<h1 style="text-align: center">Baccalaureate Core Committee</h1>
<p style="text-align: center">April 19, 2019
Minutes</p>

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

Category II Reviews
- Discussion Needed
  - NUR 420
    - Does not list any revisions required beyond the peer review. This includes the faculty revisions, which are a requirement.
      - Send back for revisions.
  - ATS 441/541
    - The course schedule was uploaded separately from the syllabus. Minimum syllabus requirements state that the schedule must be included in the syllabus.
      - Approved, with notes to the originator to add the schedule to the syllabus
  - SOC 471/571
    - The syllabus does not have course specific learning outcomes, except for one additional graduate learning outcome.
    - There is a note on how graduate students are graded differently from undergraduate students.
      - Make a note for Graduate Council to review this to make sure they are being graded appropriately.
    - Recommend that they consider adding course specific outcomes for undergraduate. students
      - Approve with recommendations
  - ANTH 447
    - The form states how the course assess and promotes critical thinking, but it is not clear on the syllabus.
      - Send back with a request to add the language about critical thinking in the form to the syllabus.
  - H 344
    - There is no required reading or day-to-day schedule.
    - There is no attempt to link the course activities to the Science, Technology and Society (STS) outcomes.
    - The syllabus still references Blackboard and the explanations in the form are very broad without focusing on the outcomes or STS requirements.
    - There is no minimum word count listed, though it does reference a minimum line requirement.
    - There are other procedural issues.
    - Overall, the course does align with the STS outcomes and requirements.
      - Send back with notes for major revisions.
  - MIME 497/498
    - Approved
    - The instructor only teaches these two courses.
    - The committee was concerned that the instructor did not have enough time to review all the papers.
      - Technical writers that evaluate student writing (averaging 40 minutes per paper)
  - PH 207
    - The reviewer is not present.
      - Review next meeting.
  - ENG 108
    - Baccalaureate Core outcomes are listed and explained in a well-organized table.
    - The syllabus is missing an explanation on how the third outcome is assessed.
    - No formal grading scale is listed in the syllabus. It is a minimum syllabus requirement.

- ▪ Missing the academic integrity link.
    - o Approve with minor revisions.
  - o NMC 421
    - ▪ The pre-requisite is a WIC course, which is limiting.
    - ▪ How they are covering history is very vague.
    - ▪ The course has an unusual grading system, broken down into decimals.
      - o Send back for revisions.
- No Discussion Needed
  - o PSY 484/584
    - ▪ Approved

Approval of New Review Form
- A new box has been added – "reason for proposal"
- The syllabus checklist is shorter and focuses more on BC requirements
  - o The committee would like to change some of the verbiage relating the mode of delivery (campus, ecampus, etc.)
- The criteria list is the same
- A new box has been added – "is this course appropriate for the category"
- Can there be a second comment box for the chairs to add comments and feedback
- Reason for Proposal box - click
- Syllabus checklist is shorter
  - o Change 'version' to location and mode of delivery
- Added some outcome check boxes
- Criteria list is the same
- Is this course appropriate for the category – added
- Can the reviewers have a second box for comments/feedback for the proposer?