AGENDA
Undergraduate Education Council (UEC)
Oregon State University
October 4, 2012 – 3:00 – 4:30pm
6th Floor Kerr, PCR

Present: Bill Bogley, Alfonso Bradoch, Jim Coakley, Dan Cushing, Gary Delander, Moira Dempsey, Kevin Gable, Mark Hoffman, Sunil Khanna, Jim Lundy, Rebecca Mathern, Kate Peterson, Susana Rivera-Mills, Joey Spatafora, Janine Trempey, Becky Warner.

Guests: Gary Beach, Linda Miller, Tom Watts

Absences: Bentley-Townlin, Doolen, Green, Harris (sub: Dan Cushing), Jensen, Kincanon (sub: Dempsey), Templeton (sub: Alfonso Bradoch)

1. Announcements
   a. Council charge and purpose: This is a council with no formal policy authority but substantial influence and expertise. Membership is comprised of people who see important aspects of the undergraduate experience.
   b. On-campus/e-campus learning outcomes: A question raised last year by Ed Jensen – Learning outcomes for e-campus and campus courses should be identical but the activities that achieve those outcomes will be different.
   c. December meeting conflict with Faculty Senate: Susie proposes that we wait to see if there are urgent agenda items for Dec. and if not then we will cancel the Dec. meeting.

2. Summer Session block scheduling – Jim Coakley
   UG business courses are almost all 2 hour 4 credit courses. In summer the courses are longer depending on the length of the sessions. A recent change by summer session that makes all classes start on the hour makes it more difficult to schedule these longer courses. The question is why must all classes start on the hour instead of block times. College of Science did not support the hourly schedule either. Susie believes that the justification for the hourly schedule was to help students schedule courses more efficiently. Kevin Gable asked if there is data to illustrate the problem. Multiple parts of term complicate the matter. Tom Watts says that all of these things were taken into consideration. It is hard to accommodate all those different factors. Jim says that the Registrar’s office is always very helpful. The Council would like to take another look at this structure and see if there is the possibility of further refinements to meet more colleges’ needs. Is it possible to get a data pull of what usage looks like and bring it back to this group to think about other options based on the data? It can’t be done before
Present: Susie Brubaker-Cole, Tracy Bentley-Townlin, Bill Bogley, Kevin Gable, Angela Austin Haney (For Gary DeLander), Brett Jeter, Sunil Khanna, Kerry Kincanon, Rebecca Mathern, Kate Peterson, Susana Rivera- Mills, Joey Spatafora, Lisa Templeton, Janine Trempy

Guests: Claire Cross, Xia Li, Dan Schwab, Tom Watts

1. Announcements – Proposed February Agenda items
   a. Amy McGowan will join us from INTO – to report on INTO pathway students. 5 points of data.
   b. Kris Winter – CONNECT Orientation changes update
   c. Moira Dempsey/Kate Halischak – Student Success Center building
   d. Tentative: FYE taskforce report – presented to Provost just before break. Provost would like to take it to the Faculty Senate EC before it is widely distributed.

2. Annual Course Scheduling Discussion – Rebecca Mathern and Tom Watts

   Current problem: Advisors and students have complained about the inability to plan more than one term in advance. They want to plan out their schedules in advance.

   History: Because there were so many last minute changes, the schedule would roll forward without being completed. The result was that the publication of the annual schedule of courses was not accurate (not helpful) and therefore, stopped.

   What’s possible: Create an accurate term schedule that can be rolled about one year out (just after the end of the term... winter 2013 ends and several weeks later, we display winter 2014).

   What it requires: Deadlines must be met with accurate data for students to benefit from this process. Early data would only need to include course offerings and general number of sections.

   Is it worth it? Not unless every department will commit to submitting data on time and make limited changes to the schedule.

   Challenges: Instructor availability, budget availability, changes to curriculum.

Discussion: Current data is not always correct. It is not unusual for there to be many changes. Annual scheduling could not include specific times/# of sessions, etc. MyDegrees could help to project needed courses. We should set up institutional resources to allow students to plan a year out. There needs to be
flexibility to allow for strategic interventions (such as MTH 241 last year). The registrar’s office is tracking the workload to input classes and then to go back later to add detail. A huge workload increase is not expected. Susie will seek to align course access planning with this schedule that the course access funds will be available that far out.

The UEC is in favor of converting to the annual course schedule as described above to give students accurate information for planning purposes.

3. Summer Session Block scheduling – Rebecca Mathern and Tom Watts – The issue was originally raised 3-4 years ago because of a request to offer courses on the half hour during summer. Registration data shows that students take courses both in their college and outside of their college, and the current scheduling plan facilitates this registration pattern. It was suggested that this discussion should be between the CoB and the Office of the Registrar. More information about CoB student enrollment patterns before the change should be gathered. The Registrar will follow up with the CoB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer2012</th>
<th>Count of CRNs offered</th>
<th>Sum of Credit Hours</th>
<th>Course In College</th>
<th>Bacccore</th>
<th>BaccOutsideCollege</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-CoAg</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02- CoB Pro</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03- CoEd</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04- CoE Pre</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>6438</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS- CoF</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08- CoS</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>6074</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09- Grad</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- CLA</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>5872</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- UESP</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- CoE Pro</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- CoB Pre</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>5938</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- PHHS</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6970</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24- EOAS</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td><strong>11827</strong></td>
<td><strong>41795</strong></td>
<td><strong>4777</strong></td>
<td><strong>5154</strong></td>
<td><strong>3603</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that students take courses both within their college and outside.

4. Academic Dishonesty and Student Grievances – Dan Schwab and Xia Li

1st offense is a teaching opportunity; second time student is subject to suspension.

Handout – Academic Dishonesty Statistics – more granular information is coming.

Instances involving International students are increasing – Dan’s office is working closely with INTO to address the problems.

There is an increase in reporting and there is also an increase of the instances of cheating.

Blackboard will soon be used to detect plagiarism by both instructors and students if the instructors agree.
Students feel a lot of pressure to help their fellow students.
Be careful to avoid bias when handling occurrences.
Susie distributed the OUS regulations on Student Appeals and Grievances.
IP, in conversation with colleges, has developed opportunities for students to learn about these issues:
Academic integrity workshops, meetings, U-engage classes, orientations, on-line components, a guide for students. They are asking for examples to use in their training.
Instructors may need some assistance in learning about how to address cultural differences.
Faculty and deans find it is useful to know the ways in which students cheat to help design environments that discourage cheating.
Change in code of conduct that no longer requires intentionality is helpful. The forms have also been helpful.

Next meeting: February 7, 2013
Student Academic Grievances

Challenges to academic decisions are governed by the Academic Regulations and Procedures adopted by the Faculty Senate, and published in the Schedule of Classes. Those regulations provide:

(1) Student grievances of academic matters including grades and student-instructor conflicts are appealed:

(a) To the class instructor;

(b) To the department head or chairperson;

(c) To the grievance committee of the college if the college maintains such a committee;

(d) To the dean of the college;

(e) To the Provost and Executive Vice President or designee.

(2) Student appeals regarding matters of academic dishonesty are appealed in accordance with written college procedures which must provide at a minimum for appeal to the dean, followed by appeal to the Provost and Executive Vice President. If a college does not maintain its own written appeal procedures, the steps for appeal shall be:

(a) The class instructor;

(b) The department head or chairperson;

(c) The dean of college in which the course is offered;

(d) The Provost and Executive Vice President or designee.

(3) Academic matters outside the authority and responsibility of instructors and the academic colleges are governed through University student-faculty committees. Students seeking an exception to academic regulations and requirements must petition the appropriate committee for a decision. An explanation of regulations, requirements, procedures, and the specific committee to which to direct the appeal can be obtained through the Registrar's Office, 102 Kerr Administration Building.

(a) If other pertinent information or factors become apparent after the original decision is reached, the student may appeal the decision to that committee for reconsideration by providing written documents or appearing in person;

(b) Appeals from committee except as in section (1) of this rule, are made to the Provost and Executive Vice President or designee.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 351.070
Stats. Implemented: ORS 351.070
Hist.: OSU 3-1991, f. & cert. ef. 3-6-91; OSU 2-1993, f. & cert. ef. 5-7-93; OSU 9-1996, f. & cert. ef. 8-23-96
Summer 2014. Office of the Registrar will generate data and communicate with Susie about when the topic should come back to the UEC for further discussion.

3. **Academic Advising – Gary Beach**
   The Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation is reviewing curricular policies. The policy that is being looked at today is the Academic Advising Policy because it originated here. Is the policy still current and is the wording still appropriate? Or is the policy outdated and no longer required? Gary suggested new wording for the policy to be called Academic Advising Frequency. The Academic Advising Council should vet the policy and then make a recommendation to the curriculum council. Carey Hilbert is the chair of the Advising Council.

4. **October 19 NWCCU accreditation site visit – Becky Warner and Bill Bogley**
   The schedule hasn’t been determined yet. One big challenge is to get a group of students. Rooms have been booked for the meetings. Martha Potvin, Montana, and Jane Sherman, Washington State, are the site visitors. Please keep the day relatively open to be available when the schedule is determined. This is an ad hoc visit (out-of-cycle) to ask us to respond to one of the 2 recommendations that came out of the assessment last year. The reviewers will be looking at our efforts relative to Bacc Core, graduate, and undergraduate program assessment. (Also includes Professional programs.) This is an opportunity to speak to our understanding of and commitment to program assessment. Next year is the 3rd year and a team will be coming for a site visit. Year 5 site visit has been cancelled.

5. **Topics for future meetings – Susie**
   Issues, policies, trends, reports, planning for future...

   **November:** A Draft proposal of a 4 + 1 degree program – masters’ degree directly from bachelors’ degree.

   Kris Winter from NSP&FO would like to talk about the new structure of CONNECT.

   **December:** Recommendations from the 1st year experience taskforce.

   Live-on policy for Fall 2013.

   Enrollment trends and projections

   **February:** Math new placement test piloted this year. Results will be available at the end of the term.

   Mth 111 has been redesigned.

   First year skills in Bac Core compliance rates.

   **November:** DPP students who come in as advanced sophomores without the first year skills. OUS EM meeting on Oct. 19 to discuss this issue as regards to admission requirements. Noah Buckley can speak to what they are doing to tighten up the requirements. Feedback will be needed before a final report is submitted in December.
November: How are INTO Pathway students doing? Sunil and Amy will be able to speak to this.

Acceleration of instances of academic dishonesty – Dan Schwab gave a presentation to SALT on that topic. We will invite Dan to speak to this topic.

Feedback on new Academic Success Center. – perhaps we can have one of our meetings there.

Early Warning Pilots and Freshman academic standing interventions.

To what degree are students using MyDegrees and how are students use it? What things do students think are missing? This is also related to the advising policy talked about earlier.

We should have a conversation about academic residency. We will track the timing as the policy moves through the Faculty Senate.

Next meeting: November 1, 2012; 4+1 degree draft proposal
Present: Susie Brubaker-Cole, Tracy Bentley-Townlin, Bill Bogley, Louie Bottaro, Jim Coakley, Kevin Gable, Angela Austin Haney, Mark Hoffman, Sunil Khanna, Kerry Kincanon, Jim Lundy, Rebecca Mathern, Cheryl Middleton, Randy Rosenberger, Joey Spatafora.
By Phone: Toni Doolen
Guests: Bob Gilmour, Valerie Rosenberg, Greg Friedman, Kay Sagmiller, Robin Pappas, Kris Winter

1. Announcements
   A meeting with colleges interested in piloting the program was held. The proposal for a co-degree program will soon move through Faculty Senate channels.
   The Veterans’ student working group is looking at improving how the university handles prior experience credit as a way to improve the veterans’ experience. Expect more discussion to come.

2. INTO OSU Pathway student performance data - Bob Gilmour, Sunil Khanna, Valerie Rosenberg, Greg Friedman
   Attached handout.
   - Brief historical overview of partnership
   - Terminology
   - Structure of group accountable for the Internationalization of the University
   - Reporting lines

Student Progression Data

The Academic Programs
- Pathway – a set schedule of classes (usually a 3 term program but can be continued for 4 or 5 terms)
- Conditional Admission Program – Students choose their own courses and able to S/U or withdraw
- Countries of Citizenship – The majority of INTO students are Chinese. OSU trends mimic national trends except for India, where our enrollments are lower. Recruitment efforts are being ramped up all over the world, except China. 65 $9000 scholarships are available.
- Students who don’t complete pathways in 3 terms often stumble in the preparatory language and writing classes, ALS 150 and ALS 152.
- A small % of students who complete pathways go on to other US institutions.
- GPA and retention data shows that INTO students score slightly higher than domestic undergraduates.
- There is only a slight difference between the student’s pathway GPA and the OSU cumulative GPA.
• Attempted credit hours versus earned hours by term shows very little difference between pathway students and OSU students.
• The final pages of the report give the average GPA by course for both general OSU students and pathway students. Pathway students perform very closely to general students. The data show that in math classes the pathway students score consistently higher than the OSU students. Pathway student math classes are typically smaller than the math classes that general students attend. It looks like there may some error in the reporting of GPA’s for the general population. (corrected on the attached copy)
• INTO OSU would like to have more sections 50% pathway and 50% general students. CH 222 is an example of a course where there are both.
• All of the pathway classes are taught in the INTO center.
• Progression is based on GPA and some courses have minimum acceptable thresholds.
• Math scores are a good predictor of success.
• Math 111 is the most failed course for the general population and also for pathway students.
• Most INTO students come in during Fall term, but it is important to have pathways start each term because of how long it might take students to meet the English requirements.

Think about there are other questions you’d like to have answered. It would be good to have another conversation about student experience, both academic and social experiences.

3. CONNECT/START update – Kris Winter
A 3 year extensive review process resulted in changes to the programs.
START – numbers go up every year in all FY sessions, transfer sessions, and family sessions.
Task force Recommendations:
• More intentional time for students to connect with one another
• More structured/consistent advising on Day 2
• Avoid “information overload”
Learning outcomes - After active participation in START, students will:
• START building a sense of belonging to the OSU community and an understanding of the expectations of being a college student
• START to identify OSU success networks related to academics, student involvement, and student life
• START developing skills to navigate Oregon State University
• START to strengthen connection with a major or areas of academic/professional exploration
Changes to FY START Program:
• Sessions begin earlier in the day
• Longer time in small group with START Leader
• Emphasis on Bacc Core and LGG’s
• Centralizing Day 2 Activities: Advising for 2 Programs (pilot), ID Card pick up, Parent Lounge
Changes to TR START Program:
• Parent/Family Program
• Networking opportunities peer-to-peer for specific student populations (pilot)
  o Veterans
  o Students with children
  o Older than average students
  o Out-of-state students
  o Living on campus

START Evaluation results:
• 91% FY Students & 89% Transfer Students agreed or strongly agreed that the overall organization and content of START was helpful in preparing to attend Oregon State University
• 96% FY Students & 95% Transfer Students agreed or strongly agreed that as a result of START, they feel more prepared to attend to OSU in the fall
• Favorite START activities for FY students include: registration/advising, small group time with START leader, Dixon Rec night, and tours
• Favorite START activities for Transfer students include: registration/advising, college specific events, and small group time during lunch

What START changes mean for campus
• Assessment opportunities
  o Advising – day 2
• Longer session
  o Students on campus longer
  o More traffic the day before
  o Transfer & FY mix

Every student who attends is called and asked about follow-up questions. The answers will be used to determine the types of information students are given in subsequent years. Some colleges do group advising, some do individual – there is data that could be used to determine advising satisfaction.

CONNECT recommendations – external review:
• A welcome week is important for a campus to host as students return to campus
• CONNECT is currently too long and can be condensed to four days before classes begin
• Information overload during START. Some information sharing should move to CONNECT Week to improve the timing of the delivery

Goal Statement: During CONNECT week students will begin to identify as an OSU academic scholar and an engaged community member.

Learning Outcomes: As a result of active participation in CONNECT week, students will:
• Be able to articulate academic expectations
• Set their own goals for first-year student success
- Express familiarity with the OSU LGG’s
- Converse with a member of the OSU faculty or staff
- Recognize themselves as a part of a community of scholars
- Develop a connection to fellow OSU students
- Become familiar with campus and Corvallis

**New for CONNECT:**
- Start with a big academic focus: Scholar Symposium, college events, convocation
- Theme days
- CONNECT app (available for Iphone and Droid) was launched with events and social networking opportunities. Students are still using the app.

**What CONNECT changes mean for campus:**
- More direction on when to offer events
- Fewer conduct violations
- Less days = less drain on resources and staff
- Concentrated week day move-in to housing
- Event changes

**Future focus:**
- FY task force recommendations will be folded in
- Student Affairs strategic Initiatives planning
- Refining focus on purpose of Bac Core/LGGs
- Thinking about better ways to assess START and CONNECT
- Mobile App expansion

4. **UCSEE Update – Susie Brubaker-Cole – tabled until next meeting.**

5. **FYE Task Force brief overview – Susie Brubaker-Cole, Mark Hoffman**
   Report was distributed *(attached)*
   This report outlines a vision but details are to be determined.
   Provost’s Council and Faculty Senate have been very receptive.
   New integrated organizational structure
   Residential living learning communities
   Advising – more frequent and intentional

Next meeting: March 7, 2013 - discuss FYE Report.

1. Announcements
   Welcome Christine Kelly, new assoc. dean in COE.

2. Referring students in difficulty/crisis, Student Care Team – Kris Winter, Office of the Dean of Student Life
   Kris began with an introduction to her expanded role in the Office of the Dean of Student Life.
   Kris distributed a folder with resources for consultation and referrals. She explained the roles of the
   student life assistance team, CAPs, Student Conduct & Community Standards, Student Care Team, and
   the Academic Success Center. Inside the folder is more information that might be helpful. The
   information will be kept current and there will be a link to all of the information on the Student Life
   website.
   A question was raised regarding what to do if there is an active shooter on campus, to stay in the
   classroom or to go somewhere else. Kris will find out and let us know.
   There was discussion about the timing for support for students when a student dies. Kris talked about
   the student death protocol that her office follows. She will send it out to the members of this
   committee, with the understanding that this is an internal document.
   The Dean of Students does not excuse absences. There is a template on-line that students can use to
   notify their instructors.

3. First Year Task Force discussion – Susie Brubaker-Cole
   4 members of the task force were present. The report was distributed at the last meeting.
   Mark and Susie gave an overview and discussion followed.
   4 key areas of action: 1) Academic Advising – task force recommended that students see advisors more
   frequently, and that the conversations would go beyond first-year curricular academic planning. 2) 
   Curriculum – Interest in expanding the enrollment in first-year orientation courses. There is a question
   about whether or not these courses should be required. What are the common learning
   outcomes/experiences that would be need to be built into the courses? Ideally these should happen
   during the first term. The task force also recommended creating opportunities for instructors of large
   enrollment courses to enhance or redesign them to make them more engaging and active. 3) 
   Living/Learning communities in residences will incorporate experiential learning; pilot of 2 or 3 with
   eventually 6 to 8 total. 4) Creation of a new Baccalaureate College that would be responsible for the
   stewardship of the FYE. They would be the hub for the FYE.
Time line: Provost Council and Faculty Senate Executive committee have seen the report and will be seeing the implementation plan on April 10 and April 15. After that the work will begin as an incremental 3-year implementation with everything fully in place by Fall of 2016. The live-in requirement did not come from this taskforce but dovetails the effort. Fraternities will be exempted this year and will have to buy into a plan that will allow them to continue an exemption in future years. They will have to show that they are able to provide equivalent experiences for first year students.

4. Update on UCSEE project – Susie Brubaker-Cole: deferred until next meeting.

5. Results of the math placement pilot with the ALEKS online system – Tom Dick and Keith Schloeman, Math Department
   The report is attached.
   The pilot will be repeated next year with the same group of students.
   Math placement tests are currently advisory – if we go to forced pre-requisites ALEKS will enable students to improve their scores to get into the courses they want.
   Several of our peer universities use the ALEKS.
   The cost is $25 per student. If students use it to its full potential it is worth it.
   These exams are not proctored and there is a concern about going back to un-proctored environments. ALEKS is not charging us for next year’s pilot. After that the university will absorb the cost. The second phase of the pilot is looking at implementation issues.
   The adaptive test sounds like a useful tool. It gives the student more information about what areas need improvement.

Next meeting: May 2, 2013
Minutes
Undergraduate Education Council (UEC)
Oregon State University
May 2, 2013 – 3:00 – 4:30pm
6th Floor Kerr, PCR

Susie Brubaker-Cole, Tracy Bentley-Townlin, Bill Bogley, Louie Bottaro, Jim Coakley, Penny Diebel, Toni Doolen, Dan Edge, Bob Gilmour, Mark Hoffman, Kerry Kincanon, Jim Lundy, Rebecca Mather, Cheryl Middleton, Randy Rosenberger, Joey Spatafora, Lisa Templeton, Janine Trempy, Joy Jorgensen

Guests: Marion O. Rossi, Karen Hooker, Noah Buckley

By Phone: Greg Chilcote, Marla Hacker

1. Announcements
Brenda McComb, Toni Doolen, and Susie finalized the proposal for the co-degree program. It will be moving through faculty senate channels.
Our next meeting on June 6 will be the last for this academic year. Items for discussion will include:
   a. Transfer issues – Kate Peterson & Sandy Jameson
   b. Growth at Cascades
   c. UCSEE & dashboards on key undergrad indicators
   d. Charge of UEC

2. Credit for Prior Learning discussion – Susie Brubaker-Cole, Rebecca Mather
   • Rebecca & Noah are on the OUS task force charged with considering credit for prior learning. The document was drafted by OUS and provided to the task force for review and revision. Rebecca also is a member of the HECC.
   • Concern was expressed over how assessment of student work for CPL would take place: Who will determine what kind of experiences will fall under this? Would it involve hiring more advisors? Faculty wouldn’t have time to sit down with students to assess every request for credit.
   • The faculty owns the curriculum, and they must determine credit. There would be a substantial faculty workload issue.
   • Faculty are concerned that this will shift roles from being teachers who design and deliver curriculum to being certifiers and examiners. We are not sure that is the business we want to be in.
   • There is concern that position descriptions for faculty would have to change and that people who are being hired don’t have the expertise to be evaluators of CPL.
   • There is nothing in the proposal about verifying that the student who is claiming credit is actually the person who did it.
   • This needs to be looked at in light of our broader student academic success agenda. Will students who are granted CPL be prepared to advance through sequenced courses in the OSU curriculum? Extensive
monitoring and assessment of CPL student success would be necessary, which poses yet another workload and capacity issue.

- IB, AB, CLEP, Challenge exams are already being used to grant credit for prior learning. OUS’s response to the legislature should highlight these things that we are doing and doing well.
- Military credits based on ACE standards aren’t being recognized as well as they ought to be. There is an immediate opportunity for OUS to make progress in this area.
- Before expanding CPL, we should first evaluate the readiness and success of students who come in with the types of prior learning that we already recognize.
- The current OUS draft makes no mention of international students. Would we need to also accept CPL from international programs/sources?
- Dartmouth and many other institutions has recently stopped accepting AP tests as they did in the past because they have evidence that even students with high scores are not prepared at college-level.
- Strong transferability among OUS institutions is a troublesome aspect of the current proposal. The authors may be overestimating the degree to which OUS is currently supportive of seamless transferability; adding another layer of transferability would take much more work than is assumed.
- Faculty viewed MOOCs as different from CPL awarded for portfolios or other less formal learning experiences, and they expressed an initially positive reaction to the ACE certification process, which would take a great deal of assessment burden off of local campuses. There was some support for direct articulation of MOOCs as well.
- CPL raises important issues for financial aid eligibility that don’t appear to be addressed in the OUS draft document. There was no representation from financial aid on the committee. If the CPL credits aren’t planned well it can cause problems with their aid eligibility by pushing students closer to credit limits for aid eligibility.
- If we were more transparent about offering challenge exams and encourage students to take them, we could avoid this discussion. Those types of exams are harder to develop than one might think.

Following are notes from Cascades that were sent via email after the meeting.

- MOOCs— Direct articulation agreements would be great for students that take and complete MOOCs and want to transfer the credit to OSU. Also, agreements where OSU could use the MOOC in a blended course, where the online portion is the MOOC and the f2f portion is done by an OSU professor for OSU credit.
- Credit for prior learning to meet the 40-40-20 state goals— Seems like this initiative may be a way to increase throughput by making it easier to obtain a baccalaureate.
- If credit for learning does happen, it is important that resources at the institution be allocated to do the thorough equivalency assessments. This was stated in the meeting, but we just want to support what was said.

3. Upper division requirement and transfer units – Mark Hoffman
• Lower division transfer credits were accepted to clear an upper division course in the major; later the student discovered that the credits didn’t count toward university requirement for 60 credits of upper division courses. Should a course be counted consistently as upper or lower division across the university?
• Problems arise when the terminology used to describe the course (and how it has been allow to count toward major/university requirements) is confusing.
• There are 2 possible solutions – either change the policy or improve the communication about the policy.
• Other institutions in Oregon have the same policy. Departments make the decision to accept community college courses as a waiver for an upper division course – but if it is to be counted as an upper division course the curriculum council would have to sign off on it.
• Requiring 60 credits of upper division ensures quality of instruction.
• The UEC consensus is to better communicate the policy rather than change the policy.

4. Call for future data inquiries re: INTO OSU and International Enrollments
• Are there other data points about International students that we would like to see? This would be something that we would look at next year.
• Bob Gilmour would like to have the committee consider data that is already produced.
• No additional data requests were made.

5. Non-major access to introductory courses – Susie Brubaker-Cole

A finding from the FYE taskforce was that our new students need to be encouraged to explore, and there needs to be clear pathways for exploration. Often the best way for students to explore is to take a class. There are two factors that complicate that; one is the overall lack of access and the second is introductory courses that are restricted to students in the major.

• What are the challenges of making introductory courses available to all students?
• Capacity – classes get too large when they are opened up to non-majors
• Facility issues, significant physical plant aspect, current building projects are just enough to keep up with increasing enrollments
• PHHS opens up their introductory courses to majors and students in UESP.
• It might be useful to look at specific courses that students would like to be able to get into.
• Be careful not to disadvantage students who know what they want.

6. Joint project between IS & OSU Libraries to improve student support and services – Cheryl Middleton
The library is looking to relocate student media and computer help to better serve students and free up more space for seating. Students designed the space and developed layouts. The feedback from students was favorable. The changes will be implemented for Fall 2013.

Next meeting: June 6, 2013
1. Announcements
   Today is the last meeting for this academic year. We will resume in October.

2. UCSEE transfer report – Kate Peterson, Sandy Jameson
   Distributed with agenda.
   Updates on selected recommendations:
   - There is ongoing concern about the maintenance of Academic Advising guides/articulation tables. Guides from some colleges are difficult to find. We need to make them more visible. Articulation tables are not always current or accurate. The workgroup recommends a process for at least annual review and updating. That recommendation is being worked on currently.
   - Another recommendation that is being addressed is the timeliness of articulation. Admissions has hired additional staffing but there is a need for more. There is also a push to have the process automated.
   - Recommendations that have been completed:
     - A new process to create a consistent, timely, and transparent process for students who wish to petition for acceptance of credit has been created.
     - Designing a central Web presence is 80% complete.
     - An effort to improve communication between OSU and partner institution is in progress.
     - Implement WebTreker the transfer version of MyDegrees – the original product did not work the way they needed it to, so OUS is having OSU pilot a different software that OUS is going to roll out to all OUS institutions. The pilot will be completed by the end of summer.
     - Financial Aid has pulled the data re: deadlines for transfer students and are analyzing it. They are now looking at the impact a May 1 deadline has. The hope is for a pilot next year.
- Strategic planning – dedicated FTE and transfer center recommendation was presented to Provost by Susie and is under consideration by Sabah.
  - Email Kate Peterson if you are interested in additional specific data.

3. UEC charge and standing rules discussion – Susie Brubaker-Cole
   Areas of emphasis; give advice on policy issues, sharing of practices; discuss new and emerging issues and initiatives.
   We haven’t participated in the work of implementing initiatives. This is not a workgroup, and it should not be.
   - This group brings a different perspective, an academic integrity focus.
   - The exchange of best practices has been very valuable for the colleges. We could do more of this type of thing.
   - The group seems to default to the student experience point of view. It would be good to bring in other Faculty Senate groups to learn about other aspects. This year we had the Bacc Core Committee and that was helpful.

Questions of membership - Current members include:
- Assoc or Assistant deans with purview over undergraduate education
- Registrar
- ASOSU representative
- Chair, Academic Advising Council
- President of Faculty Senate
- Athletic rep
- Libraries
- Ecampus
- Dean of student life
- APAA
- EM

Curriculum Council isn’t represented. Bill Bogley is aware of what goes through the CC and he is a member (APAA).

Considering this group in relationship to other committees, are there issues of redundancy? There is an overlap with University Assessment Council, but that has a very specific charge that is different than the UEC charge. Also there are changes that will be happening soon and we should wait to hear about them before changing anything.
Should there be representation from Experiential Education or should they be invited to present once a quarter?

4. Discussion of issues relating to growth at Cascades, Emerging issues:
   - INTO OSU is looking to establish a Pathways program at Cascades.
   - How closely do Cascades courses need to mirror courses at OSU?
   - How the programs get designed and rolled out at Cascades is a concern of the Curriculum Council. They are being urged to use the CAT 1 processes.
   - ASOSU officers are elected at OSU; student leadership at Cascades is hired. ASOSU tries to coordinate their efforts with the Cascades leaders.
   - How to prioritize Academic Affairs support resources such as CTL and DPD: do we limit access to some programs?
   - Let’s invite Cascades to a meeting early in Fall quarter. Marla Hacker is a member of UEC. We should also invite the chair of the Curriculum Council.

Topics for other groups beyond UEC
   - There is a concern about teaching load and research expectations; tenure process.
   - Grants – where do indirect costs go?
   - Accreditation and Assessments

5. UCSEE & dashboards on key undergrad indicators
   UCSEE project: To build upon the reports and recommendations of past 4 years and an inventory of progress to date. Identify outcomes and areas where further development is needed.
   - First year experience courses
   - UG research
   - Service learning
   - Int’l Education & study abroad
   - Internships
   - Advising
   - Academic Support
   - High D/W/F rate and gateway courses

IR office has been asked to pull together a set of indicators that can be used, disaggregated by demographics.