UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
October 1, 2013
Collaboration Room, Knight Library

PRESENT
Susan Anderson, Ron Bramhall, Sue Eveland, Lisa Freinkel, John Gage, Dave Hubin, Jennifer Joslin, Ruth Keele, Alisha Kinlaw, Susan Lesyk, Alison Schmitke, Josh Snodgrass, Beata Stawarska, Randy Sullivan, Maggie Witt, and Caitlin Yamaguchi

ABSENT
Andrew Bonamici, Coleman Boyer, Jaffrey Bradshaw, Loren Kajikawa, Danaan O'Donnell-Davidson, Glenda Utsey, and Tom Wheeler;

GUESTS
• Marilyn Skalberg, Coordinator of Accreditation and Special Projects, President’s Office
• Barbara Altmann, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs

AGENDA
I. Approval of minutes from April 19, 2013; May 3, 2013; May 17, 2013; and May 31, 2013 meetings
II. Introductions
III. Introducing new Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies: Goals for the year (Freinkel)
IV. Student perspective from our student members
V. Assessment & accreditation (Hubin)
VI. This year’s UGC agenda: Review of topics & sub-committees (Snodgrass)

MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held in Spring term 2013 (April 19, May 3, May 17, and May 31) were reviewed by the Council. The Chair asked for any emendments or a motion to accept.

The motion was made to accept the minutes from Spring term 2013 meetings (April 19, May 3, May 17, and May 31) as submitted.

Moved: Randy Sullivan
Second: Ron Bramhall

The motion passed unanimously.
II. INTRODUCTIONS
The Chair invited old and new members to introduce themselves to the group in a round robin format. He noted that several members were not able to attend the Fall term meetings due to scheduling conflicts. However, all members will be kept informed of the Council’s activity through the distribution of the minutes.

- Charge to the Council:
  For the benefit of new members of the Council, the Chair read the Charge to the Council from the University Senate (website).

*Charge and Responsibilities:*

*The Undergraduate Council shall be responsible for reviewing, evaluating and enhancing the quality of the University’s academic program. The Council’s charge includes: (1) Review and promote the objectives and purposes of undergraduate education and assure that all policies and procedures, curricula, personnel and teaching decisions that affect undergraduate education are consistent and defensible with the institution’s undergraduate education mission as defined in the University’s Mission Statement and Statement of Philosophy, Undergraduate Education; (2) Participate, on behalf of the University faculty, in planning the development and improvement of the undergraduate instructional program of the institution, in consultation with the University President, officers of administration and with relevant department heads and program directors; (3) Formulate, monitor, and respond to general academic policies, especially those which have impact on undergraduate programs across the University; (4) Develop and recommend new and revised baccalaureate degree requirements and policies as appropriate; (5) Monitor, help shape, and approve new undergraduate programs (majors, minors, certificates) and changes to existing programs; (6) Establish criteria and outcomes to determine the success of the overall undergraduate program and review the program and its various components in light of these criteria and outcomes; and, (7) Monitor the academic coherence, quality, and standards of the undergraduate academic program to assure that the quality and rigor of instruction and evaluation are consistent across the curriculum.*

(Link to University Senate website with information about standing committees, Undergraduate Studies: [http://committees.uoregon.edu/node/38](http://committees.uoregon.edu/node/38))

III. INTRODUCING NEW VICE PROVOST FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES: GOALS FOR THE YEAR (FREINKEL)
The Chair then introduced the new Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Lisa Freinkel, and invited her to comment upon her vision for undergraduate education.

- Lisa commended the work and goals of the Undergraduate Council.
She noted that up to this point, the UGC has been the primary advisory body for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies. As part of her new tenure, she is in process of appointing several additional advisory groups to assist her in evaluating undergraduate education at UO.

The first group is the unit directors within the division of Undergraduate Studies itself: First-Year Programs (directed by Marilyn Linton), Academic Advising (directed by Jennifer Joslin), the Accessible Education Center (directed by Hilary Gerdes), the Teaching and Learning Center (directed by Susan Lesyk), and the Opportunities Outreach Program (directed by Antonio Huerta).

The second group is a Council of Associate Deans, consisting of the Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education from each of the university’s schools and colleges, including Barbara Jenkins from the University Libraries. This will serve as an administrative council.

Lisa presented her understanding of Undergraduate Studies. The division is a little vague and opaque. At many institutions, Undergraduate Studies is a separate “college.” New students matriculate into the UGS college and take general education classes. This is not the way UGS functions at UO and this is a good thing. At the University of Oregon, UGS focuses on the whole trajectory of the student experience, from Convocation to Commencement. The Vice Provost coordinates the university’s conversation around this developmental process of the student scholar.

Lisa is pursuing four initiatives that are directly involved with this conversation:

1. General Education reform; Ian McNeely and Karen Sprague are spearheading this examination.
2. Examining the relationship of teaching and advising; how do teaching and advising overlap? How can we better coordinate our advising and integrate / relate it to classroom teaching?
3. Technology in education (and online education); how do we teach / learn / survive in today’s digital environment?
4. Capstone experience particularly as it relates to distinguished scholarships and undergraduate research.

Generally, Lisa wants to examine how the university responds to a problem and tries to fix it. One challenge is that we often can’t articulate the problem. Can we state a problem and develop consensus and buy-in in identifying and naming it? That may facilitate our working to “solve” it.

IV. STUDENT PERSPECTIVES FROM STUDENT MEMBERS (STUDENT INTERESTS)
The Chair invited the attending student representatives to voice the issues they would like the Council to address:
One student feels vested in the strength and future of the humanities; she would like to focus on online courses. How can classes dependent on discussion and practical activity work in an online environment? She would also like to focus on explaining the meaningful purpose of non-major classes to students.

Another student is interested in online classes.

A third would like to see a one-credit class required for all students on the topic of “consent” and sexual assault.

V. ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION

David Hubin and Marilyn Skalberg asked the Council to promote the metrics of achieving the accreditation goals for the 2016 Accreditation Report. UO will be assessed on four core themes reflected in the UO mission statement:

1. To provide outstanding undergraduate education;

2. To provide outstanding graduate education:

3. To provide outstanding programs of discovery of new knowledge and creation of new arts that enrich the human experience; and,

4. To provide outstanding service to the state and society.

The UGC is being asked to focus on goal #1, undergraduate education. The Accreditation team operates as an agency of the national Department of Education. Accreditation is important because it determines whether or not an institution will receive Federal aid.

The goal of UO is aspirational—to meet or exceed the AAU “salient measures” of the 32 comparator institutions (i.e., move to upper half of the AAU measures). Some of the metrics will include student engagement, student learning, student laboratory experience, student honors, etc.

David and Marilyn distributed a draft document of a collection of indicators/metrics and their respective sources which might be presented in a consolidated spreadsheet form for quick reference. The Council is encouraged to suggest and submit additional metrics that may contribute to a clear picture of the University’s movement toward its goals for the NWCCU regional accreditation cycle 2011–2017.

VI. THIS YEAR’S UGC AGENDA: CHAIR’S GOALS FOR UPCOMING YEAR

The Chair discussed issues for the Undergraduate Council to potentially address in 2013–2014:

1. Reform of General Education

2. Grade Culture and grade inflation:
– Information on the issue is being successfully disseminated;

– A motion on the issue was passed in the senate;

– Conversations around campus indicate that a change in understanding the significance of the issue is occurring.

3. Assessment and accreditation

4. Undergraduate research:
   – Thinking through how the UGC can encourage cutting-edge research being brought into the classroom

5. Online course oversight policy

6. Para-academic courses:
   – What should be approved and allowed to give credit;

   – There is a curriculum committee process to review courses, but experimental courses do not go through this review process;

   – Lisa suggested the Council should work on defining: what is a credit hour? What is student engagement?

The Chair suggested creating sub-committees to focus on particular goals. He felt that several of these issues are ready for sub-committee attention. It was also suggested that small working groups, rather than sub-committees, should work on these issues. For the next meeting, the Chair invited members to offer concrete ideas on working groups.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 15, 2013 at 12:00 noon in the Collaboration Room (Rm 122) of the Knight Library.