

# **Undergraduate Council Meeting**

**October 27, 2004**

**Members present:** Ron Severson, Karen Sprague, Peter Gilkey, Martha Pitts, Mark Thoma, Emily Gilkey, Herb Chereck, Anne Laskaya, Tyler Neeley, Deborah Baumgold, Deborah Exton, Colleen Bell, Julie Newton, Steven Pologe, Kathy Roberts, Laura Vandenburgh, Amalia Gladhart

**Guests:** Wendy Mitchell, Jeanne Coe

**Members absent:** Hilary Gerdes, Dave Hubin

## **General Education One Year Transfer Module**

Peter Gilkey reported on his Town Hall presentations to 6 out of 7 OUS campuses he has visited as president of the IFS. He is soliciting letters and documents from all constituents and getting a good response. He stated that each institution will have its own requirements. OIT, for example, will have more math and science credits required because of the focus of the institution.

Listed as crucial from all institutions has been the need for in-depth and consistent advising for the students in this program.

The summit meeting for this proposal is scheduled for November 19, 2004. After this meeting, if closure has been met, the proposal will go back to each institution for their vote.

## **Degree Audit System Proposal**

Jeanne Coe, assistant director of undergraduate programs in the Lundquist College of Business, presented a draft proposal for council discussion. The proposal recommends the creation of a linked degree audit system that would enable 2-year and 4-year institutions to effectively advise transfer students. Currently, LCB is looking at a system called CAS (Course Applicability System), for which Portland State is a pilot site. CAS offers a web-based, linked system to OUS campuses and community colleges that would allow students to compare their course work (completed or contemplated) to degree requirements of any major at any state institution. It would allow students and advisors to see instantly what has been completed and what still needs to be done toward students' degree requirements at any receiving institution. It facilitates effective communication among different kinds of schools, as well. Individual schools would be responsible for keeping their information current so students would always have accurate information.

It was stressed that advising will define the success of the transfer module for students. Much concern was voiced that the central K-12 student data warehouse system that is

currently envisioned would not provide the necessary institutional linkage and technological support for effective use of the Transfer Module.

A small-scale pilot study for a linked degree audit system such as CAS was proposed.

Because the pilot could take 3-5 years it was urged to start soon. In general, the Council urged implementation of and funding for a pilot program involving a few institutions where the DARS system is currently in place.

The Council wondered how this proposal fits in with More, Better, Faster and noted that it fits logically with the Transfer Module. Has the Provosts Council considered a statewide degree audit system? Support from the OUS Provosts would help the pilot take shape. It was also suggested that the degree audit proposal be included in Peter Gilkey's collection of comments from the current campus discussions of the Transfer Module.

## **Internal UO Issues Related to the Transfer Module**

The meeting ended with a short discussion of some of the internal issues the UO will face if the general education module, as currently configured, is adopted by the state. The following issues were identified:

- 1) The UO will need to determine what to do about its rule against “double dipping”—using language courses for both general education requirements and for BA requirements or, equivalently, using math courses for both general education requirements and for BS requirements.
- 2) The UO will want to engage in conversations about what particular AP scores mean in terms of the number and kinds of credits they earn, and about making the origins of credits more transparent on transcripts.
- 3) In cases where credits transfer as part of this transfer module but do not meet General Education requirements for native UO students, the UO may want to discuss whether or not such credits should be counted the same way for all students.
- 4) The UO may want to engage in conversations about what to do if a course exists as part of the transfer module from the sending institution but is not offered at the receiving institution. How would the credits transfer in such cases?
- 5) The UO may need to consider how the transfer module affects the current policy that students may count only one course within their major toward general education credit. What happens if students transfer a series of courses within a particular major as part of the module?

The council agreed that it is important to track such issues and that other issues may arise in the future. These can be discussed in more depth by the council when the proposal returns to individual campuses next term.

**Next meeting:** November 10, 2004, Johnson Hall Conference Room

Undergraduate Council, 5256 University of Oregon • (541) 346-1221 • Last Update: November 15, 2004