UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
October 15, 2013
Collaboration Room, Rm 122 Knight Library

PRESENT
Susan Anderson, Ron Bramhall, Sue Eveland, Lisa Freinkel, Dave Hubin, Loren Kajikawa, Ruth Keele, Alisha Kinlaw, Susan Lesyk, Lori Manson, Lee Rumbarger, Alison Schmitke, Josh Snodgrass, Randy Sullivan, Glenda Utsey, Maggie Witt, and Caitlin Yamaguchi

ABSENT
Andrew Bonamici, Coleman Boyer, Jeffrey Bradshaw, John Gage, Jim Imamura, Danaan O’Donnell-Davidson, Beata Stawarska, and Tom Wheeler

GUESTS:
- Barbara Altmann, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs
- Patricia Dewey, Director Arts and Administration, AAA
- Tina Rinaldi, Managing Director Arts and Administration, AAA
- Kathleen Freeman Hennessy, Director UG Studies, CAS Computer and Information Science

AGENDA
I. Minutes from October 1, 2013 meeting

II. Revised minor proposal from Arts and Administration, AAA
   Presented by: Patricia Dewey, Director, AAD, AAA and
                Tina Rinaldi, Managing Director, AAD, AAA

III. Preview of UGC agenda for 2013–2014: Goals and working groups

MINUTES

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 1, 2013 MEETING
The Chair called for emendments to the minutes of the October 1, 2013 meeting. There were typographical errors in the attendance roster and some name misspellings. These were noted.

A motion was made to accept the minutes of the meeting of October 1, 2013 as emended.

Moved: Susan Anderson
Seconded: Maggie Witt

The motion to accept the minutes with emendments passed unanimously.
II. REVISED PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE TO THE ARTS AND ADMINISTRATION MINOR IN AAA

The Chair invited members to introduce themselves to the presenters of the proposal for a revised minor in Arts and Administration. The proposal was presented by Patricia Dewey, Director of Arts and Administration and Tina Rinaldi, Managing Director of Arts and Administration. Patricia presented a brief recap of the history of the original proposal from its original submission to the Undergraduate Council in spring 2013 through the revisions in the proposal made in response to concerns expressed by the UGC at that time. Specifically, she noted that AAD had addressed five concerns voiced by the Council:

1. Revisions to the Arts Management Minor curriculum;
2. Clarification of instructional staffing and student advising;
3. Action steps regarding a departmental Grading Policy;
4. Action steps regarding evaluation of the undergraduate course content; and,
5. Update on new and “regularized “AAD undergraduate courses.

(It was pointed that the UG Council had endorsed a name change to the minor. The program was previously known as the Community Arts Minor, but the new proposed program was now the Arts Management Minor.)

Tina presented a summary of how the five points have been addressed in the revised proposal:

1. In the structure of the curriculum for the minor, courses are clustered in a way that presents a more coherent picture of the curricular structure for the minor. Students have responded very positively to this change.

2. All Tenure Track faculty in the AAD teach courses at the undergraduate level in the minor and provide advising for students seeking to pursue the minor.

3. The grading policy for the AAD program has been spelled out and posted on the department’s website. At this time, the department has adopted a not “A+” policy, but this may be revisited at a future time.

4. The department is currently doing an assessment of the AAD 250 general education courses in the program and evaluating their foundational context and material for the new 300- and 400-level courses in the Arts Management Minor. The department is also looking at the online AAD 250, 251, and 252 courses offered through Academic Extension as part of this internal assessment and evaluation process.
5. The department is moving to regularize courses for the minor at the 300- and 400-level. Four courses have already been approved, and two courses are currently in the UO Committee on Courses. Six additional courses are in development.

Discussion
The Council proceeded to question the presenters on a few points:

- Will every student in the minor have an experiential practicum course?
  
  Answer: Currently, minors are encouraged to take such a course, but it is not required. At such time as a major is developed, majors would be required to take the practicum.

- Is there a minimum of upper-division level courses required of minors?
  
  Answer: Yes, implicitly. (It was advised by the Council that this minimum should be spelled out clearly in the proposal.)

- Is there a way to include the BS degree in the minor as well as the BA degree?

- Students should take the minor for graded courses rather than P/NP.

- A residency requirement is needed in the proposal; the minor should cap the number of credits that can be transferred in from outside the institution.

- There should be a way that upper-division courses from other departments (in the student’s major) can count towards the minor.

- The Council would not totally eliminate the “A+” grade from the grading policy because it would allow for the differentiation for truly exceptional students.

- There is still a question about the ratio of tenure track faculty in the program to adjunct faculty.

The Council discussed with the presenters the procedural steps (a special request) they need to take to expedite the change to the new minor becoming effective in winter 2014. There was also discussion of how departmental advising will mitigate the effects of a transitional change in the minor on students graduating in the spring.

Following the departure of the presenters, The Council discussed the revised proposal. It was noted that the AAD had been very painstaking in responding to all the concerns the Council had raised in their original submission in spring 2013. The Chair summarized the Council’s recommendations and stated that they would be in his memo to the department.
The motion was made to endorse the revised proposal for an Arts Management minor in Arts and Administration, AAA.

Moved: Randy Sullivan
Seconded: Glenda Utsey

The motion passed unanimously.

III. UGC AGENDA FOR 2013-2014: GOALS AND WORKING GROUPS

• Goals

The Chair presented a detailed outline of the agenda for the UGC’s work for the balance of the academic year. His goal for this meeting was:

– Set the agenda for the year;
– Set specific goals for each of the issues to be considered; and
– Develop a plan for how to achieve those goals

Six topics bubbled to the surface at the end of last year and it was proposed that those issues be addressed:

1. Consideration of reform of general education
2. Grade culture/grade inflation
3. Assessment and accreditation
4. Undergraduate research
5. Online course oversight policy
6. Para-academic courses

After careful thought and consultation, the Chair would like to take several of the topics out of the UGC agenda for this year. He would like to continue to make progress on them but do so behind-the-scenes. Things may be added back in depending on progress.
Topic items to set aside at this time:

5. Online course oversight policy
The UGC left off in the spring term with drafts of two documents: 1) guidelines for oversight of online courses; and 2) form for approval of online courses. The next step is talks with the new VPUGS, then conversations with Academic Extension, Academic Affairs, and curriculum committees. The plan would be to update the documents based on those conversations then distribute it to departments across campus for review and feedback. The documents would be the basis for the Senate to use to codify a policy on Online Education.

   »» Goal: Take this to the Senate by the end of the AY.

2. Grade culture/grade inflation
We left off in the spring term with the plan to encourage programs and departments to finish crafting and posting their grading standards, as well as thinking through making progress on the larger issue this year, perhaps through rehabilitating one of the grade inflation motions from 2011. Rather than continue full Council deliberations, the Chair will work behind the scenes to: 1) encourage programs to finish and post their grading standards; and 2) increase the availability of information to departments on grading, and to encourage them to disseminate (FERPA-compliant) information to instructors and GTFs in their program.

   > Goal: By the end of the year we will effectively have all of the grade documents posted and the Chair will have contacted all program heads (perhaps through a presentation to CAS Heads and conversations with Deans of Academic Affairs of the different colleges). This suspends a plan to take something to the senate this spring.

4. Undergraduate research
Things are starting to move forward on this topic, notably money from the President to RIGE to start an undergraduate office. This would seem fairly narrow in scope. The VP UGS is also moving on creating an UG research office. There is a provost-level initiative to connect these.

   »» Goal: The Council has no immediate goal but can reassess periodically as new information becomes available.
Three topics for the Council to take up during the year:

i. General Education

In the consideration of the reform of general education, this topic should be front and center for the Council this year. There are things that make this topic compelling and the time is right to examine it:

- The last overhaul of General Education was in 1999 (with minor tweaks in 2001 & 2004). There has been massive growth and major changes in the university since then (13,000 to 21,000 UGs).
- There has been massive expansion in General Education offerings over the period with ~800 group-satisfying and multicultural-satisfying courses and more being added every term.
- There is a large (25%) and increasing amount of credit coming from courses not taken at UO (AP, IB, transfer credit, etc.) which perhaps lessens the coherence of General Education here and makes it harder to see its meaning.
- UO now has a budget model that has affected our course offerings and has pushed for the creation of large, General Education lecture classes.
- An increasing online presence of Academic Extension is driving a push into General Education classes.
- General Education is an assessment & accreditation issue.
- There is anecdotal evidence of concern with the coherence of General Education (some of this not so anecdotal—see Ron’s classes’ surveys and analyses) and dissatisfaction with General Education (both by faculty and students).
- There is the CAS General Education Renaissance project.

However, it isn’t clear if there is a problem and, if so, whether we can agree on what it is:

- Is there a problem with our approach (philosophy) to General Education (e.g., how do we operationalize providing a liberal arts and sciences education)?
- Does the current system adequately balance this with real needs for specific disciplinary and technical training?
- Is there a problem with implementation and delivery of this system?
Are there problems with articulation with the major? Or, is it largely about poor communication about the meaning of General Education and the system of General Education at UO?

UGC has discussed this issue quite a bit over the years and although this has been intellectually stimulating, there has been no concrete progress on the issue such as policy change. We should make progress this year.

**Goal:** Produce a white paper by the end of the AY on the state of General Education at UO that provides a systematic look at whether or not it is broken. If so, how? What could (what are the alternatives?) or should (what should we do?) be done? Or, should the UGC keep the scope more narrow?

### Para-Academic Classes

This is an important issue and the UGC is the right body to consider the issue. This is also doable. The UOCC requested at the end of last year for the UGC to provide policy guidance on what they described as “service learning” courses. This was precipitated by a request for regularization of two COE classes—FHS 110 (Foundations of Leadership and Life Skills) and FHS 111 (Leadership in the 21st Century). Both were originally taught as 199 courses. The UOCC denied both classes.

There is also a request from CAS to provide guidance on academic credit for CAS 407 courses, which focus on career decisions and searching for jobs and internships. They acknowledge that these courses provide valuable experiences for students, but it is not clear whether they are truly academic courses. Academic Affairs has raised a similar issue—training courses for RAs in the residence halls.

**Goal:** By the end of the year the UGC should do two things: 1) examine the scope of the issue by creating an exhaustive list of courses (regularized and experimental) that fall into this para-academic category; 2) come up with a policy document that provides clarity on this issue and will serve as the basis for curriculum committees to consider courses.

### Assessment & Accreditation

It is clear from the presentation made by Dave Hubin and Marilyn Skalberg that accreditation is a critical issue at UO. Dave has asked that the UGC focus on the first core theme of the UO mission statement—undergraduate education. 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. Dave and Marilyn ask that the Council play a role in selecting key metrics that may contribute to a clear picture of the University’s movement toward its goals for the NWCCU regional accreditation cycle 2011–2017.
To select a set of metrics judged to be key for UO to measure itself against comparator institutions and to assess progress over the next several years.

Working Groups & Plan of Action

The Chair would like to use working groups to assist in making progress on these issues. Working groups of UGC members would focus on each of the three topics. General Education would be a large group. One person should be chosen for each group to serve as the point person/team leader.

Outline of work to be done for the three topics Council will take on for the year:

i. General Education

Four meetings? A meeting to examine and review where we are. What is the system? What are its stated goals? What is its history? Working group can perhaps survey department heads and key players in General Education to hear their feedback on problems. Also, how do we assess student concerns—ASUO? This could be reported at another meeting within a larger discussion of what’s working and what’s not working. Another meeting on possible changes of course—1) what are the options out there and 2) how would we actually make a change (what would it take)? Working group could do legwork on this and could also draft the white paper. Another meeting on getting feedback on white paper.

vi. Para-academic Courses

Two meetings? One late fall with Ian McNeely on scope of the issue/problem. Working group can work with Ian and Barbara to pull these materials together. Start to craft a policy document. Second meeting can be used to get feedback from the full UGC on document.

iii. Assessment & accreditation.

Two meetings? First, Doxsee briefing. Working group review of measures. Second meeting presentation to the UGC.

The Chair asked members to be prepared to join one of the working groups by the next meeting of the Council.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 29, 2013, at 12:00 noon in the Rowe Conference Room of the Knight Library.