UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
March 5, 2007
Johnson Hall Conference Room

Present:
Andrew Bonamici, Herb Chereck, Hilary Gerdes, Dave Hubin, Dan Keller, Dean Livelybrooks, Dan Patton, Steven Pologe, Kathy Roberts, Bill Ryan, Ron Severson, Arkady Vaintrob, Kate Wagle, Pat Bartlein, and Lyllye Parker

Absent:
Anne Laskaya, Martha Pitts, Ashley Rees, Karen Sprague, Malcolm Wilson, Paul Engelking, and Ken Calhoon

Minutes:
Minutes from the February 19 meeting were not ready in time for this meeting. They will be distributed electronically to the Undergraduate Council membership for review.

Agenda
AAA Proposal for the Initiation of a New Program Leading to the Bachelor of Arts/Science, in Material and Product Studies and Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree in Product Design (See: AAA proposal for new Product Design major)

The proposal from AAA had been discussed in a preliminary fashion by the Council at a previous meeting (November 29, 2006). The review process for the proposal was clarified and final discussion of the program in the Undergraduate Council had been deferred until a synopsis of the proposal was approved by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Kate Wagle re-presented the proposal to the Council on behalf of AAA and the Art Department. The Bachelor of Arts/Science program is a 4-year liberal arts program with emphasis in Art, Interior Architecture, Art History, and Product Design. The Bachelor of Fine Arts degree program is a 5th-year program leading to a professional degree comprised of seminars, internships, studio work and courses in Art and Design theory and history. The program is seeking external funding instead of pursuing a phased-in budget. Two new faculty will be hired in Fall 2008 for the program. The Art department is looking for funding for a 3-5 year startup program that would guarantee degree completion for the first cohort of about 25 students. Initially, these students could be from outside the university or potentially current students changing their major.

Discussion
The Council posed questions to Kate about the program:
- What happens to students who are admitted into the program, but then the program “doesn’t fly”? Kate stated that students would not be admitted to the program until faculty for the program are in place.
- What is the sequence of courses to be offered?
- Will the AAA be expanding or building new labs/studios for this program? The plans are in place to utilize currently existing labs more efficiently to accommodate the program.
- Is there a curriculum map for this proposal? Kate said that there was a suggested 4-year curriculum in the proposal.
- What additional faculty would be required for the program? Kate stated that a total of two full-time faculty and two adjunct faculty would be needed per term for the program.
- Have other participating departments in the program (School of Business and School of Journalism) been consulted and have they signed off on the program? Ron Severson confirmed that Business has signed off on the program; Kate said that Journalism and Communication yet had to be consulted and thus were not mentioned in the proposal.
- Will there be feedback from the product design industry in program evaluation? When Kate confirmed that Yes, industry would provide feedback, she was advised to include that point in the proposal.

The Chair commented that the Council does not have a general practice of approving a program that does not have funding in place; yet, the merits of this particular program appeared clear and it was recognized that the endorsement of the program would probably enable more successful funding appeals by the Art Department for support of the program. The Council would have to include the caveat that funding must be established before a single student is admitted into the program.

The Chair summarized the stipulations to be placed on the Council’s recommendation:

1. Students would not be admitted into the program until funding and resources (adjuncts, GTFs, staff support) were in place;
2. Cohorts of students would have to have reasonable assurance of completion of the program;
3. Industry would participate in program evaluation for the 5th year program (BFA);
4. The start date of the program would be 2008 and the Art Department would engage in additional dialogues with other departments providing courses for the program.

The Chair called for a motion from the floor.

**The motion was made that the Undergraduate Council endorse the AAA proposal for a new program in Product Design and a 5th-year BFA program with the contingencies listed above. (See: [AAA New Program in Product Design and 5th-year BFA Program](#))**

Moved: Steven Pologe  
Seconded: Dean Livelybrooks  
The motion passed unanimously.
Multicultural Course Review

The Chair distributed copies of a “Survey of Multicultural Courses” questionnaire sheet and copies of the Multicultural Requirement Categories as listed in the course catalog. He reviewed with the Council its responsibility to review General Education courses, including multicultural courses, on a 5-year review cycle. The aim of the review is to determine if courses designated as satisfying the requirement actually meet specified criteria within the multicultural categories.

(See: Survey of Multicultural Courses, Distinguishing lower and upper division courses, UO Multicultural Requirement)

In the course of discussing the specific items on the survey questionnaire, the Council began to clarify the parameters of their evaluation of courses:

- Referring to a point made by Charles Martinez at an earlier meeting, there was question as to whether or not the perceived disconnect between course content and students’ expectations for skills training could even be addressed since that is not the purpose purpose for the multicultural requirement as stated in the course catalog.
- Criteria for evaluating courses exist as subsets corresponding to each multicultural category. Although there is some overlap among the categories, it is clear that Category A deals with comparisons among American cultures; Category B deals with the study of the construction of collective identities and the perspectives of those identities as they are influenced by prejudice, intolerance and discrimination within society; Category C deals with International Cultures.
- The Council emphasized that faculty teaching multicultural requirement courses should explain why their particular course meets the requirement of the particular category in which it is placed. It is also important that this explanation be transmitted to students taking the course or seeking to take the course.

The Chair acknowledged that the process of evaluating the courses would probably be adjusted as it went along.

The Council modified the Survey Questionnaire to reflect its current thinking. Council members were divided into two review teams. Packets of syllabi of some of the multicultural courses offered Winter 2007 were distributed. A revised Survey Questionnaire will be e-mailed to the teams and they will begin their first round of evaluations. Completed responses will be discussed at the first meeting of the Spring term.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 9, 2007, 12:00pm at Rowe Conference Room, Knight Library.