

Baccalaureate Core Committee

January 14, 2019

Minutes

Voting members present: Natalie Dollar (remote), McKenzie Huber, Filix Maisch, Bob Paasch, David Roundy, Dana Sanchez, Inara Scott, Rorie Spill Solberg, Kaplan Yalcin

Voting members absent: Pat Ball, Kathy Becker-Blease, Patrice Dragon, Daniel Faltese, Weihong Qiu

Ex-Officio members present: Faculty Affairs – Heath Henry; WIC Director – Vicki Tolar Burton (remote)

Category II Reviews

- WR 240
 - The syllabus is missing the verbatim Baccalaureate Core (BC) statement.
 - The syllabus uses a table format to go over BC requirements. It's unusual but nothing to be overly concerned with.
 - There is an issue with the numbering for graded work; it goes 1,3-6 and then 2.
 - The reviewer noted that it takes a little bit of following to go from assessment methods, to graded work, to list of assignments. There is some drift in the language being used, where assignments are named in one part of the syllabus, but seem to be referred to by another name in other parts. It makes it difficult to keep track of the assignments and how they're being assessed.
 - The committee decided to send back with a list of suggested revisions.
- BB 317
 - This is a resubmission and most of the prior issues have been addressed.
 - The 2,000 minimum word count for a WIC course is never explicitly stated on the syllabus.
 - The 2,000 word count may be in the instructions for the assignments but they were not submitted with the syllabus.
 - The BC learning outcomes and course specific learning outcomes (SLOs) are numbered in a such a way that they do not appear separated at first glance.
 - There is a small, separate statement that breaks the list so they are separated. The committee suggest re-numbering the second half of the list would erase any confusions.
 - The course was recertified back in the Spring, on the basis that the prior issues were addressed.
 - The course is approved, but the committee would like to see the instruction sheet for assignments and will send back some suggestions to improve clarity.

Discussion

- Category Reviews
 - No Discussion Needed
 - BI 101
 - Approved.
 - Discussion Needed
 - BI 206
 - There is no description on how assignments are assessed or which SLOs they are related to.
 - Is the Chemistry pre-requisite limiting to the average student who may want to attend the course?
 - There are plenty of low level Bio courses available to students so while this course may be a little more advanced, there are plenty of options.
 - Decertify and send back with instructions to align the assignments to the SLOs.
 - BI 213
 - A Cascades syllabus was not provided; the committee had to reach out for one. It mostly follows the Corvallis syllabus.
 - There are no visible connections to the outcomes and no description for how they're assessed.
 - The syllabus is very similar to BI 211 and 212. Both had issues but were recertified pending changes and clarification.
 - Each assignment claims to cover all of the SLOs, which the committee is doubtful about.

- Recertify but send back with strong suggestions to clarify how the assignments cover all the outcomes listed.
- The community college course needs to be reviewed by an advisor or someone in the department to determine if there is an equivalent course. If the course it is equivalent to is also a Baccalaureate Core (BC) course, the registrar can reportedly approve it for BC credit.
 - Why can the BC Committee not review the course?
 - The committee does not have the bandwidth to review student petitions in addition the Category Reviews and Category II Proposals.
 - If the committee were to review the course, there is not enough data for them to accurately determine whether the course meets the BC learning outcomes.

Minutes prepared by Caitlin Calascibetta