

UNDERGRADUTE COUNCIL MEETING

September 29, 2004

Members present: Ron Severson, Peter Gilkey, Colleen Bell, Kathie Roberts, Laura Vandenburgh, Tyler Neely, Emily Gilkey, Deborah Exton, Herb, Chereck, Hilary Gerdes, Anne Laskaya, Mark Thoma, Deborah, Baumgold, Karen Sprague, Steve Pology, Martha Pitts, Julie Newton, Dave Hubin

Members absent: none

Introductions

Ron Severson, Chair, began the meeting with introductions of new and continuing council members. Three Undergraduate Council lists were distributed with contact and membership information.

Outlook for This Year

The Undergraduate Council reviewed the 100-level, 200-level, and upper-division group-satisfying general education courses for approximately two years, and the review is now complete. Several new topics for discussion by the council were suggested:

- Find additional ways of measuring student progress short of a degree
- Review the academic dishonesty policies
- Address the issue of grade inflation

All council members, student members included, are encouraged to bring topics of concern to be discussed at future meetings.

Incomplete Motion

(See [Proposal to Change University Policy for "Incomplete" Mark for Undergraduates](#))

The Incomplete Motion draft crafted by the Undergraduate Council in the spring was distributed to Council members for further review. The following changes were suggested:

- Change Winter 2004 to Winter 2005.
- Move the 'extraordinary circumstances' language at the bottom of the draft to make a point #3.

The Incomplete policy with final revisions follows:

September 29, 2004

Motion

We propose the following change in University policy governing the mark of Incomplete for undergraduates.

- 1. Marks of "I" awarded to undergraduate students Winter 2005 and beyond must be removed within one calendar year of the end of the term in which the course was taken. Failure to complete the course by the deadline will result in the mark of "I" automatically changing to a grade of "F" or "N."*
- 2. Marks of "I" for undergraduate students who are graduating must be removed no later than 30 days after the degree is awarded. Failure to complete the course by the 30-day deadline will result in the mark of "I" automatically changing to a grade of "F" or "N."*
- 3. In cases where a student's inability to complete the work by the deadline is due to extraordinary circumstances* the student may choose to:*
 - Petition the Scholastic Review Committee to be allowed to withdraw from the class (change the 'I' or 'F' to a 'W').*
 - Contact the Office of Academic Advising or the Office of the Registrar who will review extraordinary circumstances and take appropriate action as defined by the Academic Requirements Committee.*

**examples: catastrophic injury or illness or severe cognitive or psychological limitations preventing completion of work*

Background to the Motion

Current Policy: "I" is an instructor-initiated mark. A mark of "I" may be reported only when the quality of work is satisfactory but a minor though essential requirement of the course has not been completed for reasons acceptable to the instructor. To remove an incomplete, an undergraduate student must complete the required work within the next four terms of residence at the university or, if absent from campus, no later than three calendar years after the incomplete was awarded, or at such earlier date as the instructor, dean, or department head specifies. The current policy has been in effect since March 1978.

A recent survey of AAU institutions indicated that:

- The vast majority of AAU universities impose a deadline for removal of incompletes.*
- Most AAU universities have a much shorter period for making up the incomplete than does UO, from four weeks to one semester.*
- Most AAU universities change marks of "I" to grades of "F" after that period.*

The proposed policy states a maximum period of time for resolution of "I"s. It does not alter the authority (under the present policy) of an instructor, dean, or department head to set a shorter period.

Approved by the Undergraduate Council – September 29, 2004

The Council voted unanimously to accept the Incomplete Policy motion. The motion will next move to the Senate for consideration. It was noted that faculty and students need to be notified before the change occurs.

Latin Honors

Herb Chereck distributed examples of the diploma with the Latin Honors sticker currently given to graduating students. There are frequently problems with the sticker not adhering to the certificate in the mail. If the Council supports the change from the sticker to the printed words: *cum laude*, *magna cum laude*, or *summa cum laude*, on the certificate, Herb will obtain bids from vendors.

The Council voted unanimously that Latin Honors be changed on the diploma from a sticker to the printed words.

Joint Boards Articulation Commission

The chair provided a general introduction to the Joint Boards Articulation Committee (JBAC) proposal:

- The transferable general education module is a subset of general education requirements.
- The timeline is short: a UO Town Hall Meeting is scheduled for October 6, 2004 at 3:00 in 177 Lawrence, feedback from this and other college and university meetings throughout the state needs to be delivered to Peter Gilkey by mid November, the proposal needs to be completed before the State Legislature convenes in January, 2005, and implementation of a transferable module is scheduled for fall of 2005.

Karen Sprague presented PowerPoint slides covering key aspects of the JBAC proposal:

- The proposal is motivated by a feeling that transferring from a two-year to a four-year college is a problem. Even if there is no problem, the state expects a useful response. JBAC is discussing articulation from a 2 year to a four-year college and is developing a transfer module.
- The key features of the General Education Transfer Module are:
 1. Can be completed in one academic year
 2. Includes a subset of typical general education course work

3. Is transferable among public colleges and universities within Oregon.
4. Relies on courses that faculty on each campus have already designed for general education.
5. Does not replace effective academic advising.

- Transfer Module vs. Existing Transferable Degree:

1. AA/OT is designed as a two-year transfer module; this would be a one-year transfer module.
2. AA/OT is defined in credits not courses and AA/OT includes electives.
3. Transfer Module defined in credits or courses and has no required electives.
4. Courses are guaranteed transferable if AA/OT is completed.

Peter Gilkey is traveling to each Oregon campus to present this proposal and is looking for faculty ideas and revisions. Revisions of the proposal must be completed before the next State legislative session meets.

The following points and questions were discussed:

- Why are three general education courses required and not two?

Response: There was a two-course model proposed earlier in the summer. The problem was that there were not enough total credits. It works well to have 45 credits, which equals one year. A compromise would be to add electives instead of the third general education course to come up to 45 credits.

- Would the transfer module allow double dipping – that is, use of Foreign Language courses for Arts and Letters credit, as well as fulfillment of BA course requirements, and the corresponding double use of Mathematics courses for Science and BS credit?
- When does the transfer module or AA/OT end? Will there be one, two and three-year transfer degrees?
- In the future, we need to continue review of the general education courses (like last year). Possibly, this proposal would encourage more statewide conversations about acceptable courses.

- Some questioned whether this might lead to standardization; others saw it as a way to prevent greater standardization. The Ohio model is a good model. The Ohio group occasionally turns a course down, and conversations about the characteristics of acceptable courses are credited with raising the level of course content throughout the state.
- To make the transfer module work, we may have to revise our UO procedure of counting credits. OIT counts courses not credits.
- It is beneficial to Community Colleges to report that a student is a completer, and the Module would mark a new completion point.
- There are benefits with the transfer module because students may come to the academic advising area earlier.
- Most students cannot complete the transfer module in one year and don't complete the AA/OT in two years, but completion of this module in a year is possible.
- Partly, the proposal presents a new package—more of a structure for transferring courses in a block. This could reduce concerns about transferability of individual courses and ease the transition for transfer students.
- Could students enroll dually at Lane and the UO and complete the module at Lane. Might students choose LCC because of the money if the UO moves to count courses and not credits?
- Would the proposal impact “swirling?”
- Do any perceived problems with the College High program relate to this proposal?
- The UO does not offer an oral communication course, so UO students who wanted to complete the module would need to take this course at LCC.

Closing Remarks

Donna Schimmer was recognized for her years of service to the Undergraduate Council now that she has accepted a new position with Financial Aid.

Next Meeting

Council members were asked to review the proposal for the Multimedia Design name change, which will be discussed at the next meeting on October 13, 2004, in Johnson Hall conference room at 3:30. Council members were also asked to bring suggestions and revisions for the continued discussion of the General Education Transfer Module.