Baccalaureate Core Committee
March 4, 2019
Minutes

Voting members present: Pat Ball (remote), Natalie Dollar (remote), Daniel Faltesek, McKenzkie Huber, Filix Maisch, Bob Paasch, David Roundy, Dana Sanchez, Rorie Spill Solberg, Kaplan Yalcin
Voting members absent: Nancy Barbour, Kathy Becker-Blease, Patrice Dragon, Weihong Qiu, Inara Scott
Ex-Officio members present: Faculty Affairs – Heath Henry; WIC Director – Vicki Tolar Burton (remote)

Category II Reviews
- MIME 497/498
  - The Academic Dishonesty Link is broken
  - This is a WIC and a two course capstone. The WIC requirements are spread out between the two courses. The WIC director confirmed this is fine, so long as everything is covered between the two courses.
  - A lot of the handouts are not available but are potentially provided through Canvas.
    - The Instruction handouts are separate documents and do not match up exactly with what is in syllabus. The reviewer believes it would be more clear to students if they were attached directly to the syllabus.
    - It was suggested that the handouts may be available through a link to cut down on syllabus length.
  - It is not explicitly stated that more than one outside source is required for one of the formal writing assignments, but based on the class content, it is very likely.
    - Page two, assignment logistics – the use of 'references' implies outside sources.
  - No information about enrollment details and coverage
    - Three Professional Tech writers are employed part-time to evaluate writing
      - Around 50 students per section
        - Send back with a request for more information on the student-faculty ratio.
- LEAD 360
  - Baccalaureate Core (BC) Learning Outcomes (LOs) are not verbatim
  - Course assignments are linked to 'objectives', which the committee believes refers to the LOs. There is no consistency in the noting how each assignments meets which outcomes.
  - There is a Graduate Table linking BC LOs to Learning Goals for Graduates (LGG) but it is not clear to the viewer if the LGG are the same as the course specific LOs. They do not link to specific outcomes or activities and it is not clear how these are being assessed. They are linked to topics, but not to assessment.
  - The committee believes the course is not suitable for the Social Processes & Institutions category
  - Which social science rhetoric is being addressed – who is the liaison?
  - Rejected – the syllabus needs some changes and the course does not fit the category it is being submitted for.
- WGSS 341
  - Has major issues
  - Where does technology even come in as a discussion point?
  - Did go through the liaison process but does not align with the Science, Technology & Society category requirements
    - Perhaps it would be a better fit for Difference, Power & Discrimination category
  - It is very similar to a course that already exists within the same category (WGSS 440) – companion course and takes place at the Hatfield Marine Science Center.
    - They also want to offer it at the Corvallis campus.
  - It is not clear that the writing assignment meets the 1,250 minimum word requirement.
  - Send back – the committee feels it does not meet the category requirements and needs to go through a redesign.

Category Reviews
- SUS 103
  - Will be reviewed next meeting.