Present:
Andrew Bonamici, Eric Carlson, Sue Eveland, Jennifer Joslin, Dean Livelybrooks, Ian McNeely, Caleb Owen, Josh Roering, Ron Severson, Josh Snodgrass, Karen Sprague, Drew Terhune, Matt Villeneuve, and Tom Wheeler,

Absent:
Susan Anderson, Kathie Carpenter, Jordynn Didlick, Paul Engelking, Amy Goeser Kolb, Dave Hubin, Karen McLaughlin, Kiwako Sakamoto, Laura Vandeburgh, Morgan Williamson, and Elizabeth Reis

Minutes:
The Chair called for comments or edits to the minutes of the November 6 meeting. The request was made that the term “articulation”, used in considering novel structures for General Education, be defined or rephrased for clarity. The Council agreed that the sentence “Would Institutes pose articulation difficulties?” should be rephrased to read “Would Institutes pose difficulties for inter-institutional transfer of credits?”

The motion was made to accept the minutes from the November 6, 2009 meeting as amended.

Moved:  Dean Livelybrooks
Seconded:  Caleb Owen
The motion to accept the amended minutes passed unanimously.

Agenda
Proposal to address CEP Status for High School Students
Sue Eveland presented a proposal from the Office of Enrollment Management to create a new “pre-baccalaureate” status for academically gifted high school students who wish to take UO courses, with approval from their parents and an official from their high schools. Currently, such students take courses through “DuckLinks.” Which is part of CEP (Community Education Program) and are limited to 8 credits per term.

The new “pre-baccalaureate” program would apply to exceptional high school students, who had exhausted their high school and DuckLink opportunities, to register for the standard undergraduate credit limits (18 initial and 21 maximum), although we anticipate that very few would approach the maximum credit limit. Pre-Bac students would be subject to tuition and fees assessed at the standard UG rate (resident/
resident as appropriate), with the exception of the Health Fee because they would not be eligible for UO Health Center services.

The Office of Enrollment Management believes that this proposal eliminates the need to completely revisit the CEP policies at UO, which would require OUS approval. The proposal addresses cross-sector collaboration in the state, and could work to increase enrollment of outstanding students from local high schools. A similar program at UW has had this effect.

- **Discussion**
  The Council discussed the proposal carefully with Sue, raising several points:
  1. The Pre-Bac program could indeed help in recruiting talented high school students to the UO.
  2. Will high school students have the necessary pre-requisites? Answer: most UO courses which high school students enroll in are at the entry level and do not have prerequisites.
  3. When would these students register? Answer: like all other CEP students, they would register after degree-seeking students who are given priority.
  4. Is there potential for abuse, whereby a high school student could take a full year of college-level courses without having to matriculate? Answer: this is unlikely because the number of eligible high school students is very small (perhaps a dozen) and there is very close monitoring from the Registrar’s Office.
  5. The Council was generally in favor of instituting the program. The Chair called for a motion.

  The motion was made that the Undergraduate Council support the proposal to initiate a pre-baccalaureate program for academically qualified high school students to enroll in UO classes, up to the UG limit of 18 credits (21 maximum).
  Moved: Dean Livelybrooks
  Seconded: Caleb Owen
  The motion passed with a majority vote and 1 abstention.

**Grading Culture Discussions with Departments**

Karen Sprague reported that her discussion with the Biology Department faculty on the Council’s ideas for Grading Culture was positive and by and large the faculty viewed the Council’s three proposals favorably. The faculty were pleased to hear that the three proposals were not “either/or” options, but that the Council favored adoption of all three. The primary concern was whether the efforts to change the Grading Culture would hurt students in the short term. Karen assured the faculty that the Council has given that point careful consideration and is aware of the concern. She noted that this is a point to be added to the Talking Points for Discussion going forward. Josh Snodgrass concurred and volunteered to make the addition.

Council members asked whether departments are concerned about the link between these proposals and the current assessment directive on campus. Answer: so far,
departmental faculty view the Council’s proposals as being useful tools for improving assessment.

The Chair told the Council that in the early part of Winter 2010, he would like to expand the discussion of Grading Culture to students. It is important to get as much feedback from students as possible.

- **Discussion**
  Council members explored various ideas for effective engagement with students on this topic:

  1. Add a survey to the on-line course evaluations. Response: There are some technical challenges to this approach. The evaluations already include 12 general questions mandated by the Senate and department-specific questions, then, each department adds specific questions. Additionally, many students simply opt out of doing the on-line evaluations. Another downside is that many students doing evaluations are too concerned about their own grades to engage in an objective consideration of grade policy. The Council agreed that these problems make this approach unworkable.
  2. Use a Duckweb tool to create a separate survey for student input.
  3. Student representatives pointed out that the most effective means of reaching students is to utilize the ASUO, the Daily Emerald, and possibly Facebook. They strongly advised the Council that the best response from students would come by using the venues for student representation already in place on campus.
  4. The questions to ask students need to be carefully structured in order to elicit the kind of information and ideas that would be of most help to the Council in its considerations.

The Chair asked whether the Council needs to be more systematic in its approach to departments to assure that a broad spectrum of faculty is heard, especially those from departments not represented on the Council. One good venue for this is the CAS Department Heads meetings. Other options will be explored by Council members. The goal is to have a formal proposal to present to the University Senate in Spring 2010.

**General Education Reform**

The Council resumed discussion of General Education reform taken up in previous meetings. Ideas on what would constitute an “ideal” General Education had been submitted by members and compiled as a basis for discussion. Several central themes emerged:

- General Education should foster learning as a life-long passion.
- Writing should be emphasized within specific areas of study (e.g., writing for history is not the same as writing for science; writing fiction is not the same as writing articles in journalism). Writing needs to be put into context of areas in which students are interested. Anecdotally, writing skills improve markedly if the subject matter that students are asked to write about really engages them.
- Reading is critical to writing, and common reading can be very effective. Again, common reading needs to be in an area students really connect with. The Honors College summer reading program of Tracy Kidder’s *Mountains Beyond Mountains* was cited by a student member as a good example.

- Several Council members noted that they hear criticism of the current UO Writing program. Karen Sprague explained that the rationale of the program is to not connect writing to specific departments, because that is difficult to do, given the scale of the composition program and the number of writing instructors who must become familiar with the readings that are used. Instead, the composition program selects readings that can be used by all instructors and that ought to have broad appeal.

- Douglas Reeves, at a Leadership and Learning Conference, has stated that the biggest predictor of GPA (at the high school level) is the number of opportunities for non-fiction writing outside of [writing] classes. Maybe General Education Institutes could provide those writing opportunities.

The Chair summarized the discussion:
1) It is clear that writing and reading are critical to General Education;
2) The integration of studies in different disciplines is important.

The Chair reminded that special guests President Lariviere, Provost Bean, and Sr. Vice Provost Tomlin would be attending the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

**The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Friday, December, 2009, 2:30pm at the Rowe Conference Room, the Knight Library.**