UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING  
November 30, 2010  
Collaboration Room, Knight Library

Present:
Susan Anderson, Andrew Bonamici, Eric Carlson, Sue Eveland, Dave Hubin, Jennifer Joslin, Dean Livelybrooks, Karen McLaughlin, Ian McNeely, Karen Sprague, Drew Terhune, Matt Villeneuve, and Julie Hessler

Absent:
Kathie Carpenter, Jordynn Didlick, Amy Goeser Kolb, Ron Severson, Josh Snodgrass, Jim Tice, Tom Wheeler (on leave), Paul Engelking, and Judith Baskin

Agenda
Minutes from November 16, 2010 meeting
Announcements
Grade Culture: moving toward Senate legislation
General Education: should FIGs be a model?

Minutes:
The minutes of the November 16 meeting were not ready. They will be reviewed and voted on at the first meeting of the Winter Term.

The Chair presented a preview of business the Council will be addressing during the Winter term, including discussion of the President’s New Partnership proposal for its impact on UO’s academic mission

On March 1, 2011, UO will be conveying to the Regional Accreditors the criteria by which it will want to be measured over the next seven years. These criteria are currently being developed and built upon the Provost’s Academic Plan. The Council noted that there should be broad consultation among academic councils as the criteria evolve.

The Council discussed the distinction between the terms “accountability” and “assessment”:

- Assessment is the term used for analytical information aimed at an informed audience, such as higher education professionals and specialists. It focuses on the measurement of a desired outcome (e.g. student learning).
Accountability refers to more descriptive information, typically numerical (e.g. graduation rates), intended for general audiences such as legislatures and families of prospective students.

**Grade Culture Proposal**
The Chair reported that feedback from the committees that have been consulted (ARC, SRC, and FAC) is generally quite favorable. The Chair asked the UGC to consider how best to prepare for presenting the Council’s recommendations on Grade Culture to the University Senate later in the year. Several questions were brought up in the discussion:

**Discussion**
1) Should Council members seek out individual Senators and discuss the recommendations with them prior to official Senate presentation? Yes: the Council should raise awareness of what it will be proposing so that Senators can formulate questions and discuss them productively in the short time typically available in a Senate meeting. The Senate Executive Committee, in particular, should be engaged, and the new Academic Council should discuss the proposal. The UGC Chair should send an e-mail to each Senator introducing the attached UGC proposal. Then, UGC members can be responsible for contacting Senate members who are in their departments and discussing the recommendations with them, answering their questions and explaining the Council’s thinking.

2) How should the final recommendations be crafted into language that the Senate can vote on? The recommendations should be in the form of a motion that can be presented for a Senate vote.

3) What kind of comparative grade statistics should be provided to the Faculty Proposal # 2? How specific should we be on this point in the motion presented to the Senate?

**Discussion:**
- As a practical matter, any reports developed for faculty must have to have a standard design. Registrar’s Office cannot produce large numbers of individuals
- We need to decide which comparisons to include with the individual data sent to each faculty member for his/her course.

There was general consensus that following data should be available to each faculty member:

- Grade distribution and mean for a particular offering of a faculty member’s course (CRN);
- Aggregate grade distribution and mean for all sections and/or offerings of the same course (if these exist);
- Aggregate grade distribution and mean for all courses with the same subject code, in the same department, and in the same college;
- Ideally, these statistics should distinguish between upper- and lower-division courses.
For the purposes of Senate legislation, the Council will identify a standard set of comparative data to be incorporated into the Registrar’s official record for a given CRN. Currently, this official record contains the list of enrolled students, their grades, etc.

Where would these reports be made available? The Registrar’s Office can make them available on Duckweb, with access controls put into place.

When would they be available? The best time to make these data available is at a moment sure to capture faculty attention, e.g. at the moment grades are submitted. At that point, the grade distribution and mean grade for the course could appear on the submission screen. Later on (10am on the day after grades are due), the comparative grade distribution would become available. Delaying the release of comparative data would help to avoid overburdening faculty members with information at the moment they submit grades.

In summary, the Council agreed to the following protocol for providing comparative grade data:

1. At the moment of grade submission, faculty would have access to a screen showing the mean grade and grade distribution for that particular CRN.
   When “Submit” is clicked, two screens would appear: an existing screen saying, “Any grades missing?” and a new screen with the mean grade and the grade distribution;
   “Submit” would be clicked again to confirm.
2. At 10am on the day after grades are due, the comparative grade statistics, in aggregate, would be available to faculty.
3. At a on individual CRNs would be available only to instructors of record and to others with access to the official record for a given course. Comparative data will be more widely available to those within a given department or college, including department heads.
4. Faculty would be able to review their historical grading patterns in a course at any time.

General Education
The Chair and Council decided that the discussion on General Education would be taken up at a later meeting.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 10, 2011, 12:30pm at the Collaboration Room in the Knight Library.