

Baccalaureate Core Committee

April 25, 2018

Minutes

Voting members present: Pat Ball (via phone), Nancy Barbour (via Webex), Isabelle Brock, Filix Maisch, Bob Paasch, Weihong Qiu, Dana Sanchez, Inara Scott, Rorie Spill Solberg

Voting members absent: Natalie Dollar, McKenzie Huber, Bill Smyth

Ex-Officio members present: Academic Affairs – Heath Henry, WIC Director – Vicki Tolar Burton

Guests: JoAnne Bunnage

Q&A on Accreditation Process – JoAnne Bunnage

- It was brought up that when the accreditation group previously visited the committee, they asked that some tasks be accomplished and for some changes to be made. Those changes were implemented and the tasks accomplished, but there was no follow-up from the accreditation group.
 - The evaluation team is made up of 8-10 individuals from peer institutes. Due to the number of people and length of the visit, they will decide who they need meet with and if a follow-up is necessary. Generally, if they do not have questions or concerns, they will not request to meet.
- How does the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) see their role in the accreditation process?
 - The BCC can prove the university has a general education program and the committee works to improve it each year.
 - Annual Reports are submitted at the end of each year, summarizing the tasks and accomplishments of the committee. However, one committee member felt that there was no follow-up or discussion of these reports by the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee and expressed some concern over it.
- Are the accreditors focusing on student learning outcomes?
 - They will be looking at the processes and how programs use the data to enhance their programs and make any needed changes.

Proposed Revisions to AR27

- It is not very clear what 'in residence' encompasses. Does it include Ecampus, the Portland Campus? Does it refer to only the home campus in Corvallis?
- What does 'regionally accredited' mean? What area does that encompass? What are the differences between national and regional accreditation? Would it be better and clearer to name the accreditation bodies?
- Not listed in the proposed revisions, but if a student is receiving a subsequent major, when their previous degree was not from Oregon State University, do they have to take Baccalaureate Core (BC) courses, or is it assumed that they took them at their previous institution?
- It is noted that, in section a, there is stated that 'a student must' before listing what needs to be accomplished. This language is not present in section b. The committee feels the same language needs to be consistent.

Category II Reviews

- No Discussion Needed
 - BI 102
- Discussion Needed
 - BI 103
 - The course is occasionally references as meeting the Life Science requirement; it needs to be changed to Biological Sciences.
 - Outcomes are referred to by different names and it is not clear if they are referring to Baccalaureate Core (BC) outcomes or course specific outcomes.
 - BI 101, BI 102 and BI 103 have virtually identical syllabuses. This issue was not caught on the previous two but it will be suggested that some clarification be made in regards to the outcomes when sent back to the originators. The other courses will not need to be resubmitted.
- HDFS 240
 - Wrong student conduct link

- The Academic Affairs office just learned that there is a new student conduct link. It was made available back in January. No announcement was made and neither the Academic Affairs office or the BCC were notified of the change.
- The course describes interrelationships in the questions, but it is not addressed in the syllabus.
 - Approve, send back for minor revisions
- May 18 is the final day to get courses into the Fall catalog.

Minutes prepared by Caitlin Calascibetta