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1. Peter Gilkey:

There are two issues concerning accreditation that I would like to bring up.

The first is the relationship between the UO and the state as a whole.

a) How do we fit in with economic development?
b) How well do we offer access to the UO? The cost of higher ed is a real issue. Issues of diversity also enter
c) How well do we articulate with K-12 and with the rest of higher ed (Universities and Community colleges) in the state. General education requirements, requirements for the major, college high, information on the web, degree audit, etc.

The State Board has working groups dealing with these issues so I don't think I have to expand on these issues, although I will be happy to do so if you think necessary.

The second is the issue of faculty governance. Here let me speak at a bit more length.

a) Different visions of faculty governance and of shared governance exist on this campus. There is perhaps a perception in Johnson hall that the faculty are poking their nose into places it doesn't belong. For example from Thursdays list of pump primers: "what does it mean, where do we serve our mission well, and where does it run amuck". On the other hand, there is perhaps a perception by the faculty that the administration is bypassing appropriate mechanisms of faculty governance. The recent vote in the Senate on Westmoreland comes to mind.

b) It is difficult to find faculty to serve. One runs across the same names over and over again. And there are no real rewards, other than personal satisfaction, to University service. Nor, realistically, should there be. Also one could note the number of Senate Presidents in recent years who are not full professors. Such an office should be the capstone of a career in University governance that is undertaken by senior faculty.

c) There are not a lot of students on the accreditation steering
committee. In fact, despite all the questions of "student power" there are really not a lot of students who serve on our committees. I chair the UGC and make a real effort to get the students to speak up and participate and I think I succeed. We need to do more in this regard.

d) There are many other issues. And they have been around as long as I have been here. There are no easy fixes.

Peter B Gilkey
Mathematics Department
University of Oregon
Eugene Or 97403 USA
gilkey@darkwing.uoregon.edu
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~gilkey
2. Deb Carver:

A few suggestions following our meeting yesterday:

I would like to endorse the idea of doing a SWOT analysis on each of the major areas. This creates a parallel structure that I think would be useful. For example, we might see that the same threat has a potential impact on more than one area, and hence might need priority attention. In addition to strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, I would add "aim", i.e. the concept that Greg L. brought up regarding where we want to be in X years.

I think Role and Identity (currently under resources and organization) is more of an uber category. It seems to set the stage for the rest of the document.

I am not sure the University Library Committee will be able to provide input by your Monday deadline (I am also out of the office for several days and over the weekend). But there is one major issue that I think might belong under the heading "Research"...and it is an issue we have dealt with for a while:

Scholarly Communication. How can we encourage/support/reward new modes of scholarly communication that promote the widest possible access to research?

I would also like to see an issue that addresses life-long learning skills/interests. What evidence do we have that we are addressing this critical need and fundamental aspect of a good education?

Deb Carver
Philip H. Knight University Librarian
University of Oregon Library
541-346-1892
541-346-3485 (fax)
Matrix Issues
Submitted by: Deb Carver
February 12, 2006

IA. ROLE WITHIN THE STATE-Teaching and Learning

How can the UO partner with high schools to help students become knowledgeable consumers of information?

Full text:
The university has made a huge investment in information resources. At the same time, K-12 has disinvested in their library systems, which means that when these students get to college, they rely heavily, if not entirely, on non-vetted information available on the network. To what extent are the university’s resources easily accessible by high school students? How can the university partner with high schools in the region and the state to help students become knowledgeable consumers of information?

IA, IIA. ROLE WITHIN THE STATE-Teaching and Learning, Research and Creative Activity

Orbis-Cascade Alliance

Full text:
The University of Oregon played a leadership role in establishing the Orbis Consortium (now Orbis-Cascade Alliance). As a result, over 90% of the students enrolled in four-year institutions have convenient access to a library collection of over 26 million items. This resource has also extended our ability to meet faculty’s research needs. Because the resource sharing mechanisms are so efficient, members of the consortium can begin to reduce the duplication and add to the breadth and depth of our collections. The consortium also serves as a model of collaboration among private and public institutions (including community colleges) over a two-state region.

ID.1. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS-Undergraduate, Teaching and Learning

Better integration of information resources and other tools and services that constitute the educational experience, e.g. Blackboard.

Full text:
The University of Oregon Libraries has made teaching its primary focus. Over 10,000 students participate in the program every year, which includes open workshops, credit classes, presentations targeted to certain course needs, and library components integrated into the first-year programs. Nevertheless, the goals of information literacy remain challenging, and the methods typically used by libraries do not always scale well. More
integration is needed between our information resources and other tools and services that constitute the educational experience, e.g. Blackboard.

Collaboration between the Honors College and the Library to teach classes around primary sources.

Undergraduate Research Award, which recognizes outstanding work by undergraduates through a special scholarship opportunity.

Full text:
A distinguishing feature of a major university is the opportunity for many, of not all undergraduates to do research. For the sciences, this research may take place in the laboratory or the field. For the humanities, this research often takes place in the library, particularly Special Collections, which houses primary source material. Two efforts underway help to encourage undergraduate research. One is an ongoing collaboration between the Honors College and the Library to teach classes around these primary sources. The other is the recent Undergraduate Research Award, which recognizes outstanding work by undergraduates through a special scholarship opportunity.

IE. SETTING AND CAMPUS EXPERIENCE-Teaching and Learning

Need for new investments in the library infrastructure: more collaborative work spaces.

Need for new investments in the library infrastructure: more high-end software and production capabilities integrated with services and the resources.

Full text:
The library facilities are relatively new and function well in today’s networked environment. They clearly are seen by many students as the intellectual center of the campus, and are used very heavily throughout the academic year. The library has extended its services to 24X7 during exam periods, which has proven to be extremely helpful. The students now consider extended hours a core service. Today’s students, however, have different social and study preferences that require new investments in the library infrastructure, e.g. more collaborative work spaces, more high-end software and production capabilities integrated with the services and the resources. To that end, the Library is designing a new Learning Commons in place of the more traditional reference area.

Need for better equipment and more resources to support and maintain equipment.

Full text:
The coordination of classroom design, functionality, and equipment is a significant challenge that is recently receiving much needed attention. Inadequate investment in presentation equipment has resulted in the archaic site of TV monitors being wheeled around campus by library personnel. This year, educational technology resources are
being earmarked for classroom equipment improvements, both for the general use and the departmental classrooms. In addition to better equipment, more resources for the support and maintenance of the equipment are needed.

**IF. USE OF INFORMATION RESOURCES AND TECHNOLOGY—Teaching and Learning.**

The University of Oregon has made a considerable investment in the technological infrastructure that allows faculty to adopt different methods of teaching appropriate for their courses and content. Part of that infrastructure includes the widespread use of Blackboard as a course management system and the Center for Educational Technology, which provides consultation to faculty who want to incorporate new technologies into their teaching. Incentives have been provided to individual faculty members through the educational technology fee to develop new approaches to teaching and learning. The degree to which faculty are supported and encouraged, as well as the real impact of technology within the classroom, are matters that need further consideration.

Many of the students arriving on our campuses are members of an increasingly media-saturated Net Generation, with social perspectives and K-12 experiences very different from those of the faculty. Successfully engaging today’s students with university-level coursework and scholarly content is a significant and critical challenge. Strategies may include development of interactive and experiential learning opportunities, blending online and face-to-face instruction, peer mentoring, real-world application of student research, and learning outcomes that span across the curriculum. These approaches are transformative and will require the concerted and fully collaborative effort of faculty, librarians, instructional designers, technologists, and central administration.

**IIF. USE OF INFORMATION RESOURCES AND TECHNOLOGY—Research and Creative Activity (I have suggested a change in this title to focus on the content as well as the technology).**

Increases in the UO Libraries’ budget have been inadequate to address inflation in the costs of scholarly resources. As a consequence, the UO has cut 3,500 journals since 1992/93, twice the rate of other ARL libraries. To some extent, the Library has been able to address this deficiency through cost effective resource sharing systems. Among North America research libraries, the UO ranks 9th and 12th respectively in what we borrow and loan to other institutions.

The Library has played a leadership role in campus conversations regarding changes in scholarly communication and publishing. In addition to promoting open access and retention of copyrights, the Library has developed a robust institutional digital repository—Scholars Bank—that both faculty and students can use to archive their work.
While the technology has created new and highly productive modes of scholarly communication, the tradition of peer-reviewed, subscription-based journals is still the dominant model. The challenge facing all universities is to promote cost-effective models that address both the need for validation (especially for tenure processes) and affordable access to support future research.

Traditionally, libraries have brought information into the university, through the acquisition and licensing processes. Increasingly, libraries are working with both faculty and students to push content out to the scholarly community. This new model involves archiving content generated on campus (both published and non-published), making it accessible through open archive harvesting protocols, and providing long-term preservation of content. Scholars’ Bank is a successful institutional repository designed to serve this purpose. For students, electronic theses and dissertations create the opportunity to explore and incorporate content beyond text, and then have their work visible and accessible over the network. For faculty, this model provides an avenue for disseminating their research without the time constraints and costs associated with commercial publishing. Wider conversations are needed on campus to explore and take advantage of the potential benefits of this new model.

The advent of e-science has created a need to understand and manage huge datasets that are being generated in many disciplines. Although disciplines such as astronomy and neuroscience were among the first to create this need, disciplines within the social sciences and the humanities are facing their own cyberinfrastructure issues. Funding agencies are increasingly concerned with the long-term preservation and accessibility of data that are the building blocks for future research. Conversations and ultimately collaboration among researchers, technologists, and librarians are needed to address these growing issues.
3. Terri Warpinski
just a few notes to share from yesterday's meeting of the reaccreditation group:
This will appear to be a punchlist of items... but my theory is better to share them to not... so here they are:

new degrees and responsiveness to changing needs of the state, the region, the world.

program cultivation and elimination -- when and why do we change what we do.
do we deliver the right programs to the right places? whether eugene, portland, bend or China

parallel the notion of student experience with a crosscut of faculty experience

statewide forces: common course numbering, Oregon Transfer Module

our configuration of school and colleges - look at anything from the discrete position of the
Honors College to whether or not we are 'rightly' naming ourselves. ... when is a school a
college and when is a college a school?

who crafts the institutional vision in a decentralized environment?

does our AAU designation matter? to whom? and why? how do we use this?

access.

transfer students versus new freshmen

staff development

for all constituencies, what does it mean to be a residential campus?

if not a three legged stool, nor a set of four cornerstones, could it be a wheel? a hub, spokes
(at least three) and a rim?

Terri Warpinski, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Professor of Art
206 Johnson Hall
1258 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1258
V: 541.346.2051
F: 541.346.2023
E: tlw@uoregon.edu
http://www.uoregon.edu/~tlw
4. Mandy Chong

Dave and Joan,

My two cents on the Alternative Organizational Structure: Illustrations. I find that Illustration #2 captures the University better than Illustration #1. However, I am curious to see how an alternative structure might look if it were based on the “cornerstones” as stated by President Frohnmayer.

With respect to the Classified Staff contribution to the Self-study, I am attaching the Meeting with the president notes from April 21, 2005 and November 1, 2005.

In addition, along with my co-chair, we compiled a list of top issues. If you see any issues that need additional explanation, we are holding a meeting of the Classified Staff Training and Development Advisory Committee (CSTDAC) Tuesday December 13th at 12pm-1:30pm. Let me know if you would like to attend this. If this time does not work for you we can arrange a meeting with some of the committee members outside of this meeting.

The Issues:

Supervisor evaluations- Staff would like an opportunity to be included in the evaluation of supervisors not just as an elective practice but as a requirement in evaluations. “360 Evaluations”.

Parking - 1. We all know it is a problem. Some greater issues…frustration by community; perspective students, staff and faculty; quality of life (time vs. access); financial impact on all. 2. Ineffective mass transportation system to/from campus—ie LTD has not proven to be a reliable transportation system for faculty/staff for a number of reasons.

Moral- As related to low wages. This is another cross group issue, student employees and staff; both have issues of moral which then become issues of retention.

Shared Governance- Staff “being given the vote” on the University Senate.

Perception of Us vs. Them- Union/Admin relations.

Perception of Staff- Often staff feel that they are not valued in the grater UO community. Looked down on because of their position, (Classism)

Fair Wages- Staff and Students

Tuition Benefit- 1. Cost of fees associated to the tuition can be high. This limits the ability of staff to take courses. 2. Lack of availability of evening classes/programs

Promotional Opportunities- Many staff members feel that there are no avenues for promotion.
Costs Text books- 1. We often hear our students struggling with the issues of how to pay for college. 2. Library book checkout times—2 wks for staff and students, 3-6 months for faculty and grad students. 3. Limited library hours—regional universities have greater library hours, and national universities in our area (UW) have 24 hr libraries.

Security- 1. Privacy of Information- This is an issue for everyone on campus; access to records online, personal information as well as professional. 2. Security on campus- poor exterior lighting, lack of campus police presence, high bike theft rate.

Poor Facilities- Buildings in need of repair.

Small Computing facilities.

Inclement Weather policy- staff are forced to use vacation time or comp time if the university closes or partially closes.
Communication- need better channels, quicker and clearer communications.

Mandy Chong
Office Manager, EMU Cultural Forum
Co-Chair CSTDAC
1228 University of Oregon, EMU Suite 2
Eugene OR, 97403-1228
Office (541) 346-0847
Fax (541) 346-4400
5. Don Harris

One clear issue we should address is the inadequate resources provided for faculty and students in the way of information technology on our campus. In comparison to peer institutions we are very far behind the resources and services we offer to our faculty and students in support of instruction and learning as well as research. Simple things like replacement cycles for computers, having standard site licenses for the campus, and having the latest and most robust version of Blackboard are not part of our makeup at UO. New services like collaborative software, virtual group spaces, and new facilities for team work are missing. Although we have had the EdTech funds at UO (which have their own history as you know), we as an institution have not spent the same amount of "non-fee" resources as our peers, even within the Oregon University System. I'm not sure how much emphasis this area will get during the accreditation, but it is clearly something that should be given some attention in my opinion.

- Don
Don Harris (addition 2/13/2006)

Accreditation Notes
Issues and Opportunities
Information Technology (IT)

I. Teaching and Learning
   F. Effective Use of Technology

1. Are our faculty current in their knowledge and use of IT in their own fields so they may provide an educational environment to our students that is relevant?
   a. Are methods related to information access, analysis and reporting used routinely by faculty in their own work?
   b. Are on-line resources in the Library and via the Internet used for research as well as to prepare classes so that the student experience is fresh and current?
   c. Are IT resources to promote collaboration and team work being used by faculty in their work with students as well as with colleagues at other intuitions?
   d. Do faculty use simulation programs to broaden their own understanding of academic content and do they incorporate such activities into their teaching?

2. What are the critical success factors in using IT in teaching and learning?
   a. Are we engaged in a conversation about pedagogical approaches and effective teaching on our campus?
   b. Is our use of limited resources toward IT purchases consistent with what we find to be effective approaches in this area?
   c. Does our faculty tenure and promotion system take into account effective teaching practices with different pedagogical approaches and technology

3. Do we have core infrastructure to support advance uses of IT in teaching and learning?
   a. Has our data network on campus and connection to the global Internet kept up with the growth in usage by our faculty and students?
   b. Have we kept pace with new developments in wireless and other technologies that could be useful in teaching and learning?
   c. Do we offer basic services in central IT, the Library, and at the school level to support the use of IT resources by faculty and students?
   d. Do we have adequate staffing to support our faculty and students in their ever increasing use of IT resources?

4. Where should we be looking to improve our use of IT to support teaching and learning?
   a. What types of new and innovative spaces should we be developing on campus that are consistent with academic program direction, use of IT resources, and effective practices in teaching and learning?
   b. How can we utilize IT in the regional and international initiatives that are being planned for Portland and China/East Asia?
   c. What new support services will be need in the future with these new facilities or services?
   d. How can we best prepare faculty and students for the effective use of new IT resources in their academic programs
II. Research and Creative Activity
   F. Effective Use of Technology

1. High performance computing
   a. What needs to our faculty have for high performance computing?
   b. How are these needs being met in our current environment?
   c. What challenges do we face in supporting faculty in this area including cyberinfrastructure, staffing, network bandwidth, etc.?
   d. What opportunities are there for expanding research activities if we were to have the adequate IT resources in place to support research work?

2. Data, Data Analysis, and Visualization
   a. What is our current experience with the use of digital data?
   b. What work needs to be done in developing IT resources to deal with data, metadata, and ontology?
   c. What work needs to be done in developing IT resources to support research, resource, and reference collections to support the work of our faculty?
   d. Where do we see opportunities for the university to work with other institutions in developing resources in this area?

3. Collaboratories, Observations and Virtual Organizations
   a. Where do we see the creation of knowledge environments in the work of our faculty research efforts in the coming years?
   b. What institutional partnerships do we see developing where this type of IT environment would be needed? Are any of these international endeavors?
   c. What will be the challenges in creating and maintaining these knowledge environments, especially with international partners?
   d. Where do we need to adjust our staffing and resource levels to meet these challenges?

4. Information Technology resource and staff development
   a. How should we improve local, regional and national networks to support the research activities of our faculty?
   b. What actions could be taken to improve the network environments for our faculty who are engaged with international partners?
   c. Where do we need to add IT staff or improve skill sets to support researchers?
   d. Are there central IT resources like high performance computing that should be expanded to support the work of the research community?
   e. What other IT services could be offered to improve service to the research community?

III. Service to Community and Society
   F. Effective Use of Technology

1. How have teaching and learning initiatives using IT resources been used to provide service to community and society?
2. How have research initiatives using IT resources been used to provide service to community and society?
6. Sasha Welka

Spoke with:
FIG Program Student Coordinator

Criticisms of UO:
Wireless access on campus: More access points and more education on accessing the network should be added.

Media Services: Computer technology failures and professionalism in technicians’ ethics.

Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships student support: Students are not supported in their off-campus ventures to interview and possibly gain scholarships.

Awards ceremonies on campus: Ceremony content often too “packed in.” The length of ceremonies also should be analyzed for efficiency.

New Student Convocation: Ceremony should be directly connected to new students and quench their minds with information and speakers/discussions that relate to their needs as new university students.

Grade inflation: Faculty are contributing too much to their class study sessions, resulting in undedicated students receiving grades that dedicated students strive and study to earn.

General Education rigor: Class difficulty, classification into groups, and pulling a class into a selected group need to be analyzed for efficiency.

Athletic Department Representation off-campus: Certain coaches do not display mature and composed attitudes at off-campus games and events.

Accomplishments at UO:

Student Orientation: Students new to the University and their parents have given positive feedback to their programs. Definitely welcoming and knowledgeable staff works well with attending families and students.

Distinctive General Education Courses: Social science and comparative literature courses, in addition to others are great sources of a well rounded education.

Spoke with: ASUO President

Student Involvement in Governance:

Accomplishments:
Autonomy and rights to expression: Students involved in ASUO have a great deal of autonomy.
Committee composition: ASUO contains several committees with equal representation of students and faculty/staff.

ASUO Faculty/Staff Assistance: Main contacts are very easy to contact and converse with, especially with their agreeable personalities.

Criticisms:

Student investment: Student leaders have paid more for things that should be covered under budget.

Assignment of Funds: The ASUO is given approx. $10 million and 64% of that goes to contracts and department investments, while student activities and events are given less.

University Radio support: Funding for the campus radio station was supportively moved from a committee to funding from the EMU.

Personal data: FIG Program Student Assistant:

Public Safety Involvement with Students: Students should be more aware of the role that the department of public safety has on campus and what their options are in emergencies.

New Student Connection with Faculty: Both a pro/con. There are groups that are open to new students that would like to get involved with faculty that are doing research, but at times, these groups are not inclusive enough and do not get advertised as well as other student organizations.

Student Research: Again, both a pro/con. There are opportunities for students to assist faculty in research as assistants, but there should be more opportunity for this sort of experience.

Educational Technology: Blackboard, a great tool for education, should be required for instructors to use to create a unified front.
The Bonamici/Smith question:

Over years of very significant investment, we have built an excellent network and technology-based infrastructure and have established a wide variety of educational technology services. What is the impact of these investments on student learning and campus life, faculty scholarship and research, and administrative efficiency?

Jo Anna Gray (drafted November 29 2005)

Candidate Issues / Themes:

I. Undergraduate Education

    Theme: We’ve done a lot. Trot it out, organize it, and let the campus know about it. Finish what we have started. Point to where we need to go next.
    Issues: For some possibilities, see asterisks
    Structure: What we do with students when they first get here, how we channel them into majors, what do we do with them as they get ready to leave, how do we support them, and who teaches them?
    Source: Gleaned from meetings of the UGC.

A. When they first get here.
   First-year experience.
   Initiatives that have been successful (both academic and student support).
   Initiatives that have fizzled or been dropped for other reasons.
   *What have we learned?
   Gen ed requirements
   *Do they make sense?
   *Are they communicated appropriately?
   Begin with 2004 UGC review, report, recommendations.
   Setting expectations and assessing performance
   *Grade inflation.
      Setting the bar for students.
      Setting the bar for instructors.
   *Effect of competition for enrollment dollars.

B. Second year and choice of major
   The major
   Patterns in majors
   *How we assist students in selecting a major
   Initiatives in this area
Distinctive opportunities at the UO
Integrating the liberal arts and the professions
Professional distinctions
CAS/Education initiatives
Research opportunities for undergraduates

C. Getting ready to depart – do we end well?
   Capstone experiences
   Career preparation

D. Support throughout the experience
   Educational technology
      *Wireless access
      Classroom technology and support
      Blackboard
   Student services
E. Quality/Composition of the Instructional Staff
   Roles of
      Tenure-track faculty
      Non-tenure-track instructional staff
      Graduate teaching fellows

II. Graduate Education
   *Preparing graduate students to teach.

III. Fostering Excellence
   *Faculty salaries – Senate Budget Committee?

IV. A University Culture
   *Shared governance / committee service
   *Communication / information flow
      Academic side
      Where do you find good examples of merit pay criteria at the department level?
      Where do you look for good examples of material on research and teaching expectations for junior faculty?
      Where do you look for convenient information on grade distributions by program?
      On the business side
      Who do you call when the lights or technology don’t work in your classroom?
      (Terri, Herb, or Andrew?)
      Diversity of ideas
      Integration of functions – teaching/research/service

V. *Articulation with OUS / K-12. Where is this conversation taking place now?
   Our vision as a campus
   Transfer modules
   Fungible education
As the University of Oregon enters its self-study phase of accreditation, it is important to reaffirm that the overriding goal of the university is attaining national and international recognition in the creation and dissemination of knowledge. While this goal is anchored in the individual and collaborative research pursuits of the University faculty, it implies a vision that extends into curriculum development, classroom experience, and structured experiential learning. Faculty and student immersion in new and developing knowledge, therefore, motivates the University’s excellence in all areas, from the freshman seminar through the large lecture course to the doctoral research lab. Other focus areas of the University, such as funding, technology, governance, and diversity, should complement and further the larger aim of the creation and dissemination of knowledge.

With this foundational principle in mind, schools, colleges, departments, and individuals must carefully choose the endeavors in which they engage, allocating financial and other resources in accordance with this overarching goal. With the increasing complexity of the institution and continued pressure on faculty to participate in administrative and outreach efforts, the danger of erosion to our most important commitment increases. All processes and projects in which faculty members participate, whether internal or external to the University, need cautious and realistic assessment about their significance in relation to our goals. While any one project or process may appear valuable and important, we must not allow the accumulation of multiple tasks to wear down the time, imagination, and energy of the faculty.

Structured formal study at the University prepares students in many ways, but it is not designed to replace knowledge from life and work, which builds its own set of skills and understanding. Keeping in mind both the value and the limits of formal study may help us maintain the emphasis on intellectual development that is the hallmark of excellence. Fostering a lively and creative life of the mind for both students and faculty is – and must continue to be - the University’s most important function.
Martha Pitts

DRAFT- Articulation with Oregon’s K-12 system and Community Colleges

Strategic Direction

There is great emphasis in the Oregon legislature and at the highest levels of educational administration in Oregon on providing a “seamless education” for students from kindergarten through college graduation, but there is not agreement on what “seamless education” means. Unnecessary administrative barriers to degree completion must be removed while retaining those policies that insure a student gets the full benefit of an undergraduate education. How do we evaluate what policies and procedures really safeguard quality and which are unnecessary roadblocks?

Recent articles on articulation and movement between educational segments can be explored briefly. Articles can include George Kuh’s recent research that “swirl” results in lesser engagement for students in academic activities and diminishes the value of a degree and the Chronicle article from a Klamath Community College board member on the pitfalls of college courses in high school.

This policy examination is at the heart of Standard 3.D.3 regarding placement of students in courses and programs to ensure a reasonable probability of success. It also addresses standard 3.C.4 on acceptance of transfer credit. The Undergraduate Council, the UO High School Counselor Advisory Council, and the UO Community College Advisory Council are good resources for these policy discussions. Further avenues for gathering input from UO academic deans, and from faculty should be explored.

Areas for possible inclusion:

Technology Tools to Improve Information Available to Students and Advisors

- Standard 3.B.5 and Standard 3.C.4
The opportunity for increased self-service for students in the award of transfer credit provides students with better access to their own academic information and greater opportunity to evaluate their own progress toward major and degree requirement. Discuss DARS, ATLAS and the significant opportunities for breaking down unnecessary barriers. This addresses Standard 3.B.5 in a way that goes beyond making the information available to enhancing usability.

The UO has made changes in policy to provide students more information on transfer or credit earlier in the process.

Identify Unnecessary Barriers in College Credits Earned in High School

- Explore process for determining the appropriate credit to award of appropriate credit.
- Discuss new requirements for standardization of credit award state-wide for AP/IB scores.
- Identify quality programs awarding college credit for work in high school.
- Highlight UO program for high school students, DUCKLINK.

**Identify Unnecessary Barriers for Admission from High School**

*Standard 3.C.2 and 3.D.1*

- Examine PASS, Small Schools Initiative, and other alternatives to traditional high school structures.

**Identify Unnecessary Barriers for Transfer of College Credit**

*Standard 3.C.2 and 3.D.1*

- Discuss implementation of evaluation methods to demonstrate completion of general education requirements that accommodate transfer, including AAOT, OTM, and other UO and statewide initiatives.
- Discuss articulation of expected educational outcomes for a baccalaureate degree statewide, and UO role in implementing this process.
- Explore need for discipline-specific communication across segments.
- Explore additional work necessary to do in identifying and evaluating policies.

Martha Pitts
University of Oregon
Accreditation
Input via Discussion and Notes from
Accreditation Core Group Meeting, January 12, 2006

As Submitted by Steve Durant

General Education Curriculum: (In some ways this would be an attempt to head-off concern about an area the last accreditation committee considered to be problematic.) What is our philosophy of general education? How do we see our problem in the context of what has sometimes been described as the tension at various universities between an integrated GE curriculum and what might be called a “smorgasbord approach” to general education? How does general education interface with departmental majors and minors? How are GE courses proposed and accepted? Which units bear the burden of GE instruction and what benefits do they derive from such instruction? Etc.

Internationalization: How are we responding in this institution to increasing globalization? Consideration of the issues of internationalization might lead to discussion of study abroad programs, our attempts to attract international students, international curricular offerings, etc. What is the relationship between the international agenda and talk of cultural diversity?

The University as a Part of the Larger Community: What are the various “communities” of which we are a part? What do we see as the relationship between our university and the larger Oregon community? What programs do we offer that might simultaneously meet the needs of the community and foster the kinds of relationships that might attract donations to the institution? This could also open up discussion of the relationship with the legislature and other administrative issues.

Collaboration and Dialogue on Campus: This sounds somewhat vague, I know. But it might include ways we try to foster communication among groups such as students and faculty, faculty and administration, etc. How we engage students and faculty in university decision-making. Programs that promote faculty and student community across discipline boundaries could also be discussed.
Potential Self-Study Questions:

1. In the 10 years since the last self-study, the UO, and most other public institutions of higher education, has seen dramatic decreases in state funding support for its mission. How has the UO responded to this shift in funding for higher education, and what are its plans for providing resources to carry out its mission in future years? What short- and long-term financial planning processes does the University employ for operating and capital needs, and how does it involve key constituencies in these processes? How does the University assess its financial health and resiliency? How does the University assess its ability to align resources with mission and strategic vision?

2. Over the last few years the campus has made significant financial investments in improving the physical attributes of classrooms and other spaces. Additionally numerous management systems have been implemented to maintain the classrooms, and respond quickly to emergencies on equipment or other classroom elements. Has this effort resulted in better learning outcomes for students, and how do we know this?

3. Recent research on classroom and learning outcomes appears to indicate that in addition to regular classrooms, buildings should have a variety of collaborative spaces that promote learning on a variety of levels. These areas may be as simple as good structured seating areas near classrooms where students can communicate with other students about the next class, to more structured seminar rooms where discussions can take place. Does UO have the right proportion of these kinds of spaces, and what views do students have about the importance of these kinds of spaces?

4. How does the university meet the professional development needs of its staff in order to ensure efficient and effective stewardship of resources and fulfillment of it’s mission.
Draft Issues for Core Group

1. Quality of undergraduate education, including the first-year experience, general eduction, coherence, assessment, majors, relationship between the liberal arts and the professions, career preparation, quality and composition of instructional staff.

2. Articulation with OUS/K-12, including our vision as a campus and our relationship to Oregon’s high schools, community colleges, and other universities.

3. Educational technology, including issues of centralization, funding, infrastructure, training and support for faculty and students, course support (e.g. Blackboard), and grants to support innovation in the classroom.

4. Fostering excellence, including strategies for hiring, supporting, promoting, and retaining the best research and teaching faculty to which we can aspire.

5. Governance issues, including (i) the incentives for service and (ii) the roles and interaction of the university’s administrators, the university senate, the university’s committees.
As Submitted by Dave Hubin

Core Group Pump-Primming Issues

1. Questions of Governance:

How do we sustain and enhance traditions of shared governance while achieving greater clarity on the distinct roles that administrators play. Where are the boundaries, how do the roles of faculty and administrators complement each other? What are the points of intersection? What are the points of distinction?

2. Faculty Service

With expectations of faculty that include teaching, research and service, how do we appropriately reward and sustain contributions to “service.” Where does “service” fall in the constellation of factors that lead to promotion and to salary enhancement? How do you measure “service.” Is energy devoted to all areas of “possible service” of equal value and therefore to be rewarded equally? Who decides?

3. Residential aspect of the University:

What does it mean to be a residential institution? What teaching and learning activities are enhanced by being “residential”? How do we nurture and support those “plusses”? What must be done to renew our residential attributes. How do “dorms like dungeons” affect us as a University?

4. Distinct Attributes:

We have been called an “AAU institution that you can get your hands around.” Does that give us “the best of all possible worlds?” or are we a compromise that does not realize the benefits of either the Liberal Arts College or the Large AAU Mega institution?

5. Faculty Salaries:

How do we move to equity with our peer institutions? Can we sustain quality if this is not addressed?

6. General Education: The Student Intellectual Experience

Do we present a coherent intellectual experience for our undergraduates? Do we effectively introduce students to the assumptions and values of a learned society? Do our general education requirements “make sense?” and is that “sense” conveyed effectively to the students. Could a student graduate from the University of Oregon and not understand the core values of a liberal arts research university?
Draft Ideas of Issues for the self-study

7. **The Major and the Capstone: The Student Intellectual Experience**

Do we effectively introduce students to the espistemology and intellectual values of the disciplines they enter? Are students left to “induction” as they sort through what it means to be “a ________” (fill in the blank with “historian” “sociologist” “linguist” “economics” “planner” ….)

8. **Matching Students to Resources:**

Do we admit the right students to benefit from what we provide and do we then support the students who we admit?

9. **Our Place in the State:**

How do we fit within the array of educational experiences available within the state and the region? What does it mean to be seamless? How does “seamless education” balance with “residential” experience?

10. **Our Community:**

How do we enhance further the institutional diversity that simultaneously ensures and underpins the high quality of our university experience for all students, and ensures that the University is serving all groups within our increasingly diverse society?
As Submitted by Richard Linton

Research and Graduate Education Issues
Accreditation Self-Study

Creation of Knowledge
How is the UO advancing the research mission of the institution?
- Support/infrastructure for faculty research
- Compliance – responsible conduct of research
- Centers & Institutes (development, management)
- Collaborative research initiatives

Dissemination of Knowledge
How is the UO advancing graduate programs and the overall quality of the graduate experience?
- Seminars and graduate student-only course offerings (400/500)
- Recruitment, retention, and completion issues
- Diversity/international engagement
- Innovation in curricular offerings (e.g., Applied Master’s programs, interdisciplinary programs, integration of Professional Schools with CAS departments or programs).
- Post-graduation placement (help with placement, tracking)

What are the benefits of UO research and graduate education on those outside the boundaries of the campus?
- Technology transfer and economic development
- Impact of faculty and graduate student research, scholarship, and creative activities on their respective disciplines and on society

Resources and Organization
Financing research
- Faculty recruitment and retention
- Utilization of indirect cost budget
- Targeted state and federal investments

Financing graduate education
- Support for graduate students
- Recognition of graduate student training in faculty workloads
- Contribution of graduate students to undergraduate teaching

Internal program review
- Policies and practices
- Performance metrics
Enrollment management

- Proportion of graduate students to undergraduate students
- Determining the optimal size of individual graduate programs
As Submitted by Gregg Lobisser

1/9/06 DRAFT UO SELF STUDY ISSUES

UO Role and identity
    Mission
    Public University
    Flagship...AAU membership
    Research
    Teaching
    Future mix of colleges and departments
    Satellites: Portland, Bend, Charleston
    Distance learning
    City/state economic development

Enrollment Goals and Strategy for Next Decade
    Enrollment goals for next decade
    Mix: res./non-res.; low income; students of color; international students
    K-12/CC seamless education
    Scholarships and financial aid
    Residential campus

Educational Program
A. Excellence in undergraduate education
    Department curriculum/program review
    General education requirements
    Faculty research, publication, and teaching
    1st year programs: FIGS, FS
    Living Learning Center
    Distance learning
    Internationalization of curriculum
    Visiting scholars
    Academic integrity

B. Excellence in graduate education and research
    Department/curriculum program review
    Faculty research, publication, and teaching
    Centers and institutes
    Grants
    Research Park/economic development
    ONAMI Center

Faculty and staff
    Recruitment & retention of faculty and staff
    GTF support
    Benefits/health care
Salaries
Diversity

**Institutional Governance**
- Organizational structure of senior administration
- Faculty Governance
- Student involvement in institutional governance
- OUS, state, and federal legislative advocacy
- Athletics oversight

**Financial Strategy for Institution**
- Declining state support
- Capital Campaign goals and beyond
- UO Foundation role
- Tuition independence from OUS
- Grants and research…fees and income
- Tuition and fees
- New building construction, operational funds
- Energy source

**Infrastructure**
- Physical plant/energy issues
- Deferred building maintenance
- Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP)
- Land acquisition
- Technology
  - Classrooms, residence halls, and service buildings
- Records technology and security
- Internet
- Distance Education

**Campus Climate and Student Health**
- Residential triangle: Housing, Recreation Center, EMU
- Student safety
- Risk prevention/education: alcohol, drugs, sexual assault, STD’s
- Grievance and mediation processes
- Campus diversity and climate
- Free speech
- Student service support programs
As Submitted by Jim McChesney

Communications: What is being done to effectively communicate with various publics, internal and external? What are the goals of this communication and how well are those goals being achieved?

Foundation support: What is the role of the university foundation and what part does it play in assuring continuation and growth of excellence in teaching and research at the university as a whole (in addition to athletics)?

Athletics: Discuss both financial and promotional (putting a public face on the university) aspects of athletics at the UO, as well as academic requirements, NCAA accreditation and facilities.
As Submitted by Terri Warpinski

REACCREDITATION POINTS OF INTEREST – ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Submitted by T. Warpinski, Vice Provost

Assessment – how well do we utilize the instruments we have and where do we need to advance in our understanding of the impacts and outcomes in our programs, policies, procedures.

Continuing Education – how well do we serve the institution, the community and beyond by the ways in which we are currently addressing CE

Decentralization – do we duplicate effort and expense? Do the benefits outstrip the issues?

Faculty Governance – what does it mean, where do we serve our mission well, and where does it run amuck?

Technology – do we know where we are going? If so, can we map how we get there? How well do our faculty perceptions match with student perceptions (see Assessment, Decentralization, Assessment, Continuing Ed)

Teaching Environment – both planning and oversight (maintenance). (See Decentralization, Technology).

Off campus programs – Bend, Portland and International initiatives
University of Oregon
Accreditation
From Conversations with Committee Chairs

I. From conversations with the current chairs of the Senate and UGC (Fall 2005):

- First-year programs – experience since 1997 study / are we where we want to be?
- Fit within the OUS system – campus vision.
  - Articulation with K-12 (AP credit, “college high”)
  - Relationship to community colleges (transfer module)
  - Relationship to other universities (uniform gen. ed.)
  - Place of online classes / distance education
- Resources and Salaries
- Governance Issues
- Multicultural requirement / diversity
- Non-tenure track instructional faculty
- Student conduct code / academic dishonesty
- Campus Planning
- Faculty oversight of off-campus programs
- Tension between revenue considerations and faculty control of the curriculum

III. From a January 19, 2006 conversation with current chairs of the Academic Requirements Committee, the University Committee on Courses, the CAS Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Standards Committee:

TBA
University of Oregon
Accreditation
Input from Standing Committees and Advisory Groups

I. From the minutes of the October 10, 2005 meeting of the Undergraduate Council:

• How well do we introduce students to the institution, especially non-traditional students and transfer (transitional and international) students? How do we help them identify non-academic related resources that can ease their entrance into the university experience? Who are we serving? Who is being helped? Who is being overlooked? (Questions raised by student member.)
• What support resources do we provide for students coming to a large university environment from very small rural areas. (Question raised by student member.)
• What is the effect of Educational Technology on teaching and learning?
• What has been the impact of new programs instituted since the last accreditation?
• How do the professional programs fit into the academic environment, esp. in regard to articulation with community college programs?
• How do the professional schools and CAS interact to produce a good general education/undergraduate experience?
• How do our students get ready for employment? How do the professional schools contribute to this preparation?
• Are we maximizing opportunities for undergraduates to do real research?
• How are we keeping the curriculum current without sacrificing its traditional and effective foundations? How well are we articulating with other institutions?
• As we look at grade inflation: Is this a discrete topic to be examined or is it part of a larger issue?

II. A list of likely Senate activities for the year ahead, take from the agenda of the 10/12/05 Meeting of the University Senate:

• Student Conduct Code
• UO diversity action plan
• Policies on externally-funded research
• Assembly membership and protocols
• NTTIF policies
• Campus planning
• Revisions to the Senate charter
• Resources and salaries

III. From 10/11/05 meeting of the Student Affairs Council

• Changes since 1997 -- highlight/emphasis on new student recruitment,
IV. Communication from the Graduate Council received January 24, 2006

24 January 2006
To: JoAnna Gray
From: Mark Reed, on behalf of the Graduate Council
Subject: Some thoughts from the Graduate Council on accreditation and related issues

In its meeting of 18 Jan 06, the Graduate Council had a wide-ranging discussion of the “mission” of graduate education at the university and how our concept of mission may help with input to the accreditation self study. We worked from the concept of the accreditation process that you outlined, wherein we view re-accreditation as a byproduct of our self examination.

On the concept of “mission”, Mark Johnson (Philosophy) contributed a particularly cogent and elegant statement, attached below – a must-read. Three excerpts of Mark’s statement express key points, as follows.

“...graduate education is an apprenticeship in the methods, skills, practices, history, and current state of any particular discipline or field. There are standards of excellence internal to the
complex practices that are the sciences, the arts, and the humanities. Students have to learn these things by doing them, by coming to incorporate the values, modes of inquiry, and virtues distinctive of their chosen fields.”

“... graduate education should realize the highest ideals and values of liberal education. Liberal education is what fits any person to take up their proper role as a citizen in a free society. Liberal education is thus about teaching citizens how to think—to think analytically, critically, creatively, and cooperatively. We are not born knowing how to think. We learn to do this . . .”

“We need to bring the University into more direct dialogue with the community. More than ever, we need citizens who can think. But this ability is in short supply, and it is dramatically absent in much of what we, as a nation, are doing. It is in fulfilling its mission of liberal education that the university can make its most important contribution to life and to human and environmental flourishing.”

In discussion and subsequent emails, the Council generated additional ideas about “mission” that tie in with issues pertinent to accreditation, expressed below as points for consideration, ranging from general to narrow, in no particular order. I am sure that the entire Council does not agree with all of the following points, but they do express a range of ideas worthy of consideration. One other caution: In illustrative examples, below, there is a bias toward science and earth science. We can certainly broaden the illustrations with more time.

• The primary rationale for PhD education is to contribute to the scholarly development and research output of the faculty. We cannot justify any PhD program if it does not make a significant contribution to the research mission of the university. In other words, a PhD program must do more than produce graduates.

• Graduate education involves teaching students critical thinking skills that enable them to frame and then solve problems in ways that are convincing and compelling to others in the discipline and beyond.

• In contrast undergraduate education, where learning the answers to questions is a significant part of the process (perhaps too much), graduate education it involves learning how to answer questions.

• On the need to attract high quality applicants to our graduate programs:
  i) Funding levels are inadequate, both during the academic year and especially during the summer. We have no routine or systematic program of support for our doctoral students during the summer, especially in the non-sciences.
  ii) In some fields, The University of Oregon is not adequately recognized for strong graduate programs. We need improved marketing by University development specialists of the UO as a place of high quality graduate programs.
  iii) A small amount of additional funding to be offered up-front to accepted graduate students to improve the competitive appeal of the Oregon opportunity would go far in attracting top students. Such funding might include summer research stipends, summer travel to conferences, or school-year support for research.
• University development specialists need to sharpen their focus on graduate education and devise ways to communicate the needs of graduate education to potential donors.

• In some or many departments, there is not sufficient credit given for effort expended in graduate education (in its various forms) vis-à-vis teaching of undergraduate courses. Should the university provide guidelines that would increase such credit and thereby strengthen graduate education?

• Should the university examine the relationship between the graduate education we offer and the opportunities for students once they leave here? Should we be putting our efforts into disciplinary categories where the potential for employment is minimal? We also recognize that a liberal education commonly leads to work outside one’s academic disciplinary focus, but that the academic experience nevertheless provides an essential basis for the future endeavors.

• Faculty and graduate student research improves the quality of teaching of undergraduates in this institution. Is this really demonstrably true? We need to make the case.

• On research ethics: should the graduate school assert a “values” expression of what research is ethically appropriate? Is there a problem? How should we address ethics in research at the University of Oregon?

• The disparate disciplines at the university share common threads in subject areas, technology use, research methods and links to the real world. How can we improve communication and interaction among departments with shared interests to foster research innovations, improve efficiency and improve teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels? Thread examples:
  i) Subject areas: applications of statistics and applied math in sciences, social sciences, business; use of geographic information systems (GIS) in geology, geography, anthropology, sociology, planning.
  ii) Technology and research methods: GIS, data mining, GPS, image analysis, remote sensing.
  iii) Links to the real world: Some folklore and myths arise from natural disasters such as tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, climate change; land use planning must respond to fundamental properties of the land as described and interpreted in geography and geology.

**Graduate Education Mission (Mark Johnson)**

It is difficult to formulate a single statement of the mission of graduate education, given the diversity of methods, values, institutions, and traditions that constitute the many disciplines and fields that typically define the contemporary research university. For example, what single conception will cover the practices and ideals of chemistry, business, art, music, philosophy, law, political science, and linguistics? However, I want to propose two quite traditional conceptions that still seem to me to be essential dimensions of our mission.

The first is simply that graduate education is an apprenticeship in the methods, skills, practices, history, and current state of any particular discipline or field. There are standards of excellence internal to the complex practices that are the sciences, the arts, and the humanities.
Students have to learn these things by *doing* them, by coming to incorporate the values, modes of inquiry, and virtues distinctive of their chosen fields. To repeat, these things are learned only by engaging in them—by doing—and not merely by reading or listening. They must be *done* in dialogue and interaction with people who have achieved a level of accomplishment and distinction in their field.

There is a second crucial aspect of our mission that is sometimes under-appreciated, even though it is perhaps the oldest ideal. I refer to the view that graduate education should realize the highest ideals and values of liberal education. Liberal education is what fits any person to take up their proper role as a citizen in a free society. Liberal education is thus about teaching citizens how to *think*—to think analytically, critically, creatively, and cooperatively. We are not born knowing how to think. We learn to do this, once again, by thinking in the presence of, and in dialogue with, those who manifest the virtues (excellences) of their areas of study. Thinking requires gaining knowledge of the underlying assumptions and the history of your discipline. It requires training in the aesthetics of inquiry, practice, and performance for each distinctive field. There is intelligence appropriate to playing basketball, doing logic, calculating economic rationality, throwing pots on the wheel, and solving quadratic equations. So, liberal education is not, and should not be, solely a matter for undergraduate education. We desperately need to carry this ideal forward at an advanced level of learning.

The first dimension described above is not a sufficient description of our most pressing mission. The reason for this is that learning to be an expert in your chosen field, however important and valuable that may be, does not necessarily fit you to engage your fellow citizens or to make the world a better place. We need professionalism, to be sure, but not merely a professionalism that cuts one off from the problems of our daily existence in a complex, everchanging world that is wracked with tension and conflict. We need to bring the University into more direct dialogue with the community. More than ever, we need citizens who can think. But this ability is in short supply, and it is dramatically absent in much of what we, as a nation, are doing. It is in fulfilling its mission of liberal education that the university can make its most important contribution to life and to human and environmental flourishing.

Mark Johnson