

Quarters to Semesters Transition Team Meeting
November 12, 2008
Baker 230

Present: Adeyanju, Carpenter, Cheripko, Conrath, Connavino, Cornell, Day, Descutner, DeLong, Downs, Elliott, Esmond-Kiger, Flaherty, Gieseey, Lombardi, Lopez-Permouth, Miles, Noftz, Ruff, Sealover, Thomas, Tuck, Watts, Wickman, Willan, Williford

2012-2013 Calendar:

Carpenter reviewed the deans' recommendations for the structure of the semester calendar, which were informed by conversations they had with chairs and directors. The deans expressed a strong preference for longer summer and shorter winter breaks.

The majority of other schools' calendars have 49 class days within quarters, which converts to 74 class days under semesters. The neutral conversion assumption would indicate a 49 to 74 class day conversion. Miami uses this calendar, and OSU has 49 class days per quarters now.

Carpenter suggested allowing faculty to review the calendar through posting it on the provost's page.

- Lopez-Permouth will let the faculty know that the calendar is posted for their review and response, and OUTLOOK will also encourage the whole community to offer comment.
- Cornell asked about the fit for new student orientations if we start in the middle of August. The calendar cannot start any later than August 20 or exam week wouldn't begin until Dec. 21.
- Wickman has some responses on the calendar from graduate students and will send them to Descutner
- Intersession:
 - Deans prefer the longer summer but are interested in the Maymester idea.
 - Descutner clarified that the summer structure must meet student academic needs and their earning (work) potential.
 - Sealover mentioned having the second summer session start late enough to allow graduating high school students to enroll. Deans Neiman and Middleton also suggested that high school graduates and local teachers will want to enroll in college coursework in the summer.
- Timeline: We should lock in calendar by the end of January 2009.

Educational Policy and Student Affairs (EPSA) Committee:

Gieseey discussed the EPSA draft proposal for general education requirements under semesters. The proposal will be sent out to the university community for review and comment. Approval for the

final form will be made by EPSA, UCC, Faculty Senate, and the provost. This proposal will go to UCC for review this afternoon. The proposal will be appended to this meeting summary as well as posted on the provost's web page. Credit for construction of this proposal was given to David Ingram

EPSA reviewed General Education course requirements in 2006 and believes that no review or revision is required at this time.

Currently, a task force is working on student outcomes for the general education curriculum.

Total Credit Hours:

- Assuming 120 credit hours for graduation, general education coursework will range between 26 and 31 percent of this total. The proposal is built on 26% to remain somewhat resource neutral, and if we can stay at 26% that would be ideal. But if the percentage creeps up toward 31% for general education, it will cause credit hour reductions in other programs that choose the 120 minum.
 - The goal is to remain resource neutral. Increased staffing may be required to meet Tier I requirements. This could cause shifts from upper level courses to meet the requirement.
 - Tuck asked if EPSA would make a recommendation if the range starts to creep up. Giese and Thomas affirmed that they would monitor the situation and coordinate a response if needed.
- Many Tier IIIs are embedded in capstone coursework and should not strain resources.
- Tier II should not result in staffing problems because students will be taking fewer courses at that level.
- Sherrie Gradin, Director of Writing Across the Curriculum, provided a report on writing requirements at other state universities.
 - English department faculty currently teach 77% of the junior composition writing courses.
 - We should not reduce writing or composition to a one term requirement.
 - We could consider redesigning upper level coursework to include intensive writing components, but all such decisions will have to wait until the experts in writing and composition have a chance to review the issues.
 - We will be discussing these issues early in December.

Course Approval Process:

Thomas said we will have to sequence approvals so that the registrar doesn't get overwhelmed trying to load everything at once.

- Each department/school will provide a packaged submission for each program which will move through approval.

- Following program review, course adds, changes, and deletions will move through the approval process.
- The Russ College of Engineering and Technology has agreed to be the first college to complete its course conversions and submit them for review/approval; the College of Business will be the second college to complete its conversion and submit them for review/approval... Dean Ogles has agreed to split Arts and Sciences curriculum according to disciplinary divisions: science and math first, social sciences second, and humanities last.
- UCC will review and approve the packages and forward them to the registrar.
 - If departments/schools propose a course without changes (only the credit hour has been changed) the course will move through without review.
 - New courses will be reviewed as always.
 - Having the approval system digitized will allow on-line tracking and allow questions to be asked and answered electronically. Digitization should be ready to implement in June 2009.
- A new curricular option would give each department/school a single upper level course that can be redefined for each offering. A variety of faculty can teach the course, changing the topic according to their particular interest or expertise. These “special topics” courses will not require approval for each offering.
- Coursework in semesters could be indicated on the transcript by adding a zero at the end of each semester course number to indicate its format. The Registrar will supply guidance on how to distinguish quarter courses from semester courses on transcripts.

Faculty Coordinators:

Colleges have now identified the program coordinators to oversee the conversion in each department/school. Meetings have been arranged to orient the coordinators to their responsibilities and to the conversion process. Digitization will help them monitor how things are taking shape. Their major responsibility is to help their colleagues convert their majors and oversee how their requirements interact with those of other department/school majors.

Andy Jorgensen visit:

Jorgensen had opportunities to meet with many constituents while on campus. Jorgensen thinks we're in a good position and have not made some of the mistakes Toledo made with our proposal and process plans. Descutner and Tuck thought the meetings went very well and helped our faculty feel comfortable with our plan. Jorgensen will provide a summary of the meeting discussions and answer questions he was unable to address during his visit. Documents he brought with him will be posted on our website once we have his permission to do so.

The next meeting is Wednesday, November 19, 8:00 a.m., Baker 230. This is the last one for this quarter. Meetings will resume on Wednesday, January 7, 2009.