NOTE: This document contains a message from Allen Thompson, Curriculum Council co-chair, dated December 5, 2017 outlining why the SE Course Designator was not supported by the Council. The December 12, 2017 message immediately below is a response to Dr. Thompson from Yong Bakos, accompanied by a revised proposal.

From: Bakos, Yong J
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 10:16 AM
To: Thompson, Allen <Allen.Thompson@oregonstate.edu>
Cc: Bailey, John <John.Bailey@oregonstate.edu>; Witzke, Kara <Kara.Witzke@osucascades.edu>; Miller, Thomas H <Thomas.Miller@oregonstate.edu>; Nunnemaker, Vickie <vickie.nunnemaker@oregonstate.edu>; Mike Bailey <mjb@cs.oregonstate.edu>; Jensen, Carlos <Carlos.Jensen@oregonstate.edu>
Subject: Re: SE Course Designator letter

Allen,
Thank you and the FS Curriculum Council for the valuable feedback on the recent request for the SE course designator. Attached please find a revision to the request that addresses the concerns raised by members of the committee.

This version specifically adds:
- an illustration of courses to be proposed using the SE designator
- an explanation for why a combined CSSE designator is a poor choice
- an explanation of why a student cannot use existing CS/ECE courses to reach the SE outcomes
- the omission of anything related to location, including SCH credits

As I thought through this revision, re-analyzed OSU precedent, and thought deeper on the council's perspective, I think perhaps the request needs to do one thing that it currently does not: influence a change in thinking.

I can see how OSU has used new designators to categorize new courses having content that does not already exist within OSU programs. For example, we may observe how the ESE designator specifies energy systems specific courses that did not exist in the engineering programs, and how the ESE program uses these ESE courses for the major. In the case of SE courses, indeed, there are topics within the SE curriculum that do already exist within CS. But the rationale for the SE designator is not solely to create a category of new course content. Rather, it is to support an *innovation in curriculum design* that is not feasible with existing courses.

Perhaps the request should rest more firmly on that argument. However, this latest revision focuses on continuing the dialog started at the last FS Curriculum Council meeting, and addresses those concerns directly.

Thank you,
yong

Yong Joseph Bakos
Instructor, Computer Science
OSU Cascades
yong.bakos@osucascades.edu
(541) 322-2060

Dear Prof. Kara Witzke,

As you heard today, a motion before the FS Curriculum Council to approve the proposal for SE Course Designator failed.

First, key considerations that were influential against the proposal concern potential consequences arising from overlap between existing CS and ECE courses and courses that would be proposed under a new SE designator. A more clear account of the relationship between such classes would be a big help. For example, consider the issue framed this way: Can an OSU student in Corvallis complete a major with a set of existing CS and/or ECE courses that would be identical to the major in Bend accomplished by taking a set of (proposed or forthcoming) SE courses? If so, the SE designator seems redundant. Council members were concerned about what will happen to existing CS and ECE courses, specifically those including "software engineering" either in the course title or figuring prominently in the course description. Members of the Council also suggested that, to address this issue, you may consider an alternative new course designator, CSSE, as attributed to Rose-Hulman in the existing proposal.

Second, several Council members emphasized that 'location is not a reason for a different designator' but the proposal does not seem to offer more.

Third, in the same vein re: location, the Council suggested a change be made in the proposal. The fourth bullet-point under Accountability presently reads:

• Which units get credit for the SCH generated by courses in the subject code?
OSU - Cascades shall receive the SCH generated by courses in the subject code.

Council would like the answer to not specify any location. Thus, one alternative would be "SCH generated by courses in the subject code will be received by the unit offering the course."

Hope this is helpful,

Allen Thompson
Co-Chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council

Allen Thompson
Associate Professor of Philosophy
School of History, Philosophy, & Religion
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon, USA

http://people.oregonstate.edu/~thompsoa/
allen.thompson@oregonstate.edu