UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
November 16, 2012
Collaboration Room, Knight Library

PRESENT:
Susan Anderson, Ron Bramhall, Ashley Buchholz, Paul Engelking, Sue Eveland, Madeleine Hudson,
Jennifer Joslin, Loren Kajikawa, Diana Salazar, Alison Schmitke, Josh Snodgrass, Kerry Snodgrass, Karen
Sprague, Beata Stawarska, Randy Sullivan, Tom Wheeler, and Glenda Utsey

ABSENT:
Andrew Bonamici, Dave Hubin, and Ben Smood

GUESTS:
Ruth Keele, Lee Rumbarger, Ian McNeely, Doug Blandy, and Barbara Altmann

AGENDA:

I. Minutes from November 2, 2012 meeting (3 mins)
II. Presentation by Doug Blandy, Sr. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (60 mins)
III. Continued discussion of online courses (30 mins)

MINUTES:

I. MEETING MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 2, 2012
The Chair called for a review and motion on the minutes of the November 2, 2012 meeting. A
typographical error was corrected.

The motion was made to accept the minutes of the November 2, 2012 meeting.

Moved: Ron Bramhall
Seconded: Loren Kajikawa

The motion passed unanimously.

II. PRESENTATION: DOUG BLANDY, SR. VICE PROVOST, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
The Chair introduced Doug Blandy, Sr. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Council members and
attending guests introduced themselves.

• UO Issue Brief: Technology and Education Delivery
Doug presented a background of his involvement in the move toward working in the area of Technology and Education Delivery, first as director of Arts and Administration and then as Associate Dean in AAA in the late 1990s. His was one of the first academic units to put courses online through Black Board. These courses became very popular, especially during Summer terms.

Recently, in his position as Sr. Vice Provost, he has worked with Academic Extension to develop an Issues Brief for the Provost. The brief outlines UO priorities and the place of technology-enhanced education in meeting those priorities. It examines the purpose of technology-enhanced learning at UO. Several major areas covered include:

- an examination of issues surrounding the current status of technology-enhanced education at UO;
- identification of the resources and collaborations necessary to “grow” online programs;
- a projection of expected outcomes in the development of an initiative to promote technology-enabled learning at UO.

After consultation with the Deans’ Working Group, Academic Extension, and other groups, Doug proposed the following:

“The University of Oregon proposes an initiative supporting the development and dissemination of innovative strategies for the effective and appropriate use of contemporary technology in educational delivery. The project seeks to: (1) determine how best to support innovation; (2) remove obstacles to innovation; (3) provide incentive and direction for new development; and (4) chart a path for ongoing development” (see UO Issue Brief)

A Steering Committee of campus leadership, including “representatives from the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils” will provide direction and insight to Supporting Innovation in Technology-Enhanced Education. The Steering Committee will work with three working groups: a technology-support working group, chaired by Deb Carver; an operational support working group, chaired by Sandra Gladney; and a faculty incentive working group, chaired by Frances Bronet. (See Technology and Education Delivery Initiative Steering Committee)

Doug confirmed that Yong Zhao will be involved on the Steering Committee or the Technology Support Working Group in some capacity. (His extensive traveling may impose some limitations on his participation.) Other persons like CAS Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education Ian McNeely and Director of CAS IT Cathleen Leue will also be included.

Doug shared with the UGC a sample of an Academic Extension evaluation of an online class, knowing that the Undergraduate Council is focusing on the qualitative assessment of online instruction. The Academic Extension evaluation focuses on instructional design of the course and the objective measurability of learning outcomes (based on Bloom’s Taxonomy). This is a sample of what may be a systematic assessment of online courses. Doug suggested it might serve as a model or resource as the Council grapples with the qualitative assessment of online courses.
III. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF ONLINE COURSES
Council members raised a number of questions and ideas regarding the move toward technologically enhanced education, including the following:

– The Council has been exploring how the process (of technological enhancement) and the product fit together; also, how resources and oversight are connected to the development of online courses. It would be helpful to have a clear statement of what resources are available.

– Academic advising is critical for the online model or the hybridized model.

– TEP will be a very important resource in this initiative.

– Q: The term “technology enhanced education” is a good umbrella term for the many different modalities of online courses. Will the Steering Committee be comparing these different modalities?
  Doug: The Steering Committee will probably be focusing more on looking at the range of possibilities in online instruction.

– We need to make sure that we don’t technologically dis-enfranchise students and faculty who may not be technologically savvy. We should work towards a trained technology staff to work one-on-one with faculty in a client-focused model of support as they learn new interface models.

– We must still remain aware of student privacy. Some professors have inadvertently exposed private information on open web classes.

– Q: Where are the online classes that are not in Academic Extension coming from? What is driving their growth and how are they monitored?
  Doug: College and school policies have their own individual models of developing courses on their own and with Academic Extension. (If an online class is offered for tuition, the department does its own data entry. There is a possibility that “new” experimental courses can be offered online without the Registrar checking into it. Generally, it is existing courses that are offered in an additional online format.)

– Blended (hybrid) courses are probably becoming the majority of online coursework. The Registrar’s office will start identifying what model an online course is (full, hybrid, partial, etc.) The Registrar offered to provide data on grade distributions in traditional and online courses.

– Q: Is there assessment of the online instruction that is occurring now?
  Doug: He would take this question back to the Steering Committee. The University Senate has also formed a task force to study technologically enhanced education and they will also probably be looking at this question.
- Will there be a limit to the number of online courses that departments can offer or that students can take? Where are we headed?

- Q: Where are we as a campus in the movement toward MOOCs? Are we taking a quantum leap? Are we at the very beginning of something radical?
  Doug: He is not personally impressed with MOOCs as a pedagogical model.
  Barbara Altmann: Many institutions are using existing MOOCs (e.g. edEX) as enrichment resources for their own courses.

- How are MOOCs assessed? Are there regional sites for exams?
  Clackamas came up as one. CAS-IT currently runs proctored exams for outside institutions. This has been in operation for at least 10 years.

- The utilization of an instructional design reviewer is new to the UO. The concept is being incorporated at UO.

  Q: How do other institutions handle this?
  Doug: UCSD seems to have a good model for this. (see handout)

- What is the cost effectiveness of online courses?

- Q: Who has ownership of online materials?
  Doug: Lawyers will be involved in licensing agreements with professors developing materials for online courses.

- We will need to look carefully at the articulation of online coursework.

- Q: Will technology enhanced courses mean multiple management systems for students?
  Doug: We will need to have support services for students as well as faculty. Some management systems work for some academic fields and not for others.

- UO needs to identify its niche in technologically enhanced education delivery.

At this juncture, Doug had to leave the meeting but the Council continued its discussion.

Ian spoke about a conference he recently attended on undergraduate education. Interestingly, science education and accreditation were topics of discussion, but the topic of online education never came up. The UCSD representative gave Ian the policy on online courses used there. This has been distributed to Council members.

- Students are getting less interaction with professors as class size grows. Online courses have the potential to remove students even further from professors.
- There was surprise that UCSD distinguishes online courses from regular courses on the transcript. Why do this? All courses should be offered with the institution’s assurance of quality and rigor.

- It is important to avoid developing too generic a process; unfortunately the whole thrust of the technology movement is to remove variation in courses.

- We also need to preserve the particular value that undergraduates receive by studying at a research institution.

- There is an impression that online courses are attractive to students who are not academically motivated.

- Q: How does the online environment affect the development of TAs and GTFs?  
  A: Online courses will require development of a whole new apparatus to support GTFs who are thrust into online instruction. On the other hand, online courses could be an opportunity for transitioning GTFs into the teaching required of regular faculty.

- Is it possible to observe some current online course offerings?

- The hybrid model, where online components are enrichments, is best.

- The ObaWorld model looks great from the student perspective. It could potentially be tested with FIGs.

- Resources would be needed to support students and faculty while such a new system was introduced.

The Chair announced that the next meeting will be a live demonstration of the ObaWorld system.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 30, 2012, 2:00pm in the Room 230T, HEDCO Building at the College of Education.