

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

May 8, 2006

Rowe Conference Room, the Knight Library

Present:

Andrew Bonamici, Herb Chereck, Hilary Gerdes, Anne Laskaya, Julie Newton, Patrick Bartlein, Steven Pologe, Ron Severson, Margarita Smith, Karen Sprague, Mark Thoma, Malcolm Wilson, Paul Engelking, Glenda Utsey, and Kate Wagle

Absent:

Deborah Exton, Kelsea Feola, Dave Hubin, Martha Pitts, and Kathy Roberts

Minutes:

The Chair called for a discussion of the minutes for the April 24th meeting. A clerical error was noted by Steven Pologe.

The Chair called for a motion on the minutes.

The motion was made to accept the minutes from the April 24, 2006 meeting, with the inclusion of clerical corrections.

Moved: Julie Newton

Seconded: Anne Laskaya

The motion to accept the minutes passed unanimously.

Updates:

Tech Support Coordination

Andrew Bonamaci presented an update report (via e-mail) re. the meeting on Technical Support Coordination that was held to address the equipment problem that plagued the recruitment (DuckDay) on April 17, and was described in the April 24 Council minutes:

Per discussion, here are follow up meeting notes and correspondence concerning the tech support incident mentioned in our minutes from 24 April 2006. I'll provide further updates as more information becomes available.

Best,

Andrew

=====
MINUTES FROM DEBRIEF MEETING OF 24 APRIL, 2006

EMU/Media Svces Coordination

April 24 2006, 3 pm
Rowe Conference Room

Attending:
Herb Chereck, Tom Matney, Dusty Miller, Andrew Bonamici

1. intros
2. review. (Dusty provided a handout; see below). Dietrich Belitz had given a similar presentation in the ballroom the week before, and equipment had worked. On April 17, it didn't work. The problem was not with Dietrich's computer but with the EMU projector. The event was disrupted, but for the record, the problem was never abandoned by EMU tech support; in fact, four people worked on it. The projector was operational approx. 30 - 40 minutes into the event.
3. Action items:
 - a. Major presentation venues in the EMU do not have permanently installed equipment. This complicates scheduling and booking, increases staff workload for delivery, and creates a variable environment for presenters. Tom will work with EMU Tech Support staff to assess EMU spaces and provide recommendations for campus-standard equipment installations where appropriate, [Andrew's added suggestion: review the portable equipment inventory at the same time.]
 - b. Tom will provide a budget requirement for the prioritized list of

rooms. Given the importance of EMU spaces for a wide variety of UO academically-sponsored programs, recruitment and outreach events, etc., we think this is a campus-wide issue that needs to be addressed beyond the confines of the EMU self-support budget.

c. The Media Services Classroom Technology Group will include EMU tech support staff in ongoing general training. This will be good in terms of general coordination and backup. Improving EMU staff familiarity with campus classrooms outside the EMU may be especially beneficial, in order to reduce or eliminate the need for deliveries to spaces that have permanent systems in place.

d. Tom and Andrew will also assist EMU staff with an initial review of the current tech support staffing relative to service expectations. This will include both total FTE available and duties/classifications of permanent staff.

We will provide a status report on items a. - d. by May 5.

Additional ideas (from Andrew):

1. I suggest scrapping the 1997 MOU in favor of something new that is informed by our current collaborative efforts.
2. Developing, communicating, and adhering to a comprehensive event planning protocol/checklist. I have a long-standing interest in this because uncoordinated event planning not only compromises tech support, but results in lost opportunities for video capture and distribution, publicity and promotion, and so on. This clearly involves many stakeholders beyond our group, but improving the event planning process and communicating it to the campus would be a big help to the tech support enterprise by:
 - a) getting venues, calendars, and all necessary support staff lined up in a timely way
 - b) managing expectations of host departments/event sponsors.

**EMU SUMMARY FROM DUSTY MILLER
(HANDOUT FOR DEBRIEF MEETING OF 24 April 2006)**

Dietrich Belitz [event date] April 17, 2006

Event problems

*Dietrich's laptop was not communicating with web projector.

*EMU Staff was in attendance and immediately tried to assist. The first attempt did not work and the student technician on duty immediately called Event Services for assistance. Mike Kraiman left the Fir Room and Jeremy Olson left from Gerlinger Hall to assist. Mike arrived and attempted to trouble shoot the problem. His initial attempts were not successful.

Dietrich made some telephone calls during Mike's attempt to solve the problem. Dietrich decides to move forward with presentation without the desired media. Mike and Tim step back to allow speaker to begin.

Concurrently, Cora Bennett contacts Amy Johnson in Scheduling and alerts her to the problem in the Ballroom. Amy goes to the Ballroom to see if she can assist. Amy asks Tim to find another LCD projector. She attempts to contact Dietrich. Jeremy Olson arrives.

Amy finds one LCD projector and Tim finds another. The event eventually was able to use this media for the presentation.

In response

It is very unfortunate when any event does not meet the expectations of the organizer.

While attempting to get the media to work the Technician on duty first attempted to fix the problem, then called for assistance from two additional staff. The student technician felt that he had been asked by Dietrich to stop working on the problem as the session needed to begin.

Amy and Jeremy arrive and eventually the media is successfully set up. The EMU sincerely regrets not having solved the problem prior to the start of the event.

Once a problem was identified we brought four staff (at different times) to address the issue. The event was NEVER abandoned and the problem was solved.

The statement that Rachel Raia received from Media Services and shared with Dietrich, "was told they are not allowed to provide support in the EMU" is incorrect. The EMU and Media Services routinely work successfully together.

DIETRICH'S RESPONSE

Subject: RE: EMU/Media Svces Coordination: meeting notes & further ideas
Date: Tue, 2 May 2006 08:54:45 -0700
From: "Dietrich Belitz" <adsciences@cas.uoregon.edu>
To: "Andrew Bonamici" <bonamici@uoregon.edu>,
"Dusty Miller" <dusty@uoregon.edu>,
"Herbert Chereck" <hchereck@uoregon.edu>, <tmatney@uoregon.edu>,
"Andrew Bonamici" <bonamici@uoregon.edu>, <kus@smtp.uoregon.edu>,
<deharris@uoregon.edu>, <dcarver@smtp.uoregon.edu>
Cc: "Rachele Raia" <raraia@cas.uoregon.edu>

Andrew and all,

Thanks a lot for following up on this; I very much appreciate it. I also would like to apologize for probably overstating or misphrasing the "abandonment" issue. I should have said it was not clear to me whether anybody was still working on it, and whether a remedy was being prepared, until a very nice young lady showed up with a portable projector.

Thanks again,
Dietrich

Agenda

English Department proposal appendix

(See: [Appendix to English Department Proposal](#))

The Chair presented a summary of the response of the English Department to the Undergraduate Council's recommendations for the proposed new minor in Writing, Public Speaking, and Critical Reasoning [February 27, 2006]. The response was formulated as an appendix to the original proposal and answered the Council's questions regarding faculty, funding, and enrollment related to the new minor. The Chair commented that the appendix showed the department's careful consideration of some of the Council's concerns. Although some concerns remain regarding class registration for students in the program, and enrollment management if demand exceeds capacity, the Council agreed that the department has the ultimate responsibility to address those issues as they arise and that the proposed new minor is a laudable endeavor that has been carefully thought through.

Grade Inflation Report feedback

Karen Sprague reported that she has presented the Council's Grade Inflation Report to the Deans and the CAS Department Heads. She noted that there was strong support for the Council's efforts in producing the report and there is strong support for dealing with the problem within the University. Karen will make a compilation of the notes and comments that come in response to the report.

Margarita Smith reported on the presentation of the report she and Karen Sprague made to the ASUO Senate. Students' initial response was that grade inflation was a faculty problem, not a student problem. However, as discussion on the issue ensued, students began to admit that inflated grading could be detrimental to them in the long run in the competition for graduate school or careers. They concurred that making grading policy public and transparent would improve the competitive standing of University of Oregon students overall.

Karen Sprague commented that she was very impressed with the ASUO senators and her opinions were echoed in a memo by Interim Vice President for Student Affairs, Mike Eyster, who also attended the meeting.

Margarita observed that it would be helpful to address the cause of grade inflation (as one of the student senators recommended), but to do so would be difficult and complicated. It is better to choose a single entry point in the “cycle” of grade inflation and begin seriously addressing the problem. She also feels that standardization of what is expected in our 300-400 level courses (in terms of depth and rigor) is an integral part of dealing with grade inflation.

Glenda Utsey reported that feedback from the Academic Review Committee included the idea of developing a “faculty notebook,” which would include a clear statement by the University on what grades mean. Some faculty feel that there are incentives for grade inflation. One is the current use of student evaluations of teaching.

Accreditation Self-Study comments

Karen asked the members of the Council if they had any comments to offer on the information re. undergraduate curriculum currently outlined in the Accreditation Self-Study. Several suggestions were made:

- A look should be taken at the proliferation of “little programs” that may be monetarily rewarding to faculty but of little academic value to students.
- General Education requirements ought to be revisited.
- Analyze our assessment of academic programs.
- Complete the extended course description project.

Karen reported that Travis (in the Registrar’s Office) has created a mock-up of a web page for illustrated versions of these descriptions. She reminded the Council that some samples of these descriptions had been presented at a previous meeting [November 28, 2006], but Travis’s version is even better. It is modeled on the MIT Open Course website. Although only 2/3 of the group-satisfying course descriptions have been turned in, that is enough to start setting up a web site. Malcolm Wilson noted that this project would be an excellent submission for Educational Technology funding.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 22, 2006, 1:00pm at Rowe Conference Room, the Knight Library.