

Undergraduate Council

October 17, 2000

Minutes of Meeting

Attending: F. Chadwell, H. Chereck, M. Fishlen, H. Gerdes, W. Gottshall, C. Hickman,

R. Koch, J. Nicols, K.J. Park, S. Ponder, S. Pratt, K. Roberts, M. Smith,

K. Sprague, R. Zimmerman

Absent: P. Engelking, A. Leavitt, W. Mitchell, G. Utsey

General Education/Group Satisfying Courses

J.Nicols distributed a list of arguments for and against Motion 1 (which was distributed at the last meeting). He brought attention to number 2. under “Pro” recognizing Marliss Strange’s proposal that if a course loses its group status and then is reinstated, it should receive a new number. H.Chereck objected to this stating that this would create problems because some of the courses have general course numbers that are used throughout the state. In addition, some courses may be part of a sequence. The courses may not be group satisfying but they do have a commonality, and this matter should be investigated more before a decision is made. Also, he was worried about students and advisors regarding the 7-year effectiveness and the problems created by the change in number.

K.Sprague asked if there was any way the Progress Report would indicate that the status of a course has changed, but Chereck noted that there is no automated way to do this. Another suggestion was to have a list of courses that were removed in the time schedule (i.e., an addendum). Chereck’s main objection was students do not look at the list of courses that do satisfy the requirement; how are we going to get them to look at the courses that do not satisfy the requirement? Another problem is if the course is assigned a new number, the title must change.

Nicols noted that solutions were:

- 1) add a supplementary list to the time schedule of courses removed
- 2) have the signs removed
- 3) change the course title or number

He asked that Chereck, Gerdes, and Marliiss Strange discuss the problem and try to come up with a solution by the next UC meeting (Oct. 31).

Nicols then moved on to Motion 2—courses in a major cannot count as group satisfying. R.Zimmerman asked that number 2 under Contra be addressed. KJ Park indicated that using majors as a criteria presents problems as some students declare a major, then change majors to take the class, then change back again. He suggested a penalty for changing majors and noted that it is very easy to change majors at the UO. But it was unknown how widespread the problem is throughout campus. Another problem is with students who have double majors. Double majors are encouraged, especially in the Humanities. Would this cause them to take more classes? Nicols indicated that this would be an exception. R.Zimmerman indicated again that students do change majors, and this process would penalize too many students.

Nicols noted that this is a major problem in Music and Education. M.Fishlen noted that some departments list recommended courses from other departments that support their major. This is an advising issue, but students may change their minds after advising. A suggestion was made that a study of the catalog be done to see where the matter is being abused and to “unofficially” inform the departments that are the abusers.

Chereck noted that this process would force students in their senior year to take lower division courses and take away elective. K. Sprague suggested that for students who complete their requirements in the early years and then change majors, this rule should not apply to them. Chereck suggested that putting the onus on individual departments and advisors and not automating the process is the only way to go. This is not a problem with Journalism and Business as they stipulate courses their majors have to take. R.Koch noted that Math majors are taking courses outside, and he was not clear as to the significance of the problem.

Nicols observed that there was not much support for this motion, and the responsibility should be on the department and advisors. K. Sprague said that advising would be getting better. Nicols will review the minutes and review the options and motions originally set forth.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 am

Next meeting: October 31, 9:00 am, Rogue Room

Minutes submitted by Carol White