

## **Agenda**

### **1) Presentation of current OUS initiatives re.: curriculum (Attach A)**

- a. Karen Sprague presented an update of SB 342 which mandates the development of a statewide articulation and transfer system.

She related that much of the discussion last year between OUS and the legislature focused on the Oregon Transfer Module (which was modeled on the Community College AAOT transfer degree). Because of complaints to legislators re. problems with transfers, three bills were proposed that would have legislated common course numbering throughout the state. Schools recognized that this would be very problematic for institutions and proposed the Oregon Transfer Model. The OTM was accepted by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and the original common course numbering bills were transformed into the final version of SB 342, which is more appropriate (see below).

Another initiative of OUS is still currently pending, viz. the development of an inter-institutional statewide course applicability system that would enable students and advisors to query and audit credits and degree requirements online. This is the ATLAS project, which was not funded by the current legislation. There is expectation that it will be funded in the future.

The OTM is now to be implemented across the state. There are two important questions that need to be answered in order to effect the implementation: which courses are to be included in the OTM? And what is the basis for this inclusion? It has been agreed that the OTM must be based on general education courses and criteria established for those courses.

The Undergraduate Council established criteria for UO general education courses over a period of years and also conducted a review UO general education curriculum. The review highlighted strengths and weaknesses in the courses and made recommendations for changes where necessary. Most OUS institutions and some community colleges have similar criteria in place. Now the goal is to find statewide concurrence on such criteria. A proposal is currently being forwarded to create small committees to draft criteria in each OTM area (see handout). Each committee would be composed of excellent faculty (with alternates) from 4-year institutions, community colleges, and private schools.

### **2) Self-Study of Existing Degree Programs**

Karen explained that the Self-Study of Existing Degree Programs is a pilot project. Previously, there had been a 10-year self-study cycle, but it is being revamped in this pilot. Data will be collected for individual schools and departments by central university staff (Resource Management). Departments will then use those data to analyze their own performance. It is felt that some of these collected data could also be used for the Accreditation Self-Study. Thus, in suggesting topics for the Accreditation Self-Study, the Council to have a clear idea of what kinds of data will be collected.

### **3) Distribution of Undergraduate Council 2004-2005 Annual Report to Senate (Attach C)**

### **4) Accreditation Self-Study**

The Chair proposed items that the Council might want to recommend as topics for the Accreditation Self-Study. These included: grade inflation; non-tenure track instructional faculty; First Year Programs, academic integrity issues; relations with OUS; faculty oversight of off-campus programs/internships.

Dave Hubin explained that the Self-Study committee was asking the UGC to think of general questions that might be asked that would incorporate these points. The goal is to collect the ideas and “cluster” them into broad themes, framed in questions, that would help drive self-study.