UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
October 7, 2011
Collaboration Room, Knight Library

PRESENT
Susan Anderson, Andrew Bonamici, Ron Bramhall, Kathie Carpenter, Sue Eveland, Dave Hubin, Jennifer Joslin, Loren Kajikawa, Dean Livelybrooks, Ian McNeely, Ben Smood, Josh Snodgrass, Karen Sprague, Michael Sugar, Zachary Taylor, Tom Wheeler, Li-Shan Chou, and Paul Engelking

ABSENT
Ashley Buchholz, Karen McLaughlin, Matt Villeneuve, and Elizabeth Reis

AGENDA
I. Minutes from June 6, 2011 meeting
II. Chinese certificate (Maram Epstein, EALL)
III. Presenters for motion 11a (on grade culture) for professional schools
IV. New process for program reviews
V. Appointment of representative to Academic Infrastructure Committee
VI. Agenda for rest of 2011-12
VII. Election of Undergraduate Council chair

MINUTES

I. (agenda item I) APPROVING MINUTES FROM JUNE 6, 2011 MEETING
A review and vote on minutes from the meeting of June 6, 2011 was inadvertently omitted.

* NON-AGENDA ITEM: CHARGE FROM UNIVERSITY SENATE TO UGC
The Chair opened the meeting by reading the Charge to the Undergraduate Council from the University Senate. (See attachment). Members introduced themselves to each other around the table.
II. (agenda Item II) PROPOSAL FOR CHINESE FLAGSHIP CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

The Chair introduced Maram Epstein, Associate Professor of Chinese in the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, to present the proposal for a Chinese Flagship Certificate Program.

In 2004, the University received a major (multi-million dollar) Federal grant, in conjunction with a K-12 Chinese immersion program in Portland, to bring students to a “Superior” level of fluency in Chinese language and through a “Flagship Program.” Prior to receiving the grant, the University offered an established program, 1st through 4th year, in Chinese. Flagship has allowed three additional levels of courses that extend the language to outside areas such as Business, Chemistry, Architecture, International Studies, and other fields. This enables students to master the language skills necessary to work in these fields in Chinese.

It is important to understand the difference between the National Flagship program and the proposed UO Certificate in Chinese.

- The National Flagship Program

  Students in this program go through the national curriculum, which includes a year studying in China -- first semester in Nanjing University, enrolled with regular Chinese students in their major field (business, chemistry, Chinese literature, etc); the second semester in an internship associated with their career or academic interests. The idea is to put them in an entirely Chinese environment. There are some problems with this National model:

  o the student must be a U.S. citizen to participate, but the UO would like to educate any and all students interested in learning Chinese;

  o programs in China do not provide accommodations for physically disabled students; and

  o an HIV test is required to get a visa for China, and a positive result precludes entrance into the country

- The UO Certificate

  This Certificate will attest to the fact that students in the Chinese program have accomplished something significant, even if they haven’t met all of the National standards. The requirements for the UO Certificate are the same as those for any other Certificate program: 36 credits with 24 credits in upper-division courses, 12 of those at the 400-level. To earn the UO Certificate, students will be required to test at the “Advanced” level in all three skills of the Program: speaking, reading, and writing. This level is only slightly below the “Superior” level required by the National Standards. (Most native speakers do not achieve the “Superior” level in their native language.) An example of “Superior” language skill is a student being able to explain how to do the crawl swimstroke without making any bodily motion or using a physical illustration of any kind.
DISCUSSION

– Does the Flagship program admit students than those in K-12 immersion programs?
   Answer: It is open to other students. Initially, the program was envisioned as being for the graduates of the Portland immersion program but, we now have some Flagship students who began Chinese as freshmen. By taking summer programs through their academic careers, they are able to complete the Flagship program in five years—an impressive accomplishment.

– Where does the name “Flagship” come from?
   Answer: The name and funding for the program come from the State Department, which has targeted certain languages as strategically important: Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Farsi, Korean, and a number of African languages. Students, however, do not owe any government service for admission to the program.

– How does the UO Chinese Certificate program fit in with the general education requirements for graduation?
   Answer: Originally, the plan was to have a number of the content courses count toward general education, but this proved unworkable because the availability of personnel to cover these courses cannot be guaranteed. Now, students do the Flagship program in conjunction with whatever their major is. The workload is similar to being in the Honors College.

– Ques. Is there any concern about the rigor of the coursework that is taught in Chinese as compared with the corresponding courses taught in English?
   Answer: All of the faculty hired to teach in Chinese are hired in the department in which the English counterpart course resides. These are regular faculty or visiting professors; sometimes post-docs, who teach existing courses, but in Chinese.

– The title of the Certificate program is unusually long. Is there a way it might be shortened for transcript purposes?
   Answer: “Chinese Flagship” is copyrighted and owned by the U.S. Government and the “UO” designation is placed in front of the name to distinguish the Certificate from National Certification. A suggestion from the Council for a shorter name would be welcome.

– There is not a residency requirement in the Certificate proposal. Do you want to specify the number of credits to be taken at UO?
   Answer: Generally, the residency requirement is about a quarter of the required credit hours. Suggest more than half of the credit hours should be required for residency -- perhaps 20 of the 36 total. There also needs to be a minimum grade specified for the program.
– Does the National program appear on the transcript?

*Answer:* No, because it is a program beyond the degree (like ROTC). Nor does a “minor” designation apply, because the program is beyond even the Chinese major in terms of the level of academic achievement.

– *Ques.* How will the UO Certificate fit into the future need for teachers of Chinese?

*Answer:* We are considering courses that would cover “Teaching Chinese,” “Teaching Japanese,” etc., but this will depend on discussions with the College of Education.

– What is the prospect for the Certificate to continue when the Flagship grant ends?

*Answer:* The Registrar noted that programs remain on the record for a sunset period of seven years. Maram pointed out that it would be possible for the EALL department to maintain the Certificate program, even if the Flagship program disappeared. Content classes could still be offered in Chinese from a few departments.

The Chair thanked Maram for her time to make the presentation and informed her that he would notify her of the Council’s decision via email. After Maram’s departure, there was no further discussion, and the Chair asked for a motion with the emendation of the technical corrections: 1) addition of a residency requirement; 2) clarification of the distinction between the National Flagship program and the UO Certificate.

The motion was made to endorse the proposal for a UO Certificate Program in Chinese.

**Moved:** Susan Anderson  
**Seconded:** Josh Snodgrass

The motion passed unanimously.

**III. (agenda Item III) PRESENTERS FOR MOTION 11A OF GRADE CULTURE**

The Chair gave a brief explanation of the Senate passage of Motion 11a, which asks departments to discuss internally and post their rationale for grading on their websites. To ensure that the intent of the Senate legislation is widely understood, members of the Council will meet with department chairs in the schools and colleges as early as possible during Fall Term 2011. Council members volunteered for the following assignments:

– College of Arts and Sciences: already done by Ian McNeely;

– Robert D. Clark Honors College: Michael Sugar and Ian McNeely;

– School of Journalism and Communication: Tom Wheeler;

– Lundquist College of Business: Ron Bramhall;
Andrew emphasized that departments need only post their grading rationales on their own websites. From there, they will be linked to the Grade Culture website, as well. A reminder message can be sent each year to update the postings, if necessary. Ian explained that the UGC will report to the Senate as to which departments have posted these rubrics. The original end of Fall Term 2011 deadline in the Senate legislation should be considered soft because the process is starting later than anticipated, but the expectation is that departments will have completed this work by the end of Winter Term 2012.

IV. (agenda Item V) REPLACEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ON ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE (FORMERLY THE CLASSROOM COMMITTEE)
Karen McLaughlin, who has been representing the Undergraduate Council on this committee, is no longer able to do so. Tom Wheeler volunteered to replace her.

V. (agenda Item IV) NEW PROCESS FOR PROGRAM REVIEW
Karen Sprague distributed a draft of a revised form for reviewing new programs for majors, minors, or certificates. The current OUS form does not ask for the intellectual design and academic rationale for a new program, and focuses instead on bureaucratic detail and political or utilitarian justification. The revision is intended to shift the emphasis and thus provide the information that is most relevant for review. It will also simplify the process by creating a single form that can be used for minors, majors, and certificates – through incremental expansion of the number of sections to be completed. Members were asked to review the draft and bring their comments, questions, or suggestions to a later meeting.

* NON-AGENDA ITEM: COURSE CONNECTOR ONLINE
Karen gave a demonstration of the new Course Connector program now active online for students and faculty. The program was activated for IntroDUCKtion so freshmen and advisors could consult its course descriptions while constructing their Fall class schedules.

Karen also reported that she is working with the IT staff who created Course Connector to develop a central syllabus repository.
VI. *(agenda Item VI I)* ELECTION OF CHAIR
Two nominations for Ian McNeely had been submitted prior to the meeting. 
The motion was made that Ian McNeely be elected Chair of the Undergraduate Council by acclamation.

Moved: Paul Engelking  
2nd by: Tom Wheeler

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

VII. *(agenda Item VI)* SUGGESTED UGC 2011–2012 AGENDA TOPICS
The Chair briefly outlined a list of topics which could be addressed by the Council this year. These had been suggested by last year’s Council, and include:

- completing discussion on issues raised in *Academically Adrift*;
- considering a proposal on improving writing across the disciplines;
- looking at the use of technology in education;
- examining an honor code, the grading climate, and the prevalence of a culture of academic cheating (Carl Yeh would like to talk with the Council on this issue);
- examining the pressures exerted by increased enrollment on classroom space and other aspects of the learning environment;
- revisiting the Grade Culture proposals that did not pass in the Senate;
- inviting Bob Berdahl to speak to the Council about undergraduate education from a national perspective.

The Chair proposed that members think about how these topics should be prioritized for future meetings.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 21, 2011, at 2:30pm in the Collaboration Room of the Knight Library.