

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

September 26, 2005

Rowe Conference Room, University Library

Present:

Andrew Bonamici, Herb Chereck, Kelsea Feola, Hilary Gerdes, Peter Gilkey, Dave Hubin, Julie Newton, Kathy Roberts, Ron Severson, Margarita Smith, Karen Sprague, Mark Thoma, Mary Ann Beecher, Kate Wagle

Absent:

Deborah Exton, Mike Eyster, Anne Laskaya, Martha Pitts, Steven Pologe, Malcolm Wilson

Guest:

Jo Anna Gray, Economics/UO Accreditation Team

Marian Friestad, Associate Dean, Graduate School

Introductions:

The Chair asked the members of the 2005-2006 Undergraduate Council to introduce themselves in round-robin fashion. Following the introductions, the Chair introduced the first guest.

Agenda

UO Accreditation – April 2007

(See [Accreditation 2007](#))

Jo Anna Gray, head of the UO Accreditation Team, introduced two other team members, David Hubin and Becky Couch-Goodling. The last Accreditation of the University was done in 1997. Accreditation is done on a regional basis by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). David Hubin is the UO Accreditation Liaison Officer to the NWCCU.

Jo Anna gave an overview of two processes that could be used for the 2007 Accreditation self-study report preparation:

Plan A – (also the default plan) follows the NWCCU Self-Study structure (See [Self-study format for review of existing UO degree programs](#)) which is organized around a large number of standards, elements and indicators which are generic and applied to a broad range of institutions – from small community colleges to large research universities. Using this approach, institutions

must respond to all of the points of the self-study, whether or not the details are appropriate for a particular kind of institution.

Plan B – allows the institution to design an alternative Self-Study structure. Such a structure can be organized around the mission of the institution, focused on local educational issues that are generally recognized as important and worthy of careful examination, and addressed to future leaders of the institution. (One potential audience for the UO report would be the new academic leadership for the University.)

The University of Oregon has chosen Plan B for the Self-Study Accreditation Report. This allows the University to focus the preparative work required for accreditation in areas where self-examination is most needed. Dave Hubin noted that the standards, elements and indications of the typical self-study (Plan A) must be kept in mind as we embark on our customized self-study, but he believes that the major points can be coherently incorporated into the Report we will prepare.

Jo Anna explained that the Accreditation Team was soliciting assistance from the Undergraduate Council to identify key issues to include in the customized self-study. The Accreditation Team would like the issues identified by the end of the Fall term. Their goal is to have the self-study completed by Fall 2006

- **Discussion**

The Council expressed willingness to assist the Accreditation Team as requested.

It was noted that the UGC was already actively examining several issues that might be appropriate for the self-study, such as grade inflation and the content of group-satisfying courses.

Additionally, the Chair asked that Karen Sprague and Dave Hubin report on recent state legislative activity that may affect educational policy at OUS institutions.

The Chair suggested that the agenda for the next meeting be centered on discussing, fleshing out and prioritizing the key issues for the Accreditation Self-Study.

Internal Review of Existing Degree Programs

Marian Friestad, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, reminded the Council that the University has an established pattern of periodic (10-year cycle) review of individual departments, which is distinct from the University-wide review required for accreditation. Marian announced that the degree programs for four departments in CAS were currently engaged in a revised version of the self-assessment process. The revised self-assessment is being tested as a 2-year pilot program. One of the ways in which it will differ from past practice is that departments will no longer have to collect their own data. Instead, the relevant data will be collected centrally, by the Office of Resource Management, and distributed to departments for analysis and comment in their individual reviews. Moreover, the data will be collected and made available at frequent intervals, not just at review time.

The Undergraduate Council was asked for four volunteers, one to serve on the internal review committees for each of the four departments participating in the pilot project (Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, and Sociology). The time commitment would not be onerous. Both faculty and ex-officio members of the Undergraduate Council could volunteer, but some familiarity with the broad area under review is desirable.

The Chair proposed that discussion of the request be moved to the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 10, 2005 at Rowe Conference Room, University Library.