A Shared Governance Vision for OSU's Baccalaureate Core
Report of the Baccalaureate Core Implementation and Leadership Workgroup (BCIL)
DRAFT v7 August 19, 2018

Summary

OSU's Baccalaureate Core is an opportunity waiting to happen. With a combination of proceedual revisions and resource investments we may develop our undergraduate general education program into a assessment-driven curriculum designed to meet the needs of students and objectives of faculty.

The Baccalaureate Core is not dysfunctional or "broken." It serves the university teaching and learning community with a clear set of options and processes for curricular choices. That thousands of undergraduates succeed in the Baccalaureate Core to obtain their degrees shows that the system functions. Yet Baccalaureate Core it is not sustainable as presently constituted and managed. The Baccalaureate Core must adapt to meet the new demands and conditions occasioned by OSU's growth and change.

Of primary importance, the Baccalaureate Core has not been developing by design to meet the changing needs of students, OSU, and the world. It is a program that is not run as a program; no budget, no director, with few changes in policy or strategy over the last decade.

The Baccalaureate Core Implementation and Leadership Workgroup (BCIL) was formed in April 2018 with the charge to make recommendations in order to "establish a basis of shared governance leadership for the Baccalaureate Core and increase effectiveness of the Baccalaureate Core curricular process."

This proposal is intended as an impetus. By altering the Baccalaureate Core governance and category review process in we will construct a foundation upon which larger changes may be predicated. These proposed actions are intended to activate the leadership potentials of the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) of the Faculty Senate in order to focus on strategy, policy, planning, and assessment issues of the Baccalaureate Core curriculum.

The necessary counterpart to the proposed changes in Faculty Senate leadership is a coordinated administrative leadership. We propose a Director to develop and implement assessment, strategy, communication, and faculty development for the Baccalaureate Core.

In this proposal we are not recommending how the Baccalaureate Core should be structured and conducted. Our purpose is to enable a shared governance vision that allows faculty and administrative leadership to work collaboratively in order to improve and maintain a vital and relevant general education for OSU. The relatively small steps recommended in this proposal are conceived as working synergistically to produce large results. We present this proposal with a positive sense of what general education at OSU may become. It is in the vital interest of OSU that it be so.

A Shared Governance Vision for OSU's Baccalaureate Core
Report of the Baccalaureate Core Implementation and Leadership Workgroup (BCIL)
DRAFT v7 August 19, 2018

Proposal

Problem

OSU's general education program, the baccalaureate core, does not have the leadership infrastructure required to set strategy, make policy, and plan implementation. The Baccalaureate Core Committee has the defacto authority to make policy but is fully expended in the task of category review of courses. There is not an administrative Director of the Baccalaureate Core. All of the issues of strategic planning, assessment, communication, and faculty development follow from the gap in leadership.

Solution

Create latitude in the Baccalaureate Core Committee to engage executive deliberation: strategy, policy, and planning.

Revise the Baccalaureate Core Committee to specify the its executive deliberation authority over strategy, policy, and planning (with approval by full Faculty Senate).

Dedicate administrative resources to course review and academic unit support in category review.

Revise category review process in order to attenuate the work flow of the Baccalaureate Core Committee, thus freeing time for executive deliberation.

Dedicate administrative resources to provide leadership on issues of assessment, communication, faculty development, collaboration with advisors, and academic unit support.

Method

1. Dedicate a 1.0 fte Baccalaureate Core specialist in Academic Programs and Assessment.
APA analyses the data necessary to course review and provides training for BCC members for units. Dedicating a full-time specialist to Bac Core review will support longer-term course review planning and allow for annual audit reviews of categories. Accomplishing recommendation this requires allocating resources to APA.

2. Enhance training and support for units.
Workshops and support for units preparing for category review improves quality of submissions. Such support makes the process for better for academic units and reduces the submissions send back for provisional recertification. Dedicating a 1.0 Baccalaureate Core specialist in APA will allow for workshops and increased support for units preparing for review. More quality review submissions results in stronger review results and more effective review process overall.

Accomplishing recommendation this depends upon a dedicated 1.0 fte Baccalaureate Core specialist in Academic Programs and Assessment

3. Clarify the executive functions of the Baccalaureate Core Committee
The Baccalaureate Core Committee is the appropriate point of decision-making regarding Baccalaureate Core strategies, policies and planning. This entire proposal turns on the premise that by enabling the Baccalaureate Core Committee to exercise its executive functions OSU will gain a key capability to make productive change to the Baccalaureate Core. This revision of the Baccalaureate Core Committee in combination with a Director of General Education will result in substantive transformation university-wide of the Baccalaureate Core strategy, process, and curriculum. This potential is genuine even taking into account the difficult fiscal and political issues that Baccalaureate Core curricular reform entails. Accomplishing this recommendation requires revision of the standing rules dependent upon Faculty Senate approval to include the following;

> *The Baccalaureate Core Committee has the authority to approve strategy, policy, and planning for the Baccalaureate Core.*
>
> *Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core strategy, policy, and planning will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.*

Revision of standing rules requires approval by the Committee on Committees and the Faculty Senate.

4. Director of General Education
The Director reports to the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education and works in collaboration with Baccalaureate Core Committee, the WIC Director, and the DPD Director to implement Baccalaureate Core strategy, planning, and policy. The Baccalaureate Core Committee and Faculty Senate hold decision-making authority over Baccalaureate Core strategy, planning, and policy. Yet, that committee is not constituted to manage the practical functions of a program. Director of General Education provides the administrative function to implement out comes of the Baccalaureate Core Committee's executive function. The Director of General Education reports to the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education.

5. Establish a 10 year Baccalaureate Core category review cycle.
The 7 year review cycle divides Baccalaureate Core courses into 21 categories for review. 2018-2019 will be the 7th year. Establishing a 10 year Baccalaureate Core category review cycle reduces the number of courses under review in a year thus opening time for executive functions of the BCC. Accomplishing this recommendation requires action by the Baccalaureate Core Committee, the Faculty Senate, and APA.

6. Establish a Baccalaureate Core Committee summer schedule.
The Baccalaureate Core Committee operates on a 9 month schedule of weekly meetings and individual preparation. Adding the summer months to the schedule will ease the general workload. A BCC summer schedule will involve a subset of the members that may work asynchronously. Tasks suitable for such a summer schedule are preparing reviews for action in Fall and focusing on category II course proposals. Accomplishing this recommendation requires action by the Baccalaureate Core Committee, the Committee on Committees and the Faculty Senate in the case of standing rules change, and support from APA.

These recommendations are intended to work together to produce a synergistic effect actuating an environment in which Baccalaureate Core reconsideration becomes the norm.

	Realignment	Investment
Review Process	Support for academic units in developing course review documents and proposals.	Dedicated 1.0 fte Baccalaureate Core specialist in Academic Programs and Assessment. Currently at .80 fte.
	Move from a 7 year to a 10 year review cycle.	
	Establish BCC summer schedule (e.g., Cat II).	
Leadership	Revise BCC standing rules to specify leadership role respecting Bacc Core policies, procedures, and requirements.	1.0 fte Director of the Baccalaureate Core under Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education to work in collaboration with BCC.
Objectives	Bacc Core program assessment (students, advisors, faculty).	
	Bacc Core Strategic Plan.	
	Identify general education models for the Bac Core.	
	Develop a communication plan for Bacc Core.	

A Shared Governance Vision for OSU's Baccalaureate Core
Report of the Baccalaureate Core Implementation and Leadership Workgroup (BCIL)
DRAFT v7 August 19, 2018

Timeline

April 2018	BCIL Charged
September 2018	BCIL Report issued
November 2018	Standing rules revision brought to Faculty Senate
December 2018	10 year category review cycle brought to Faculty Senate
April 2019	Baccalaureate Core Policy proposal brought to Faculty Senate
July 2019	Baccalaureate Core Director established
December 2019	Baccalaureate Core Assessment plan implemented

Workgroup members
Dana Sanchez, Baccalaureate Core Co-Chair, Fisheries and Wildlife
Bob Paasch, Baccalaureate Core Co-Chair, Engineering
Bill Bogley, Mathematics
Alix Gitelman, Faculty Senate President-Elect, Statistics
Julie Greenwood, Undergraduate Studies
Heath Henry, Academic Programs and Assessment
Nana Osei-Kofi, Difference, Power, and Discrimination
John Edwards, College of Liberal Arts, Psychology
Workgroup Chair: Jon Dorbolo, Faculty Senate President, Information Services

Appendix A: SWOT analysis of the Baccalaureate Core produced by the BCIL.

Baccalaureate Core SWOT analysis	
Strengths ▸ Bacc Core is faculty governed. ▸ The process provides check and balance between colleges and Faculty Senate. ▸ All Bacc Core courses are reviewed. ▸ BCC is an engaged and active committee. ▸ Bacc Core succeeds in educating and graduating students. ▸ Bacc Core provides values that are educationally and professionally valuable to learners.	**Weaknesses** ▸ BCC's role has become a defacto review group. ▸ BCC's diminished leadership role has limited both administrative and faculty senate options. ▸ Bacc Core lacks leadership continuity. ▸ Bacc Core is perceived as less valuable by learners than it is. ▸ Learners typically do not take advantage of the values that Bacc Core offers to them. ▸ DPD is under-resourced to serve OSU's expansion. ▸ WIC is under-resourced to serve OSU's expansion.

Opportunities	**Threats**
▸ BCC wants to exercise a leadership role. ▸ With BCC leadership working with academic units, the Bacc Core can be rethought. ▸ A revitalized Bacc Core with administrative support will offer increased relevance to learners. ▸ New models of general education in practice are available as options for the Bacc Core. ▸ Students, faculty, and administrators are in agreement that rethinking the Bacc Core is important.	▸ Any change in Bacc Core structure has funding and political impacts across the enterprise. ▸ Resources for Bacc Core support are tenuous in the current fiscal environment. ▸ The RCM budget model may spark new incentive to claim BCC Core credits by units. ▸ State mandated transfer agreements may limit Bacc Core flexibility. ▸ The current Bacc Core model is unsustainable to serve OSU's current and future expansion.

Appendix B

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. Three of the faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts, three from the College of Science, two from OSU-Cascades and six from faculty in other colleges or academic units. In addition, the following shall be ex-officio members, non-voting: the Writing Intensive Curriculum program director, the Difference, Power, and Discrimination program director, an Academic Affairs representative appointed by the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and an Ecampus representative appointed by the Associate Provost for Extended Campus.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

- adequate access to courses within the category;
- consistency of category criteria and learning outcomes with institutional goals for undergraduate learning;
- evidence of students achieving satisfactory success relative to category learning outcomes; and
- 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.

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

Changes in Core or Criteria or Process
Any changes in the Baccalaureate Core or the supporting criteria or the process will require the approval of the Faculty Senate.