

## UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes of November 15, 2001

### **Members present:**

John Nicols, Herb Chereck, Hilary Gerdes, Gail Unruh, John Postlethwaite, K.J. Park, Paul Engelking, Bob Zimmerman, Priscilla Southwell, Kate Kranzush, Wendy Roberts, Steve Ponder, Amanda Stocker and Faye Chadwell

### **Members absent:**

Scott Pratt, Wayne Gotshall, Craig Hickman, Anne Leavitt, Kathy Roberts, Marian Smith, and Karen Sprague

### **Guests:**

Marilyn Linton (substituting for Karen Sprague), and Sue Eveland

### **Meeting began at 8:08**

### **Day and Time Change**

It has been approved that the Undergraduate Council meetings for the Winter term will move to every other Tuesday from 8:30 to 9:30. There will be an option for the meeting to extend to 9:50 if there is a need for further discussion.

### **Online Grading**

Sue Eveland, the Associate Registrar, presented the three step online grading system:

1. Log in to Duck Web with your user ID and PAC number.
2. Click on faculty menu then select grade roster. Select term, select course, and enter grades.
3. Select submit completed roster, check the check box and select submit.

The rosters with grades will be available on the web for 4 terms to the faculty. The information will be stored forever with the registrar's office. Faculty without adequate computer access should contact either their departments or the registrar's office. Departmental grade sheets are available on the web November 29. Grades are due on Tuesday, December 11, by 12:00 noon. Two fliers have already been sent by the registrar's office to each faculty regarding online grading. An information fact sheet regarding frequently asked questions will be sent out shortly.

### **Three hour/Four credit Issue**

Paul Engelking distributed the sub-committee's work regarding the three-hour/four credit issue. Proposal 0 is John Nichol's original document. Proposal 1 is John's document marked up to match existing policy. Proposal 2 specifies a method of monitoring. Proposal 3 focuses on student workload management as a primary goal of accurate crediting.

[Link to Proposals](#)

## **Review and Monitoring Process**

Paul Engelking commented on a recommendation from the dean's office for more frequent program review. At the present time, curricular reviews occurred infrequently (approximately every ten years). The imprimatur of the review body would encourage all departments and faculty to come into compliance with the policies on credit hours. It would be the responsibility of the departments to create methods to review the courses and report on them to the committee. Each department should develop criteria, expectations and policies to monitor and review the additional outside work that is expected for the fourth credit hour.

At present, the process for monitoring the additional outside work varies for each department. There is also the additional expectation of faculty/student contact for the fourth credit hour and not just a paper or reading assignment. The focus is on how the work is being monitored, not on an accounting for hours of work out of class, since it takes students differing amounts of time to do homework.

John requested that the sub-committee reduce their proposals to one page. Departments need to come up with an articulated policy, but the committee should give the departments guidance on the process, including a mechanism to review courses.

By the first of the year, the committee should investigate what each department currently uses to monitor the four credit classes that meet for three hours. Those committee members are: Wendy Mitchell, Kathy Roberts, Stephen Ponder, Craig Hickman, Priscilla Southwell and John Nicols.

## **Oversight Committee**

In the four proposals, Herb Chereck does not see any reporting expectations. He sees a need for an Oversight Committee that would be responsible for reviewing a departmental year-end report. At the end of the year, each department should present a summary of the courses taught during the year, with an explanation of the workload for three contact-hour, four credit courses. These reports should be kept in a central repository, so that the committees writing the accreditation reports would have access to them. Priscilla Southwell would like to see each departmental report include all of the four credit courses that meet for three hours, whether upper or lower division, and an accounting of the expectations for the fourth contact hour. John proposes a specific and concise justification for this report to departments. Department accountability, accreditation

review, OUS review, and State Legislature review are all justification points. In the Course Review Committee, Gail Unruh reports that faculty review of a 3-credit course at OSU is seen as identical to the four-credit counterpart at the U of O. John will contact department heads to advise them of these proposals so that they can inform College Advisory Councils.

## **Summary**

The Proposal document submitted to the council today by the sub-committee will be revised. Paul Engelking, Priscilla Southwell, Gail Unruh and Kate Kranzush will reduce and clarify the original document and present it at the next council meeting on November 29.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:15**

[Link to proposals](#) *Minutes by Donna Schimmer*