Update of Computer Science/Course Description Changes

M. Fishlen started with a discussion about CS 121. This course has been changed from a computer science/technical course that should satisfy the math requirement to a social issues course that should not satisfy the math requirement. The changes were made by the department by changing the course description rather than the content.

J. Nicols added that departments are allowed to change course descriptions but not content without going to the curriculum committee. Although changing the description in this case has done exactly that.

H. Chereck noted that changing the course number and description and leaving it as a course that satisfies the math requirement is not being very responsible.

It was agreed that this issue needs to be looked at more closely next term. The opinion is that colleges need to be more adamant about what departments can change.

Languages

Most of the departments have cut back on 102 courses. This holds back students who should be in 102 courses – either they have to wait for the 102 course or they get into the 101 course which is inappropriate for them.

J. Nicols suggested a study to discover what courses are that needed. Working with the departments, begin prep-work for next term.

K. Sprague is working on a similar issue in math placement and would like to work hand-in-hand with the group to coordinate consistency of the studies.

M. Fishlen suggested a program to help high school students to know exactly where they stand prior to their coming to the University of Oregon.

Language of Group Requirements Statement

Reminder not to make changes just for change sake per J. Nicols.
J. Nicols asked does the new language make things more comprehensible to students? The purpose of the group requirement statement changes of the last three lines are to add some coherence since 2 courses in one department.

H. Chereck suggested that the difference between subject and major need to be defined better (i.e., can’t have more than one course in a major).

K. Sprague stated that it sounds like we don’t want students to take an entire year for depth rather than only getting credit for one course. D. Koch is concerned that students will take some general education courses instead.

R. Zimmerman pointed out that departments can still require certain courses.

H. Chereck suggested wording such as, “if subject code is same as major subject code, only one course will be allowed.”

J. Nicols added that general education is a different problem and departments can still require courses with majors. K. Sprague noted that this relies on the departments to make sure general education courses are taken. This wording may discourage students from taking 3 courses. They may stop at 2 courses since that is all that is required or allowed.

H. Chereck suggested the wording of the last line to be changed to “at least 2, but no more than 3 in any one subject code” which will allow for an entire sequence. Committee agreed to wording.

K. Sprague offered an option on the second sentence (“Within each group,…”), remove that phrase and replace with something like “Across all groups,…”. This wording was agreed upon by the committee.

M. Fishlen suggested writing the statement in list/outline form for ease of understanding.

This is where the statement stands at the end of the meeting:

The purpose of the Group requirements is to insure that students complete a set of courses that insure both coherence and breadth.

1. A minimum of 16 credits in approved group satisfying courses is required in each group.

2. Across groups, students may count:

   a. no more than one course in their major (major code is the same as the subject code)

   b. at least two, but no more than three in any one subject code
Meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m. Next meeting in 2 weeks on November 28, 2000 at 9:00 a.m. in the EMU Rogue Room.