we made adjustments that we think will help proposal writers better understand the question.

10. During spring term, the BCC reviewed compliance numbers for the First-Year Skills Requirement, which mandates that students complete their Writing I, Speech, and Mathematics Bacc Core categories within their first 45 credits. This requirement has been in place now for two academic years, and the BCC agreed to review compliance numbers after two years to determine if an enforcement mechanism was needed. The BCC was content with compliance rates. We decided not to create an enforcement mechanism and to continue to rely on advisors to promote and advocate for completion of these three categories in the first year. A table comparing compliance rates by college for the 2010-2011 cohort (the year before the requirement was implemented) and the 2012-13 cohort can be found in the June 5, 2013 meeting minutes.

11. Inspired in no small part by the pivotal role that Vicki Tolar Burton has played for OSU in her three-year tenure as Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation, the BCC drafted a memo at the end of the academic year advocating for the creation of a permanent Director of Baccalaureate Core (See Appendix E). Such a position would provide stability in oversight of the Bacc Core and an individual well-positioned to shepherd long-term projects related to OSU’s General Education efforts.

On the Horizon for the BCC in AY 2013-14

• In addition to recommending explanatory matter to help with writing in Synthesis, the Writing Advisory Board suggested that the BCC also develop a "rationale statement" that would govern the larger "parent category" of Synthesis. The BCC favored this suggestion, but we simply ran out of time this year to complete this task. While each category of the Bacc Core has a rationale statement, the larger parent categories (Skills, Perspectives, and Synthesis) do not (DPD does because it is a stand-alone category). Drafting rationale statements for Skills, Perspectives, and Synthesis would be good undertaking for the BCC in 2013-14.

• Per a request from Sunil Khanna, Associate Provost for International Programs, and Valerie Rosenberg, INTO Director of Student Experience and Director of International Admissions, the BCC should consider having representation on a task force that is exploring Dual Degree Programs with international institutions. (see meeting minutes from June 5, 2013).


• Fall Term: Co-chairs should work with Stefani Dawn in the Office of APAA to initiate communication to units offering DPD and College of Engineering WIC classes regarding gathering data to submit at the spring term 2014 for Category Review in the fall of 2014. Stefani may also need support in offering workshops and/or consultations in winter and spring term to these units, as well as those who offer Western Culture, Cultural Diversity, and WIC classes in the School of Writing, Literature, and Film, the School of Psychological Science, and the School of Arts and Communication from the College of Liberal
Arts.

- Winter Term: Have the BCC or a subcommittee of the BCC review the Baccalaureate Core Web Site for accuracy and make suggestions or changes for updates (Per the recommendation of 2012-2013 BCC, this should be an annual task). Changes, for the time being, can be relayed to Dr. Susie Brubaker-Cole, Associate Provost for Academic Success and Engagement.
- Spring Term: The BCC should work with Academic Affairs and/or the Registrar’s Office to get compliance data on the 2nd Year Skills Requirement (i.e., students who started in fall 2011 or after must have completed their Writing II requirement by the time they’ve finished 90 credits).
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Resource Materials

- Baccalaureate Core Course Review
- Reports
- Baccalaureate Core Course Review by Year
- 2007 Baccalaureate Core Review Materials
- Review/Relevance of the Baccalaureate Core Program
- OSU Bacc Core Comparison with AAOT Requirements
- The Baccalaureate Core: Approved and Pending Courses
- Baccalaureate Core Course Articulation Table for Oregon Community Colleges
- Course Equivalencies/Articulation Tables for Oregon Institutions and Community Colleges
- Baccalaureate Core Courses Approved
- Baccalaureate Core Courses Scheduled
- Schedule of classes
- Baccalaureate Core Courses
- Scheduled Baccalaureate Core Courses
- 2011-2012 Curriculum Review Process
- OSU Curricular Policies and Procedures
- BCC Template Syllabus
- OSU General Education Assessment Road Map – Outcomes, Evidence, Reflection, Improvement
Per BCC Chair Kevin Gable:
We have received the following request from LBCC concerning a change to a course articulated into the Bacc Core on transfer:

Hi Kevin,
I'm a LBCC faculty involved in revising a LBCC course that articulates as a OSU Bacc Core requirement for the Physical Sciences perspective. Vicki Tolar Burton passed along your name as the contact/chair of the Bacc Core Committee.

In a nutshell, we are wanting to change the title of GS 105 Principles of Chemistry, to GS 105 Environmental Chemistry, to make this class more appealing to non-science majors. We are not changing any chemistry content, credits or hours, outcomes, or lab requirement, just how it is presented.

The class articulates to OSU as a LDT (meaning there's no equivalent course at OSU), and it is also listed as counting towards the Physical Science Perspective of Bacc Core.

Our Dean of Instruction wants an OK from OSU about this change, and that it will still count towards the Physical Science Perspective of the Bac Core. Do you happen to know what kind of process we need to go through to get this approved from OSU's end?

Thanks,
--Deron

Deron Carter
Physical Sciences Faculty
Linn-Benton Community College
Albany, OR 97321
541-917-4745
**LINN-BENTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
*Outcomes-based COURSE OUTLINE AND APPROVAL FORM*

The information contained in this course outline reflects an accurate picture of the course at the time of development. However, conditions can and do change. Thus, the college must, as in the past, reserve the right to make any necessary changes in the course description, objectives, prerequisites, texts and references, course content, methods of instruction, methods of evaluation, credits, hours and times of offerings or any other matters discussed herein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of Chemistry</th>
<th>Clock Hrs</th>
<th>Per Week</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Name</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>33hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS 105</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>22 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline Developed By</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math and Science</td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Weeks</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading:</th>
<th>PNP OPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-F</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Admission Procedures</td>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Please check the following area in which this course will be taught: |
| College Transfer       | Professional Technical | Adult Supplemental | Post-secondary Remedial |
| Other Education (Reimbursable) | Community Service (Non-Reimbursable) |

**PREREQUISITE:**
Math 065, Elementary Algebra

**CATALOG DESCRIPTION:**
Survey course providing non-science majors a broad background in the fundamentals of chemistry. No previous science background required. May not be taken for credit if six or more hours of college level chemistry have been completed. There is no restriction on the order in which the courses are taken.

**COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES:** What should they be able to do as a result of taking this class?

Have a broad understanding of how chemistry relates to everyday life and real-world issues.

**LEARNING ACTIVITIES:** What will your students be doing, i.e. listening to a lecture, attending a field trip, participating in group activities?
Performing laboratory experiments, listening to lectures, participating in group activities, giving group presentations.

**ASSESSMENT TASKS:** How will the students show evidence of achieving the learning outcomes?
Taking exams and quizzes, writing lab reports.
### COURSE CONTENT:

#### Themes:
- Matter and its Properties as a Chemical Foundation
- Laboratory Skills
- Teamwork
- Problem Solving
- Scientific Literacy
- Chemistry and society

#### Concepts:
- Measurement
- States of matter
- Conservation of energy and mass
- Science is observable
- Scientific models evolve
- Environmental chemistry
- Types of reactions
- Chemical nomenclature
- Gas Laws
- Atomic structure

#### Issues:
- Quantifying processes that happen on a microscopic level
- Precision and accuracy in data recording
- Chemical and physical properties
- Chemical bonding

#### Skills:
- Balance chemical reactions.
- Perform basic laboratory procedures safely.
- Record and interpret measurements (should be specific items such as graphing, creating tables, etc)
- Use various sources of information to research, analyze and evaluate chemical information.
- Perform unit conversions.
- Use and apply SI units.
- Use appropriate chemical vocabulary
- Be able to estimate.

---

Approved by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean/Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Academic Affairs Office</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Revised 6/20/06)
COURSE PROPOSAL FORM AND NEW/REVISED COURSE OUTLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE NUMBER/NAME: GS105 Physical Science: Environmental Chemistry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECTION I: PROPOSAL INFORMATION**

- **Course Developed By:** Bridgid Backus
- **Date:**
- **Course Revised By:** Deron Carter
- **Date:** 10/20/14

- **Catalog Year to take effect:** 2014-15
- **Include in Print Catalog:** Yes [ ] No [x]

- **Effective Term of this course:**
  - [x] Fall
  - [ ] Winter
  - [ ] Spring
  - [ ] Summer

**TYPE OF PROPOSAL**
- [x] Revised Course
- [ ] Reactivated Course
- [ ] 199/299 Experimental

**TYPE OF COURSE**
- [x] Lower Division Transfer
- [ ] Career-Technical (required or elective)
- [ ] Career-Technical (embedded)
- [ ] Occupational Preparatory (stand-alone)
- [ ] Occupational Supplemental
- [ ] Developmental, numbered below 100

**TYPE OF INSTRUCTION**
- [x] Traditional
- [ ] Distance Education
- [ ] Hybrid
- [ ] Virtual College
- [ ] Other: Specify

**Which degree/program does this course apply to:** AS and AAOT

*Note: All programs impacted by the change must be consulted prior to the Curricular Issues meeting.*

**RATIONALE:**

1. How does this proposal further the goals of the program or department?
   - The department would like to increase the appeal of a general education chemistry course designed for non-science majors interested in how chemistry relates to environmental problems and solutions.

2. What assessment evidence supports this proposal?

3. (New courses) How do you know there is a demand for this course?

**SECTION II: NEW/REVISED COURSE OUTLINE**

1. **Course Number:** GS105

2. **Full Course Title for Print Catalog:** Physical Science: Environmental Chemistry
3. State Course Numbers (CHOOSE ONE ONLY)

- [ ] Lower Division Collegiate
- [ ] Career and Technical Education Occupational Preparatory
- [ ] Career and Technical Education Stand-alone Occupational Preparatory
- [ ] Career and Technical Education Occupational Supplementary
- [ ] Developmental Education
- [ ] Cooperative Work Experience

4. Offered For:
- [x] Credit  Number of Credits: 4
- [ ] Non-Credit

5. How many times can this course be taken for credit?

(This is not the same as repeating a course for a better grade. This refers to how many times a student can get credit on their transcript for the same course.)

- [x] Once
- [ ] Twice
- [ ] 3 Times
- [ ] Other (Specify)
- [ ] Unlimited

6. Course Load Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLOCK HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL COURSE HOURS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CREDITS</th>
<th>Department of Education’s Formula (Generate One Credit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LECTURE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lecture: 10-12 hours/term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lab: 30-36 hours/term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture/Lab: 20-24 hours/term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/Activity: 30-36 hours/term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTURE/LAB</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ACTIVITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA LAB HOURS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Course Description:

An introductory level laboratory science course offering a non-quantitative and descriptive survey of chemical principles relevant to everyday life. Topics presented in this course include applications of chemistry to environmental issues such as nuclear energy, recycling, air and water pollution, global warming, and energy resources. May not be taken for credit if six or more hours of college level chemistry have been completed.

8. Required Prerequisites:

If more than one course is listed, please indicate with OR or AND.

Note: This information will be entered into Banner and required for students’ registration.

- Prerequisite Course(s): Math 065
- Minimum Grade Required in prerequisite(s): C
- Placement Test Score: Other

9. Is Instructor Consent Required to Register? [x] Yes  [ ] No

10. Required Concurrent Courses:

Note: This information will be entered into the system and required for students’ registration.
Course Number(s):
Lab(s) Course Number:

### 11. Required:
Note: Any other skill that is necessary to participate in the class such as age, skill level, etc. that cannot be expressed as a prerequisite.

### 12. Recommended:
Note: Any other competency, skill or course that does not fall into one of the above categories, but that would help the student succeed in this course.

### 13. Is this course double numbered?  
- [ ] Yes Course Number:
- [x] No

### 14. Student Learning Outcomes
What will the student know or be able to do at the end of the course? (Upon completion of the course the learner will...)

- Have a broad understanding of how chemistry relates to everyday life and environmental problems and solutions.
- Students will safely conduct experiments both qualitatively and quantitatively to solve scientific problems and answer scientific questions.

### 15. Assessments/Evaluation of Student Learning
What evidence will demonstrate that students have achieved course outcomes? (Assessment tools may include departmental tests, written products, portfolios, juried performances, quizzes and exams or alternative assessments such as qualitative studies, capstone projects, external reviewers, etc.)

- Exams, quizzes, homework sets, written lab reports, class presentations.

### 16. Grading
- [✓] A,B,C,D,F,I  
- [ ] Optional  
- [ ] P/NP  
- [ ] NON-GRADED  
- [ ] Add WP Option

### 17. Does this course require a special fee?  
- [ ] Yes (complete Course Fee Request form)  
- [x] No

### 18. Contents Outline
Themes: Matter and its properties as a chemical foundation, laboratory Skills, teamwork, problem solving, critical thinking, Scientific Literacy, Chemistry and the environment, science is observable and testable, theories evolve through history

Concepts: Measurement, states of matter, conservation of mass and energy, atomic structure, radioactivity, chemistry relates to environmental and societal issues

Issues: Quantifying processes that happen on a microscopic level, precision and accuracy in data recording, chemical and physical properties, chemical bonding

Skills: Balance chemical reactions, perform basic laboratory procedures safely, record and interpret measurements (should be specific items such as graphing, creating tables, etc), use various sources of information to research, analyze and evaluate chemical information, Perform unit conversions, use and...
apply SI units, use appropriate chemical vocabulary, be able to numerically estimate.

SECTION III: DEGREE REQUIREMENTS
This course may be used to fulfill the following degree requirements:

AAS Related Instruction
- ☐ Computation*
- ☐ Communication*
- ☐ Human Relations*
- ☐ Computer Competency
- ☐ Environmental Awareness
- ☐ Job Search
- ☐ Safety
*Complete the Related Instruction for CTE Courses form for each course that includes embedded Related Instruction.

AAOT Foundational Requirement
AS General Education Requirement
- ☐ Writing
- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Mathematics
- ☐ Health/Wellness/Fitness

AS Distribution Requirements
- ☐ Biological Science
- ☒ Physical Science
- ☐ Cultural Diversity
- ☐ Difference, Power & Discrimination
- ☐ Literature & Arts
- ☐ Biological Science
- ☐ Social Processes & Institutions
- ☐ Western Culture

AAOT Discipline Studies
- ☐ Arts and Letters
- ☐ Social Science
- ☒ Science/Math/Computer Science
- ☐ AAOT Cultural Literacy Requirement

AAS, AS, AAOT: ☐ Elective
☐ Other Specify:

SECTION IV: TRANSFERABILITY (Lower Division Transfer only)
Department should contact the corresponding OSU department for confirmation that the class will be transferrable.
Check all that apply:
☐ There is an equivalent lower division course at OSU. Course Number:
☐ The department will accept the course for its major or minor requirements.
☒ The course will be accepted as part of the baccalaureate core requirement.
☐ The course will be accepted as a general elective.
☐ If not OSU, which OUS school will the course transfer to:

Provide evidence of transferability:
☐ Email correspondence  ☒ Other - provide evidence (minimum one, more preferred)

SECTION V: LIBRARY IMPACT STATEMENT
Under accreditation standards, Library consultation is essential for new programs, new courses and substantively revised courses when the revisions entail any change in library use.

Check One:
☒ Library/media resources are adequate to support this new/revised course.
☐ Additional resources are needed to support this new/revised course and we have contacted the library and/or media department to request additional resources.

SECTION VI: GREEN TOPICS
Does a percentage of the class focus on one or more of the following areas?
☐ Increase Energy Efficiency  ☐ Clean Up & Restore Natural Environment
☐ Produce Renewable Energy  ☐ Prevent, Reduce, Mitigate Environmental Degradation
☐ Educate, Consult, & Provide Other Services that Support these Categories

If one or more of the above areas are checked, please estimate the total amount of teaching time spent on these topics:

SECTION VII: WORKLOAD CALCULATIONS
Instructor workload/pay will be based on the information provided.

Check One:
☐ Course has no lab hours  ☐ All hours use the .789 workload factor  ☒ Complete sections below

Complete the following sections if:  ☐ New course  ☒ Revised course with credit change

Lecture Hours (10 - 12 hrs per student cr) have a workload factor of 1.0.

Lab Hours (20 - 36 hours per student cr) have a workload factor of 1.0 or .682. In order for some lab hours to have a workload factor of 1.0, they must meet BOTH of the criteria shown below**. The total number of hours with a workload factor of 1.0 cannot exceed the number of credits the student earns.

Check one:
☐ The lab hours for this class do not meet both of the criteria listed below.
☒ The lab hours for this class meet both of the criteria listed below for the following reasons:
**Criteria 1:** In order to effectively achieve the outcomes of the course, the learning activities that occur during lab hours create work for faculty that must be accomplished outside of the scheduled course hours. This time required outside of lab is similar to the time required outside of a lecture class of similar length.

**Criteria 2:** Faculty are engaged in facilitating learning by leading demonstrations and by guiding and supervising a student’s application of learned concepts during lab hours. This regular and consistent interaction requires faculty and students to be present during the lab hours.

For classes that meet on a regular schedule and run for the full term, including a final during finals week, use the hours per week for the workload calculations below.

For classes that do not meet on a regular schedule, or do not run full term, take the total number of each type of contact hour and divide by 11 to get ‘weekly hours’. Round workload calculations to three decimal places.

### Workload Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture Hrs</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>x 1.0 WCE =</th>
<th>3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Hrs at 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Hrs at 0.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Workload: **3.0**

### Workload for additional lab sections (if applicable):

| Lab Hrs at 1.0 | 1 | x 1.0 WCE = | 1.0 |
| Lab Hrs at 0.682 | | | |

Total Workload for each lab section: **1.682**

---

**SECTION VIII: DIVISIONAL APPROVAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chair Signature/Date:</th>
<th>Dean Signature/Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECTION IX: COLLEGE APPROVAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Specialist Signature/Date:</th>
<th>CIP Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction Signature/Date:</td>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Issues Meeting Date:</th>
<th>□ Approved</th>
<th>□ Resubmit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Welcome to Chemistry!

Have you ever thought of how chemistry affects your daily life? I’d be willing to bet that almost everyone in this class has asked questions like “why are lemons sour?,” or “what causes the greenhouse effect?” Almost everyday you can pick up a newspaper, read one online, or watch TV and encounter stories on energy, global warming, water pollution, or nanotechnology. Knowledge of the science behind these front-page issues helps one understand and evaluate news reports on these events. Not all events related to chemistry make the front page of a newspaper of course. But, throughout this quarter, I hope you will raise important questions that may have as much practical value. I hope this course will help you learn the basics of chemistry you need to appreciate what it is and how it impacts all of our daily lives.

During the quarter we will focus on three major goals:
1. To develop and improve our curiosity about how chemistry relates to your world. In this class we will examine some fundamental principles of chemistry, and then apply these principles to societal issues like oil, energy, global warming, and water pollution. By the end of this course, I hope you will examine your world a little more in depth.
2. To develop knowledge on the science of chemistry, so we can make reasoned judgments on societal issues that are affected by the processes and fruits of science in general and chemistry in particular.
3. To develop skills to solve problems, evaluate situations, and answer questions. I hope the skills you acquire and refine in this class will carry over to your other classes and your daily life. My goal is to make science interesting and exciting.

This class counts towards the AS and AAOT physical science laboratory requirement, is appropriate for students with little to no background in chemistry, or are just curious about how the natural world works.

**GRADING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labs and class lab project</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class activities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale for final grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 100-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 89-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 79-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 69-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 59%-below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other possible grades:** A **Y grade** will be not be assigned to any student who submits any work after the end of the second week of classes. An **incomplete grade (IN)** will only be considered if a student has talked to me in advance, and a signed agreement between the student and myself is completed. I will only consider an IN grade if the student has a good reason for making the request, has only the minority of coursework to complete, and has scored a C or better on work that has been submitted.

**Classroom environment:** It is my job as an instructor to foster a positive learning environment for everyone. In order to do this all electronic devices must be put away and cell phones must be silenced before class begins;
they act as a distraction to other students and myself. While in class, I ask that you be considerate of others, have an open mind, and a willingness to learn a great subject.

**Exams:** There are two exams and a comprehensive final exam. Study guides will be posted before exams to help focus your study. If you have a conflict with an exam date talk to me before the test to discuss options. If you do not you will fail the exam. *Once exams are handed back they cannot be made up.*

**Labs:** Every week we will have at least one class period devoted to a lab. Labs generally cannot be made up; however, if you know you will miss a lab please talk to me before hand to discuss options. Since this is a lab-based class, a passing grade (60% or higher) on all lab activities is required to pass the class.

**Quizzes:** There will be four short quizzes during the term each worth 10 points. Quiz format will vary; some quizzes will be multiple choice; for others I may ask you to solve a problem. Quizzes may or may not be announced. *Quizzes are important study resources to prepare you for exams.* If you know you will be absent on a quiz date, please let me know before the quiz to discuss options. Once quizzes are handed back they cannot be made up.

**In-class activities:** I have found that students get much more out of class and have a lot more fun if we devote some class time to group activities rather than me standing up and talking, talking, talking. So, on some days we will break into groups and work on solving problems or do short experiments related to chemistry. *You must be in class the day the activity is assigned to receive credit.*

**Homework:** There are eight homework assignments each worth 5 points. These will consist of questions from the readings as well as questions I will write based on material we discuss. I assign homework to help prepare you for exams and quizzes. *Assignments are posted online. Late work is not accepted.*

**Concerning cheating and plagiarism:** I encourage group work on labs and homework assignments, however, your answers must be expressed in your own words, numbers, etc. Exams and quizzes will generally be closed book, closed note, and taken individually. Any copying or cheating will result in a zero on that assignment and possible recommendation to LBCC administration for further consequences.

**Students with special needs:** Students who may need accommodations due to documented disabilities, who have medical information which I should know, or who need special arrangements in an emergency, should speak with me during the first week of class. If you have not accessed services and think you may need them, please contact Disability Services, 917-4789.

**Tips for this class:** Here’s a list of tips that can help you in this class and hopefully other ones:

- Attend class everyday. Make school a priority in your daily life.
- Work to understand the material rather than relying on memorization for an exam. Be able to apply ideas learned from other parts of the class and other classes to what you are studying.
- Come prepared for class and have done the assigned reading before class.
- Strive to work well in groups by having a willingness to listen and consider other ideas, actively participate in group discussions, and ask questions.
- Understand that the primary responsibility for learning is your own and not the instructor’s.
- Actively study and do not just sit and read the text. Outline, take notes, copy their notes after class, solve problems, do the homework, and use study guides. Studying is a constant, daily, self-motivated activity.
- Take advantage of your resources! If you are having difficulty with the material, please let me know during class, office hours, etc. and do not wait until right before an exam. Be proactive in your education!

**A FINAL NOTE:** I believe that we are all resources for this course. To that end, I hope you ask questions and initiate discussions in class. In this way, I think we will all learn a lot more! *Thanks, Deron*
# TENTATIVE SCHEDULE (subject to change):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Assignments/Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>p. 1-27</td>
<td>Jan. 7</td>
<td>Course introduction; Nature of science</td>
<td>Jan. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>p. 121-129</td>
<td>Jan. 21</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td>Jan. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>p. 130-149</td>
<td>Jan. 28</td>
<td>Radioactive decay, nuclear energy</td>
<td>Jan. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>p. 159-174</td>
<td>Feb. 4</td>
<td>EXAM 1</td>
<td>Feb. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>p. 239-250; 389-410</td>
<td>Feb. 11</td>
<td>The chemistry of water and polar molecules</td>
<td>Feb. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Feb. 18</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td>Feb. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Feb. 25</td>
<td>Chemical reactions</td>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>p. 198-206</td>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>EXAM 2</td>
<td>March 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>Organic compounds</td>
<td>March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, March 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labs
Ch12: Spectral analysis/flame tests
Ch13: Radiation: time, distance, shielding
Ch14: Physical and chemical changes
Ch15: Chemical bonding: ionic or covalent?
Ch 16: Density column
Ch 17: Energy in a nut
Principles for access to the Baccalaureate Core Curriculum

1. Completion of the Baccalaureate Core Curriculum is a central piece of the OSU undergraduate curriculum and the experience of obtaining an OSU degree. In total, students are expected to devote a minimum of 45 credits out of 180 total to Skills, Perspectives, DPD and Synthesis courses (an additional 3 credits satisfying the WIC requirement lies in the major).

2. To the extent that individual courses in the Bacc Core exceed the minimum credit needed (most categories: 3 credits, though 4 credits for lab sciences), the additional credit(s) must be pedagogically justified by the nature of the material and supported by a reasonable expectation of student work both in class and outside of class.

3. Each category must retain a reasonable number of options for any given student to complete the category requirement without entailing the scheduling, effort and financial costs associated with courses carrying credit in excess of the minimum. “Reasonable” should be judged by both:
   - Number of seats available in courses at different credit levels;
   - Number of courses at any credit level offered in a given term.

4. In general, 100- and 200-level BCC lecture-only courses should be 3 credits. 4-credit lecture courses in the BCC should be limited to 300- (and the rare 400-) level courses.

5. The BCC will use these principals in part to consider curricular proposals involving BCC courses. Proposed addition of credit to existing courses in contravention of these principals will be viewed as making a course inappropriate for the Baccalaureate Core Curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Requirements</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Credits from Approved Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills 15 credits/5 courses</td>
<td>Writing I</td>
<td>Must be taken and completed satisfactorily within first 45 OSU generated credits.</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing II</td>
<td>Must be taken and completed satisfactorily within first 90 OSU generated credits. For transfer students with sophomore standing or above, WR II must be completed within first 45 hours of OSU generated credits.</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>Must be taken and completed satisfactorily within first 45 hours of OSU generated credits. For transfer students with sophomore standing or above, Speech must be completed within first 45 OSU generated credits.</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Must be taken and completed satisfactorily within first 45 OSU generated credits.</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives 24 credits/7 courses</td>
<td>Biological Science w/ Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature and the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Science w/ Lab</td>
<td>GEO courses listed under Physical Science are considered to be from a different department than GEO courses listed under any other Perspectives category.</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Lab Science</td>
<td>Choose an additional course from either Physical Science or Biological Science.</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Processes and</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Western Culture</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>53% are 4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference, Power, and Discrimination 3 credits/1 course</td>
<td>Difference, Power, and Discrimination</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>34% are 4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Courses 6 credits/2 courses</td>
<td>Contemporary Global Issues</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>28% are 4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science, Technology, and Society</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>38% are 4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive (WIC) 3 credits/1 course</td>
<td>Writing Intensive</td>
<td>Taken in the major</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If students are unable to get 3 credit courses here is the potential impact:

**Additional Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to get 1 class</th>
<th>2 classes</th>
<th>3 classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>$573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Resident</td>
<td>$613</td>
<td>$1226</td>
<td>$1839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36.8% of our students are non-resident = 10,268 students

**Scheduling Impacts:**

- Pushing credit hours above 180 minimum
- Impacts on highly structured degree programs (e.g. Engineering)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Standing Rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate student attainment of category learning outcomes. This work depends on the availability of data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC may solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

2. All existing, modified and new courses proposed by individual faculty, groups of faculty, or departments for inclusion in general education must be approved by an appropriate faculty curriculum committee within the college of origin prior to BCC submission.

3. All submissions shall be routed for additional curriculum review at the discretion of the BCC. Request for such reviews, and selection of the reviewing unit, will be made by the BCC. The criteria used to select the reviewing unit will be based upon that unit's ability to assess the specific general education objectives proposed.

4. All submissions that deal with WRI and WRII must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

5. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses which are deemed by the BCC to meet these criteria and address the category learning outcomes can be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to approval by the Curriculum Council.

6. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.
**B. Category Reviews**

1. The BCC will periodically request and review institutional data in order to evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:
   a. adequate access to courses within the category;
   b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning;
   c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes; and
   d. continued satisfaction of category criteria by individual courses.

2. The BCC has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses.

3. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

**C. Changes in Core or Criteria or Process**

1. Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.

(Rev 04/01; 06/07; 06/08; 04/12)
To: Kate Hunter-Zaworski, Faculty Senate President, and Kevin Gable, Faculty Senate President-Elect
From: Bill Bogley and Kerry Kincanon, Baccalaureate Core Committee Co-Chairs
Date: June 23, 2012
Re: BCC Support for Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core Report

On May 30, 2012 Dr. Susan Meyers forwarded Kate the final report of the Committee for the Review of Writing within the Baccalaureate Core. Dr. Meyers presented this information to the Baccalaureate Core Committee on May 21, 2012, and we speak for the entire BCC when we say we are most grateful for and impressed by the work of this review team. The BCC is supportive of the overall findings and recommendations of the report, which include matters that relate directly to the curricular authority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee and the Faculty Senate, but which also include reflections on issues that affect institutional priorities. Their findings and recommendations will be indispensable as our collective faculty seeks to strengthen the cumulative writing efforts embedded in our institutional core curriculum. To that end, the BCC endorses the report and itemizes the following items for near or long-term consideration by the BCC and the EC.

As noted in the report, the Core currently contains five separate components that specify writing as a required element. These include the Writing I, Writing II, WIC, and both Synthesis categories.

Elements of the report of that fall within the continuing purview of the BCC include:

- Enhancement of the writing requirements within the Synthesis categories to ensure that students engage in a sustained writing effort; minimum word count, required drafting, feedback, revision.
- Focus on writing requirements in Synthesis category review and assessment.
- Update Writing II category criteria to ensure compatible outcomes across all category courses.
- Consider establishment of an information literacy component in the Core, either within an existing category or as a new and separate category.

Some recommendations extend well beyond the curricular authority of the BCC, but for which the BCC should be a strong voice.

- Institute a cap on Synthesis course enrollment to ensure feasibility of high-quality feedback on writing assignments.

Here is a brief summary of the BCC discussion following Dr. Meyers’ presentation.

- The discussion and recommendations regarding writing in Synthesis categories generated immediate conversation. The expectation that courses in the Synthesis categories incorporate writing is articulated in the category criteria and learning outcomes both for Contemporary Global Issues and Science, Technology, and Society. Our conversations this year around restarting the BCC Category Review have made us anecdotally aware that many units with existing Synthesis classes are challenged by this expectation, primarily due to size. There are Synthesis classes with well over 100 students, which means examinations and quizzes are often favored over writing assignments of length and substance. Indeed, the qualitative commentary included in the report from the faculty focus groups points to this dynamic as well. Because the BCC is embarking on the Synthesis
Category Review in the fall of 2012, it behooves our group to pay particular attention unit responses to how, if at all, the category learning outcome that involves writing is playing out in their course. Per the recommendation in the Review report, specific writing word/page counts and limits on class size may ultimately be in order.

- The BCC, through its existing responsibilities and processes and via any unique charges that come its way from the Executive Committee, should be an advocate for and a proponent of the “culture of writing” and a well-intentioned, cumulative writing experience in the five Bacc Core categories that specify a writing component. Executing recommendations – such as greater uniformity in Writing II offerings, transparency in WR II courses to help students and advisors make informed decisions of the best choice in this category, innovation in curriculum like the proposed “stretch model”, and faculty coordination and development surrounding the progressive nature of the writing experience in the core – is matter of getting the right experts on campus in the right places to impact change. The BCC seems poised to help facilitate getting those experts in the right places and advocating for the human and financial resources necessary to take on these recommendations.

- The bold suggestion of adding a mandatory information literacy course or category to the course merits further discussion and consideration. The mention of this idea by Dr. Meyers instigated a lively conversation amongst our group, and, in a short period of time, inspired other brainstorms of how the intent of the recommendation, improved information literacy and research skills, might be realized. Even if adding a class or category is not feasible at this time, keeping the idea on the table in the coming years may generate traction for other avenues to infuse information literacy skill development into the core.

Thanks to you and Executive Committee, both for convening the committee to examine Writing in the Baccalaureate Core and for your consideration of their findings. We’re optimistic that the report can serve as a foundation to improve OSU writing efforts and processes in the Bacc Core, not only to put us on par with peer institutions, but also to strengthen our overall undergraduate educational experience.
Final Report from the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core

Overview

Purpose: Evaluate the effectiveness of writing within the Baccalaureate Core.

Problems Identified

1. Curriculum and Communication
   - Curriculum needs to be more uniform.
   - Information about expectations and results needs to be better communicated.
2. Resources and Management
   - Class sizes need to be better tracked and managed.
   - There are not enough extended writing assignments (i.e. more than 4 pages).
3. Student Support
   - Low-achieving students need more support.
   - Students overall need more practice with writing.

Sources of Information

- National Survey of Student Engagement Consortium for the Study of Writing in College
- Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core
- OSU faculty survey and focus group data
- Comparative institutional data

Results of Analysis

Strengths

- Faculty priorities are aligned with national expectations for writing.
- The current writing curriculum within the Bacc Core has several strengths.

Weaknesses

- Undergraduate writing at OSU needs improvement.
- The major areas of complaint about student writing are behavioral issues (e.g. lack of engagement, academic dishonesty, etc).
- Writing assignments within Bacc Core courses are not sufficient.
- Faculty are not taking advantage of tools related to the writing process.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Make sure that curriculum is uniform across sections and give advisors more information.
- Establish clearer expectations for writing in Synthesis courses.
- Introduce a model of Faculty Writing Advocates.
- Offer training on writing pedagogies to departmental units.
- Pilot a “stretch model” 100-level writing class for students with additional needs.
- Add and Information Literacy course to the Baccalaureate Core.

Potential Benefits

- Establish clearer, more uniform curriculum.
Create means of managing the newly aligned curriculum.
Maintain ongoing awareness of the importance of writing (i.e. build a *culture of writing*).
Improve students’ written communication skills and their success as graduates.

**Summary of Recommendations**

Based on the needs outlined above, the committee recommends focusing improvement efforts on four general areas:
- Faculty, Student, and University Involvement
- Clarity of Expectations
- Quality of Assignments
- Effective Evaluation of Student Work

I. Faculty, Student, and University Involvement

Develop a “culture of writing” at OSU by:
1. Providing students with clear guidelines, sufficient practice, and adequate resources.
2. Communicating clear expectations so that faculty can develop quality assignments.
3. Demonstrating administrative commitment through public announcements about the importance of writing and through allotting resources to writing initiatives.

II. Clarity of Expectations

1. Update *Synthesis requirements*: minimum word count, required revision, class cap.
   - Include writing in new Synthesis course assessment.
   - Communicate Synthesis requirements to faculty.
2. Update *Writing II curriculum* to ensure uniform outcomes and curriculum.
   - Provide advisors with a means of guided students into appropriate WR II courses.
3. Establish a *Writing Advocate model* in order to provide faculty leadership related to writing in each academic unit.

III. Quality of Assignments

1. Require writing assignments of adequate length.
   - Create a minimum word count for Synthesis courses.
   - Create a reasonable cap for Synthesis courses, such that writing can be taught.
2. Provide faculty development in order to ensure that assignments use the writing process. Possible models include Faculty Writing Advocates, new faculty mentoring, faculty pairs, and departmental professional development.
   - Writing process assignments should include drafting, feedback, and revision.

IV. Effective Evaluation of Student Work
1. Improve coordination between writing classes and DAS in order to support students.
2. Pilot a “stretch class” model in order to better support students who struggle with writing.
3. Create a database of students support resources related to writing.
4. Add an “Information Literacy” course to the Baccalaureate Core.
5. Develop departmental rubrics (in additional to existing departmental writing handbooks).
Baccalaureate Core Committee

March 18, 2013
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Trischa Goodnow, Uta Hussong-Christian, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Melinda Manore, Rebecca Olson, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Ken Winograd

Ex-officio Non-voting Members Present: Vicki Tolar Burton, Michelle Bothwell

Summary of Action Items

- Three new courses were approved for addition to the Baccalaureate Core, and one change course proposal to an existing Bacc Core course was also approved. Decisions on two other courses were deferred pending the BCC receiving additional information.
- The BCC co-chairs updated the committee on additional Synthesis Category Review work, which will commence spring term.
- Under the guidance of Vicki Tolar Burton, the BCC engaged as a group in an exercise aimed at prioritizing recommendations from the Review of Writing Report. The BCC agreed to continue the process individually prior to our first meeting of spring.

Meeting Minutes from February 13 were approved.

Course Reviews
BEE 469 (WIC), PS 343 (Cultural Diversity), and WS 463 (Contemporary Global Issues) were approved as additions to the Baccalaureate Core. A change course proposal to an existing Cultural Diversity course, ES 231, was also approved.

Per the BCC Standing Rules, WR 329 (Writing II) was referred to the Writing Advisory Board. The BCC was concerned with the narrow focus of the course. The content of the course focuses heavily on preparing a law school admission essay. Writing II is a Second Year Skills requirement, meaning students should complete it by the end of their second year. The BCC was concerned about a second year student’s readiness to focus on preparing a law school essay, but the BCC deferred decision until we hear back from the Writing Advisory Board.

A decision was also deferred on HORT 111 (Biological Science). The BCC wanted to get more information from the proposal originator regarding the proposed shift of what was formerly a departmental orientation course to a Bacc Core lab science and have requested that the co-chairs invite the proposer to a meeting early spring term.

The BCC noted that proposers continue to struggle with the last question in each BCC question set in the Curricular Proposal System. This question specifically refers to unit level assessment plans for the course. A request was made to talk with the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation to incorporate instructions to proposers to consult with the school or department head prior to answering the question. The co-chairs will move this request forward.

Synthesis Category Review Updates
Kerry Kincanon and Marion Rossi shared updates regarding the Synthesis Category Review follow-up. Units with courses who had incomplete files (Category Review webform and/or syllabi) have an April 1 deadline for submitting outstanding materials. Those units whose initial submission was insufficient for us to recertify have an April 15 deadline to submit follow-up information. We will commence with reviewing these courses during spring term.
Review of Writing Report Prioritization Exercise
Vicki Tolar Burton led the group in an initial exercise to start prioritizing recommendations from the 2011-2012 Review of Writing in the Bacc Core Report. Vicki created a review rubric that we initially started considering as a group. Given the number of considerations, the BCC decided as a group that this was an activity best handled individually prior to our next meeting, and Vicki agreed to provide specific instructions to the group via email. Vicki will collect and collate responses.

Other Business
Vicki Tolar Burton also reported on positive developments relating to a project to update WIC Writing Guides. WIC has applied for a Technology Resource Fee (TRF) grant to help facilitate continued movement forward on this project.

A request for spring term meeting availability will be forthcoming from the co-chairs prior to the start of spring term.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.
Voting Members Present: Jaga Giebultowicz, Trischa Goodnow, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Melinda Manore, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Ken Winograd, Joe Zaworski
Ex-officio Non-voting Members Present: Michelle Bothwell, Vicki Tolar Burton

Summary of Action Items

- Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) members submitted the last of the individual course reviews for the Synthesis Category Review. The BCC co-chairs will now review BCC feedback and make final recommendations on these courses.
- Four proposals were reviewed (QS 364, 431, and 462 for DPD and WSE 453 for WIC). All were deemed solid additions to their respective categories, but were sent back to proposers with suggested revisions.
- The BCC reviewed recommendations shared by the Writing Advisory Board regarding writing in Synthesis classes and agreed to integrate the recommendations as explanatory matter to supplement the outcomes.
- It was announced that Academic Affairs is phasing out the Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation now that recommendations from the Ad Hoc Baccalaureate Core Review Task Force have largely been implemented. The BCC recommended drafting a letter to Academic Affairs leadership advocating for a permanent Director of Baccalaureate Core position.

The BCC approved minutes from the April 10 and April 24 meetings.

Synthesis Category Reviews Phase II
BCC members submitted complete reviews for assigned Synthesis courses in Phase II. These courses were either missing part or all of requested materials by the initial deadline last year. BCC members shared general observations from their reviews and noted that these courses, like those in Phase I, generally met the criteria of the category, but most instructors/units had not yet fully integrated assessment or consideration of Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes into the course. The BCC co-chairs have designated time later in the month to make final considerations based on the feedback provided by BCC members.

Course Reviews
The BCC completed four course reviews. Three Queer Studies (QS) courses, 364, 431, and 462, were submitted for consideration for Difference, Power, and Discrimination. All reviewers felt the courses fit well with the category and complemented the courses on their design and integration of creative pedagogy. The only concern surrounded the issue of prerequisites and limitations. All three courses list unenforced prerequisites. QS 262, which the BCC just approved for DPD, is listed as an unenforced prerequisite on all three, and the 431 and 462 have it set up as an "or" situation with WGSS 223 or WGSS 224. BCC members did not feel we could approve a situation where one DPD class (QS 262) is a prerequisite for another DPD class (QS 364, 431, 462), even if it is not a mandatory prerequisite. Students are strongly encouraged by advisors to abide by listed perquisites, even if they are unenforced. Students also only need to take one class to meet the category requirement. If the class a student ultimately wants to take for DPD is QS 364, 431 or 462 having QS 262 as a prerequisite, essentially makes them take two DPD classes instead of one in order to ensure success in upper division QS course. Having WGSS 223/224 as recommended or even enforced prerequisites was easier for BCC members to reconcile because even though these two courses are DPD, they also are part of Social, Processes, and Institutions. So, in that instance, students can still meet another category by taking the prerequisite.

The BCC decided to send back these courses with recommended changes to ensure students who potentially will take these classes have the appropriate academic background and acumen to succeed. Our reviewers
noted that the curriculum of these courses, as outlined in the proposals, is appropriately upper division in its rigor. Given that rigor, and that the 431 and 462 are slash classes with graduate students, the BCC would like to see the following changes before we can add these courses to DPD.

1. Remove QS 262 as a recommended prerequisite on all three classes.
2. Class restrict QS 364 to sophomore level and above.
3. Class restrict QS 431 and 462 to junior level and above.

The BCC was fine with the proposer leaving WGSS 223/224 as recommended prerequisites on QS 431 and 462. The BCC felt that adding the class level restrictions would be a good way to assure that students are prepared to manage the expectations and workload of the course.

The final review this week was for Wood Science and Engineering (WSE) 453 as a possible addition to WIC. The proposal is strong, but the course will be sent back to the proposers with a request to have the WIC Category Learning Outcomes listed distinctly from the course outcomes and clearly identified as Bacc Core Category Learning Outcomes.

**Addendum to Synthesis Outcomes**

Given that both the Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core report and the Synthesis Category Review both illuminated the great variability amongst Synthesis courses with regard to addressing and integrating the Category Learning Outcome and criteria related to writing, the BCC co-chairs followed up on a BCC recommendation to reach out to the Writing Advisory Board (WAB) for suggestions on how we might augment the Synthesis Outcomes to clarify writing expectations in these categories. The WAB responded with the following recommendation:

**From the Writing Advisory Board**

Thank you for inviting us to consider ways to strengthen writing in Synthesis courses. We have discussed the [Review of Writing in the Baccalaureate Core](http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/min/2012-2013/0507/index.html) recommendations.

We recommend that Synthesis courses include the following:

- A course cap of 70 students. If enrollment is over 70, then break-outs (recitations) or GTAs should be used to ensure that students receive adequate and timely writing feedback.
- A single out-of-class written assignment with a minimum of 1250 words plus references that develops and sustains a critical perspective using evidence as support and a multidisciplinary approach. The assignment should include at least 2 outside sources.

We also recommend that the Bacc Core Committee develop a Synthesis rationale statement that will precede the learning outcomes for CGI and STS on each syllabus. Students and faculty need a stronger understanding of what “synthesis” means.

We are willing to provide supporting materials that Synthesis faculty might use to strengthen writing in their courses. These will be available on the Bacc Core website Faculty page and will include a rubric for responding to writing that faculty can adapt to their needs, if they desire.

The BCC discussed several possibilities for incorporating this recommendation in a visible way to help Synthesis faculty better understand means to best achieve the Bacc Core Category Learning Outcome in both Synthesis categories that references evidence-based writing. Ideas ranged from changing the criteria to be more specific, to changing the outcomes. Vicki Tolar Burton noted that there was precedence with the BCC adding explanatory matter to help clarify criteria/outcomes in the WIC category. BCC members agreed to take the bullet-pointed portion of the WAB recommendation, preface it with commentary on how these recommendations generated from the Review of Writing report and the 2012 Synthesis Category Review, and add it as explanatory matter to supplement the outcomes. The BCC co-chairs will also propose revisions to the Synthesis Bacc Core Question sets in the Curricular Proposal System to incorporate the WAB recommendations.

**Update from Academic Affairs**

Vicki Tolar Burton shared with the BCC that her position as Transitional Director of Baccalaureate Core Implementation is being phased out. The original intent of the position was to be transitional to see through recommendations generated by the Ad Hoc Task Force review of the Bacc Core, and that intent is now largely complete. She will remain in her WIC director position and will return to her faculty position in the School of Writing, Literature, and Film. While the BCC acknowledged the completion of the implementation phase,
members were interested in advocating for the creation of a permanent Director of Baccalaureate Core given that the institution is shifting toward thinking of the Bacc Core as a program. Such a position would help with oversight, advocacy, and consultation around the Bacc Core, and be of great resource and continuity to the BCC co-chairs and committee members, who turn over frequently. Based on suggestions and recommendations generated by the BCC at the meeting, the BCC co-chairs will work on drafting a letter to Academic Affairs leadership advocating for such a position.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

**Next Meeting**: Tuesday, May 21 from 1:00-2:30 in 120 Waldo Hall.
Appendix A
Five-Year Annual Review
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Interviewed Vicki Tolar Burton, Mary Cluskey, and Victor Hsu on June 8, 2011
Reviewed by Associate Professor William E. Loges, Member, Committee on
Committees

This review of the Baccalaureate Core Committee is submitted in accordance with
the duties of the OSU Faculty Senate Committee on Committees to review each
Faculty Senate committee at five-year intervals using the following criteria
established by the Faculty Senate:

1. Do the Standing Rules clearly reflect the function & composition of this
committee?
2. Have the committee’s actions/function, as reported in the annual reports and
based on consultation with the current chair and committee, been consistent with
their Standing Rules?
3. Do the annual reports provide a memory of the issues this committee addressed,
their activities and any outcomes?
4. What has been the role/benefit of the student members?
5. What connection is there to the University’s strategic plan?
6. To what extent does the committee add value to the university and/or faculty
governance?
7. If the chair believes the committee does not add value, please explain and
address the question as to whether the committee should continue to exist.
8. Does this committee’s work enhance OSU’s commitment to diversity? If so, how?

Professors Tolar Burton, Cluskey, and Hsu were sent these questions prior to our
interview.

The Committee on Committees reports that:
1. The Standing Rules of the Baccalaureate Core Committee may need some
revision to accurately reflect the function and composition of this committee.
(The standing rules can be found here: http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/bcc/sr/index07.html) Specifically:
   a. Rule A1 states that the committee “will solicit courses” for inclusion in
      the Baccalaureate Core. The committee found that language somewhat
      misleading, since they rarely actively solicit courses; most are
      submitted spontaneously by the various departments and schools. The
      committee will solicit courses when a particular area is lacking in
      sufficient options for students, but that is not common. The committee
      recommended replacing “will” with “may” in this rule.
   b. Rule A4 calls for writing skills courses submitted for consideration for
      the Baccalaureate Core to be evaluated by the Writing Advisory Board.
      That board, however, is not accurately described in the rule. This rule
      should be revised to include the director of the Writing Intensive
      Curriculum and delete obsolete references.
   c. Rule B3 was found to be inconsistent with the current operation of the
      committee, and perhaps obsolete completely. The committee
      recommended deleting it entirely.
d. Rule B4 was also found to be inconsistent with the current operation of the committee. The committee recommended that it be deleted.

2. The Baccalaureate Core Committee is satisfied that its actions, as described in its annual reports, are consistent with their Standing Rules, with the exceptions described above.

3. The Baccalaureate Core Committee is satisfied that its annual reports provide an accurate memory of its activities and outcomes.

4. This committee presently has no student members. It has proven difficult to find reliable student members, although when they are available they can be valuable. Student perspectives on the Core and on specific courses can be informative. Student members can also be counted on to conduct basic reviews of syllabi submitted for consideration, checking that they include the minimum information the university requires. To date, it appears that ASOSU has had the role of designating students to this committee. The committee is curious to know if they could recruit student members themselves from those they know personally to be reliable and willing.

5. The strategic plan does not play a large role in this committee’s routine work, but of course in the most fundamental sense this committee’s work is focused on undergraduate education, a core mission of the university.

6. This committee serves an essential role in faculty governance of the curriculum. The committee was able to specify occasions when the insight and concerns of the faculty differed from the administrative staff’s evaluation of courses in ways that protected the integrity of the Baccalaureate Core. This committee’s core function is to give faculty a definitive role in shaping the core curriculum.

7. N/A

8. This committee enhances the university’s commitment to diversity in part by reviewing courses for the categories in the Core, such as Cultural Diversity and Difference, Power, and Discrimination, that are specifically meant to provide students with an understanding of perspectives and experiences beyond their own.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Standing Rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC may will solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

2. All existing, modified and new courses proposed by individual faculty, groups of faculty, or departments for inclusion in general education must be approved by an appropriate faculty curriculum committee within the college of origin prior to BCC submission.

3. All submissions shall be routed for additional curriculum review at the discretion of the BCC. Request for such reviews, and selection of the reviewing unit, will be made by the BCC. The criteria used to select the reviewing unit will be based upon that unit’s ability to assess the specific general education objectives proposed.

4. All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which consists of the English Department's Composition and Professional Writing Coordinators, and the Writing Center Coordinator, and this Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

B. BCC Reviews

1. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses meeting these criteria will be
approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to prior approval by the Curriculum Council.

2. The BCC will periodically review courses accepted for general education to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria.

3. The BCC shall consist of two subcommittees, each with one-half of the committee membership and in proportion to its overall representation, for the purposes of general and categorical reviews. Each subcommittee will review separate categories as part of the periodical review to assess whether:

   a. Enrollment patterns allow adequate access to courses within the category;
   b. Category criteria and learning outcomes are consistent with institutional goals for undergraduate learning; and
   c. Students are achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes.

4. In order for courses to be accepted for or denied from inclusion by a BCC subcommittee, each course must receive the approval of two-thirds of the voting members.

5. The BCC has the authority to deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the appropriate criteria.

C. Changes in Core or Criteria or Process

1. Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.

(04/01, 06/07, 06/08)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Standing Rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate whether institutional assessment data reflects student attainment of category learning outcomes. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC may will solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

2. All existing, modified and new courses proposed by individual faculty, groups of faculty, or departments for inclusion in general education must be approved by an appropriate faculty curriculum committee within the college of origin prior to BCC submission.

3. All submissions shall be routed for additional curriculum review at the discretion of the BCC. Request for such reviews, and selection of the reviewing unit, will be made by the BCC. The criteria used to select the reviewing unit will be based upon that unit’s ability to assess the specific general education objectives proposed.

4. All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

4.5. All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which consists of the English Department's Composition and Professional Writing Coordinators, and the Writing Center Coordinator, and this Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals.
B. BCC Reviews

1. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses meeting these criteria will be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to prior approval by the Curriculum Council.

2. The BCC will periodically review courses accepted for general education to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria.

3. The BCC shall consist of two subcommittees, each with one-half of the committee membership and in proportion to its overall representation, for the purposes of general and categorical reviews. Each subcommittee will review separate categories as part of the periodical review. Will periodically review and evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:

   a. adequate access to courses within the category;
   b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning; and
   c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes.

4. In order for courses to be accepted for or denied from inclusion by a BCC subcommittee, each course must receive the approval of two-thirds of the voting members.

C. Changes in Core or Criteria or Process

1. Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.

(04/01, 06/07, 06/08)
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Standing Rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate student attainment of category learning outcomes. This work depends on the availability of data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC may will solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

2. All existing, modified and new courses proposed by individual faculty, groups of faculty, or departments for inclusion in general education must be approved by an appropriate faculty curriculum committee within the college of origin prior to BCC submission.

3. All submissions shall be routed for additional curriculum review at the discretion of the BCC. Request for such reviews, and selection of the reviewing unit, will be made by the BCC. The criteria used to select the reviewing unit will be based upon that unit's ability to assess the specific general education objectives proposed.

4. All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

5. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses meeting these criteria will be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to approval by the Curriculum Council.

6. A two-thirds majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.
4. All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which consists of the English Department’s Composition and Professional Writing Coordinators, and the Writing Center Coordinator, and this Board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals.

B. BCC Reviews

1. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses meeting these criteria will be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to prior approval by the Curriculum Council.

2. The BCC will periodically review courses accepted for general education to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria.

1. The BCC shall consist of two subcommittees, each with one-half of the committee membership and in proportion to its overall representation, for the purposes of general and categorical reviews. Each subcommittee will review separate categories as part of the periodical review will periodically request and review institutional data in order to evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:
   a. adequate access to courses within the category;
   b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning; and
   c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes; and
   d. continued satisfaction of category criteria by individual courses. The BCC has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the appropriate criteria.

2. In order for courses to be accepted for or denied from inclusion by a BCC subcommittee, each course must receive the approval of two-thirds of the voting members. A two-thirds majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

3. The BCC has the authority to deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the appropriate criteria.

C. Changes in Core or Criteria or Process

1. Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.

(04/01, 06/07, 06/08)

9/9/2011
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Standing Rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate student attainment of category learning outcomes. This work depends on the availability of data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC may solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

2. All existing, modified and new courses proposed by individual faculty, groups of faculty, or departments for inclusion in general education must be approved by an appropriate faculty curriculum committee within the college of origin prior to BCC submission.

3. All submissions shall be routed for additional curriculum review at the discretion of the BCC. Request for such reviews, and selection of the reviewing unit, will be made by the BCC. The criteria used to select the reviewing unit will be based upon that unit's ability to assess the specific general education objectives proposed.

4. All submissions that deal with writing skills must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

5. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses meeting these criteria will be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to approval by the Curriculum Council.

6. A two-thirds majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

10/21/2011
B. BCC Reviews

1. The BCC will periodically request and review institutional data in order to evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:
   a. adequate access to courses within the category;
   b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning;
   c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes; and
   d. continued satisfaction of category criteria by individual courses. The BCC has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses that no longer meet the appropriate criteria.

2. A two-thirds majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

C. Changes in Core or Criteria or Process

1. Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.
Baccalaureate Core Committee
2011-2012 Curriculum Review Process

All BCC members are a part of the Curriculum Proposal System and will automatically receive system notification when there are courses awaiting review by the BCC. Here is the agreed-upon process we will use to address these course reviews.

1. The BCC co-chairs will assign each course proposal to an individual BCC member for review, who will, in turn, offer commentary and recommendations when the course is discussed at a BCC meeting. BCC members are welcome and encouraged to look at all pending proposals if they wish.

2. When assigning a review, the BCC co-chairs will send a review cover sheet to the BCC member in charge of the review. The BCC member will then go into the Curriculum Proposal System to consider the materials submitted on behalf of the course. For the time being, reviewers will be responsible for all information on the cover sheet. Hopefully, we will soon have a qualified student worker who can assess the more perfunctory sections of the course proposal.

3. BCC members do not need to enter commentary in the Curriculum Proposal System. The BCC chairs will designate a portion of selected meetings for discussion of course reviews. Agendas for these particular meetings will be established in advance, and proposals up for discussion will have their proposal numbers listed on the agenda.

4. Reviewers will present comments/recommendations/issues with the course proposal. Reviewers should also highlight exceptionally strong proposals. The BCC will discuss, and the co-chairs will enter the decision of the committee into the system and serve as correspondent on behalf of the committee in follow-up discussions with proposers.
To: Vickie Nunnemaker
From: Bill Bogley and Kerry Kincanon, BCC Co-Chairs for 2011-2012
Date: November 10, 2011
Subject: Proposed Changes to the Baccalaureate Core Committee Standing Rules

On August 24 2011, the BCC was charged by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to review the committee’s Standing Rules in light of a Five-Year Review of those rules that was submitted by the 2010-2011 Committee on Committees. The BCC hereby submits the following ad hoc report, including a proposed update to BCC standing rules. The proposed text is at the end of this report.

The BCC has met weekly since the beginning of Fall term with revisions to the standing rules as a primary order of business. The committee approved its proposed text at regular meeting of the committee on November 4, 2011.

Our proposal follows the recommendations of the Committee on Committees closely, but enlarges upon those recommendations in a substantial way. This is due to a second charge that we received from the EC, which is to incorporate evidence relative to student learning into our category review processes.

The Committee on Committees recommended changes to Items A.1 (relative to solicitation of course) and A.4 (relative to the composition of the Writing Advisory Board) and we have adopted those changes exactly. The committee also specified the scope of the Advisory Board in its consideration of course proposals involving writing, limiting its considerations to proposals in WRI and WRII. The committee concluded that the writing components in WIC courses are already subject to review by the WIC Director and that Synthesis courses, which also have a required writing component, are more clearly rooted in their disciplines.

The Committee on Committee also recommended deletion of items B.3 and B.4 (both concerning BCC operations relative to category review). In light of the EC charge relating to student learning outcomes and category review, the BCC has concluded that additional clarity and specificity is needed in the standing rules relative to this BCC function. To meet this need, we re-titled Section B of the standing rules to refer specifically to category review. Thus Section A refers exclusively to proposals for courses to be added to the Core. As a result, item B.1 from the current rules was re-cast and moved to Section A.5 inasmuch as it pertains to proposals seeking to add courses to the Core. Item A.6 relating to quorum and voting standards was added to ensure that business will be completed in a timely manner. These standards comply with default standards used by the Faculty Senate.

Section B is re-titled “Category Reviews,” which is the primary means by which the BCC oversees the overall cohesiveness and effectiveness of the Core. B.1 specifies the obligation of the BCC to conduct category review and to incorporate evidence of student learning into the process. Item B also specifies interactions with institutional administrative actors for the purpose of data-gathering. We have also added a sentence to the preamble of the standing rules indicating the expectation that the BCC will have access to “data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee.” This aspect of shared
governance and institutional support for the Core is embedded within the “vitalization agenda” for the Core that was adopted by the Faculty Senate in June 2010. Finally, Item B.2 asserts BCC authority and obligation to work with departments to ensure that courses meet the standards and needs of the Core and Item B.3 details quorum and voting standards for category review processes.

The proposed text is appended, as approved by the BCC at its regular meeting on November 4, 2011, and is respectfully submitted for consideration by the Senate.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Standing Rules

The Baccalaureate Core Committee reviews the content and appropriateness of both existing and proposed baccalaureate core courses. The committee shall conduct periodic reviews of the overall baccalaureate core program, and of existing courses within this program, to ensure that the criteria of the general education model are being met and to evaluate student attainment of category learning outcomes. This work depends on the availability of data to be provided by university administration at the request of the Baccalaureate Core Committee. The committee shall also evaluate proposals for additional and new courses deemed relevant to the core and stimulate proposals for additional and new courses as deemed necessary and advise faculty members in the preparation of such proposals. The committee shall consist of fourteen faculty and two students. Four of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, four from the College of Science, and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. The Writing Intensive Curriculum program director and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

A. Course Selection

1. The BCC may solicit courses, which include detailed descriptions and outlines, from all colleges/departments.

2. All existing, modified and new courses proposed by individual faculty, groups of faculty, or departments for inclusion in general education must be approved by an appropriate faculty curriculum committee within the college of origin prior to BCC submission.

3. All submissions shall be routed for additional curriculum review at the discretion of the BCC. Request for such reviews, and selection of the reviewing unit, will be made by the BCC. The criteria used to select the reviewing unit will be based upon that unit's ability to assess the specific general education objectives proposed.

4. All submissions that deal with WRI and WRII must be routed to the Writing Advisory Board, which is composed of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Director, the Director of First Year Writing, the Coordinator of the Writing Center, and a writing faculty member with expertise in technical and professional writing. This board will consult with faculty to develop and implement proposals that meet Baccalaureate Core criteria.

5. The BCC will review all submissions to assure compliance with the criteria adopted by the Faculty Senate; those courses which are deemed by the BCC to meet these criteria and address the category learning outcomes can be approved for inclusion as general education courses, subject to approval by the Curriculum Council.

Proposed changes approved by the Baccalaureate Core Committee November 4, 2011
6. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

B. Category Reviews

1. The BCC will periodically request and review institutional data in order to evaluate Baccalaureate Core categories based on:
   a. adequate access to courses within the category;
   b. consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning;
   c. evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes; and
   d. continued satisfaction of category criteria by individual courses.

2. The BCC has the authority to request changes to existing courses and/or deny continuation of Baccalaureate Core status for courses.

3. A majority of the Baccalaureate Core Committee voting members present is required to approve or deny the status of any Baccalaureate Core course.

C. Changes in Core or Criteria or Process

1. Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.

(04/01, 06/07, 06/08)
**2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics**
- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills perspectives &amp; DPD Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highlights indicate topics under current discussion*
Emerging Issues

- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.
### 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality:</th>
<th>Visibility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills → perspectives &amp; DPD → Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights indicate topics under current discussion**
Emerging Issues

- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.
- Discussion ITEM: Should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)
- Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?
- Discussion ITEM: Further, are all courses (and all sections) assessed each year, or just a subset (random sample)?
- Discussion ITEM: how can these course reports help address specific issues – can they include prereq details, etc...
2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td><em>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system</em> (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td><strong>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes Assessment:</strong> <em>defining the role of the BCC</em></td>
<td>*<em>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text-descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td><strong>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</strong></td>
<td><strong>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills → perspectives &amp; DPD → Synthesis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights indicate topics under current discussion**
2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: Design, Quality, Visibility (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories). (see reverse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills → perspectives &amp; DPD → Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights indicate topics under current discussion

**Emerging Issues**

- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.
- Discussion ITEM: should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)
- Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?
- Discussion ITEM: Further, are all courses (and all sections) assessed each year, or just a subset (random sample)?
• Discussion ITEM: how can these course reports help address specific issues – can they include prereq details, etc...
Materials linked from the January 26, 2012 Baccalaureate Core Committee agenda.

### 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: Design, Quality, Visibility (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills→ perspectives &amp; DPD→ Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights indicate topics under current discussion

### Emerging Issues

- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional application of "no prereqs" policy.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in Ecampus course conversion process.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until the following September.
- Discussion ITEM: Should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree).
- Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?
- Discussion ITEM: Further, are all courses (and all sections) assessed each year, or just a subset (random sample)?
- Discussion ITEM: How can these course reports help address specific issues – can they include prereq details, etc...
### 2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories). (see reverse)

#### Design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories. | Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC | Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year. |

| Experiential Learning and the BC | Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system | Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills → perspectives & DPD → Synthesis |

| Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole. | Vetting the BC web site as it develops | Consulting on faculty development related to BC |

**Highlights indicate topics under current discussion**

### Emerging Issues

- Discussion ITEM: Writing II category as prerequisite for WIC courses
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until the following September.
- Discussion ITEM: should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the Bacc Core requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)
- Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?
• Discussion ITEM: Further, are all courses (and all sections) assessed each year, or just a subset (random sample)?
• Discussion ITEM: how can these course reports help address specific issues – can they include prereq details, etc...
2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories). (see reverse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.

| Experiential Learning and the BC | Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC | Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year. |
| Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole. | Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system | Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills → perspectives & DPD → Synthesis |

| Highlights indicate topics under current discussion |

**Emerging Issues**

- Discussion ITEM: Writing II category as prerequisite for WIC courses
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.
- Discussion ITEM: BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.
- Discussion ITEM: should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)
- Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?
• Discussion ITEM: Further are all courses (and all sections) assessed each year, or just a subset (random sample)?
• Discussion ITEM: how can these course reports help address specific issues – can they include prereq details, etc...
### Discussion Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Writing II category as prerequisite for WIC courses</th>
<th>May 21 meeting? Writing Review (Susan Meyers) on the agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of lower division/upper division policy for Perspectives categories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials linked from the April 13 Baccalaureate Core Committee agenda.

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories). (see reverse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design: Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</th>
<th>Quality: Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</th>
<th>Visibility: Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills ➔ perspectives &amp; DPD ➔ Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting on faculty development related to BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights indicate topics under current discussion
**Materials linked from the April 13 Baccalaureate Core Committee agenda.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>How Soon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> Writing II category as prerequisite for WIC courses</td>
<td>May 21 meeting? Writing Review (Susan Meyers) on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong> BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.</strong> Should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.</strong> Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G.</strong> Compliance with First Year Skills Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.</strong> Review of Revised Bacc Core CPS questions</td>
<td>May 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Materials linked from the April 13 Baccalaureate Core Committee agenda.**

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standi ng Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills → perspectives &amp; DPD → Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highlights indicate topics under current discussion*
### Emerging Issues for Discussion at Upcoming meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>How Soon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Writing II category as prerequisite for WIC courses</td>
<td>May 21 meeting? Writing Review (Susan Meyers) on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Compliance with First Year Skills Requirement</td>
<td>June 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Review of Revised Bacc Core CPS questions</td>
<td>May 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics

- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: **Design, Quality, Visibility** (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design: Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</th>
<th>Quality: Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core Implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</th>
<th>Visibility: Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills [perspectives &amp; DPD] [Synthesis]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights indicate topics under current discussion**
BCC question revisions

Writing I
1. Is the course lower division and at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Writing I, and that successful completion of the Writing I category is one of OSU’s First Year Skills requirements?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Writing I been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Writing I Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe the means by which students will develop and demonstrate the use of multiple and increasingly sophisticated writing strategies to explore, clarify and effectively communicate ideas to appropriate audiences.
5. Describe how students will develop and demonstrate an understanding of language, form and style.
6. Describe how students will engage in significant writing practice and revision.
7. Describe the various ways that students will engage in critical thinking activities as they progress through the writing process.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Writing I Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Writing II
1. Is the course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Writing II, and that successful completion of the Writing II category is a Second Year Skills requirement?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Writing II been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Writing II Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific wording)?
4. Describe how students will apply multiple theories, concepts, and techniques in creating and evaluating written communication.
5. Describe how students will develop and demonstrate effective writing for diverse audiences within a specific area or discipline using the appropriate standards and conventions.
6. Describe how students will engage in significant writing practice and revision.
7. Describe the various ways that students will engage in critical thinking activities as they participate in the writing process and the evaluation of written communication.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Writing II Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Speech
1. Is the course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Speech, and that successful completion of the Speech category is one of OSU’s First Year Skills requirements?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Speech been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate
Core Speech Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe the ways in which students will develop and demonstrate the ability to articulate theories of communication and rhetoric.
5. Describe the ways in which students will learn and demonstrate principles essential for competent, ethical communication.
6. Describe the ways that students will engage in critical thinking activities related to rhetoric and communication.
7. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Speech Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Mathematics
1. Is this course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Mathematics, and that successful completion of the Mathematics category is one of OSU’s First Year Skills requirements?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Mathematics been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Mathematics Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to identify situations that can be modeled mathematically.
5. Describe how students in this course will calculate and/or estimate relevant variables in a mathematical setting.
6. Describe how students will develop and demonstrate the skills necessary to critique the applicability of a mathematically approach or the validity of a mathematical conclusion.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Mathematics Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Fitness
1. Is this course lower division?
2. Is this course intended to meet the two-credit lecture or the one-credit activity component of the Fitness requirement?
3. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Fitness, and a clear identification of which portion (lecture or activity) of the requirement the course meets?
4. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Fitness been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Fitness Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
5. Describe how students in the course will identify and explain scientific principles and concepts of physical fitness, nutrition, and positive health behaviors.
6. Describe how students in the course will assess personal physical fitness and develop an appropriate personal health and fitness program.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Fitness Category Learning Outcomes.
Physical/Biological Sciences
1. Is this course lower division and at least 4 credits, and does it include a laboratory?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Physical/Biological Science?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Physical/Biological Sciences been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Physical/Biological Science Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will learn how to recognize and apply key concepts and theories of basic physical or biological science.
5. Describe how students in this course develop and demonstrate the ability to apply scientific methodology and draw conclusions based on observation, analysis, and synthesis.
6. Describe how students in this course will explore how Physical/Biological science connects with other subject areas and interacts with society.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Physical/Biological Category Learning Outcomes.

Western Culture
1. Is this course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Western Culture?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Western Culture been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Western Culture Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe the ways in which students in this course will identify significant events, developments, and/or ideas in the Western cultural experience and context.
5. Describe how students will relate philosophical, historical, and/or artistic phenomena to contemporary Western Culture, and how these activities ask them to interpret its significance.
6. Describe the means by which students will develop and demonstrate their ability to analyze aspects of Western culture in relation to broader cultural, scientific, or social processes.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Western Culture Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Cultural Diversity
1. Is this course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Cultural Diversity?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Cultural Diversity been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Cultural Diversity Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will identify and analyze characteristics of a cultural tradition outside of European/American culture.
5. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate an understanding of how perspectives can change depending on cultural and historical contexts.
6. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate their ability to describe aspects of Non-Western culture that influence or contribute to global cultural, scientific or social processes.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Cultural Diversity Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Literature and the Arts**
1. Is this course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Literature and the Arts?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Literature and the Arts been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Literature and the Arts Learning Outcomes (see [http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core](http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core) for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to recognize literary and artistic forms/style, techniques, and the cultural/historical context in which they evolve.
5. Describe how students in this course will analyze how literature/the arts reflect, shape, and influence culture.
6. Describe opportunities that students in this course will have to reflect critically on the characteristics and effects of literary and/or artistic works.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Literature and the Arts Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Social Processes and Institutions**
1. Is this course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Social Processes and Institutions?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Social Processes and Institutions been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Social Processes and Institutions Outcomes (see [http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core](http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core) for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will use theoretical frameworks to evaluate the role of an individual within social processes and institution.
5. Describe how students in this course will analyze current social issues and place them in a historical context.
6. Describe opportunities that students in this course will have to critique the nature, value, and limitations of the basic methods of the social sciences.
7. Describe how students in this course will explore interrelationships or connections with other subject areas.
8. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
9. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Social Processes and Institutions Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Difference, Power, and Discrimination**
1. Is this course a regularly numbered departmental offering (rather than x99 or blanket numbered) and at least 3 credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core category for Difference, Power, and Discrimination?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Difference, Power, and Discrimination been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Difference, Power, and Discrimination Outcomes (see [http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core](http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core) for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how the course focuses primarily on the United States
5. In what way(s) does the course provide a multidisciplinary perspective on issues of difference, power, and discrimination?
6. Describe the means by which students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to explain how difference is socially constructed.
7. Describe the means by which students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to describe how perceived differences, combined with unequal distribution of power across economic, social, and political institutions, result in discrimination, using both historical and contemporary examples.
8. Describe the means by which students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to analyze ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States.
9. Describe the interactive learning activities (e.g., ungraded, in-class writing exercise; peer-review of written material; web-based discussion group, et. al.) that students in this course will experience.
10. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
11. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Difference, Power, and Discrimination Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Contemporary Global Issues**
1. Is this course upper division and at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Synthesis category for Contemporary Global Issues?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Contemporary Global Issues been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Contemporary Global Issues Outcomes (see [http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core](http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core) for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will analyze the origins, historical contexts, and implications of contemporary global issues.
5. Describe how students in this course will be develop and demonstrate the ability to explain the complex nature and interdependence of contemporary global issues using a multidisciplinary approach.
6. Describe how students in this course will use evidence-based writing to articulate a critical perspective on contemporary global issues.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Contemporary Global Issues Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Science, Technology, and Society**

1. Is this course upper division and at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Synthesis category for Science, Technology, and Society?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Science, Technology, and Society been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Science, Technology, and Society Outcomes (see [http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core](http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core) for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to analyze relationships among science, technology, and society using critical perspectives or examples from historical, political, or economic disciplines.
5. Describe how students in this course will analyze the role of science and technology in shaping diverse fields of study over time.
6. Describe how students in this course will use evidence-based writing to articulate a critical perspective on issues involving science, technology, and society.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Science, Technology, and Society Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Writing Intensive Courses**

1. Is the course upper division, at least 3 credits, and is class size 20 or fewer? If anticipated class size exceeds the recommended enrollment (be specific about class size), how will the instructor manage the work load?
2. What kinds of informal writing will students do in this class? In what ways will students use ungraded or minimally graded writing to articulate content knowledge and think critically about course material? How frequently will students be doing such writing?
3. Describe how students will demonstrate knowledge/understanding of audience expectations, genres, and conventions appropriate to communicating in the discipline.
4. Describe how students will demonstrate the ability to compose a document of at least 2000 words of individual writing through multiple aspects of writing, including (note the role of critical thinking in formal writing):
   - Brainstorming or another pre-writing practice
   - Drafting
   - Evaluating, integrating, and documenting sources appropriately for the discipline
   - Revising comprehensively after receiving feedback on a draft. Revision is required, not optional. Be specific about how feedback will be given.
   - Attach writing assignment handouts.
5. Using the chart below, explain how students will satisfy the WIC requirement to write:
   - At least 2,000 words that have been revised after feedback, and,
   - At least 5,000 words total. Refer to specific assignments in the syllabus.
6. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Writing Intensive Course Category Learning Outcomes in this course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment title</th>
<th>Will writing be graded or ungraded?</th>
<th>No. words</th>
<th>Individual or group assignment?</th>
<th>Will students revise the assignment?</th>
<th>Total word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1  The term “ungraded” here encompasses assignments that are minimally graded—that is, ones where students receive credit simply for turning the assignment in; where the writing is evaluated on a check minus, check, or check-plus basis; and so on.
2  One typed double-spaced page of 12 pt. text = approximately 250 words; thus, a 5-page assignment would translate here to 1,250 words.
3  In WIC courses, at least 25% of students’ grades must be based on individual writing. Individually written sections of group papers can count toward this requirement only if the sections are graded individually.
4  To meet the WIC requirement, students must revise a minimum of 2,000 words, with the revision work either spread over several shorter assignments or applied to a single 10-or-more-page assignment.
5  When a student revises a paper, the word count of the draft and the revision both count toward the total word count. Thus a 2000 word draft that is revised counts as 4000 words.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>How Soon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Writing II category as prerequisite for WIC courses</td>
<td>May 21 meeting? Writing Review (Susan Meyers) on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BCC needs to take up intentional application of “no prereqs” policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. BCC needs to take up intentional discussion of need to insert ourselves in e-Campus course conversion process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. BCC needs to craft statement to the effect that submissions after [designate month] may not be addressed until following September.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Should the BCC consider a blanket “philosophy” be that no students should be required to take additional prereqs in order to satisfy the BaccCore requirement? (similar to the stated goal that no students are required to take Ecampus courses to obtain their degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Discussion ITEM: Should AP/transfer credits be allowed to satisfy BaccCore requirements for DPD?</td>
<td>June 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Compliance with First Year Skills Requirement</td>
<td>Data forthcoming in the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Review of Revised Bacc Core CPS questions</td>
<td>May 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights indicate topics under current discussion
2011-2012 Work Agenda/Topics
- Guiding Categories for 2011-2012: Design, Quality, Visibility (there will be crossover and intersection in these categories). (see reverse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve changes to BCC Standing Rules</td>
<td>Course Proposal review process/Review of BC section of curriculum proposal system (possible subcommittee) – Do we hire a work study student again via Bacc Core implementation to pre-screen proposal reviews</td>
<td>Crafting the campus narrative surrounding the bacc core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Questions and Data analysis: major restrictions, Synthesis and class-level restrictions; Lower Div. requirements for BC categories.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment: defining the role of the BCC</td>
<td>Develop more thorough overarching catalog text/descriptions for Perspectives and Synthesis like what was done for Skills last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning and the BC</td>
<td>Resuming/Re-visioning Category Reviews: Defining the next generation category review process (integration with assessment) – Category review system</td>
<td>Framing the BC as a progressive process – skills – perspectives &amp; DPD – Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level: continued review of the BC as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vetting the BC web site as it develops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights indicate topics under current discussion
(Proposed) Guidelines for Category I and Category II Submission

The length of time required for adequate review of curriculum is unpredictable. The recommended minimum time allowances listed below do not guarantee final approval by a particular date.

**Category I**

Minimum length of time required for final approval after submission of the first Draft to the Office of Academic Programs:

- Abbreviated proposal 7 months
- Full proposal 12 months

**Category II**

Minimum length of time required for final approval after submission of the proposal by the College to the Online Curriculum System:

- Undergraduate course 8 weeks
- Undergraduate program 10 weeks
- Baccalaureate Core course 10 weeks
- Graduate course 10 weeks

NOTE - The Curriculum Council does not meet during the summer. There will be NO REVIEWS of Category II proposals by Council members between June 15 and September 15.
Faculty Senate

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Minutes

- 2013-2014
- 2012-2013
- 2011-2012
- 2010-2011
- 2008-2009
- 2007-2008
- 2006-2007
- 2005-2006
- 2004-2005
- 2003-2004
- 2002-2003
- 2001-2002
- 2000-2001
- 1999-2000
- 1998-1999
Fitness courses shall:

1. be lower division and consist of a lecture component of at least 2 credits and an activity-based component of at least 1 credit (these components are graded independently and can be taken in different terms);
2. emphasize critical thinking in approaches to principles of health and fitness;
3. provide information and experiences in the safe and effective means to initiate and maintain healthful behavior change and a physically active lifestyle;
4. the fitness lecture component will:
   i. focus on an understanding of the scientific principles of physical fitness and positive health behaviors;
   ii. expose students to concepts related to physical fitness and health, such as stress management, nutrition, and risk avoidance behaviors;
   iii. provide practice and evaluation in the development of personal fitness and health programming; and
5. the fitness activity component will:
   i. provide techniques and opportunities to assess, evaluate, and practice physical fitness and associated health behaviors;
   ii. lead to the development of an appropriate fitness program based on assessments and in-class experiences in physical activity.

Physical fitness and positive health behaviors are recognized as central to wellness. In order to achieve wellness, students need to assume personal responsibility for a physically active and healthy lifestyle. To reach this end, students need an understanding of the relationship between chronic diseases and positive lifestyle choices and strategies to promote an active and healthy lifestyle.
## OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY BACCALAUREATE CORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements (Credits)</th>
<th>Course(s) Used to Fulfill</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Course Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKILLS COURSES (15 credits/5 courses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing I (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing II (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSPECTIVE COURSES (24 credits/7 courses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science w/Lab (4 or 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science w/Lab (4 or 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and the Arts (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Processes and Institutions (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Culture (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIFFERENCE, POWER, AND DISCRIMINATION COURSES (3 credits/1 course)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNTHESIS COURSES (6 credits/2 courses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Global Issues (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology, and Society (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRITING INTENSIVE COURSES (WIC) (3 credits/1 course)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken in the Major (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Classes shaded in orange, must be taken at OSU.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 24, 2013 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Linda Bruslind, Uta Hussong-Christian, Lori Kayes, Kerry Kincanon (co-chair), Michael Lerner, Marion Rossi (co-chair), Joe Zaworski
Ex-officio Non-voting Member Present: Vicki Tolar Burton
Guests: Stefani Dawn, Sarah Finger McDonald

Summary of Action Items
- The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) welcomed Sarah Finger McDonald from Horticulture for a conversation about her change course proposal for HORT 111. The BCC shared feedback and suggested revisions for the syllabus and course proposal.
- The BCC reviewed and sent back proposals for QS 262 and QS 461 for revisions. The BCC approved the addition of HST 488 for Contemporary Global Issues.
- Vicki Tolar Burton shared a final summary of our prioritization process for the Review of Writing Report. The BCC co-chairs will reach out to the Writing Advisory Board for consultation on writing in Synthesis classes and will get an update from the School of Writing, Literature, and Film on recommendations in the Review of Writing Report related to the Writing II category.

Course Reviews
Per the request of the BCC, Sarah Finger McDonald from Horticulture joined our meeting to discuss her change course proposal for HORT 111 (85875). Sarah was tasked by her department with redesigning this class, currently a two-credit introduction to the discipline class, into a four-credit Bacc Core class aimed at a broader audience of Ecampus students. The Horticulture department has moved to a different two-credit class, HORT 112, as its introductory course for majors, although both it and HORT 111 are still listed in the catalog as part of the Ecampus General Horticulture major. McDonald discussed her vision for the new course and shared several examples from her lab manual to demonstrate how online students would realize the lab component of the course. The BCC expressed concern about potential student confusion about the HORT 111 still being listed in the major curriculum, when the intent of the new class is to reach a broader audience. The BCC recommended that Horticulture get its major curriculum adjusted before resubmitting the proposal. The BCC also suggested that McDonald consider proposing the course as a new course under a new number rather than a change course to mitigate any potential confusion with the old version of the course. Finally, BCC members recommended that McDonald consider adding greater detail to the syllabus about lab activities and make a more transparent connection between activities in the course and the Biological Science Category Learning Outcomes. The proposal was sent back to McDonald in the Curriculum Proposal System with these recommendations.

The BCC also discussed two other proposals for new courses under the Queer Studies (QS) designator from the School of Language, Culture, and Society. The originator for both proposals was seeking admission to Writing 1 and DPD for QS 262 (85345) and Cultural Diversity and Writing Intensive Course (WIC) for QS 461 (85619). Per our standing rules, the QS 262 course was submitted to the Writing Advisory Board for consideration for the Writing I category. The Writing Advisory Board recommended that the BCC not approve the course for Writing I. The primary focus of Writing 121 and the primary intent of the Writing I category is the practice and refinement of writing skill. While QS 262 may have assignments and activities that facilitate writing improvement, the primary intent of the class is providing an Introduction to Queer Studies. The Writing Advisory Board also noted that having WR 121 as the only approved Writing I class is congruent with policy and practice at institutions throughout the state. The BCC voted to approve the course for DPD, but the course was returned to remove the Writing I request. For QS 461, the BCC thought it worked well for WIC, but expressed concern about adding the class to Cultural Diversity. Our reviewers understood and appreciated how the course could fit into Cultural Diversity. Ultimately, though, the BCC wasn’t comfortable
with having a 400 level class with a Writing Intensive focus in Cultural Diversity. The committee noted the progressive nature of writing in the Bacc Core. WIC classes are purposefully upper division and thus inherently assume completion of the lower-division writing experiences in the Bacc Core (Writing I [a first year skills requirement] and Writing II [a second year skills requirement]). Placing the class in Cultural Diversity (a category traditionally accessible to and promoted to lower-division students) would mean that a student would potentially access a WIC class prior to completing Writing I and Writing II. The BCC voted to return the course to the originator and request removal of the Cultural Diversity request, and also had recommendations for the originator to reconcile some discrepancies in the WIC word count chart.

Kerry Kincanon updated the committee on HST 488 (824489). We had previously reviewed this course for Cultural Diversity and Contemporary Global Issues. We agreed it would be a good addition to Contemporary Global Issues, but we returned it to the originator and asked him to remove the request for Cultural Diversity status. He did so, and the course was approved.

**Academic Programs, Accreditation, and Assessment (APAA) Update**

The Office of APAA played a key role in our Category Review process as it collected and organized requested materials from the units. Stefani Dawn, the Assistant Director of Assessment, shared a presentation called "Building a Bigger Picture," where she offered a summary of the process and shared how the way we have set up the Category Review process might lead us to make conclusions about the efficacy of the classes in a category. Eventually, Category Review in the aggregate will allow us to make overall conclusions about the Baccalaureate Core and whether it is fulfilling its defined role in undergraduate education. A copy of the presentation will be sent to the BCC.

**Review of Writing Report Prioritization Update**

Vicki Tolar Burton presented a summation of where we ended up with our prioritization process for the Review of Writing Report. This list will inform an update that the BCC co-chair will have an opportunity to present to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee likely in the summer. We still need to reach out to colleagues for assistance in helping us to frame our top two low/no cost priorities. We’ll seek feedback from the Writing Advisory Board to offer suggestions on how we can augment our Synthesis outcomes to clarify the writing expectations. We’ll also reach out to the School of Writing, Literature, and Film to get an update on any progress made with recommendations from the meeting related to the Writing II category.

**Synthesis Category Review - Phase II**

Kerry Kincanon handed out review assignments for Phase II of the Synthesis Category Review. Courses in this phase had incomplete files at our initial deadline and submitted complete files by a secondary deadline (April 1) established by the BCC. These reviews are due on May 7.

Meeting adjourned at 10:25.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, May 7 from 1:00-2:30 PM in 120 Waldo Hall.
Multi-State Collaborative Principles

What is the Multi-State Collaborative?

- The Oregon University System (OUS), with consultation from its university stake-holders, has agreed to participate in a national pilot effort to explore a system-level program of learning outcomes assessment that builds on faculty and campus-based formative assessment while adding features to provide for benchmarking at the state and national levels.
- The goal is to find a way to compare the level of learning achieved by students in the various “segments” of the public system (community colleges, universities) with the level of learning achieved by students at peer institutions in other states without relying on a standardized test.
- Efforts are being actively supported and sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) through its LEAP initiative and by the national State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) Association office.
- The following states are represented: MA, OR, KY, RI, CT, IN, MN, UT
- The following OUS institutions are engaged as part of the OR team: OSU, UO, PCC, OIT

Guiding Principles

1. A statewide system of assessment should help to build and support a culture of student learning that allows for assessment results to be used by each campus for improving student learning and for program improvement.

2. A statewide plan for assessment should be based upon authentic student work and allow for the use of multiple measures of student learning-indirect, direct, and embedded--without a single mandated statewide test.

3. A common framework is needed for the statewide system of assessment. The AAC&U LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and Value Rubrics provide such a framework.

4. Assessment approaches should involve an iterative process, and, as such, be viewed as a "work in progress."

5. Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time.
Materials linked from the May 21, 2013 Baccalaureate Core Committee minutes.

Scope of Work OSU Multi-State Collaborative Working Group

Questions to investigate:

- Can we use the VALUE Rubrics to assess relevant OSU Bacc Core outcomes?
- What criteria do existing, embedded assessments need to have to be validly assessed using the VALUE Rubric?
- What faculty development/orientation/materials/information do we need to provide to pilot test faculty?
- What assessments exist that meet these criteria?
- What is the best way to set up a pilot study such that it streamlines with faculty processes and minimizes additional effort?

Goals:

- Develop a process to test the above questions
- Identify faculty to participate in pilot study
  - Fall 2013 (Winter 2014?) – writing
  - Winter 2014 (Spring 2015?) – math/quantitative literacy
- Provide input into the larger multi-state collaborative methods and metrics

Summer

- Composition (math & writing representative) – 2-3 people (+ Assistant Director for Assessment)
- ~10-15 hours
- $750 stipend ($750 x 2 = $1500)

Pilot Study Implementation - per term

- Working group members
  - ~10-15 hours for the persons in the working group representing area being focus on in the term; Original working group representative from the summer work + one additional faculty member participating in the pilot for that term
    - $750 x 2 = $1500
  - ~5-10 hours for the other original representative
    - $375 x 1 = $375
- Pilot study participants - $250 per participant (this is proposed and may vary based upon the number of participants and amount of funding)

Comment [S1]: This is proposed and funding needs to be obtained. These numbers may need to be adjusted to adequately compensate for participation. I’d like to pull together a proposal to submit to Becky Warner.
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Quantitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a "habit of mind," competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

Quantitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

Current trends in general education reform demonstrate that faculty are recognizing the steadily growing importance of Quantitative Literacy (QL) in an increasingly quantitative and data-dense world. AAC&U’s recent survey showed that concerns about QL skills are shared by employers, who recognize that many of today’s students will need a wide range of high level quantitative skills to complete their work responsibilities. Virtually all of today’s students, regardless of career choice, will need basic QL skills such as the ability to draw information from charts, graphs, and geometric figures, and the ability to accurately complete straightforward estimations and calculations.

Preliminary efforts to find student work products which demonstrate QL skills proved a challenge in this rubric creation process. It’s possible to find pages of mathematical problems, but what those problem sets don’t demonstrate is whether the student was able to think about and understand the meaning of her work. It’s possible to find research papers that include quantitative information, but those papers often don’t provide evidence that allows the evaluator to see how much of the thinking was done by the original source (often carefully cited in the paper) and how much was done by the student herself, or whether conclusions drawn from analysis of the source material are even accurate.

Given widespread agreement about the importance of QL, it becomes incumbent on faculty to develop new kinds of assignments which give students substantive, contextualized experience in using such skills as analyzing quantitative information, representing quantitative information in appropriate forms, completing calculations to answer meaningful questions, making judgments based on quantitative data and communicating the results of that work for various purposes and audiences. As students gain experience with those skills, faculty must develop assignments that require students to create work products which reveal their thought processes and demonstrate the range of their QL skills.

This rubric provides for faculty a definition for QL and a rubric describing four levels of QL achievement which might be observed in work products within work samples or collections of work. Members of AAC&U’s rubric development team for QL hope that these materials will aid in the assessment of QL – but, equally important, we hope that they will help institutions and individuals in the effort to more thoroughly embed QL across the curriculum of colleges and universities.

Framing Language

This rubric has been designed for the evaluation of work that addresses quantitative literacy (QL) in a substantive way. QL is not just computation, not just the citing of someone else’s data. QL is a habit of mind, a way of thinking about the world that relies on data and on the mathematical analysis of data to make connections and draw conclusions. Teaching QL requires us to design assignments that address authentic, data-based problems. Such assignments may call for the traditional written paper, but we can imagine other alternatives: a video of a PowerPoint presentation, perhaps, or a well designed series of web pages. In any case, a successful demonstration of QL will place the mathematical work in the context of a full and robust discussion of the underlying issues addressed by the assignment.

Finally, QL skills can be applied to a wide array of problems of varying difficulty, confounding the use of this rubric. For example, the same student might demonstrate high levels of QL achievement when working on a simplistic problem and low levels of QL achievement when working on a very complex problem. Thus, to accurately assess a students QL achievement it may be necessary to measure QL achievement within the context of problem complexity, much as is done in diving competitions where two scores are given, one for the difficulty of the dive, and the other for the skill in accomplishing the dive. In this context, that would mean giving one score for the complexity of the problem and another score for the QL achievement in solving the problem.
Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric
for more information, please contact value@aaaucc.org

Definition
Quantitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a “habit of mind,” competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Milestones 1</th>
<th>Milestones 2</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to explain information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line.</td>
<td>Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph.</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information. For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Milestones 1</th>
<th>Milestones 2</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</td>
<td>Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.</td>
<td>Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is inappropriate or inaccurate.</td>
<td>Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.</td>
<td>Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Milestones 1</th>
<th>Milestones 2</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.</td>
<td>Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application / Analysis</th>
<th>Milestones 1</th>
<th>Milestones 2</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Milestones 1</th>
<th>Milestones 2</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Milestones 1</th>
<th>Milestones 2</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

**Framing Language**

This writing rubric is designed for use in a wide variety of educational institutions. The most clear finding to emerge from decades of research on writing assessment is that the best writing assessments are locally determined and sensitive to local context and mission. Users of this rubric should, in the end, consider making adaptations and additions that clearly link the language of the rubric to individual campus contexts. This rubric focuses assessment on how specific written work samples or collections of work respond to specific contexts. The central question guiding the rubric is "How well does writing respond to the needs of audience(s) for the work?" In focusing on this question the rubric does not attend to other aspects of writing that are equally important: issues of writing process, writing strategies, writers' fluency with different modes of textual production or publication, or writer's growing engagement with writing and disciplinarity through the process of writing.

Evaluators using this rubric must have information about the assignments or purposes for writing guiding writers' work. Also recommended is including reflective work samples of collections of work that address such questions as: What decisions did the writer make about audience, purpose, and genre as s/he compiled the work in the portfolio? How are those choices evident in the writing— in the content, organization and structure, reasoning, evidence, mechanical and surface conventions, and citational systems used in the writing? This will enable evaluators to have a clear sense of how writers understand the assignments and take it into consideration as they evaluate.

The first section of this rubric addresses the context and purpose for writing. A work sample or collections of work can convey the context and purpose for the writing tasks it showcases by including the writing assignments associated with work samples. But writers may also convey the context and purpose for their writing within the texts. It is important for faculty and institutions to include directions for students about how they should represent their writing contexts and purposes.

Faculty interested in the research on writing assessment that has guided our work here can consult the National Council of Teachers of English/Council of Writing Program Administrators' White Paper on Writing Assessment (2008; www.wpacouncil.org/whitepaper) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication's Writing Assessment: A Position Statement (2008; www.ncte.org/ccccc/resources/positions/125784.htm)

**Glossary**

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Context Development**. The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.

- **Content of and purpose for writing**. The content of writing is the situation surrounding a text: who is writing it? who is writing to? Under what circumstances will the text be shared or circulated? What social or political factors might affect how the text is composed or interpreted? The purpose for writing is the writer's intended effect on an audience. Writers might want to persuade or inform; they might want to report or summarize information; they might want to work through complexity or confusion; they might want to argue with other writers, or they might want to convey urgency or amuse; they might write for themselves or for an assignment or to remember.

- **Disciplinary conventions**. Formal and informal rules that constitute what is seen generally as appropriate within different academic fields, e.g. introductory strategies, use of passive voice or first person point of view, expectations for thesis or hypothesis, expectations for kinds of evidence and support that are appropriate to the task at hand, use of primary and secondary sources to provide evidence and support arguments and to document critical perspectives on the topic. Writers will incorporate sources according to disciplinary and genre conventions, according to the writer's purpose for the text. Through increasingly sophisticated use of sources, writers develop an ability to differentiate between their own ideas and the ideas of others, credit and build upon work already accomplished in the field or issue they are addressing, and provide meaningful examples to readers.

- **Evidence**: Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.

- **Genre conventions**. Formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices, e.g. lab reports, academic papers, poetry, webpages, or personal essays.

- **Sources**: Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that writers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes -- to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example.
**Written Communication VALUE Rubric**

*for more information, please contact value@aacu.org*

**Definition**

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context of and Purpose for Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surrounding the writing task(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stylistic choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources and Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates skilful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The language in the portfolio has few errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>although writing may include some errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**: This rubric is designed to evaluate written communication skills across various contexts and formats. It considers the quality of ideas, the appropriateness of content, the adherence to discipline-specific conventions, the use of sources, and the effectiveness of syntax and mechanics. Each area is rated on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest level of performance and 1 the lowest. The rubric is intended to guide evaluators in providing constructive feedback and identifying areas for improvement.
Comparison of First Year Skills Completion Rates Before and After Implementation of First Year Skills Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>90.95%</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td>80.90%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>81.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Bus</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Engr</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>86.81%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>79.62%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>93.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COF</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>96.49%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>85.96%</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>91.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>91.92%</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>87.46%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>93.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>88.95%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>88.95%</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
<td>61.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UESP</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>89.06%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>84.69%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>82.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHHS</td>
<td>85%(HHS)</td>
<td>92.69%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>90.64%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>79.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEOAS</td>
<td>93.18%</td>
<td>93.18%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The educational mission begins and ends with students.
Proposed Changes to AR 12. Withdrawal From Individual Courses

**Rationale for changes:**

The proposed changes to AR 12 seek to address misuse of the current course withdrawal policy. Upon review it was revealed that there are cases of students withdrawing from as many as 29 – 104 courses during their OSU career. Course withdrawals have potential to negatively impact the student (due to cost or lack of progress toward their degree, or both), and impacts other students (who are closed out of classes where withdrawals ultimately open a seat). A review of the course withdrawal policies of comparator institutions showed a range of policies such as not allowing students to withdraw from courses, requiring students who withdraw from courses to reapply to the university, and limiting the number of course withdrawals.

The proposed changes identify a limit for the number of courses from which a student may withdraw, clarify the process by which a student may petition for an exception to the policy, and set a date for putting the new regulation into effect.

This shows the AR as currently written with proposed changes highlighted in yellow and proposed deletions shown as strike-through text:

**AR 12. Withdrawal From Individual Courses**

Any student may withdraw from a maximum of 10\(^1\) individual OSU courses throughout their undergraduate career\(^2\) at OSU\(^3\). Any student may petition for an exception from this limitation if the justification for withdrawal is clearly associated with circumstances beyond the student’s control. Withdrawal from a course with a W grade begins after the tenth day of classes and continues through the end of the seventh week of classes. After the seventh week of classes, students are expected to complete the program attempted and will receive letter grades (A, B, C, D, F, I, S, U, P, N) for all courses in which enrolled unless they officially withdraw from the university. Procedures for withdrawal from individual courses are outlined in the term Schedule of Classes.

---

\(^1\) Complete withdrawal from the university, as defined in AR 13, is not included in the maximum of 10 individual OSU courses.

\(^2\) This regulation applies to undergraduate, post baccalaureate, and non-degree undergraduate students.

\(^3\) Effective for all students enrolling Fall term 2012 or beyond.

This is how the AR would read if all changes are accepted:

**AR 12. Withdrawal From Individual Courses**

Any student may withdraw from a maximum of 10\(^1\) individual OSU courses throughout their undergraduate career\(^2\) at OSU\(^3\). Any student may petition for an exception from this limitation if the justification for withdrawal is clearly associated with circumstances beyond the student’s control. Withdrawal from a course with a W grade begins after the tenth day of classes and continues through the end of the seventh week of classes. After the seventh week of classes, students are expected to complete the program attempted and will receive letter grades (A, B, C, D, F, I, S, U, P, N) for all courses in which enrolled unless they officially withdraw from the university. Procedures for withdrawal from individual courses are outlined in the term Schedule of Classes.
Complete university withdrawals as defined in Academic Regulation 13 are not included in the maximum of 10 individual OSU courses. This regulation applies to undergraduate, post baccalaureate, and non-degree undergraduate students. Effective for all students enrolling Fall term 2012 or beyond.

Proposed Changes to AR 17. Grades

Rationale for changes:

The proposed additions to AR 17 address issues that occur when faculty have no basis for submitting a grade, or when faculty (for this or other reasons) do not submit a grade to the Registrar’s Office. Ultimately, students must receive a grade of some kind for each course taken. Assigning grades is a faculty responsibility. Through creation of the NG (no basis for a grade) and WC (complete withdrawal) grade identifiers, faculty are provided with a grading option when there is no basis for a grade, and the Registrar’s Office is directed with a protocol for situations where there are missing grades.

This shows the AR as currently written with proposed additions highlighted in yellow:

AR 17. Grades
The grading system consists of twelve basic grades, A, A–, B+, B, B–, C+, C, C–, D+, D, D–, and F. The grade of A denotes exceptional accomplishment; B, superior; C, average; D, inferior; F, failure. Other marks are I, incomplete; W, withdrawal; R, thesis in progress; P, pass; N, no-credit; S, satisfactory; U, unsatisfactory; AUD, audited course; WAU, withdrawal from audited course; NG, no basis for a grade (administratively assigned by the Registrar’s Office, see below); WC, complete withdrawal.

When a requirement of a course has not been completed for reasons acceptable to the instructor and the rest of the academic work is passing, a report of I (incomplete) may be made and additional time granted. The I is only granted at the discretion of the instructor. The alternate grade will become the default grade if the missing work is not completed. That alternate grade will become the default grade if the missing work is not completed. The instructor documents the deficiency and the deadline for completing the missing work. A record of the deficiency shall be kept on file in the unit or department office. The allotted time awarded shall not exceed one calendar year except by petition* or the time of the degree conferral, whichever comes first. To remove the I grade, the student must complete the deficiency within the allotted time and the instructor will then submit the appropriate grade. If the student fails to complete the work within the allotted time, the Registrar’s Office will automatically change the I grade on the student’s record to the alternate grade submitted by the instructor at the time the I was given. The alternate grade will be included in the grade point average. Under no circumstances shall a student who earns an A–F grade or an N or U grade have his or her grade changed retroactively to an I grade.

When an instructor does not submit a grade for a student, the Registrar’s Office will automatically record an interim Y grade. To remove the Y grade, the instructor must submit a Change of Grade in the Registrar’s office. If no such change is made the Registrar’s Office will change the interim Y grade to a grade of NG, either at the end of one year or at the time of degree conferral, whichever comes first.

An instructor may move to correct a grade by filing a Change of Grade in the Registrar’s Office. Grade changes for students of a permanently separated instructor will be managed by the department chair of the course involved. Upon permanent separation from the university an
instructor’s change of grade will not be accepted by the Office of the Registrar. The Office of the Registrar will routinely review grade changes.

*A student may petition via the Office of the Registrar for an extension of the one calendar year deadline with the concurrence of the faculty. An approved petition will grant an extension of a single additional term, with a maximum of three total extensions being possible. An approved petition for an extension of time to remove an incomplete will be voided at the time of degree conferral.*
Overview

Purpose: Evaluate the effectiveness of writing with the Baccalaureate Core.

Problems Identified

1. Curriculum and Communication
   - Curriculum needs to be more uniform.
   - Information about expectations and results needs to be better communicated.

2. Resources and Management
   - Class sizes need to be better tracked and managed.
   - There are not enough extended writing assignments (i.e. more than 4 pages).

3. Student Support
   - Low-achieving students need more support.
   - Students overall need more practice with writing.

Sources of Information

- National Survey of Student Engagement Consortium for the Study of Writing in College
- Preliminary Findings for the Committee Reviewing Writing in the Baccalaureate Core
- OSU faculty survey and focus group data
- Comparative institutional data

Results of Analysis

Strengths

- Faculty priorities are aligned with national expectations for writing.
- The current writing curriculum within the Bacc Core has several strengths.

Weaknesses

- Undergraduate writing at OSU needs improvement.
- The major areas of complaint about student writing are behavioral issues (e.g. lack of engagement, academic dishonesty, etc).
- Writing assignments with Bacc Core courses are not sufficient.
- Faculty are not taking advantage of tools related to the writing process.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Make sure that curriculum is uniform across sections and give advisors more information.
- Establish clearer expectations for writing in Synthesis courses.
- Introduce a model of Faculty Writing Advocates.
- Offer training on writing pedagogies to departmental units.
- Pilot a “stretch model” 100-level writing class for students with additional needs.
- Add and Information Literacy course to the Baccalaureate Core.

Potential Benefits

- Establish clearer, more uniform curriculum.
- Create means of managing the newly aligned curriculum.
- Maintain ongoing awareness of the importance of writing (i.e. build a culture of writing).
- Improve students’ written communication skills and their success as graduates.
Summary of Recommendations

Based on the needs outlined above, the committee recommends focusing improvement efforts on four general areas:

- Faculty, Student, and University Involvement
- Clarity of Expectations
- Quality of Assignments
- Effective Evaluation of Student Work

I. Faculty, Student, and University Involvement

Develop a “culture of writing” at OSU by:
1. Providing students with clear guidelines, sufficient practice, and adequate resources.
2. Communications clear expectations so that faculty can develop quality assignments.
3. Demonstrating administrative commitment through public announcements about the importance of writing and through allotting resources to writing initiatives.

II. Clarity of Expectations

1. Update Synthesis requirements: minimum word count, required revision, class cap.
   • Include writing in new Synthesis course assessment
   • Communicate Synthesis requirements to faculty.
2. Update Writing II curriculum to ensure uniform outcomes and curriculum
   • Provide advisors with a means of guided students into appropriate WR II courses.
3. Establish a Writing Advocate model in order to provide faculty leadership related to writing in each academic unit.

III. Quality of Assignments

1. Require writing assignments of adequate length.
   • Create a minimum word count for Synthesis courses.
   • Create a reasonable cap for Synthesis courses, such that writing can be taught.
2. Provide faculty development in order to ensure that assignments use the writing process. Possible models include Faculty Writing Advocates, new faculty mentoring, faculty pairs, and departmental professional development.
   • Writing process assignments should include drafting, feedback, and revision.

IV. Effective Evaluation of Student Work

1. Improve coordination between writing classes and DAS in order to support students.
2. Pilot a “stretch class” model in order to better support students who struggle with writing.
3. Create a database of students support resources related to writing.
4. Add an “Information Literacy” course to the Baccalaureate Core.
5. Develop departmental rubrics (in additional to existing departmental writing handbooks).
Appendix. Revised CPS Questions for Baccalaureate Core Course Proposals

Approved BCC June 6, 2012

BCC question revisions

Writing I
1. Is the course lower division and at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Writing I, and that successful completion of the Writing I category is one of OSU’s First-Year Skills requirements?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Writing I been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Writing I Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe the means by which students will develop and demonstrate the use of multiple and increasingly sophisticated writing strategies to explore, clarify and effectively communicate ideas to appropriate audiences.
5. Describe how students will develop and demonstrate an understanding of language, form and style.
6. Describe how students will engage in significant writing practice and revision.
7. Describe the various ways that students will engage in critical thinking activities as they progress through the writing process.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Writing I Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Writing II
1. Is the course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Writing II, and that successful completion of the Writing II category is a Second-Year Skills requirement?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Writing II been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Writing II Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific wording)?
4. Describe how students will apply multiple theories, concepts, and techniques in creating and evaluating written communication.
5. Describe how students will develop and demonstrate effective writing for diverse audiences within a specific area or discipline using the appropriate standards and conventions.
6. Describe how students will engage in significant writing practice and revision.
7. Describe the various ways that students will engage in critical thinking activities as they participate in the writing process and the evaluation of written communication.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Writing II Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Speech
1. Is the course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Speech, and that successful
completion of the Speech category is one of OSU’s First-Year Skills requirements?

3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Speech been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Speech Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?

4. Describe the ways in which students will develop and demonstrate the ability to articulate theories of communication and rhetoric.

5. Describe the ways in which students will learn and demonstrate principles essential for competent, ethical communication.

6. Describe the ways that students will engage in critical thinking activities related rhetoric and communications.

7. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Speech Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Mathematics

1. Is this course at least three credits?

2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Mathematics, and that successful completion of the Mathematics category is one of OSU’s First-Year Skills requirements?

3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Mathematics been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Mathematics Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?

4. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to identify situations that can be modeled mathematically.

5. Describe how students in this course will calculate and/or estimate relevant variables in a mathematical setting.

6. Describe how students will develop and demonstrate the skills necessary to critique the applicability of a mathematical approach or the validity of a mathematical conclusion.

7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.

8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Mathematics Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Fitness

1. Is this course lower division?

2. Is this course intended to meet the two-credit lecture or the one-credit activity component of the Fitness requirement?

3. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Skills category for Fitness, and a clear identification of which portion (lecture or activity) of the requirement the course meets?

4. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Fitness been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Fitness Category Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?

5. Describe how students in the course will identify and explain scientific principles and concepts of physical fitness, nutrition, and positive health behaviors.

6. Describe how students in the course will assess personal physical fitness and develop an appropriate personal health and fitness program.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Fitness Category Learning Outcomes.

**Physical/Biological Sciences**
1. Is this course lower division and at least 4 credits, and does it include a laboratory?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Physical/Biological Science?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Physical/Biological Sciences been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Physical/Biological Science Category Learning Outcomes (see [http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core](http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core) for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will learn how to recognize and apply key concepts and theories of basic physical or biological science.
5. Describe how students in this course develop and demonstrate the ability to apply scientific methodology and draw conclusions based on observation, analysis, and synthesis.
6. Describe how students in this course will explore how Physical/Biological science connects with other subject areas and interacts with society.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Physical/Biological Category Learning Outcomes.

**Western Culture**
1. Is this course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Western Culture?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Western Culture been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Western Culture Learning Outcomes (see [http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core](http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core) for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe the ways in which students in this course will identify significant events, developments, and/or ideas in the Western cultural experience and context.
5. Describe how students will relate philosophical, historical, and/or artistic phenomena to contemporary Western Culture, and how these activities ask them to interpret its significance.
6. Describe the means by which students will develop and demonstrate their ability to analyze aspects of Western culture in relation to broader cultural, scientific, or social processes.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Western Culture Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Cultural Diversity**
1. Is this course at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Cultural Diversity?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Cultural Diversity been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Cultural Diversity Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?

4. Describe how students in this course will identify and analyze characteristics of a cultural tradition outside of European/American culture.

5. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate an understanding of how perspectives can change depending on cultural and historical contexts.

6. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate their ability to describe aspects of Non-Western culture that influence or contribute to global cultural, scientific or social processes.

7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.

8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Cultural Diversity Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Literature and the Arts**

1. Is this course at least three credits?

2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Literature and the Arts?

3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Literature and the Arts been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Literature and the Arts Learning Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?

4. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to recognize literary and artistic forms/style, techniques, and the cultural/historical context in which they evolve.

5. Describe how students in this course will analyze how literature/the arts reflect, shape, and influence culture.

6. Describe opportunities that students in this course will have to reflect critically on the characteristics and effects of literary and/or artistic works.

7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.

8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Literature and the Arts Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Social Processes and Institutions**

1. Is this course at least three credits?

2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Perspectives category for Social Processes and Institutions?

3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Social Processes and Institutions been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Social Processes and Institutions Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?

4. Describe how students in this course will use theoretical frameworks to evaluate the role of an individual within social processes and institution.

5. Describe how students in this course will analyze current social issues and place them in a historical context.

6. Describe opportunities that students in this course will have to critique the nature, value, and limitations of the basic methods of the social sciences.
7. Describe how students in this course will explore interrelationships or connections with other subject areas.
8. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
9. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Social Processes and Institutions Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Difference, Power, and Discrimination**

1. Is this course a regularly numbered departmental offering (rather than x99 or blanket numbered) and at least 3 credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core category for Difference, Power, and Discrimination?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Difference, Power, and Discrimination been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Difference, Power, and Discrimination Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how the course focuses primarily on the United States.
5. In what way(s) does the course provide a multidisciplinary perspective on issues of difference, power, and discrimination?
6. Describe the means by which students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to explain how difference is socially constructed.
7. Describe the means by which students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to describe how perceived differences, combined with unequal distribution of power across economic, social, and political institutions, result in discrimination, using both historical and contemporary examples.
8. Describe the means by which students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to analyze ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States.
9. Describe the interactive learning activities (e.g., ungraded, in-class writing exercise; peer-review of written material; web-based discussion group, et. al.) that students in this course will experience.
10. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
11. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Difference, Power, and Discrimination Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**Contemporary Global Issues**

1. Is this course upper division and at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Synthesis category for Contemporary Global Issues?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Contemporary Global Issues been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Contemporary Global Issues Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will analyze the origins, historical contexts, and implications of contemporary global issues.
5. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to explain the complex nature and interdependence of contemporary global issues using a multidisciplinary approach.

6. Describe how students in this course will use evidence-based writing to articulate a critical perspective on contemporary global issues.

7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.

8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Contemporary Global Issues Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Science, Technology, and Society
1. Is this course upper division and at least three credits?
2. Is there a statement on the syllabus of the course’s participation in the Baccalaureate Core Synthesis category for Science, Technology, and Society?
3. Have the Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes for Science, Technology, and Society been listed verbatim in the syllabus and been clearly identified as Baccalaureate Core Science, Technology, and Society Outcomes (see http://oregonstate.edu/ctl/baccalaureate-core for specific outcome wording)?
4. Describe how students in this course will develop and demonstrate the ability to analyze relationships among science, technology, and society using critical perspectives or examples from historical, political, or economic disciplines.
5. Describe how students in this course will analyze the role of science and technology in shaping diverse fields of study over time.
6. Describe how students in this course will use evidence-based writing to articulate a critical perspective on issues involving science, technology, and society.
7. Describe any other ways that students will develop and demonstrate critical thinking skills.
8. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Science, Technology, and Society Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

Writing Intensive Courses
1. Is the course upper division, at least 3 credits, and is class size 20 or fewer? If anticipated class size exceeds the recommended enrollment (be specific about class size), how will the instructor manage the work load?
2. What kinds of informal writing will students do in this class? In what ways will students use ungraded or minimally graded writing to articulate content knowledge and think critically about course material? How frequently will students be doing such writing?
3. Describe how students will demonstrate knowledge/understanding of audience expectations, genres, and conventions appropriate to communicating in the discipline.
4. Describe how students will demonstrate the ability to compose a document of at least 2,000 words of individual writing through multiple aspects of writing, including (note the role of critical thinking in formal writing):
   - Brainstorming or another pre-writing practice
   - Drafting
   - Evaluating, integrating, and documenting sources appropriately for the discipline
   - Revising comprehensively after receiving feedback on a draft. Revision is required, not optional. Be specific about how feedback will be given.
   - Attach writing assignment handouts.
5. Using the chart below, explain how students will satisfy the WIC requirement to write:
   - At least 2,000 words that have been revised after feedback, and,
   - At least 5,000 words total. Refer to specific assignments in the syllabus.

6. Describe the process the unit will use to measure the achievement of the Writing Intensive Course Category Learning Outcomes in this course.

**WORD-COUNT TABLE for PROPOSED WIC COURSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment title</th>
<th>Will writing be graded or ungraded?¹</th>
<th>No. words²</th>
<th>Individual or group assignment?³</th>
<th>Will students revise the assignment?⁴</th>
<th>Total word count⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The term “ungraded” here encompasses assignments that are minimally graded—that is, ones where students receive credit simply for turning the assignment in; where the writing is evaluated on a check minus, check, or check-plus basis; and so on.

² One typed double-spaced page of 12 pt. text = approximately 250 words; thus, a 5-page assignment would translate here to 1,250 words.

³ In WIC courses, at least 25% of students’ grades must be based on individual writing. Individually written sections of group papers can count toward this requirement only if the sections are graded individually.

⁴ To meet the WIC requirement, students must revise a minimum of 2,000 words, with the revision work either spread over several shorter assignments or applied to a single 10-or-more-page assignment.

⁵ When a student revises a paper, the word count of the draft and the revision both count toward the total word count. Thus a 2,000 word draft that is revised counts as 4,000 words.
Dear Lynda, Jay, and Cheryl:

The Curriculum Council invites you and all members of the BCC to our next CC meeting on Friday March 7 from 1:30 to 3:00 PM in Kidder 128.

The topics under discussion will be the History Proposal and whatever action the BCC has taken regarding that proposal and, more broadly, substantive issues that were raised at the CC meeting yesterday that should be addressed regarding academic changes that have taken place on the OSU campus over the past 10-15 years and their relation to the baccalaureate core. The CC is in process of making detailed minutes of the meeting that will make the foregoing clearer. Early next week, once the minutes are perfected, I will share them with you.

Jay thanks very much for the information you sent to the CC last week. It was very helpful.

The CC hopes that many of you will be able to attend our next meeting. We value your views and we need your insight and advice.

Have a good weekend,
John

--
John Lee
Mathematics Department
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
jwlee at math dot oregonstate dot edu
Dear Members of the Curriculum Council:

In light of our conversation on Friday, the History Department Curriculum Committee wanted to add a few words of further explanation about our proposal. The “justification” statement in the on-line proposal lays out the broad outlines of our thinking but does not get into the details of assignments or the reasoning behind them.

The chief benefit of a change from three to four credits is that it will allow students to work on their writing. We find that our students vary considerably in their abilities to write, from those who compose lucid and forceful prose to those who struggle at the most elemental level with sentence structure. The initial push for a conversion from three to four credits grew out of a meeting with our majors, who were invited to speak to the Department’s teaching discussion group about their writing experiences in our courses. The students encouraged faculty not only to assign more writing, but to think about ways in which different facets of writing might be treated in our courses. While we have left individual assignments up to the discretion of each instructor, the extra credit hour of course work will enable faculty to work more intensively with students on two fronts.

First, we will be able to assign more formal writing assignments, including additional take-home essays and exams. Such work asks students to engage a different mode of historical inquiry than many have encountered in earlier training. In contrast to the common experience that many students have had in secondary school, which asks them to recount what has happened in the past, our courses emphasize that students need to interpret the past, which they do by addressing substantial questions for which there is no “right” or “wrong” answer, but rather more or less persuasive answers depending on how one defines terms, uses evidence, and structures an argument. Did the Federal Constitution betray the American Revolution? Was there an alternative to Cold War? We want students to uncover what is at stake in such questions and make historical arguments that synthesize the work of historians and draw heavily on primary materials.

Second, the extra contact hour can be used for in-class writing exercises that will better help students consider the individual steps needed to compose longer essays: workshops on common grammatical errors, on effective introductions, on topic sentences, on paragraphs that are structured around a single governing idea and sustained by carefully chosen examples, and on strategies for pulling an argument through an entire essay. We believe as well that good writing is intimately tied to careful reading, and so we want students to engage critically the monographs and articles we assign by prominent historians in the field: What is a given book about? What is the author’s research question and why is it important? What is the argument of the book? How persuasive is the evidence upon which it is based? The same sorts of questions pertain to “primary materials,” those written by historical actors themselves. What inspires a given person to write? To whom are they writing? What are they promoting in their texts? What kinds of questions do they obscure, intentionally or otherwise? These
sorts of questions can be part of small group discussions, informal writing in class, or discussion board exercises. But this sort of work cannot be done in either surveys or upper division courses at present without sacrificing significant content. A conversion to four credits will afford the faculty the time to help students have more sustained, critical, and meaningful engagement with the course material.

The History Department had taken on these changes in part to better serve our majors, but also with the University’s mission to write across the curriculum. The vast majority of the students we teach are non-majors. We recognize from our conversations with our colleagues in other disciplines that these students may not get the opportunity to write as much as desired. Increasing our courses from three to four credits will give them that chance. We believe that the writing skills that students learn in our courses will serve them well after graduation in whatever profession they choose. Finally, it is our hope that careful attention to writing will promote a rigorous and intelligent civic engagement – one of the great promises of a college education.

Jon Katz
Ben Mutschler
Nicole von Germeten
Proposed Guidelines for Thesis as Writing Intensive Course

November 6, 2002

As part of the Baccalaureate Core Committee's review of Writing Intensive courses, and in order to meet the request of several departments that they be permitted to use a thesis option as a WIC, the committee has developed guidelines which must be met for a department's thesis option to be approved. The department will submit documents to the BCC, including documents distributed to students, that demonstrate that their thesis writers will meet the guidelines. The committee wants students who write a thesis to have as full a writing experience as students in regular WIC courses, learning the writing skills, types, and practices required of all WIC students.

The Baccalaureate Core Committee's guidelines for departments using the thesis as a Writing Intensive Course are:

- The thesis must be written in the student's major, or in the case of a student with an interdisciplinary major, in a subject area relevant to the major.

- Students in a major who are writing a thesis will meet together regularly in a group, with faculty leadership, to discuss and demonstrate understanding of issues related to writing in the discipline; to discuss and demonstrate familiarity with a variety of types of writing used by those working in the field (for example, writing done for various audiences); and to participate in peer review of ongoing drafts of writing projects in the major.

- The person leading the thesis writing group will be a faculty member in the discipline rather than a graduate teaching assistant.

- Students writing a thesis will gain experience in the steps involved in the process of writing a large document over time. Documents in the process might include: thesis proposal or project description, update memos to the committee or faculty mentor, literature review, drafts of required thesis sections on which the student received feedback, a whole draft with feedback, and a final polished version.

- Thesis writers will receive instruction in revising their writing and will perform significant revision of their writing.

- Thesis writers will have opportunities (perhaps in the thesis writing group) to use informal, minimally graded or ungraded writing as a mode of learning and understanding content.

- Thesis writers will write at least 2000 words of polished writing that has gone through revision in response to feedback, and a total of 5000 words including drafts. Graphics are not included in the word count. Drafts to prepare for an oral presentation can also be counted in the 5000 words.

- Thesis writers will demonstrate in their thesis the ability to integrate and document information from outside sources.

- Students receiving WIC credit in a thesis option will take a minimum of three hours of
Additional Recommendation:

- It is recommended that at least one person in a department offering a WIC thesis experience have taken the WIC Seminar in order to be familiar with current research and pedagogies for helping students become better writers.
January 28, 2004

To: Name  
Dept.  
Address

From: Ruth Vondracek, Chair of Baccalaureate Core Committee and the Members of the Baccalaureate Core Committee

Subject: BCC Review of Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions Category Courses  
-- Course number and name

Deadline: Return review materials by March 1, 2004

The Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) is preparing the periodic review of Baccalaureate Core courses as directed by the BCC Standing Rules. Our purpose is to ensure that Baccalaureate Core criteria continue to be addressed in these courses. During academic year 2003-2004 we will review all Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions courses approved prior to January 1, 1999. As your department offers one or more such courses, you are receiving a packet for each course subject to the periodic review.

Courses that successfully complete the review process will retain their status as Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions courses in the Baccalaureate Core. Courses that do not successfully complete the review process will be removed from Baccalaureate Core status for this category effective at the end of Summer Term 2004. You may also request removal of a course from Baccalaureate Core status (see attached form).

Return Your Review Materials by March 1, 2004 to ensure timely review of your course. See page two of this letter for instructions on completing the materials required for the review.

All requests for reviews will be sent only to Department Chairs. We request that you, as the Department Chair, communicate as soon as possible with the faculty in your department who are responsible for the courses under review, and that you ensure that all review documents are returned to the Curriculum Coordinator for Academic Programs by March 1, 2004.

The BCC realizes that completing the review process will take faculty time to complete. We appreciate your work and the work of faculty members who will assist in the review process. Thank you very much.

Return all documents, requests for continuation or requests for removal of Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions designation to:

Curriculum Coordinator for Academic Programs  
Undergraduate Academic Programs  
105 Kerr Admin  
Campus

For more information on the Baccalaureate Core Curriculum see:
http://oregonstate.edu/dept/academic/cph1998/021_The_Baccalaureate_Core.htm

For electronic copies of the review packet, see:
http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/bcc/review/index.html

Please direct questions to Ruth Vondracek at 737-9273 or Ruth.Vondracek@oregonstate.edu.
Faculty Senate

Baccalaureate Core Committee

Baccalaureate Core Course Review 2003-2004

Instructions to Request Continuation of Baccalaureate Core Status

Please return the following documents, as indicated on the cover letter, to request continuation of the Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions designation for the course under review.

1. **Cover sheet** - Use the "Request to Continue Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions Designation Checklist/ Signature Form", included in the packet, as your cover sheet.

2. **Narrative (2 pages maximum, 1" margins, minimum 12 pitch)** describe how this course meets the Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions rationale and criteria. The Committee requests that you elaborate on your answers by demonstrating with examples of how criteria are met.

   **Rationale:** Human beings are inevitably social, influencing and being influenced by social groups. The social sciences study social institutions and processes and deal with the human behaviors and values that form and change them, and are essential for an understanding of contemporary society.

   **Criteria:** In your narrative please specifically address how your course meets the following criteria. Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions courses shall:
   1. Be lower division and at least 3 credits;
   2. Emphasize elements of critical thinking;
   3. Place the subject(s) in historical context;
   4. Demonstrate interrelationships or connections with other subject areas;
   5. Focus on methods, concepts, and theories for understanding the structure and change of major social institutions, and for understanding individual behavior as part of a social dynamic;
   6. Examine the nature, value, and limitations of the basic methods of the social sciences and discuss the interaction of the social sciences and society; and
   7. Provide a perspective on the evolution of the theories and ideas emphasized in the course.

3. **Course syllabus:** One per course, unless the course has multiple sections that do not use a common syllabus. When each section uses a unique syllabus, please return a syllabus and a separate narrative for each section. This applies, as well, for courses where some sections are delivered online, rather than in the classroom.

   **The course syllabus should:**
   1. include expected learning outcomes
      - Learning outcomes refer to the added competence (value) developed by a learner through a learning experience
   2. demonstrate how critical thinking skills are developed in the course
      - The proposal should make clear what constitutes "critical thinking" within this particular discipline (or class). Examples include but are not limited to: development and defense of logical arguments; a specific problem solving technique, such as the scientific method; or an understanding of how the individual fits within the larger context of society. The committee won't agree or disagree with the definition given, but wants to see that it has been carefully considered.

      - The proposal should make clear how the class will develop critical thinking skills in students. For example, what activities will be used to develop those skills in students and to demonstrate
their success in achieving them? Active skill development is encouraged over passive approaches. Often such activities are listed in the course syllabus weekly schedule.

- The proposal should indicate how critical thinking skills will be factored into the assessment or grading of students.
- The proposal should also indicate how the structure of the course and chosen teaching methods foster critical thinking.

3. indicate that it is a BCC course
4. indicate the category, i.e. Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions and describe how the goals of the course reflect the criteria for the category

4. **Handouts or Instructions** students receive for lecture and lab-related work.

5. **Enrollment Information Form**

6. **Any additional information** about the course that is relevant to the review.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Baccalaureate Core Course Review 2003-2004

Request to Continue Perspectives - Social Process and Institutions Designation

Checklist/Signature Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number:</th>
<th>Course Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of credit hours for the course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the course grade that is based on lecture related activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical number of students in lecture section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical number of students in lab section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical number of hours per week a student spends in lecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical number of hours per week a student spends in lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please include the following review documents. Attach a copy of this form to the top of the accompanying documents. See accompanying letter for criteria and more detailed descriptions of what is required for each document.

#1 Cover sheet (this document)

#2 Narrative (2 pages maximum, 1" margins, minimum 10 pitch) - describe how this course meets the Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions criteria.

#3 Course syllabus - One per course, unless the course has multiple sections that do not use a common syllabus; submit one syllabus from each section and a separate narrative for each section. Syllabi should include expected learning outcomes and demonstrate how critical thinking skills are developed in the course.

#4 Handouts or instructions students receive for lecture and lab-related work.

#5 Enrollment Information Form

#6 Any additional information about the course relevant to the review.
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Baccalaureate Core Course Review 2003-2004

Enrollment Information Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of offering (circle): 1/year 2/year every term Other____________________

FILL IN ONLY THE "CLASS" ROW AND "Total" ROW IN THE TABLE BELOW. Provide data for the three most recent terms the course was taught. If more than one section was taught in a particular term, provide data for each section. The BCC will gather the data for the "College" section. We will use your total as a crosscheck that the demographic data is accurate. (Past experience has shown that this check is worthwhile.)

IF MORE THAN ONE SECTION OF THE COURSE WAS TAUGHT IN A PARTICULAR TERM, PLEASE INCLUDE A SEPARATE TALLY SHEET FOR EACH SECTION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>Term/Year CRN</th>
<th>Term/Year CRN</th>
<th>Term/Year CRN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (First Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Sophomore)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Junior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Senior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Postbac)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agricultural Sci.
Business
Engineering
Forestry
Health/Human Sci.
Liberal Arts
Oceanic/Atmos Sci.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UESP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baccalaureate Core Committee

Baccalaureate Core Course Review 2003-2004

Request for Removal of Baccalaureate Core Status

**Course Number** ______________

**Course Name** ____________________________________________

If you wish to **remove** the Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions designation from this course, you may request that change using the statement below. Removing the designation requires college level approval and the signature of the Dean. Please submit the following request:

Please **remove** the course named above and on the cover letter from the list of approved Perspectives - Social Processes and Institutions courses.

Is this course used as a prerequisite for other courses? Yes _____      No _____

*If yes, indicate courses, if known:*

Reason for removal. Please be explicit (attach additional sheet if necessary):

________________________________________________________________________________

Department Chair/Head ___________________________ Date

________________________________________________________________________________

Dean ___________________________ Date
Baccalaureate Core Category Course Review by Year

2019-2020
- Synthesis:
  - Contemporary Global Issues
  - Science, Technology and Society
- WIC:
  - College of Forestry
  - College of Education
  - College of Pharmacy
- One-year follow-up:
  - Writing I
  - Writing II
  - WIC:
    - College of Science
    - College of Earth, Ocean & Atmospheric Sciences
    - Interdisciplinary Programs:
      - BRR
      - ENC
- Three-year midpoint reporting:
  - Western Culture
  - Cultural Diversity
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Writing, Literature and Film; Psychology, and Arts and Communications)

2018-2019
- Physical Science
- Biological Science
- One-year follow-up:
  - Literature and the Arts
  - Social Processes and Institutions
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Language, Cultural and Society; History, Philosophy and Religion; Public Policy; American Studies, and Liberal Studies)
- Three-year midpoint reporting:
  - Difference, Power and Discrimination
  - WIC: College of Engineering

2017-2018
- Writing I
- Writing II
- WIC:
  - College of Science
  - College of Earth, Ocean & Atmospheric Sciences
  - Interdisciplinary Programs (BRR & ENC)
- One-year follow-up:
- Western Culture
- Cultural Diversity
- WIC:
  - College of Liberal Arts (Writing, Literature and Film; Psychology, and Arts and Communications)

- Three-year midpoint reporting:
  - Speech
  - Mathematics
  - Fitness
  - WIC:
    - College of Agricultural Sciences
    - College of Business
    - College of Public Health and Human Sciences

- 2016-2017
  - Literature and the Arts
  - Social Processes and Institutions
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Language, Cultural and Society; History, Philosophy and Religion; Public Policy; American Studies, and Liberal Studies)
  - One-year follow-up:
    - Difference, Power and Discrimination
    - WIC: College of Engineering
  - Three-year midpoint reporting:
    - Synthesis: Contemporary Global Issues; Science, Technology and Society

- 2015-2016
  - Western Culture
  - Cultural Diversity
  - WIC:
    - College of Liberal Arts (Writing, Literature and Film; Psychology; and Arts and Communications)
  - One-year follow-up:
    - Speech
    - Mathematics
    - Fitness
    - WIC:
      - College of Agricultural Sciences
      - College of Business
      - College of Public Health and Human Sciences

- 2014-2015
  - Difference, Power and Discrimination
  - WIC: College of Engineering
  - One-year follow-up: Synthesis

- 2013-2014
  - Speech
  - Mathematics
  - Fitness
  - WIC:
    - College of Agricultural Sciences
    - College of Business
    - College of Public Health and Human Sciences

- 2012-2013 – Synthesis
- 2012-2013 – Mathematics, Speech, Fitness, and selective WIC courses
- 2009-2010 – Biological Science with Lab, Mathematics, Science Technology and Society History
courses, Social Processes and Institution

- 2008-2009 – Fitness, Physical Science with Lab
- 2007-2008 – Science, Technology and Society
- 2006-2007 – Science, Technology and Society (delayed)
- 2005-2006 – Contemporary Global Issues
- 2004-2005 – Difference, Power and Discrimination
- 2002-2003 – Cultural Diversity
- 2001-2002 – Perspectives Science/Lab
- 2000-2001 – WIC
- 1999-2000 – Western Culture

- Archives 2003-2004