

Curriculum Council

November 18, 2016

Minutes

Voting members present: John Bailey, Allison Dorko, Michael Harte, Sue Helback, Mina Ossiander, Jeff Reimer, John Schuna, Allen Thompson

Voting members absent: Joan Gross, Prem Mathew, Tom Miller, Richard Nafshun, John Schlipf, Michele Swift, Ann Zweber

Ex-officio members present: Academic Affairs – Gary Beach, Extended Campus – Alfonso Bradoch, Graduate School – Stephanie Bernell, Registrar's Office – Rebecca Mathern, University Libraries – Anne-Marie Deitering

Liaison member present: OSU Cascades – Marla Hacker (via phone)

Undergraduate Program Review: Natural Resources Action Plan –

Curriculum Council Reviewers: Michael Harte, Daniel Stroud

- [Reviewer Report](#)
 - [Unit Response to Review Report](#)
 - [Action Plan](#)
-
- Daniel noted there are a number of components per recommendation. For some, the unit thanked the reviewers for the recommendation, but declined to take action. It's a complex program.
 - Michael observed that Natural Resources is delivered at Corvallis, Bend, Eastern Oregon University and via Ecampus, and are run as separate programs. It was previously an interdisciplinary program, but is now run through Forestry. Perhaps the review committee didn't understand the Natural Resources program since the reviewers were from Environmental Sciences. What happens to courses taught by other units? How should the program be packaged? Because there wasn't a dedicated tenured faculty member who has oversight of the program, this was a recommendation. Michael had no concerns with the unit responses.
 - Was the unit given priorities? Michael responded that the recommendations were prioritized. In the Action Plan, the responses raised issues related to former interdisciplinary issues that are now college-centric. For recommendations that the unit is not planning to implement, they provided clarification of why they're not implementing the recommendations.
 - One questioned whether the Curriculum Council should indicate that the recommendations are not satisfactorily addressed. Michael noted that some are operational decisions by the unit; they addressed the spirit of the recommendation – the unit may not have embraced the recommendations as noted, but did address them in different ways.
 - There was discussion, in particular, regarding the recommendation to have a 1.0 FTE academic faculty director of the program. There is .75 FTE for a professional faculty member as the program coordinator who handles administrative work that would otherwise be handled by the unit head. The unit head will continue as the program director, although she has no dedicated FTE assigned to Natural Resources.
 - One member felt that there is some confusion, (i.e., offering two similar degrees with two different titles – Environmental Sciences & Natural Resources; curriculum subject matter, etc.).
 - One member felt that the Curriculum Council doesn't embrace the voting members' privilege and responsibility. If the Council isn't satisfied with the responses, it's the right and responsibility of the Council to push back and identify why they're not satisfied; they don't believe that the Curriculum Council feels empowered.
 - Regarding resources, "We're doing the best we can with the resources we have." The Council has no authority to ask administration to seriously take note of the resources issue.
 - In regard to governance & budget model issues, reviews are supposed to help address issues. The program could overlap with Environmental Sciences in areas of marketing, etc. Additionally, one member felt that the response that OSU Cascades addressed the

issues raised serious issues regarding disparate workload issues and function of the 1.5 FTE, as well as demands on time and funding.

- Michael questioned how the same program can be offered across three locations.
- Daniel noted that it's been nearly a three-year process to determine the position description, and what the faculty member actually does. One recommendation was for experiential learning; it doesn't seem feasible to do with the number of students – it's an investment.
- One asked, what is the problem? There is competition between programs; programs must be distinct. How can the programs be different and yet be appropriately reflected in the learning outcomes? Having clear and identifiable outcomes communicates the differences to stakeholders, students, employers, etc.; it's not currently clear.

Action: Michael Harte, John Bailey and Daniel Stroud will draft a Curriculum Council response to the Action Plan related to the 3-4 main points; the Curriculum Council will review and discuss the draft at an upcoming meeting.

Curricular Proposals

- [New Degree Program Proposal – Master of Adapted Physical Education \(MAPE\)](#) Reviewers: Allison Dorko, Sue Helback
- Money is earmarked in the budget and tied to the current college budget – there are no additional costs. The unit will retain the Adaptive Physical Activities option; three of the courses are in another program. Regarding MAPE as an existing degree – it doesn't exist anywhere else; it's being proposed to distinguish their program.
 - Q: Is developing new degree types the way to go, or should the Curriculum Council help them find other solutions? A: Regarding the Master of Athletic Training (MATRN), it may be problematic to recruit students as there appears to be a problem with the program layout.
 - Q: Should there be an option in Physical Education? A: It wouldn't be transcript visible.
- A question for the Graduate School was whether a program can make up its own degree type. Stephanie didn't know whether this could occur, typically they're within a field; she will determine the answer from someone in the Graduate School. Stephanie did note that the Graduate School was not a liaison on this proposal, but would like to be a liaison on all graduate programs. Gary noted that Jennifer Dennis, Graduate School Dean, participated in the Academic Program meeting and had an opportunity to comment. Stephanie explained that Jennifer wants the Graduate School to be included in the approval process for all graduate programs.

Action: Stephanie and Gary will discuss this issue offline.

- Allison noted that she has a degree in Kinesiology and Public Health – could there be a Master's in both? Rebecca responded there is only one degree that falls outside the Master's degrees.

Actions:

- *Table proposal to determine clarity. Why is an option not connected to a degree? Specific outcomes are needed for the MAPE degree. Stephanie will email Megan McDonald to determine responses for some of the concerns.*
- *Invite Heidi Wegis and Megan McDonald to meet with the Council after a response is received from the Graduate School.*

Approval of [October 27, 2016 Minutes](#)

Revise the minutes to reflect that Allison Dorko was present and Michael Harte was absent.

Action: The October 27 minutes were approved by acclimation.

Matters Arising

- One noted that there is an opportunity to meet with new leadership to discuss the types of issues that arose today.
- John Bailey will invite Mike Bailey (no relation) to discuss the role of the Curriculum Council and how big the Council's foot is when it's put down.
- The December 1 meeting may be canceled.

Report from the Co-chairs – John Bailey, Prem Mathew

No report

Report from Academic Affairs

No report

Minutes recorded by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff