<div align="center">

Curriculum Council
November 26, 2013 ~ 9:00-11:00 AM
Minutes

</div>

Remote participation: D. Stroud – 541-322-3155
Voting Members Present: Paul Adams, Mike Bailey, Neil Davison, Alix Gitelman, Kate MacTavish, Prem Mathew, Richard Nafshun, Mina Ossiander, Daniel Stroud (via phone)
Ex-Officio Members Present: Stefanie Dawn – Academic Affairs; Dianna Fisher – Extended Campus
Liaison Member Present: Carey Hilbert – Academic Advising Council; Daniel Stroud

Guests: Anita Azarenko, Rebecca Mathern, Becky Warner

Credit for Prior Learning

Guests: Rebecca Mathern, Becky Warner

- [Memo from the HECC re: Credit for Prior Learning](#)
- Rebecca – Need feedback from faculty on four standards – deadline for feedback is early the week of December 16 – Mike will forward document for viewing
-
- Standard #4 – How credits for prior learning are transcripted
  - Must be noted on the transcript
  - Issues –
    - Do we want to allow credit for prior learning?
    - Do we want to allow credit for prior learning assessment to occur here? There currently is no assessment process.
    - Dianna- some ccs are accepting credit for prior learning, but it's not noted on the transcript, and we're accepting those credits – aren't we already allowing this? Rebecca – all NW Commission on Community Colleges are supposed to note on transcript.
    - Stefani – the report is going to the HECC for approval? Where does the HECC stand – do they decide to put standards into place? Can OSU ignore them? Can OSU come up with its own policies? Becky – it appears that HECC will accept the report and take it under advisement. It appears that the institutions can choose to accept these credits – it would be difficult to start down this path, and then decide to rescind accepting these credits.
    - Anita felt that we need to talk to institutions who have implemented acceptance rather than OSU starting from scratch.
    - Rebecca – there are some departments have state-wide colleagues who talk amongst themselves about course/credit issues. Assessment frequently varies, but outcomes are typically the same.
    - Carey – if OSU accepted this, do the units still have the right to deny due to accreditation standards? Rebecca – how are institutions accepting credit for prior learning – may or may not have the option to deny; however assessment at institutions may be altered by unit. OSU can override HECC and units can override OSU. Need to articulate issues to the HECC.
    - Stefani – document appears to be open-ended to allow institutions to develop own policy. OSU is being forced to do this, so needs to develop its own policy which will necessitate next steps, developing policies, etc. She noted that the time to create policies is unreasonable. Rebecca felt that OSU has standards now – helpful to decide how the policies should be broadened. If we have formalized standards, it would require a structure, possibly an office, to support faculty, require a payment component.

- Richard – departments would accept credits and student would receive OSU credit? Rebecca – OSU has challenge exams where credit is not given, and exams where credit is given – it would be noted on the transcript. Idea for awarding credit for experiential experience is for the thought process they demonstrate for the course. Richard – if students are testing out, Chemistry is missing the students' participation in class and providing a service to the community by contributing to the class. Rebecca requested Rick to articulate his thoughts into writing and send to her to be included in the feedback to HECC.
    - Neil – will we lose students if we don't do this? Rebecca felt the number of students lost would be minimal, but it is more political. Becky – felt that community colleges would push more for this; 40-40-20 is driving conversations and the pressure is on. Felt that CC needs to discuss what it means to earn an OSU degree. Implementation would require additional administration and funding to achieve.
    - Carey – if the policy was enacted, OSU could still refuse to participate. Felt that OSU is different community college requirements.

- Rebecca wants input no later than December 16.

1. **Course Designator Issues** – Stefani Dawn
   Guest: Rebecca Mathern
   - Upcoming course designator proposals (AREC/AEC and EECS) and considerations for course designators
       - Proposals in system are affiliated with EECS and one with AREC – need to respond in a timely manner.
       - SD – not clear why the unit wishes to use EECS for some courses. Courses currently in CS and EECS. Why need a course designator that could be a cross-listed course?
           - Mike – reason why EECS merged was due to commonality. IF CS is used it appears that the ?? course was taken rather than the EECS course which is broader.
           - Stefani questioned whether the unit was trying to differentiate that a course design would be used for an online version rather than on-campus version? Mike was unclear of the intent.
           - SD assumed that a current cross-listed course would become EECS.
           - Dianna noted there is no mention of OSU-Cascades.
           - SD – wants to be able to provide feedback to unit. May ask CC for feedback after completion of course designator discussion.
           - Stefani – could move proposals forward after addressing issues individually, or could send back and ask unit to do liaison – CC was in agreement of liaison. Two courses EECS 472 and ECE 572 doing a slash course cross-list together –there are issues with this process. It's unusual to combine course designators in slash courses. Dianna indicated Ecampus has cross-listed slash courses. Sarah felt that many don't understand the slash course process – perhaps the unit doesn't understand that they can create an EECS572 or doesn't want to. Mike will determine the purpose of the EECS 472 and ECE 572 slash request.
       - MOU Courses with OSU-Cascades – This would change all 84 AREC courses to AEC.

- o Stefani – there is a lot of work affiliated with changes in Registrar's and APAA offices. When a course designator is change, a student could accidentally take a course twice because they don't realize they have taken the course because the designator has changed (this affects hundreds of students each year).
  - o We either put strict restrictions on course designator changes or revise the process and possibly adopt a process that uses numbers.
  - o Need flexibility to allow units to change course designators, bur need to find a way to lessen the paperwork and process.
  - o Stefani – what should she take back to EECS and Applied Economics?
    - ▪ Mike will find out about ECE 572 and bring back to CC.
    - ▪ Stefani felt the others could be approved.
    - ▪ SD - what should her office do with these proposals, and where does the institution go from here with similar proposals?
    - ▪ Rebecca – other institution use LING for new courses until there is a critical mass of courses (this relates to DUC for Dutch)
    - ▪ What do other institutions do? RM – some institution assign the course designators rather than the unit requesting a specific designator
    - ▪ SD suggested developing several options for the Council to consider.
    - ▪
  - o WILL Return the cross-listed slash course; will consider the below requests next time and invite representatives
  - • [Proposal to convert FOR to TOL for classes at OSU-Cascades](#)
  - • [Proposal for a DCH Designator](#)
  - • [Proposal for a CAG (College of Agricultural Sciences) Designator](#)

2. **Category I Proposal**
   - • New Graduate Certificate Program Proposal – Graduate Certificate in Wildlife Management
     Graduate Council Reviewers: Paul Adams, Sue Helback
     - o [Online version](#)
     - o [PDF version](#)
   - • Paul – distributed two documents
     - o Key characteristics: 18 Credit post-grad certificate; offered solely via Ecampus; based in F&W; describe it as being fine for on-campus students who wish to add a certificate at a grad level; precedent in same department – cert in Fisheries Management; claim there is demonstrated demand based on Fisheries certi; about 3500 F&W in Oregon and 50,000 nation-ide; no additional courses needed; limited need for resources; required categories and classes are listed; 15 credit split between Science and Human Dimension and 3 credit project mentored by outside individual; target enrollment of 40 in year 5; students are currently working full-time or in another graduate program. Evaluation – letters of support and liaison look good; PSU and UO liaisons ere positive; UO raised issues of joint campus and issue of tuition waivers. Similar programs – COF has a sustainable natural resources certificate, but COF had no problem with this proposal and noted that it complements their master program. Budget appears to be optimistic regarding enrollment,

otherwise OK. 4 letters from key agencies were very supportive; no letters from private sector.
  - o There was liaison with the Graduate Council, but none with the Graduate School.

Action: DS moved to approve with contingency that we double-check to determine whether liaison needs to occur with the Graduate School; motion seconded; motion passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. Mike will confer with Anita and determine whether the GS has concerns, if so he will contact the proposer.

3. **Report from the Chair** – Mike Bailey
   - Richard presented three proposals at November FS; all passed. Mike thanked Richard for representing the CC.
   -
   - Curricular proposals on deck – reviewers needed:
     - o **Renaming an Academic Program Proposal – Pharmaceutical Sciences – MS, PhD.** #87166
       - ▪ Online version
         - Reviewer – Dianna Fisher & Kate MacTavish

     - o **New Option Proposal – Engineering Management** #87775
       - ▪ Online version
         - Reviewers; Prem Mathew and Mina Ossiander

Reviewers will advise Mike and Vickie if tey are ready for the next meeting and whether proposers should be invited.

Report from Academic Affairs – Stefani Dawn
   - Definition of types of programs
     - o Academic Unit
     - o Program Type Communication Policy
       - ▪ On-Campus Program Policy
       - ▪ Extended (Ecampus)
       - ▪ Mixed Delivery Program Policy

   - Proposed Undergraduate Program Reviews
     - Undergraduate Program Review Metrics – review the metrics and consider the following questions:
       - o Do they provide data that can be useful to the unit/program to inform them about their history, progress over time, and goals to set for the future?
       - o Do they provide data that the college and university can look at and consider how the program fits in and meets the larger institutional goals?
       (Note: I'd like the above two bullets to appear as a smaller font than the rest of the text)
   - *SD invited feedback re: UPR metrics; will be on the next agenda.*
   - *SD has finalized needs for new CPS and catalog system – will distribute list and discuss with CC at the next meeting.*
   -

Pending Issues:
  - Category I proposals eventually need to include mention of assessment and learning outcomes (includes Ecampus memos)? CC to discuss
  - Review guidelines for Category II proposals

[Curriculum Council Resource Materials](#)
[Online Curricular Proposal System (CPS)](#)