

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

April 10, 2006

Rowe Conference Room, the Knight Library

Present:

Andrew Bonamici, Herb Chereck, Kelsea Feola, , Anne Laskaya, Julie Newton, Patrick Bartlein, Kathy Roberts, Ron Severson, Margarita Smith, Karen Sprague, Mark Thoma, and Glenda Utsey

Absent:

Deborah Exton, Hilary Gerdes, Dave Hubin, Martha Pitts, Steven Pologe, Mary Ann Beecher, Kate Wagle, Malcolm Wilson, and Paul Engelking

Guests:

Bill Daley, College of Business – Co-Chair Student Code of Conduct Ad Hoc Committee

Lisa Frienkel, Department of English - Co-Chair Student Code of Conduct Ad Hoc Committee

JoAnna Gray, Co-Chair Accreditation Committee

Minutes:

The minutes of the March 13, 2006 meeting were distributed and the Chair asked that any amendments needed to the minutes be e-mailed to the recording secretary.

Introductions:

The Chair introduced Patrick “Bart” Bartlein, Chair of the CAS Curriculum Committee for the Spring 2006 term.

Agenda

Grade Inflation Report presented at the Deans Work Session and CAS Department Heads meeting

Karen Sprague reported that there was strong support in the Deans Council for recognizing grade inflation as a problem at UO, especially from President Dave Frohnmayer. Department heads from CAS will discuss the issue within their own departments. They will be collecting more detailed data within their departments.

- **Discussion**

The Council discussed ways in which departments could gather grading data. The Registrar's Office will explore designing a standard query set that would be available to departments. The Council thanked Karen for presenting the Grade Inflation Report to the Deans Council and discussed other groups that will be presented with the report.

Group	UGC Presenter	Date
Deans Work Session	Karen Sprague	3/21/06
CAS Departments	Karen Sprague	4/10/06
Academic Requirements Committee	Glenda Utsey	
Scholastic Review Committee	Mark Thoma	
Student Senate	Margarita Smith and Karen Sprague	5/03/06
University Senate	Ron Severson	4/12/06

University Senate	Ron Severson and Mark Thoma	
-------------------	-----------------------------	--

The Council designated the recording secretary as the point-person for receiving the feedback on the report and submitting to the Council.

Revised Student Code of Conduct proposal from Ad Hoc Committee

(See: [Summary of Significant Proposed Changes to the Student Conduct Code](#), [Proposed Student Conduct Code Passages from proposed Student Conduct Code-02062006 draft](#))

The Chair introduced Bill Daley, Sr. Instructor in LCB and Co-chair of the Student Code of Conduct Ad Hoc Committee.

Bill presented the history of the development of the code. He emphasized that the code is the responsibility of faculty. The first code was written in the 1960s. Ten years later, the section on sexual misconduct was revised. Seven years ago, the process leading to the current proposal began. Bill noted that the code is a living document. There has to be trust in the process of the document's development.

The two contentious areas in the current proposal are: 1. The extent of University jurisdiction, and 2. representation of both parties during disciplinary hearings.

Lisa Freinkel, Department of English and Co-chair of the Student Code of Conduct Ad Hoc Committee, addressed questions from the Council. In response to concern that the University might be put in jeopardy by discrepancies between decisions made within the context of the Code and those made through an external judicial system, Lisa pointed out that case law has established that the UO Student Code of Conduct is binding on members of the UO community. Decisions based on it must be defensible within that system, but are not subject to review based on external judicial practice. The new Code has been thoroughly vetted by the Risk Management Office and it significantly decreases the University's potential for liability.

Discussion:

The Council noted several items that are not clear:

- Who makes the decision when an issue needs to go outside of the university? (Response: the Office of Student Judicial Affairs)
- Faculty have a perception that the process dealing with academic misconduct is becoming less effective, even in the new code, and that cheating does not have serious consequences. (Some members felt the shift in philosophy of the new code away from punishments toward education, gives the impression of a more lenient rather than more stringent code. Questions were raised about who is in charge of the educational consequences, what those look like, and how effective they would be at reducing plagiarism.)
- There seems to be no provision for "expert" advice which might be needed in cases when an argument depends on specialized knowledge that the Hearings Panel does not possess.
- Faculty need to receive timely feedback on the disposition of complaints they make about instances of academic misconduct.
- A student member of the Council questioned the wisdom of University jurisdiction in off-campus cases involving a student and a non-student.
- Has the University considered developing an Honor Code? Operating from the positive position of such a code might be more effective overall.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 24, 2006, 1:00pm at Rowe Conference Room, the Knight Library.