

Undergraduate Council Meeting

October 13, 2004

Members present: Ron Severson, Karen Sprague, Mark Thoma, Emily Gilkey, Dave Hubin, Deborah Exton, Hilary Gerdes, Anne Laskaya, Tyler Neely, Julie Newton, Steven Pologe, Kathy Roberts, Laura Vandenburg

Members absent: Herb Chereck, Martha Pitts, Peter Gilkey, Deborah Baumgold, Colleen Bell

Two issues were on the agenda for discussion and action:

1. Proposal to change the name of the Multi Media Design Program to Digital Arts,
2. Continued discussion of the General Education Transfer Module.

PROGRAM NAME CHANGE

A proposal from Kate Wagle with a letter of support from Dean Robert Melnick was presented regarding changing the name of the Multi Media Design Program to Digital Arts. It was felt the new name would better characterize the content of the program and was more consistent with the general fine arts program. Questions raised from a recent accreditation visit indicated that Multi Media Design was a misleading title for the program and a name change was recommended. It was felt that Digital Arts was a more appropriate name.

A motion to approve was presented and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

GENERAL EDUCATION ONE YEAR TRANSFER MODULE

Continuing the discussion from last academic year the council was asked to raise questions, concerns and suggestions regarding the proposed transfer module. Karen Sprague reported on her presentation of the module at a Town Hall meeting that was received with generally positive response by the 150 people in attendance. The model Karen presented was a slightly varied version which included a clarification of the credit issue. Discussion topics posed by the council follow:

Concerns and Questions:

- How will the Transfer Module affect general education? Will it weaken the program that is in place at the UO? In general, council members felt it was

important that the module, as currently proposed, allows room for individual institutions to require additional general education coursework.

- Will it mean more labor for the faculty? In general, council members recognized that the current proposal creates no new faculty committees and that any additional inter-institutional conversations which arise related to the proposal could be very constructive.
- Will it dissuade students from taking electives? It is true that the Module does not include much room for electives, but students would have a great deal of choice in selecting the courses that introduce them to the 3 disciplinary areas.
- How will additional and needed advising for students to avoid potential problems or confusion be provided? Strong support was voiced for developing better web and data systems to help students and advisors quickly determine which courses they would need to take to complete graduation requirements if they transferred from one institution to another.
- Are there issues that the UO would have to face if/when this passes? Council members gave the example that the UO would want to maintain its current process for counting language credits either for the BA requirements or for arts and letters but not for both.
- How would AP course scores be interpreted with this module? Support was voiced to initiate statewide conversations about what kinds of course exemptions are given for various scores on AP exams to gain more consistency across institutions.
- Will there be alternative ways of fulfilling the requirements other than at the community college level? Members noted that “College High” credits would be included because, at present, they are indistinguishable on transcripts from credits earned on a college campus. Council members recognized the importance of statewide conversations about the origin of credits and the need for greater transparency on transcripts.
- Should a threshold of proficiency be required? How would a student demonstrate basic proficiencies?
- How will credits earned outside the state –particularly through on-line or distance courses—be counted? Council members favored ensuring that credits toward the Module be from regionally accredited institutions, only.
- Will we see fewer students taking lower division courses at UO? The effect at the lower division isn’t predictable. The Module might encourage students to transfer earlier – and thus take more lower-division course work at UO.

- Will there be a “ripple effect” in the upper division courses, as students who enter with a lack of foundational skills attempt to catch up?
- Community colleges do not currently have a way to log educational success, other than AA/OT completion. The Module provides a new completion point that can be counted. How will this be done?
- There is no UO course that would meet the oral communication requirement of the module. How will that be handled? Members agreed that UO students wishing to complete the module could take the oral communication course at LCC.
- Can the module, as it applies to UO, be titled, “UO Certified Transfer Module”?

Suggested clarifications:

- Module should state that credits must be from “regionally accredited” community colleges/institutions.
- With the exception of electives, all Module courses should be 3 or more credits. [Note: 5-credit courses are possible. OIT has some.]
- Stipulate the criteria for a passing grade under a P/NP option as C- or better.
- Each campus will need to develop an advising document to clearly specify what coursework beyond the Module will be needed to complete a student’s General Education at that institution.
- Institutions would have an interest in knowing from which other institution credits come. Perhaps transcripts could denote the origin of credits (i.e., community college, college high or AP classes.)
- For students who transfer to the UO, second year foreign languages, if taken at a community college, could count either toward the Arts and Letters requirement or toward a BA. Students would choose how their foreign language courses would be credited.
- There is a need to articulate the problems the module will solve and to clarify its benefits to students.
- It was suggested that the notes that are now at the end of the proposal be included as an integral part of it to help with interpretation.

Final Comments:

The committee was asked to continue to think of other changes or suggestions. It was also felt that each campus should develop advising documents that clearly specify what a student will need to fulfill the module requirements, and the state should develop a degree audit/course applicability system to support advising for students intending to transfer. Advising and database issues will be addressed at the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING

October 27, 2004, 3:30 – 5:00pm in the Johnson Hall conference room.