

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

October 10, 2005

Rowe Conference Room, Knight Library

Present:

Andrew Bonamici, Kelsea Feola, Hilary Gerdes, Peter Gilkey, Dave Hubin, Anne Laskaya, Martha Pitts, Julie Newton, Steven Pologe, Kathy Roberts, Ron Severson, Margarita Smith, Karen Sprague, Mark Thoma, Mary Ann Beecher, Kate Wagle, Heiner Linke, Glenda Utsey

Absent:

Herb Chereck, Deborah Exton, Malcolm Wilson, Wendy Mitchell

Introductions:

The Chair invited the members of the Council to introduce themselves around the table.

Minutes

The minutes of the September 26, 2005 meeting were distributed by the Chair for review.

Julie Newton moved to provisionally approve the minutes.

Ron Severson seconded the motion.

The Council voted unanimously to accept the minutes provisionally. If there are no modifications reported to the recording secretary by the end of the week, the minutes will be deemed as accepted and will be posted on the Undergraduate Council website.

Announcements:

There were no announcements.

Updates:

Updates to discussion from the previous meeting comprised the agenda.

Agenda

1) Presentation of current OUS initiatives re.: (See [UGC Chair's Report of 2004-5 UGC Business](#))

Karen Sprague presented an update of SB 342 ([Enrolled Senate Bill 342](#)) which mandates the development of a statewide articulation and transfer system.

She related that much of the discussion last year between OUS and the legislature focused on the [Oregon Transfer Module](#)

(which was modeled on the Community College AAOT transfer degree). Because of complaints to legislators re. problems with transfers, three bills were proposed that would have legislated common course numbering throughout the state. Schools recognized that this would be very problematic for institutions and proposed the Oregon Transfer Model. The OTM was accepted by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and the original common course numbering bills were transformed into the final version of SB 342, which is more appropriate (see below).

Another initiative of OUS is still currently pending, viz. the development of an inter-institutional statewide course applicability system that would enable students and advisors to query and audit credits and degree requirements online. This is the ATLAS project, which was not funded by the current legislation. There is expectation that it will be funded in the future.

The OTM is now to be implemented across the state. There are two important questions that need to be answered in order to effect the implementation: which courses are to be included in the OTM? And what is the basis for this inclusion? It has been agreed that the OTM must be based on general education courses and criteria established for those courses.

The Undergraduate Council established criteria for UO general education courses over a period of years and also conducted a review UO general education curriculum. The review highlighted strengths and weaknesses in the courses and made recommendations for changes where necessary. Most OUS institutions and some community colleges have similar criteria in place. Now the goal is to find statewide concurrence on such criteria. A proposal is currently being forwarded to create small committees to draft criteria in each OTM area (see handout). Each committee would be composed of excellent faculty (with alternates) from 4-year institutions, community colleges, and private schools.

Karen distributed copies of [Enrolled Senate Bill 342](#). She pointed out that the goals listed in Section 1. (2) of the bill are being addressed. Current discussion within OUS focuses largely on two items: Section 1.(2)(b), the development of “specific degree pathways”, and Section 1.(2)(c), the development of “an outcome-based framework for articulation and transfer”.

- **Discussion**

The Chair opened the floor to general discussion in response to Karen’s report.

- Martha Pitts explained that the creation of the “specific degree pathways” arose from the creation of the ASOT in Business, which prescribes a very

specific list of courses required for transfer from community college into a business degree program at a 4-year institution. There is a move to expand this model to other areas.

The Council generally agreed that the creation of Pathways programs was good if they were used as advising tools; however, it was not good if the Pathways programs were seen as a step to creating additional statewide degrees.

- The Council felt that an “outcome-based” framework for articulation is more difficult to apply to a broad general education curriculum that promotes the development of thinking, reasoning and analytical skills than to a technical curriculum that teaches discrete skills.
- The Council was generally troubled by the expansion of “early college programs for 11th and 12th graders”, several commenting that the products of these programs are “victimized” by “being set up for failure” when they enter the 4-year institution. There are only a very few programs that are “acceptable” because they have built-in controls and standards (e.g., A.P. and International Baccalaureate). But, by and large, high schoolers are poorly served by “college level” accelerated programs. Members of the Council strongly felt these programs do more to destroy students’ chances for academic success than enhance them.

Karen noted that she has learned that high school curriculum directors are not aware of the fact that university faculty generally disapprove of high school college credit courses. The Chair suggested that a meeting be set at a later time for discussion of the issue.

- The Chair asked if there were any actionable items that Karen could suggest in relation to her report. She said that nominations should be solicited by the Undergraduate Council and the Academic Senate for people to serve on the proposed general education criteria committees for the OTM.

2) Self-Study of Existing Degree Programs (See [Self-study format for review of existing UO degree programs](#))

Karen explained that the Self-Study of Existing Degree Programs is a pilot project. Previously, there had been a 10-year self-study cycle, but it is being revamped in this pilot. Data will be collected for individual schools and departments by central university staff (Resource Management). Departments will then use those data to analyze their own performance. It is felt that some of these collected data could also be used for the Accreditation Self-Study. Thus, in suggesting topics for the Accreditation Self-Study, the Council to have a clear idea of what kinds of data will be collected.

Action

The Chair called for volunteers from the Council membership to serve on the review committees for the departmental self-study project. Four members volunteered:

Julie Newton - Anthropology review committee

Peter Gilkey - Economics review committee

Anne Laskaya - Political Science review committee

Glenda Utsey - Sociology review committee

3) Distribution of Undergraduate Council

4) Accreditation Self-Study

The Chair proposed items that the Council might want to recommend as topics for the Accreditation Self-Study. These included: grade inflation; non-tenure track instructional faculty; First Year Programs, academic integrity issues; relations with OUS; faculty oversight of off-campus programs/internships.

Dave Hubin explained that the Self-Study committee was asking the UGC to think of general questions that might be asked that would incorporate these points. The goal is to collect the ideas and “cluster” them into broad themes, framed in questions, that would help drive self-study.

Discussion

The Council began posing possible questions to explore:

- How well do we introduce students to the institution, especially non-traditional students and transfer (transitional and international) students? How do we help them identify non-academic related resources that can ease their entrance into the university experience?
Who are we serving? Who is being helped? Who is being overlooked?

- What support resources do we provide for students coming to a large university environment from very small rural areas?

- What is the effect of Educational Technology on teaching and learning?

- What has been the impact of new programs instituted since the last accreditation?

- How do the professional programs fit into the academic environment, esp. in regard to articulation with community college programs?

- How do the professional schools and CAS interact to produce a good general education/undergraduate experience?

- How do our students get ready for employment? How do the professional schools contribute to this preparation?

- Are we maximizing opportunities for undergraduates to do real research?

- How are we keeping the curriculum current without sacrificing its traditional and effective foundations? How well are we articulating with other institutions?

- As we look at the issue of grade inflation: is this a discrete topic to be examined or is it part of a larger issue?

Dave thanked the Council for their discussion and suggested that members start considering how these questions might be “themed.” He also introduced Peter Gilkey and Karen Sprague as being additional members of the Accreditation Team for the University of Oregon.

The Chair adjourned the meeting.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 24,2005, 12:00pm at Rowe Conference Room, Knight Library.