

**TO: Margie Paris, University of Oregon Senate President**

**FROM: J. Josh Snodgrass (Anthropology), Undergraduate Council Chair**

**CC: Lisa Freinkel (Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies)  
Ruth Keele (Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs)**

**RE: Undergraduate Council End-of-Year Report**

**Date: October 17, 2013**

The Undergraduate Council focused on two main sets of issues during the 2012-2013 academic year: 1) online courses and education, with the goal of developing a policy document for the oversight of online courses; and 2) the review of proposed program changes. In addition, the Council directed attention to several other topics, including undergraduate research and grade culture/inflation. The Council Chair was also involved in a variety of other discussions and approvals that did not require consideration by the full Council membership. This end-of-year report summarizes Council business during the year. Additional details can be found in the minutes of individual meetings, which are available on the UGC website (<http://pages.uoregon.edu/ucouncil/meetings/meetings2012-13.html>).

#### **A. PROGRAM REVIEW**

A primary charge of the Council is to participate in the program review process by considering proposals for new and revised majors, minors, certificates, and other programs. In the 2012-2013 AY the Council reviewed a number of requests for program changes, and several additional program reviews were performed by the Council Chair (the results of which were reported to the membership).

#### **Full Council Reviews with Approvals**

**1. AAA Proposal for Revisions to the Interior Architecture Minor.** The Council considered and voted on a request at the 4/19/13 meeting on proposed changes that included the adoption of more consistent credit requirements (especially in regard to the Architecture minor), a reduction in the number of required courses and minimum number of credits required (36 to 26 credits), and clarification of requirements for those in the Interior Architecture minor who are majoring in Architecture.

**2. AAA Proposal for Revisions to the Architecture Minor.** The Council considered and voted on a request at the 4/19/13 to make changes to the Architecture program for undergraduate minors. The proposed changes included the adoption of more consistent credit requirements (especially in regard to the Interior Architecture minor), a reduction in the number of required courses and minimum number of credits required (29 to 26 credits), and clarification of requirements for those in the Architecture minor who are majoring in Interior Architecture.

**3. CAS/Ethnic Studies Proposal for a New Minor in Native American Studies.** The Council considered a request from CAS to establish a new undergraduate minor program in Native American Studies housed in the Department of Ethnic Studies. The request was considered by the Council and voted on at the 4/19/13 meeting. The Council voted unanimously to approve the new minor and required no revisions to the proposal; several suggestions for future changes to improve the program were offered.

**4. CAS/Religious Studies Proposal for a New Minor in Arabic Studies.** The Council reviewed a request from CAS to establish a new undergraduate minor program in Arabic Studies housed in the Department

of Religious Studies. The request was considered by the Council and voted on at the 5/3/13 meeting. The Council voted unanimously to approve the new minor and expressed enthusiastic support for the establishment of this new minor at UO; however, the Council requested two slight modifications to the proposal.

### **Full Council Reviews with Delayed/Tabled Action**

**1. College of Education.** A request for a name change of the Substance Abuse Prevention Program (SAPP)—from Substance Abuse Prevention Program (SAPP) to Substance Abuse Professional Preparation (SAPP) Program—was tabled after consideration by the Chair. After reviewing the seemingly minor request and program documents, the Chair decided it was appropriate to refer the matter to the full Council for review. This was as a result of several irregularities, including lack of regularization of SAPP classes, grade inflation, inappropriate course level offerings, and an inappropriate certificate offering. A memo from the Chair to the program directors (Shoshana Kerewsky and Sandra Gladney) and College of Education Dean (Mike Bullis) and Academic Dean (Ron Beghetto) explained in detail reasons for this decision. In response to the Chair's correspondence, the SAPP directors asked the meeting to be postponed from 2/25/13 to a later date in the Spring 2013 term. To date, the SAPP directors have not contacted the Chair to reschedule. The Chair reported on this issue at the 2/25/13 meeting.

**2. AAA/Arts & Administration (AAD).** AAD submitted two proposals to the Council: 1) to make substantive changes to the undergraduate minor in Community Arts, including a name change (to Arts Management) and revisions to the required curriculum and elective course offerings; and 2) a proposal for a new major in Arts Management. The revision to the minor proposal was considered by the Council during a meeting on April 2, 2013 that was attended by Patricia Dewey (Director, AAD Program) and Tina Rinaldi (Managing Director, AAD Program). Furthermore, the Chair provided a detailed response to the minor request in a memo dated March 20, 2013. Issues raised by the Chair and Council members included serious concerns about instructional staffing and student advising, curricular coherence, departmental grading standards, and the regularization of AAD courses. Similar concerns were voiced about the proposed new major, with general sentiment by the Council that AAD should focus on revising the minor proposal during the 2013-2014 AY and leaving the proposed major for a future year. No Council action was taken on the proposals and the requests were tabled. Later in the Spring term, an additional request was made by AAD to change the name of the minor to Arts Management with a plan for later substantive curricular changes to the minor. The Chair approved the name change without additional consideration by the Council; this was reported to the Council on 5/31/13.

### **Full Council Recommendations on OUS Programs**

Time in the 5/3/13 meeting was reserved to discuss a proposal by the Oregon University System (OUS) initiative on Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). Two documents were forwarded to the Council in advance of the meeting. A discussion was led by Ian McNeely (CAS Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education) and Kassia Dellabough (Senior Program Manager, Academic Extension & Director of Professional Outreach and Development for Students [PODS], Architecture and Allied Arts). Feedback was provided to McNeely and Dellabough that included concerns about the need for clearer guidelines across institutions as to what CPL experiences will be accepted given the potential impact on majors as well as general education courses. Additional information can be found in the minutes of the 5/3/13 meeting.

### **Chair Reviews of Minor Program Changes**

**1. School of Journalism and Communication/Communication Studies.** Approval of a name change request for the major and minor (Communications Studies to Media Studies), as well as small changes to requirements for the minor that include removing one class (J314; Introduction to Communication

Studies) as a requirement for the minor, reducing the number of required credits for the minor (27 to 24), and imposing a grading requirement for the minor (C or better in all SOJC classes).

**2. School of Music and Dance/Music Education.** Approval of a name change for one of their Baccalaureate programs—Bachelor of Music in Music Education to Bachelor of Music in Music (Pre-Teacher Licensure). This request was made for clarification and was at the request of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Commission on Accreditation.

**3. CAS/Chemistry Department.** Approval of small changes to the Chemistry and Biochemistry Majors, which included changes to the organic chemistry lab course offerings—namely the drop of CH 339 (Organic Analysis) and the addition of two new laboratory courses (CH 348 and 349; Organic Chemistry Lab for Majors). These changes do not affect the current organic chemistry labs (CH 337 and 338; Organic Chemistry Laboratory) that are taken by non-majors (primarily pre-med students).

**4. CAS/Economics Department.** Approval of a change in the residency requirement for the Economics major. The new policy requires students to take at least 7 of 11 of their upper division (300-400 level) courses at UO, which replaces the existing requirement of 3 of 11 courses at UO. The residency requirement was changed because of a concern that an increasing number of students are taking more of their upper division economics courses online or from foreign universities of unknown quality.

**5. CAS/Women's and Gender Studies.** Approval of small changes in the major, largely as a reflection of new faculty hires and the shift to focus on international and comparative gender studies. The changes include the drop of WGS 415 (Advanced Seminar) as a major requirement, the addition of WGS 351 (Introduction to Global Feminisms) as a major requirement, and the inclusion of a new course (WGS 451; Global Issues and Perspectives) as an elective requirement for the major and minor.

**6. CAS/Interdisciplinary Program in Cinema Studies.** Approval of a small curriculum change to the major that requires Cinema Studies majors to take at least two courses bearing the "CINE" subject code out of the major's six "CORE" requirements (previously there was not a required minimum number of CINE classes).

#### **Informal Reviews of Programs by the Chair**

**Informal Review of the Law School's Competition Not Conflict Certificate Program.** An informal review of the Competition Not Conflict (CNC) program and its courses (the latter was in conjunction with the UO Committee on Courses [UOCC; spearheaded by Lisa Wolverton] was conducted by the Council Chair at the request of the UOCC, as a number of courses were being proposed to be regularized) revealed a number of serious problems and irregularities, most notably that they were offering a certificate that had not been approved by the necessary bodies. After a review of materials, the UGC Chair met with Law School Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Adell Amos (1/24/13) to convey details of the review and to offer the assistance of UGC in regularizing the program. The Law School decided in February to temporarily suspend the program; they cancelled all Spring 2013 CNC classes. No classes are scheduled to be offered in Fall 2013.

#### **B. ONLINE EDUCATION & POLICY**

Considerable attention during the 2012-2013 AY was directed towards an investigation of online courses/education at UO, with the goal of considering whether to pursue Senate legislation mandating oversight of online courses. The Council held extensive discussions with the campus community to get feedback on the current online landscape at UO, as well as the broader picture of online education

trends nationally. The Council held meetings with: 1) Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Doug Blandy about online/distance education at UO and efforts by the Educational Technology Steering Committee; 2) Sandra Gladney, the Associate Director of Academic Extension; 3) Yong Zhao, Presidential Chair, Associate Dean for Global Education and Director, Center for Advanced Technology in Education, College of Education; 4) Dane Ramshaw, Learning Platform Systems Developer, College of Education; 5) a panel of six experts who shared their expertise and best practices in online education (Kassia Dellabough, Adjunct Faculty & Director of PODS, AAA; Stephen Fickas, Professor, Department of Computer and Information Science; Sandra Gladney, Associate Director, Academic Extension; Stephen Haynes, Professor Emeritus, Department of Economics; Cathleen Leue, Director, CASIT; and Robert Voelker-Morris, IT Faculty Consultant, TEP/TLC; and 6) Kassia Dellabough (Adjunct Faculty & Director of PODS, AAA) and Sandra Gladney (Associate Director, Academic Extension) who provided a tour of several online courses. Several additional Council meetings were dedicated to the topic of online education.

The Council Chair and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (VPUGS) Karen Sprague worked together to develop two documents, which are currently in draft form: 1) guidelines for oversight of online courses (**Appendix 1**); and 2) a form for the approval of online courses (**Appendix 2**). Council members provided extensive feedback during the process and the documents were revised several times. During the 2013-2014 AY the Council Chair will circulate copies of these documents to the new VPUGS (Lisa Freinkel), Office of Academic Affairs, Associate Deans for Academic Affairs in each of the Colleges; Academic Extension; and key curriculum committees (UOCC and CASCC) to solicit feedback. These documents will be revised based on this feedback but will eventually be brought to the Senate in order to codify an oversight policy on online education.

### **C. OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS**

**1. Grade Culture: Availability of Departmental/Program Statements.** Grade culture was the topic of the 1/14/13 meeting. The goals were threefold: 1) to summarize and review UO grade culture issues for those new to the Council; 2) to discuss plans for actions during the 2012-2013 AY; and 3) to strategize for actions over the next several years. On the second goal, the Council laid out plans to make progress on getting departments to be in compliance with the Senate resolution from 4/13/11 that required programs to post discipline-specific rationales for grading standards by the end of the Fall term 2011. Council members volunteered to talk to Department Heads in various departments and encourage them to complete and post their grading standards. The Chair also visited the CAS Department Heads meeting (4/17/13) and presented on the issue, and encouraged Department Heads to comply with the policy. As of 7/26/13 only 20 of 57 departments had posted their statements. Clearly, follow-up in the 2013-2014 AY is necessary. The Chair and VPUGS Karen Sprague identified four posted grading standards as models for other departments—these are Comparative Literature, Human Physiology, Mathematics, and History (see **Appendix 3**)

**2. Undergraduate Research.** Undergraduate research was the topic of the 5/17/13 meeting. The Council invited a number of guests (Doug Blandy, Audrey Cramer, Kimberly Espy, David Frank, Kevin Hatfield, Marilyn Linton, Ian McNeely, Julie Newton, Peter O'Day, Marjorie Taylor, and Gail Unruh) to consider the topic of what it means for UO undergraduates to be at a Research 1 institution. Goals included: 1) increasing awareness of how different units around campus are involved in undergraduate research in order to facilitate future cooperation; 2) building support for the establishment of a campus-level office to coordinate elements of the undergraduate research experience and champion this issue; 3) outlining a plan for a central website that celebrates past research, provides information to current students

about opportunities available in different departments/programs, and makes our undergraduate research visible and accessible to those outside the university; and 4) outlining a plan for what the UGC can do next year to help make progress on this issue. The meeting was very successful and has already led to connections between previously disparate groups. The Chair followed up with several meetings on the issue, including with Cramer, Espy, Hatfield, McNeely, as well as Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Barbara Altmann. Additional information is provided in **Appendix 4**.

**3. Committee on Committees 10-year Review of the UGC.** The Council Chair provided feedback on the UGC, including on committee charge, workload, and accomplishments. Suggestions were also made for minor changes to the membership (add an elected representative from the Clark Honors College; add several new *ex officio* members) and charge (for clarification, not substance). The Chair, along with the former Council Chair (Ian McNeely) and VPUGS (Karen Sprague), met with a representative from the Committee on Committees to discuss proposed changes.

**4. Intercollegiate Athletic Committee (IAC) Access to Student Athlete Grades.** The IAC requested UGC Chair support in gaining access to grade data for student athletes. The UGC Chair participated in several meetings and was asked on several occasions to review data requests and data provided to the IAC. The UGC Chair felt that the requests were reasonable, were consistent with the charge of the IAC, and that the data they had access to were inadequate to examine the issue. Further, a suggestion was made by the UGC Chair to examine the broader issue of data access by university committees; this matter should be considered by the Senate Transparency Committee.

**5. Clarification of Approval Protocol for the Council and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies.** The UGC Chair worked with the VPUGS (Karen Sprague) and the Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Ruth Keele) to clarify the approval process for new programs and changes to existing programs. The protocol, which follows that of the Graduate Council, is that recommendations and rationale are communicated to the VPUGS (typically in the form of a memo). The VPUGS then forwards to the Office of Academic Affairs a recommendation; this includes the VPUGS' recommendation, the Council's recommendation and, if necessary, a statement addressing any differences between the two recommendations. The Provost then provides the final approval of the proposal. These approvals are then formally entered into the curriculum report, which is presented to the Senate for consideration.

**6. ASUO Request for Increasing Student Feedback on the Curriculum.** ASUO Vice President Nicholas McCain requested that the Council consider including a link on the Course Evaluations webpage where students may submit various ideas directly to the Council regarding their curriculum. The idea was raised and briefly discussed at the 5/31/13 Council meeting. The Council expressed support for the idea and asked the Chair to follow-up in the 2013-2014 AY on implementing the suggestion.

## **D. FUTURE COUNCIL BUSINESS**

### **Council Membership, Structure, and Agenda for AY 2013-2014**

Josh Snodgrass was elected to and has agreed to serve as Chair from 2013-2014. There is no change in the composition of the elected faculty membership. The student membership will change completely, with five members rotating off (Ashley Buchholz, Madeleine Hudson, Diana Salazar, Benjamin Smood, and Kerry Snodgrass). After an interview process conducted by the Chair and the outgoing VPUGS (Karen Sprague) that involved interviews of six finalists who were culled from 22 applicants. Six new members were selected and all will be joining the Council: Coleman Boyer, Alisha Kinlaw, Caitlin Yamaguchi, Danaan O'Donnell-Davidson, Jeffrey Bradshaw, and Maggie Witt. The new Vice Provost for

Undergraduate Studies, Lisa Freinkel, joins the Council as an *ex officio* member and as the Council Convener.

Given the considerable number of program reviews and action items considered by the Council, the Chair decided to shift the format of the UGC to include working groups that will consider specific topics and then report to and lead discussions with the entire Council.

**2013-2014 Agenda:**

1. Online education and policy
2. Grade culture
3. General education
4. Undergraduate research
5. Para-academic courses
6. Learning outcomes, assessment, and accreditation

**E. APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX 1: Draft guidelines for oversight of online courses**

**APPENDIX 2: Draft form for the approval of online courses**

**APPENDIX 3: Model Departmental Grading Standards (Comparative Literature, Human Physiology, Mathematics, and History)**

**APPENDIX 4: Undergraduate Council Meeting on Undergraduate Research at the University of Oregon**

## APPENDIX 1: Draft guidelines for oversight of online courses

### Guidelines for Oversight of Online Courses – *DRAFT (v. 5/30/13)*

- **Faculty eligible to propose online and hybrid courses:** Ideas for new online or hybrid courses may originate with any member of the university teaching staff – including tenure-related faculty (TRF), career non-tenure-track faculty (career NTTF), adjunct faculty, and advanced graduate students. To enter the approval process, each course must be sponsored by an appropriate academic department that has articulated the intellectual rationale for placement of the course within its curriculum.
- **Faculty eligible to teach online and hybrid courses:** The responsibility for making teaching assignments has historically been with departments, an arrangement that is also appropriate for courses with partial or full online character.
- **Review of proposals for online courses:** Online and hybrid courses will go through the same review process as all new or revised courses, except that an additional, specialized review of the course's online aspect will be conducted. The intent of this specialized attention is not to stifle creativity by adding a bureaucratic barrier, but to ensure that the pedagogical opportunities, as well as the challenges, of the online environment have been thought through. Online or hybrid courses that are completely new, as well as existing courses that are gaining online character, will be reviewed, but with different kinds of attention, as outlined below. CourseLeaf software will be used to streamline the course approval process and to provide relevant review and feedback more quickly than is currently possible.

#### Review Processes for New and Existing courses

- **Online courses that are completely new**
  1. Departmental Curriculum Committee
  2. School/College Curriculum Committee
  3. University Committee on Courses (UOCC)
  4. University Committee for Special-Status Courses: This would be a newly-created committee, analogous to the Inter-College Committee on General Education (ICGER) that reviews Group-satisfying courses. The intent is for this new committee to have strong links to the UOCC and ICGER.
- **Existing courses that are gaining online character**
  1. Departmental Curriculum Committee (or other approval at the departmental level)

2. University Committee for Special-Status Courses
  3. University Committee on Courses (UOCC), which will not review these courses, but will serve to record approval by the Special-Status Course Committee.
- **Continuing university support and oversight for online courses**
    1. When working with students who are interested in taking online courses, academic advisors should appreciate the confidence and self-direction that is necessary to thrive in this educational environment. This should be communicated clearly to students.
    2. When designing online courses that are likely to attract first-year students, faculty should pay particular attention to the need to communicate effectively with these students about the self-direction necessary to succeed in them. Instructors should also provide timely feedback to students in order to detect problems quickly.
    3. The university will ensure that instructors are prepared to make the most of this teaching medium, by offering:
      - a. training for faculty who create and/or teach online courses
      - b. training for GTFs who lead discussion sections for online courses
      - c. access to teaching resources that demonstrate best practices in online and hybrid classes
      - d. guidance from the Accessible Education Center to ensure that courses are designed so as to make them accessible to students with disabilities.
    4. The university will provide ongoing logistical support for online and hybrid courses, including:
      - a. technological support for students and faculty that is as readily available as possible – similar to the schedule of technical support provided by UO Libraries and the Computing Center.
      - b. mid-course support for faculty and students new to this form of pedagogy
    5. The university will maintain archives that make descriptions and syllabi for online courses publicly available
    6. In keeping with the university's commitment to the integrity, relevance and rigor of the curriculum, existing courses, including those offered online, will be periodically reviewed by university-wide curriculum committee(s), based on syllabi, exams or other course material, and grade distributions.



## APPENDIX 2: Draft form for the approval of online courses

### Proposal to Create an Online Version of an Existing Course – *DRAFT (v. 5/30/13)*

**College/School:**

**Department:**

**Name and Number of the Existing Course:**

- 1. Description of the Existing Course:** Please describe the intellectual underpinnings of the existing course – that is, the key ideas it deals with and the principal pedagogical approaches currently used to make those ideas accessible to students. Your description should be clear and compelling to someone unfamiliar with the topic, and should resemble the expanded descriptions that are posted in two places for Group-satisfying courses:

Course Connector <http://courseconnector.uoregon.edu/>

The Class Schedule <http://classes.uoregon.edu/>

- 2. Description of the Proposed Online Version of the Course:** Please describe the kind of online course you are proposing (e.g., fully online [distance delivery] or hybrid [online course with at least one hour of instruction where there is no physical separation from the instructor]; synchronous or asynchronous interactions with students), and the rationale for this conversion. Specifically,
  - What is the educational advantage of the change you propose?
  - Will the change take advantage of effective teaching methods that are unique to the online environment or particularly needed in your discipline?
  - Does the online course replace an existing face-to-face course, or will it be offered in addition to such a course?
  - If you are proposing a hybrid course, what are the relative proportions of effort expended online and in class (by the instructor and by the students).
- 3. Design Features Intended to Maximize Intellectual Interaction:** Recognizing that the online environment creates pedagogical challenges as well as opportunities, the following questions ask about the means you will use to ensure that the intellectual exchange in your class is lively and persistent. That is, students should regularly have opportunities to seek help and to discuss ideas with you and with each other.

- a. How will your students be introduced to the relevant technology?
- b. Is there place-bound work required for your course (e.g., labs, field trips, face-to-face meetings, proctored exams)? If so, how will that requirement be communicated before students have registered?
- c. How will the course material be made available to your students?
- d. What provisions have you made to ensure that the course material will be fully accessible to students who may have disabilities of various kinds?
- e. How will your students be able to ask questions about course material they don't understand, or discuss, with you and with classmates, particular concepts in more detail? For example, will you hold office hours (e.g., face-to-face or by Skype), answer e-mail queries, participate in electronic discussion boards? How much of your time do you plan to dedicate to this activity each week? [Detailed quantitation isn't needed here; the question is simply a reminder of that such activity can be time-consuming.]
- f. Incoming students, who may underestimate the degree of self-direction required by online courses, as well as the pace and rigor of university-level coursework, are particularly vulnerable to losing intellectual engagement in the online environment. If beginning students are likely to take your course, what precautions will you take to minimize this threat?
- g. If you will use teaching assistants, how will they be prepared to be effective in the environment of your course?

**4. Design Features Intended to Maximize Feedback to Students about their Progress in the Course During the Term**

- a. How will feedback on assignments and test performance be provided? Will students have the opportunity to discuss assignments and test questions if either the questions or the answers aren't clear to them?
- b. How will students be able to assess their progress in the course as it proceeds?

**5. Design Features Intended to Minimize Academic Dishonesty:**

- a. How will you verify the identities of the participants in your class?
  
- b. How will you administer exams and ensure they represent the students' own work?

**6. How will you maintain privacy of students' educational records, as required by the University's Student Records Policy (e.g, the need to use consent forms for blogs and e-portfolios).**

### Appendix 3. Example grading standards for History, Comparative Literature (COLT), Human Physiology, and Mathematics



#### Grading policy

What follows is meant to help students understand the departmental consensus, to the degree that there is one, regarding the grading of individual assignments. Each faculty member in the Department of History, however, will have her or his own interpretation of this consensus.

It is the student's responsibility to attend closely to the course syllabus, assignment descriptions, oral indications in class and in conference, and written comments on graded assignments in order to gain a more precise understanding of the interpretation that guides a given course.

A+: Work of unusual distinction. Therefore, in the History Department, this grade is rarely awarded.

A: Work that distinguishes itself by the excellence of its grasp of the material and the precision and insight of its argument, in addition to being well executed and reasonably free of errors.

B: Work that satisfies main criteria of the assignment, and demonstrates command of the material, but does not achieve the level of excellence that characterizes work of A quality.

C: Work that demonstrates a rudimentary grasp of the material and satisfies at least some of the assigned criteria reasonably well.

D: Work that demonstrates a poor grasp of the material and/or is executed with little regard for college standards, but which exhibits some engagement with the material.

F: Work that is weak in every aspect, demonstrating a basic misunderstanding of the material and/or disregard for the assigned question.

<http://history.uoregon.edu/undergraduate/>

COLT Grading Policies

| <b>Overall Course Grade</b>                         | <b>Holistic Performance in Class</b>                                | <b>Engagement with Course Materials and Participation</b>  | <b>Essay Writing*</b>   | <b>Exams</b>   |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| A-/A/A+   | Excellent, exceeds expectations                                     | Reads texts or images closely and carefully, and incorporates this consideration of the materials into thoughtful contributions to class discussion. | Makes an original argument supported by a clear line of reasoning and analysis of textual evidence. Allows the scholarly community to conceive of the question at issue in a new way. No errors in grammar, style, or mechanics. Exceeds expectations. Revises. | Demonstrates a clear, comprehensive understanding of all material covered in the class, including lectures, in-class discussion, and readings. Answers all questions completely and exceeds expectations. Has mastered the material and met all course objectives. |
| B-/B/B+   | Good, meets expectations and occasionally exceeds some expectations | Reads texts or images carefully. Listens to fellow students and instructor but contributes only occasionally to class discussion.                    | Makes an original argument about a text. Textual analysis supports a line of reasoning. Few errors. Revises.  | Understands all material covered in the course. Answers questions completely and meets expectations.   |
| C-/C/C+   | Adequate, meets but does not exceed expectations                    | Has read or viewed course materials and actively listens.  | Makes an argument. Some reasoning supports main argument. Textual evidence is present. Some errors.   | Understands most material covered. Answers questions completely but makes some mistakes.   |
| D-/D/D+   | Poor, fails to meet some expectations                               | Occasionally is not present in class. Has read only part of assigned material.   | No clear main argument. Errors are such that meaning is obscured. Some reference to text in question, but no textual evidence. Does not meet expectations for assignment.   | Understands only some of the material or has a superficial grasp of the material. Answers some questions completely but not all. Makes mistakes.   |
| Failing Grade [automatic in the case of plagiarism] | Does not meet expectations  | Doesn't attend class or hasn't completed the reading.  | Essay does not meet assignment expectations. No argument, no line of reasoning or original thought expressed.   | Does not understand course material. Many mistakes.  |

\* In 300 and 400 level courses, essays should make the stakes of the argument clear. In upper-division courses, essay writing may also include attention to the critical discourse surrounding the text or issue at hand, incorporate literary research, and/or be clearly placed in a critical dialogue with outside sources.

## **What do grades reflect for the Department of Human Physiology?**

A+ signifies a rarified level of achievement. The student shows a command of material that includes both faultless explanation of the details of the content, and the ability to apply the material at all levels assessed.

A signifies an exceptional level of achievement. The student shows a superb command of the material and the ability to apply their knowledge at many different levels. *This grade is indicative of committed, motivated, and fully engaged learners who take advantage of all learning opportunities, both inside and outside of the classroom.*

B signifies a good but not exceptional level of achievement. The student shows a decent grasp of the material and the ability to apply it at several but not all levels.

C signifies a fair level of achievement. The student shows some mastery of the material and a narrow range of application. *This grade may be indicative of a mismatch between the study techniques and course assessments, or a lack of commitment, motivation or engagement leading to less than full participating in learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom.*

D signifies little or no true understanding of the material. *This grade may be indicative of little or no commitment, motivation or engagement in the course learning opportunities.*

F signifies a performance below the level of random chance. It is assumed that the learning objectives have not been met, and therefore no credit has been earned for the course.

Many courses in human physiology use criterion-referenced grading, rather than norm-referenced grading (i.e., grading on a curve), to promote cooperative learning among students. In some courses the instructor may choose to use norm-referenced grading in order to, for example, minimize any negative impact on students when new teaching or testing methods are being implemented or mitigate grade inflation.

Instructors in human physiology put considerable thought into the criterion for determining final grades before they post grades. If you believe there has been an error in how your grade has been calculated, please check with your instructor. However, it is considered inappropriate behavior to lobby an instructor for a better grade, and these requests are never granted.

Academic misconduct including plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration on assignments, cheating or disrespectful communication will not be tolerated by faculty or students, and may result in an F in the class.

Mathematics Department  
Undergraduate Grading Standards  
November 2011

There are two important issues that this grading policy recognizes.

- (1) Mathematics is hierarchical. A student who is given a grade of C or higher in a course must have mastery of that material that allows the possibility of succeeding in courses for which that course is a prerequisite.
- (2) Some mathematics courses are primarily concerned with techniques and applications. In such courses student success is measured by the student's ability to model\*, successfully apply the relevant technique, and bring the calculation to a correct conclusion. The department's 100-level courses and most calculus courses are examples in this category although these are not the only examples.

Other courses are primarily concerned with theoretical structures and proof. In such courses student success is measured by the student's ability to apply the theorems and definitions in the subject, and to create proofs on his or her own using the models and ideas taught during the course.

Many courses are partly hybrids incorporating both techniques and applications, and some element of theory. Some lean more toward applications, others more toward theory.

**Rubric for applied courses:**

- A: Consistently chooses appropriate models, uses correct techniques, and carries calculations through to a correct answer. Able to estimate error when appropriate, and able to recognize conditions needed to apply models as appropriate.
- B: Usually chooses appropriate models and uses correct techniques, and makes few calculational errors. Able to estimate error when prompted, and able to recognize conditions needed to apply models when prompted.
- C: Makes calculations correctly or substantially correctly, but requires guidance on choosing models and technique. Able to estimate error when prompted and able to recognize conditions needed to apply models when prompted.
- D: Makes calculations correctly or substantially correctly, but unable to do modeling.
- F: Can neither choose appropriate models, or techniques, nor carry through calculations.

---

\*Modeling, in mathematical education parlance, means the process of taking a problem which is not expressed mathematically and expressing it mathematically (typically as an equation or a set of equations). This is usually followed by solving the relevant equation or equations and interpreting the answer in terms of the original problem.

**Rubric for pure courses:**

- A: Correctly states important theorems and definitions. Applies the important theorems from the course. Constructs counterexamples when hypotheses are weakened. Constructs complete and coherent proofs using the definitions, ideas and theorems from the course. Applies ideas from the course to construct proofs that the student has not seen before.
- B: Correctly states important theorems and definitions. Applies the important theorems from the course. Constructs counterexamples when hypotheses are weakened. Constructs complete and coherent proofs using the definitions, ideas and theorems from the course.
- C: Correctly states important theorems and definitions. Applies the important theorems from the course when the application is direct. Constructs simple proofs using the definitions when there are very few steps between the definitions and the conclusions. Explains the most important counterexamples.
- D: Can do some single step proofs and explain some counterexamples.
- F: Unable to do even single step proofs or correctly use definitions.

Many courses combine pure and applied elements and the rubrics for those courses will have some combination of elements from the two rubrics above. Detailed interpretation of the rubrics depends on the content and level of the course and will be at the discretion of instructors.

Whether to award grades of A+ is at the discretion of the instructor. If an instructor chooses to award A+s, such a grade indicates that the student has consistently demonstrated a level of understanding above and beyond the normal requirements of the course.



## **APPENDIX 4: Undergraduate Council Meeting on Undergraduate Research at the University of Oregon**

### **Undergraduate Council Meeting on Undergraduate Research at the University of Oregon; May 17, 2013**

#### **Guests**

Doug Blandy, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Audrey Cramer, Director of Academic Enrichment, Center for Multicultural Academic Excellence

Kimberly Espy, Vice President for Research

David Frank, Dean of the Clark Honors College

Kevin Hatfield, Assistant Director—Intellectual Connections, University Housing

Marilyn Linton, Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies

Ian McNeely, CAS Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education

Julie Newton, SOJC Associate Dean for Undergraduate Affairs

Peter O'Day, Director of Summer Program for Undergraduate Research (SPUR)

Marjorie Taylor, Director of CAS College Scholars Program

Gail Unruh, Director of the McNair Scholars Program

#### **Introduction**

The topic of the meeting is the research-teaching synthesis, with the overarching goal of addressing what it means for our undergraduates to be at a Research 1 institution. UO is outstanding in both research and undergraduate education, yet in many respects these two cornerstones of our mission operate in relative isolation (though there are many exceptions). In this time of economic and technological changes that have universities grappling with questions about the value and return on investment of higher education, this disconnect seems particularly problematic. For the good of our students and the university, we must better integrate these elements of our mission and improve how we communicate what an education at UO provides.

The topic of research and its integration with undergraduate education raises several interrelated issues:

1. The appropriate role of undergraduate education at a major research university and UO in particular
2. How we maximize the involvement of undergraduates in research (defined broadly to include not just sponsored scientific research but also research training opportunities, creative work, and other scholarship) but with reasonable expectations that don't place additional burdens on faculty, graduate students, and staff, or create false expectations among students
3. How we broaden participation of undergraduates in research beyond current strengths such as the Clark Honors College, McNair Scholars Program, and CAS Natural Sciences, among others
4. How we build on, connect, and better promote existing campus efforts in order to improve the student experience, reduce the burden on faculty, and do all this in the most cost-effective manner
5. Strategies to encourage and support faculty to incorporate the latest research developments into their teaching in order to provide an enriched classroom experience, and to link this with our general education mission
6. How we better communicate the importance (and the existence) of research at UO to our undergraduates
7. How we better articulate and communicate the importance of research in undergraduate education to stakeholders such as parents, the Eugene/Springfield community, and government officials

#### **Format**

After introductions and an introduction to the topic by the UGC Chair, each of the guests will spend ~5 minutes talking about the experience of their unit with undergraduate research and/or addressing any issues they see as relevant. We will then use the remaining time in discussion of the key issues, with the plan to spend the last few minutes strategizing on what are the next steps.

**Goals—I hope we leave the meeting having accomplished the following:**

1. Increased awareness of how different units around campus are involved in undergraduate research; this should increase future cooperation and help to minimize duplication of effort
2. An appreciation for the need for a campus-level office (with adequate funding and staffing) to coordinate elements of the undergraduate research experience and champion this issue
3. Outline a plan for a central website that celebrates past research, provides information to current students about opportunities available in different departments/programs, and makes our undergraduate research visible and accessible to those outside the university
4. A plan for advancing this issue during the transition to an interim/new Provost and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (i.e., How do we keep this issue on the table in the midst of so much institutional transition?)
5. Generate ideas for advancing this issue with the Development Office to identify strategies and opportunities for fundraising
6. Outline a plan for what the UGC can do next year to help make progress on this issue. One possibility is the formation of a working group with representatives from all CAS divisions and the professional schools that will work with representatives from the UGC to further discuss and integrate diverse perspectives on the research-teaching synthesis across campus

**Here are the questions I raised in the introductory e-mail:**

1. What units are leading the way in the integration of research into the undergraduate experience, and how can we export these best practices to other programs and departments?
2. How does the issue of the research-teaching synthesis vary across the university, such as in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the professional schools?
3. What should the role of centers and institutes be (if any) in undergraduate education/teaching?
4. How do we best centralize available resources and what new resources are needed?
5. How do we maximize research experiences for undergraduates without (further) overloading the existing resource-limited infrastructure? What's a reasonable goal for participation in research experiences by our undergraduates?
6. What data are we collecting now on this issue (e.g., how many of our undergraduates have research experiences?) and what data should we be collecting?
7. How best should we communicate to the public, prospective students, and current students the value of the undergraduate experience at an R1 university?

**UGC Members (2012-2013)**

Josh Snodgrass, Chair (CAS Anthropology)

Elected Members

Susan Anderson (CAS German and Scandinavian)

Ron Bramhall (LCB Management)

John Gage (CAS English)

Loren Kajikawa (MUS)

Alison Schmitke (COE Education Studies)

Beata Stawarska (CAS Philosophy)

Randy Sullivan (CAS Chemistry)

Thomas Wheeler (SOJC)

Glenda Utsey (AAA Architecture)

Student Members

Ashley Buchholz

Madeleine Hudson

Diana Salazar

Ben Smood

Kerry Snodgrass

Ex Officio Members/Committee Representatives

Andrew Bonamici (Libraries)

Sue Eveland (Registrar)

Dave Hubin (President's Office)

Jennifer Joslin (Office of Academic Advising)

Karen Sprague (Undergraduate Studies)

Paul Engelking (Chair, UOCC)

Karen McLaughlin (Chair, ARC)