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 Marine Biology Major

The Oregon Institute of Marine Biology, which is part of the Department of Biology, proposes a new major in Marine Biology. A program proposal was distributed to each council member for review prior to this meeting. Discussion of the proposal generated some suggestions for revision, and Deborah Baumgold, Chair, will forward the council’s conclusions in the following document:

11/10/03

TO: Lorraine Davis, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Jack Rice, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

FROM: Deborah Baumgold, Political Science and Chair, Undergraduate Council

At our meeting on November 6, 2003, the Undergraduate Council reviewed a proposal to create a Marine Biology major in CAS. Our discussion led to the recommendations listed below, and pending their incorporation, we approve the proposal,

1. In the interest of consistency with the Biology major, we recommend that students be permitted to earn either a B.A. or a B.S. in Marine Biology. Students pursuing the B.A. would complete the same math and science requirements as B.S. students, but would also fulfill the B.A.’s foreign-language requirement.

2. We recommend that pre-majors complete the full set of Lower Division core courses before being considered for admission to the Marine Biology major. As listed on pp 2-3, this core coursework is:
but as currently specified on p. 4, section 4b, admission to the major requires completion only of the Biology sequence.

3. We recommend clarification of the admissions process (p. 4, section 4b), as follows:

a. In anticipation of growing student demand for the major, the Program should develop well-articulated, objective criteria for admission.

b. Material used for recruiting and academic advising should make plain the nature of the written statement on career goals and its role in the review process.

c. In addition to a written statement on career goals, students’ academic qualifications and performance should be considered in the admissions process.

d. To emphasize the Program’s high academic expectations and to allow for future adjustments, the phrase “good academic standing” should replace the current specification of a minimum GPA of 2.00 for admission.

4. We recommend clarification of plans for academic advising, anticipating that advising for pre-majors will be carried out by advisers in the Department of Biology.

Review of the 300-level Group Satisfying Courses

Martha Pitts distributed data that had been requested by the council to estimate the need for 300-level group-satisfying courses by junior transfer students. In a random survey of 150 such students in Fall 2003 (out of a total 706), the average student needed 4 group-satisfying courses. This translates into approximately 35 classes of 50 students each that should be offered for
this cohort of students. The UO currently offers 57 300-level group-satisfying courses in Fall term alone.

**Next Meeting**

The desirable characteristics of 100- or 200-level group-satisfying courses have been easier to define than the corresponding qualities of 300-level courses. For the next meeting, council members will try to develop specific criteria for 300-level group-satisfying courses. What, in particular, should distinguish upper-division from lower-division courses? Among courses that are clearly at the upper-division level, what makes some group-satisfying and others not? Answers may be solicited at departmental meetings, from faculty colleagues, from the College of Arts and Sciences Committee on Courses and from the 300-level course syllabi. Please send the criteria by Tuesday, November 18, to Donna Schimmer.

The next meeting will be on November 20, at 10:00 in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.