Present: Alison Schmitke, Kimberly Johnson, John Gage, Frances White, Susan Lesyk, Bree Nicolello, Ian McNeely, Lee Rumbarger, Andrew Bonamici, David Hubin, Susan Anderson, Ron Bramhall, Lisa Freinkel, David Hubin, Barbara Altmann and Sue Eveland

Absent: Beata Stawarska, Bill Harbaugh, Ocean Howell, Emma Ivie, David Adams, Kelli Matthews, Tyler Barrett, Loren Kajikawa,

Guests: Dr. Jocelyn Hollander

AGENDA

1. 5/7/15 Minutes

2. Proposal for a New Minor Program
   Minor in Sociology, Department of Sociology: Dr. Jocelyn Hollander

3. Policy Implementation Update: Faculty-Student Engagement in UO Courses
   The Council will be updated regarding the Motion to Amend Policy on Faculty-Student Engagement in UO Courses (Senate Meeting Agenda, 5/20/15 http://senate.uoregon.edu/content/senate-meeting-agenda-may-20-2015).

4. Repeating Courses
   We will review and discuss the policy draft.

5. Next meeting:
   June 4, 2015
   12:30-2:00
   Lokey Education, Room 119
**Minutes:**
The Chair called the meeting to order.

**May 7, 2015 Minutes**
May 7, 2015 minutes were submitted to the council for review. The chair called for any amendments to the minutes. No amendments were brought forward.

The motion was made to accept the minutes by Bree Nicolello. John Gage seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

**Proposal for a New Minor Program:**
Minor in Sociology, Department of Sociology: Dr. Jocelyn Hollander

The sociology department had a minor many years ago, but they dropped it because they had too many students at that time. That is not the case anymore, so we are hoping to reactivate the minor. Students are asking for the minor. The minor would consist of 24 credits with 12 of those at the upper division level. One 200 level intro class is required. Student advising and oversight will be the same as for their major. Online classes will count for credit toward the minor. Because sociology classes aren’t full at the moment, the sociology department does not foresee a problem with students seeking the minor finding room in classes.

**Question and Answer**

Do you think there will be issues with advising capacity?

- No, the sociology department has the capacity to advise for the major as well as the minor.

Will students in the minor receive priority for registering for certain classes if they have a major outside of CAS?

The current policy is that students who have majors in CAS will receive registration priority within CAS classes. Minors do not receive priority if they have a major outside of CAS.

We have a big problem with this in my department. Students only know they are blocked from taking a class, they don’t know why or if they will ever be allowed. We override, but only if they ask and many students don’t know to ask.

There is a limited amount of space where we can write an error message. It has to apply to a lot of different reasons. It’s hard to write a general description about it.

Can we expand the priority to majors and minors?

Or if not that can waitlist be an option?

Unfortunately, that wouldn’t work. Here’s something that would work – You can load them all in. Preload all students who have declared, for instance, sociology, as a minor into all the classes they can be in. It overrides the major restriction.

Different question, I didn’t see here, I may have missed it. Do you have a lot of transfer courses that would apply to the minor.
12 credits must be taken in residence – they could transfer upper divisional classes from elsewhere as it doesn’t indicate one way or the other.

Some of the credits earned in residence need to be upper division. Perhaps the minor policy can read: At least 12 credits must be earned in residence and at least 8 of the upper division courses need to be in residence.

It’s good to be strategic about it- if one purpose is to raise enrollment.

As you’re thinking about this, you might want to add in online classes, especially over the summer.

- We don’t have many faculty who teach over the summer or online, but I agree that they should be included.

You should make a comment on page 2. You can’t get a major and a minor in sociology. If a student is a general social science major, a student could potentially tack on the minor without lifting a finger. It needs to codify it.

We shouldn’t hold sociology to a different standard.

We should have a standard. Other departments have operated with a standard.

We have language about double dipping in my department.

We’ve looked at what other AAUs do. Some are strict, some leave it up to the department.

You should look at the Gen Social Science – say something about what can be used in both places. My standard is 75% difference. But no one agrees with me. Two classes overlap.

We should consult with GSS – one of the other tracks in GSS is with the business major. It was a faculty discussion on what to do about the major and minor situation (and not double dipping) and that was what was important to me.

This is incredibly needed. Students take the 3PM minor because it sort of fills the need, but not really like this will.

*John Gage moved to approve the minor with the recommendations discussed. Bree Nicollello seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.*

**Policy Implementation Update: Faculty-Student Engagement in UO Courses**

The motion was drafted and given to the senate yesterday. I presented the proposal to the senate. After I presented it, an amendment was made to combine two sections of the proposal and to rescind the policy. This made me realize that there is a marketing piece involved with passing these policies.

The Committee on Courses is looking for guidance and I felt that this was a good policy that gave us that guidance. Without the policy, it will be that much more difficult to review courses, particularly online courses.

In re-crafting another policy, I think we need to leverage what’s already going on in business and in AAA.
When we recraft a policy, we should be sure to involve senators in the process.

Perhaps we should add some senators to this committee.

I don’t know if we’ll get anywhere with the governance piece. What should we do with this policy?

My interpretation was that this policy is done. We can recraft a new policy and move that forward.

I feel very passionately about this policy. I liked how we formulated this, I liked that there was an underlying principle that we were holding to. It was coming from a place of principle not a place of blame. Not just with online courses, but with new formats that we don’t fully understand. I hate to kill that strategy and that whole line of thinking.

There are all kinds of modes of delivery right now. We should pay attention to all of them. But maybe the timing just isn’t right. Maybe we should let people wrap their heads around the strategic plan.

We were putting a flag in the ground that this is what we believe pedagogically. And then that was promulgated by the senate. But now it’s been reversed.

That’s what set off my trip wire, it was going to be applied to a vast swath of classes. We need to be careful with the language of policy. I think we need to craft an approach that is very carefully wordsmith. I would be comfortable focusing with online courses. That’s the new thing and we should figure out how to deal with it.

Since you’ve heard the difficulties, would you like to take the first stab at crafting it. There is almost nothing, no policy for the committee on courses. This document, it well describes the thinking of the committee. It won’t disappear completely as it frames what we do.

I don’t know that we are sure we’re ready to start crafting again. For four credits that meet three hours. What other activities would be acceptable?

Instead of worrying too much at the specifics, we should think about the process and getting buy in. We need to get more input and feedback. We need to put it out to all the committees and groups. All departments are trying to grapple with this.

One thing that came out of strategic planning process – how do we ensure that they want to be here for four years? Bigger context with online education. We really want online education to fit into the four year experience. That bigger question needs to be answered. We can do a little more with online courses, collect syllabi. Do some of that in fall. Are there really good practices that will help us think about.

Is it too ambitious to do this by the end of fall?

I think that’s too ambitious. Considering that the council is largely turning over. Also, how do we make sure we have real buy in? As I reflect on the length of time in implementing a policy, one thought might be to be part of the task force/working group that is already considering online courses. That might be a memo from us to Doug Blandy to suggest working with that task force.

Setting Undergraduate Council Expectations:
Chair – I would like reset expectations for this council in the fall term.

The senate has the rule now that if you miss two meetings that are unexcused you’re out of the senate. That’s now being enforced. Maybe we add a similar rule.

It might increase transparency to state who’s in the room, and what the vote was. It might help our decisions carrying more weight with the senate.

One reason to clarify some of these rules, if we embark on general education reform, if we don’t have those lines of communication open, we won’t make change.

I have two action items; two memos to write. Ask Doug Blandy to include the UGC in the online task force. One to the senate about procedural concerns. For the next meeting, make some recommendations for incoming members.

**Mission Fulfillment:**

David Hubin – on another topic, I wanted to thank the council for what it did to prepare me to go to Seattle. You will see when you get to page two or three who the key people would be in consideration of our mission fulfillment project, the UGC is listed.