

Summary of CCN Systems & Operations Subcommittee Recommendation Report (6/9/2022) and Memo (8/11/2022)

The following chart provides a summary of the framework for course numbers, titles, prefixes, and course descriptions for CCN. –CCN System Subcommittee Charge

Recommendation		Vote
Course Designator	There must be a common designator.	Approved 13 Y-3 N.
Subject Code (Prefix)	Schools are encouraged to align subject codes where feasible. If the subject matches, schools may retain their existing subject codes even if they are abbreviated differently (i.e., HIST and HST are both allowable). <i>*See the August 11, 2022 Memo for additional information.</i>	Approved 13 Y-3 N.
Course Number	Include a uniform designator in the course number suffix as part of all CCN course numbers. [For example, Math 111A.] Change course numbers when necessary to align across all Oregon community colleges and universities.	Approved 13 Y-3 N.
Course Description	Individual institutional catalog course descriptions must match the baseline course description as approved by faculty subcommittees. Additions to course descriptions may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stylistic nuances that do not change the meaning of the description, based on institutional guidelines • Course requisites • Other housekeeping items • Substantive (less than 25% of the course) additional statements that summarize any local course outcomes 	Approved 13 Y-3 N.
Course Title	Course titles should match among institutions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing for some institutional stylistic nuances The course title will not be the required primary designator for the common course numbering system courses. <i>*See the August 11, 2022 Memo for additional information.</i>	Approved 13 Y-3 N.

Chart approved by CCN Systems & Operations Co-chairs Julia Pomerenk and Chris Sweet, 9/16/2022.

Note: on p. 5 of the attached Memo, the HECC advises the first sentence after “Guidance for Faculty Subcommittee Related to Outcome” read as follows: *For courses identified as part of the Common Course Numbering System, institutions are expected to adopt course outcomes as written by faculty subcommittees, recommended by the Transfer Council, and approved by the Commission.* [emphasis added to the proposed revision). This is consistent with language used in both legislation and Transfer Council concerning recommendations and approval of CCN.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Transfer Council

FROM: Chris Sweet and Julia Pomerenk, Co-Chairs,
Systems & Operations Subcommittee

DATE: August 11, 2022

SUBJECT: Additional Information Related to Recommended Framework
for Common Course Number Numbering (CCN)

On behalf of the Systems & Operations Subcommittee, we thank you for the time and attention that you have dedicated to your review of our subcommittee's recommendations for the framework for Common Course Numbering (CCN).

Based on the questions that were raised during our discussion of our recommended framework with the Transfer Council at its meeting on July 21, the subcommittee is pleased to provide additional information, as requested during the meeting. This additional information was discussed at our subcommittee meeting on July 28 and again at our subcommittee meeting on August 11 (today).

Below you will see the original recommendations regarding subject code and course title, along with our response to the request for additional information.

In addition, the subcommittee has provided guidance related to course outcomes that may be helpful for faculty subcommittees, as noted below.

Please let us know if there is any other information that would be useful as the Transfer Council continues to review our recommended framework and votes on the recommendation, which we anticipate will take place during the Transfer Council meeting on August 18.

Wishing us all the best as we work to implement successful Common Course Numbering for the students and citizens of the state of Oregon.

Copies: Donna Lewelling, HECC
Jane Denison-Furness, HECC
Jennifer Markey, HECC
Members of the Systems & Operations Subcommittee

**Subject Code Recommendation, from Systems & Operations Subcommittee
Report, dated June 9, 2022**

Subject Code

Schools are encouraged to align subject codes where feasible.

If the subject matches, schools may retain their existing subject codes even if they are abbreviated differently. i.e. HIST and HST are both allowable.

Definition:

Subject Code is defined as the element of a course that is an abbreviation of the Subject and that precedes the Course Number. Courses are most often referred to by the Subject Code and Course Number, such as MATH 121.

Rationale:

This recommendation aligns with Guiding Principles #2.

Based on Guideline #2, we view minor abbreviation differences as acceptable. Forcing full alignment could cause a lot of unnecessary work and create confusion for students. Slight variations such as MTH and. MATH and HST and HIST are not viewed as problematic.

NOTE:

The Sys Ops Subcom recognizes that there are broader discussions happening when subjects do not align.

Sys Ops Subcom will make recommendations after getting additional guidance.

Additional Information Related to the Subject Code Recommendation

(The subcommittee uses “subject code” in parallel to the term “prefix” as used in SB 233.)

Encouragement for Subject Codes to Align Where Feasible

Opportunities for alignment include:

- Selecting the subject code used most across the state, when an institution begins to offer courses in a new subject for that institution
- Selecting the subject code used most across the state, when an institution revises existing courses to align subjects for courses in the common course number system (such as Math courses being revised to Statistics courses)
- The Systems & Operations Subcommittee will make further recommendations after gaining further perspective from the Faculty Subcommittees about mismatched subjects.

Limitations for Characters in Subject Code Fields in Student Information Systems

Please note that Student Information Systems (SIS) have character limits to the fields for subject codes.

Anthology subject code character limit (field includes subject code and course number) = 12

Anthology is used by 2 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee.

Banner subject code character limit = 4.

Banner is used by 13 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee. Banner is used by all public four-year institutions in Oregon. Ellucian Colleague character limit = 7

Ellucian Colleague is used by 1 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee

Rogue CC system character limit (field includes subject code and course number) = 8

This homegrown system is used by 1 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee.

Jenzabar character limit = not yet reported to the subcommittee

Jenzabar is used by 2 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee

**Course Title Recommendation, from Systems & Operations Subcommittee
Report dated June 9, 2022**

Course Title

**Course titles should match among institutions
Allowing for some institutional stylistic nuances**

The course title will not be the required primary designator for the common course numbering system courses.

Rationale

This recommendation aligns with Guiding Principles #1, 2, and 5.

Because courses in the common course numbering system will primarily identified by the common designator of a suffix following the course number, exact matches among course titles are not necessary.

With other alignment among the CCN courses, course title alignment is expected.

NOTE:

Institutions need to be able to include stylistic elements that follow course title protocols at the institution.

Course titles, as abbreviated on transcripts, are limited by the number of characters in that data field.

Additional Information Related to the Course Title Recommendation

Course Titles Should Match Among Institutions

Faculty Subcommittees are encouraged to work toward course titles that match, as much as possible. Institutions will use the full title, as determined by faculty subcommittees and faculty at their institutions, to enter titles into their Student Information Systems, in fields such as short title (to appear on transcripts and other documents) and long title (to appear in other locations).

Noting that the short title field is limited across all institutions and that 13 of the 19 institutions use Banner with a 30-character short title field, Faculty Subcommittees are strongly encouraged to agree on a common 30-character abbreviation for the Common Course Numbering courses. Short titles that match exactly will help convey that the courses (which will share a common number) are the same.

Limitations for Characters in Course Title Fields in Student Information Systems Note that Student Information Systems (SIS) have character limits to the fields for course titles.

Anthology character limit = 75 for title field (there is only one title field in Anthology) Anthology is used by 2 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee.

Banner character limit = 30 for short title field
= 100 for long title field

Banner is used by 13 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee. Banner is used by all public four-year institutions in Oregon. Ellucian Colleague character limit = 30 for short title; Nearly unlimited for long title

Ellucian Colleague is used by 1 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee

Rogue CC system character limit = 50

This homegrown system is used by 1 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee.

Jenzabar character limit = not yet reported to the subcommittee

Jenzabar is used by 2 of the 19 institutions that have provided SIS information to the subcommittee

Guidance for Faculty Subcommittee Related to Course Outcomes

For courses identified as part of the Common Course Numbering System, institutions are expected to adopt course outcomes as written by faculty subcommittees and approved by the Transfer Council. Variations in outcomes are only allowed to account for stylistic nuance requirements of individual institutions. The intent of the outcome must remain the same. Measurability does not represent a stylistic nuance.

The following is an example of how an outcome may be written differently without changing the intent:

- Students will be able to apply biological principles and generalizations to novel problems.
- Apply biological principles and generalizations to novel problems.

- Application of biological principles and generalizations to novel problems.

If an institution chooses to add course outcomes beyond the adopted statewide outcomes, they should follow the same design as the outcomes adopted by the Faculty Subcommittees.

CCN Subcommittee Progress Report & Recommendations Systems & Operations Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chairs

Julia Pomerenk

jpom@uoregon.edu

Chris Sweet

Chris.sweet@clackamas.edu

June 9, 2022

Link to [8/11/2022 memo](#), in the report

Date of last meeting

June 2, 2022

Plans for next meeting

Next meetings are expected to be set for late June or July.

Members of the Systems & Operations Subcommittee do plan to meet over the summer.

Overview

Beginning with a meeting on April 12, 2022, the members of the Systems & Operations Subcommittee (Sys Ops Subcom) have met five times to date and have logged 12 meeting hours. The 16 voting members have demonstrated commitment to student success and the success of the Common Course Numbering (CCN) work. Their collegiality runs as strongly as their expertise. They are to be commended for constructing a framework within a tight timeline.

The perceived need to provide the framework as soon as possible prompted the subcommittee to hold a marathon meeting on June 2, 2022, so that our recommended framework could be forwarded to the Transfer Council for consideration at its meeting on June 17, 2022. The Systems & Operations Subcommittee met the challenge to build a sturdy framework, while the concurrent work of the faculty subcommittees had already begun, without the benefit of an approved framework for their work.

The subcommittee will also move forward with further Subject Code Recommendations in cases where the subject itself does not align (for example, Statistics and Math), following additional guidance from the Transfer Council.

The subcommittee will move forward to gather information from individual institutions to support ongoing discussion and additional decisions regarding implementing the framework, as approved by the subcommittee on June 2, 2022.

The subcommittee remains willing and able to serve as a resource for the Transfer Council and the faculty subcommittees as the work to implement common course numbering continues.

Action Items Completed

See the [8/10/2022 memo](#) for revisions/additional clarification (by TC) to this report.

ACTIVITY	STATUS
<p>Establish Guiding Principles for Subcommittee’s Work</p>	<p>APPROVED (unanimously) May 27, 2022</p> <p>Guiding Principles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the most good for the most students. 2. Make the most meaningful changes, and create the fewest negative impacts. 3. Courses in the CCN (Common Course Number Numbering) framework are clearly identifiable. 4. Meet minimum requirements of the legislation. 5. The framework should be sustainable.
<p>Recommend Framework for CCN (Common Course Numbering)</p>	<p>APPROVED (13 to 3) June 2, 2022</p> <p>CCN Framework</p> <p>There must be a common designator in the framework.</p> <p>[The subcommittee uses “designator” to note some element added to the course so that it is clearly identified as one of the Common Course Number courses. The common designator recommended (below) is a suffix added to the course number, such as MATH 111*. The chosen suffix has not been identified, yet.]</p> <p>Schools have the ability to have the designator in additional locations as desired.</p>

[The subcommittee uses “additional locations” to note the fields in Student Information Systems and/or the places in a course title or course description that an institution may use to identify a Common Course Number course, in addition to using the common designator.]

Rationale:

This recommendation aligns strongly with Guiding Principles # 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

A common designator placed in a common location supports students as they take courses and transfer among schools.

With the common designator in place for similarity across schools, then schools may identify the CCN courses in additional ways, as well, to meet their needs.

Subject Code

Schools are encouraged to align subject codes where feasible.

If the subject matches, schools may retain their existing subject codes even if they are abbreviated differently. i.e., HIST and HST are both allowable.

Definition:

Subject Code is defined as the element of a course that is an abbreviation of the Subject and that precedes the Course Number. Courses are most often referred to by the Subject Code and Course Number, such as MATH 121.

Rationale:

This recommendation aligns with Guiding Principle #2.

Based on Guideline #2, we view minor abbreviation differences as acceptable. Forcing full alignment could cause a lot of unnecessary work and create confusion for students. Slight variations such as MTH and. MATH and HST and HIST are not viewed as problematic.

NOTE:

The Sys Ops Subcom recognizes that there are broader discussions happening when subjects do not align.

Sys Ops Subcom will make recommendations after getting additional guidance.

Course Number

(can include prefixes and suffixes)

Include a uniform designator in the course number suffix as part of all CCN course numbers.

Change course numbers when necessary to align across all Oregon community colleges and universities.

Rationale:

This recommendation aligns with Guiding Principles #1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Placing the designator in the course number is the most readily seen location for students and advisors, within registration systems and degree audit systems.

Using the course number is more reliable and trustworthy in terms of systems use and data reporting because the course number field in Student

Information Systems (SIS) is a validated field and not a 'free' format field which would be subject to error.

[The subcommittee uses validated fields to refer to elements in Student Information Systems that are double-checked automatically against tables of allowable entries. In contrast, 'free' format fields are open to whatever a user may type into that field and are not double-checked against allowable entries. More user errors can be introduced in "free' format fields. Validated fields provide more dependability.]

This recommendation supports a more sustainable, long-term solution than alternatives considered.

Course Description

Individual institutional catalog course descriptions must match the baseline course description as approved by faculty subcommittees.

Additions to course descriptions may include:

- **Stylistic nuances that do not change the meaning of the description, based on institutional guidelines**
- **Course requisites**
- **Other housekeeping items**
- **Substantive (less than 25% of the course) additional statements that summarize any local course outcomes**

[The subcommittee uses the term "housekeeping items, above, to note the individual items that an institution may add to course descriptions, such as how often the course is taught or whether the course fulfills an

institutional requirement.]

Rationale

This recommendation aligns with Guiding Principles #1, 2, 3, and 4.

Following the work of the faculty subcommittees and the alignment of learning outcomes, the courses in the common course numbering system will be equivalent at their core, so a baseline course description will reflect that equivalency.

In addition to the baseline description, institutions may add elements that are particular to the needs and/or protocol of the institution as described, above.

Course Title

Course titles should match among institutions

- **Allowing for some institutional stylistic nuances**

The course title will not be the required primary designator for the common course numbering system courses.

Rationale

This recommendation aligns with Guiding Principles #1, 2, and 5.

Because courses in the common course numbering system will primarily be identified by the common designator of a suffix following the course number, exact matches among course titles are not necessary.

With other alignment among the CCN courses, course title alignment is expected.

	<p>NOTE: Institutions need to be able to include stylistic elements that follow course title protocols at the institution.</p> <p>Course titles, as abbreviated on transcripts, are limited by the number of characters in that data field.</p>

Action Items In-progress/Pending

ACTIVITY	STATUS
Recommend Framework for Subject Code when subjects do not align	<p>Pending Additional guidance from the Transfer Council is needed.</p> <p>Subcommittee members will discuss further and make a further recommendation, after receiving additional guidance from the Transfer Council.</p>
Required Research prior to the next Sys Ops Subcom meeting	<p>In Progress Subcommittee members will gather information from their institutions (and peer institutions) to support ongoing discussion and additional decisions regarding implementing the framework, as approved.</p> <p>This research includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine if a "+", other character

	<p>or other letter is problematic for the software your institution uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine if the 4th or 5th character following the number is best for your institution. • Determine if a delimiter [a character to note the boundary between two regions in text] is needed to interface with external systems (e.g. Fed, VA, etc) and if that will be feasible in combination with other items like honors courses (101-C and 101H-C). • Determine if local guidelines/outcomes currently exceed the 25% rule (e.g. GenEd information, course outcomes). • Define parameters of course outcomes as was done for course description. • Be prepared to discuss pros/cons.

Questions for Transfer Council

- What guidance can the Transfer Council provide regarding subject codes when the subjects do not align, such as Math and Statistics?
- What communication protocols are appropriate among the subcommittees? For example, should the subcommittee chairs/co-chairs connect directly with each other? Or should the subcommittee chairs/co-chairs connect directly with the co-chairs of the Transfer Council?
- How will elements of the CCN system be recorded and stored, for reference over time?

- How will the process to introduce change for any CCN course be monitored over time?

Other Notes

- Members of the Sys Ops Subcomm referred to the Guiding Principles (unanimously approved by the subcommittee) as they developed the framework. Members established Subject Code as the term for the abbreviation used by institutions for Subjects, for example HIST or HST for History. Members did note that our charge uses the word “prefix” for this term.

Signed (via email transmission) by Julia Pomerenk and Chris Sweet Date:
June 9, 2022

Copies provided to:

CCN Systems & Operations Co-chairs: Julia Pomerenk and Chris Sweet
Transfer Council Co-chairs: Susan Jeffords and Teresa Rivenes
HECC Support Staff: Jane Denison-Furness, Jennifer Markey

— END OF REPORT—