

Report on Academic Continuity During Fall 2014 GTFF Strike
Academic Council
March 11 and May 6, 2016

In Fall 2014, a GTFF strike close to finals week required the university administration to consider how students in GTF led or supported courses would receive grades and not have their financial aid affected. The Office of Emergency Management & Continuity (EMC), as the responsible office for university business continuity during emergencies, was called upon to coordinate an Academic Continuity Plan. The purpose of this report is to examine the events surrounding academic continuity planning, and advise on ways to improve such planning in the future.

Academic Continuity Plan

In anticipation of the potential strike, then President Gottfredson established an Academic Continuity Team which included representation from: Academic Affairs, Student Life, Research, EMC, CAS Dean's Office, Graduate School, General Counsel, HR, Public Affairs Communication, Registrar, IR, IS and Library Academic Technology. The ACT surveyed some departments and consulted with CAS and other academic department heads.

Based on the surveys and meetings, the ACT recommended the following coping strategies:

- * Extending the grading deadline for all courses
- * Canceling some or all class hours in dead week that were not tied to exams to free faculty time to focus on creating/revising finals
- * Expediting grading, which may include modifying finals for some or all courses
- * Where applicable, providing students the option to forgo the final and take their current grade
- * Where applicable, increase grading capacity through increased FTE of existing staff or hiring staff who were not employed

In early communications from the administration, it was also stated that faculty could input an "X" as a final grade if they preferred. This was later determined not to be a viable option due to the difficulty of processing the many potential "X" grades to meet Federal financial aid regulations. The administration determined the risk of students losing financial aid was too high and retracted the "X" grade as an option.

The Academic Continuity Team, after much consideration, determined that there were no viable "short-cuts" regarding grades that would eliminate the risk to students regarding financial aid and other academic consequences. Thus, the primary goal for the ACT was to ensure that all UO students received final grades by the extended deadline.

These coping strategies were considered recommendations and it was communicated that implementation was at the discretion of deans or designees to approve and apply in consultation with department heads and faculty. The goal was to have as much local control of grades as possible, within the constraints of the situation using the options provided above. The bottom line for the administration

was that grades had to be posted by the deadline (See Appendix A for a summary of University continuity planning by Andre Le Duc – Executive Director of Enterprise Risk Services.

Faculty and Senate Response to Academic Continuity Plan

As the Academic Continuity Plan was rolled out, some faculty expressed objections to the recommendations themselves and to the consultation process. Some faculty also had moral objections to supporting what they perceived to be administrative efforts to “break” the strike. In addition, the Senate and Senate councils concerned with academic quality resisted an Academic Continuity Plan that did not involve them, as the sole, including the President, governance authority on academic matters in developing that plan. Finally, ambiguity in United Academic’s collective bargaining agreement with the university added to the confusion regarding faculty’s obligations during the GTFF strike. The specific clause states that “Bargaining unit faculty members will not unreasonably refuse to perform such work.”, referring to work previously performed by a striking employee of another bargaining unit. United Academics and the administration were unable to agree on how to define “unreasonably”, so faculty were left to interpret that at risk of potential discipline.

On November 19, 2014, the Senate passed a resolution (Appendix B) rejecting the recommendations in the plan and calling on President Gottfredson to work with the UO faculty through the UO Senate to determine how to maintain academic standards in the event of a strike by the GTFF. Seeing no response on that resolution, the Senate, passed a resolution December 3, 2014 (Appendix C) creating the “Academic Integrity Task Force” charged with evaluating the Academic Continuity Plan and consulting with faculty, department heads and administrators to develop and implement plans to preserve academic integrity during the GTFF strike. That task force consisted of the chairs of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, and the chair of the UOCC.

The Academic Integrity Task Force met with members of administration, the registrar and financial aid to gain a better understanding of the academic continuity plan and available options for final grades. On December 7, 2014, the task force presented a report (Appendix D) that outlined some principles regarding academic integrity and outlining options for faculty in terms of reporting final grades, with an emphasis on faculty choice and control over their grades. The report also called on the Senate President to convene the Academic Council *“and charge that body with developing, in consultation with Academic Affairs and the President’s office, clear protocols for the involvement of the Senate and the relevant Senate committees in campus-wide academic planning and decision-making.”*

The conflict around these issues escalated as the strike continued, and schools and colleges began to implement the Academic Continuity Plan. The challenge of ensuring that students received final grades were dealt with differently across the campus but some faculty had particular concerns about the way these issues were managed in parts of the College of Arts and Sciences. Of particular concern to some faculty during this time was the decision in some units for Deans/Associate Deans to replace the instructor of record on GTF led/supported courses so that final grades could be posted. Some Department Heads also reported that the work they were required to do would be impossible to accomplish in any reasonable timeline. In addition, some faculty were concerned about reports that Department Heads that refused to follow the Academic Continuity Plan would be subject to discipline.

These concerns led to two motions presented and passed on the Senate floor charging the Academic Integrity Task Force with investigating “*the alleged grading irregularities in the philosophy and other departments during Fall 2014.*” and “*the alleged plans to establish the groundwork for disciplinary procedures or other action against department heads or others in relationship to the Academic Continuity Plan of the administration in Fall 2014.*” (Appendices E & F)

Final Grades and Discipline of Department Heads

Andrew Marcus, Interim Dean of CAS and Professor Bonnie Mann, Department Head in Philosophy, were interviewed for this report to understand their perspectives on how grades were handled in CAS and on the subject of discipline of department heads.

Grades

Dean Marcus explained that his starting point was that students had to have final grades and that, as much as possible, local decision-making on these matters was best. Andrew discussed the many students that came to him and other administrators really worried about their grades, and the consequences if grades were not submitted. He acknowledged that this was a triage situation – that he was faced with choosing the best of many undesirable options.

For GTF-supported classes, faculty who were already the instructor of record were expected to take on the work of finalizing grades in their classes where possible. In many cases, faculty agreed to do this work. In some cases they did not and department heads were asked to step in to help submit end-of-term grades.

For GTF-led classes, it was negotiated that the GTF would turn in all grades and work to date prior to the strike. Most GTFs did this but some did not. Since faculty who supervise the GTF are already also listed as the instructor of record, they were asked to help finalize grades where possible. This was treated as overload and many faculty did carry out this work. Department Heads were, however, excluded from receiving overload compensation, but were not informed of this until overload compensation was calculated. For the classes where faculty did not carry out the work, department heads were assigned as the instructor of record and asked to submit end-of-term grades. Many department heads accepted this assignment, but some did not.

At least two department heads refused to take on the work of finalizing grades for GTF led/supported classes. In these cases, the associate dean was assigned as the instructor of record and completed the submission of grades, following the guidelines and options in the academic continuity plan.

Discipline

According to Dean Marcus, as plans and options were communicated across CAS, some department heads asked what would happen if they refused to carry out the work of finalizing grades as requested. Dean Marcus explained that there might be some consequences for that. In the end, two department heads initially received letters of discipline related to their refusal to comply with the Dean’s requests.

Subsequently, many other department heads approached Dean Marcus and expressed their disagreement and concern regarding the letters of discipline. Dean Marcus reconsidered, taking into account the extraordinary circumstance and the lack of clarity about the expectations of department heads, who find themselves in a dual role of administrator and faculty. Dean Marcus withdrew the letters of discipline and instead issued letters that clarified the role and expectations of department heads moving forward. Dean Marcus suggested that one desirable outcome is to get clarity on the role and expectations of all department heads and outline those in letters of appointment that department heads would receive and agree to upon accepting the position. This would make clear what is expected and give faculty a clear choice as to whether they want to accept the position or not.

The Dilemma for Department Heads

One department head, Professor Bonnie Mann in Philosophy, was interviewed for this report. Professor Mann was one of two department heads sent a letter of discipline related to actions during the GTFF strike. For Professor Mann, carrying out the academic continuity plan as directed was fraught with ethical dilemmas. These dilemmas are magnified because of the unique position of department heads in the university. Professor Mann pointed out the following concerns:

1. Department heads manage a complex community of faculty, staff and students. Given that, what does it mean to be a “good citizen”? In the particular scenario of a GTFF strike, there are diverse views on complicated issues among faculty and students. These are not easily reconciled by central directives.
2. Department heads are both faculty and administrators, and, as such, must manage complicated relationships with colleagues and students. In her view, taking the actions outlined in the academic continuity plan raised ethical questions and had the potential to seriously damage relationships with her colleagues and students. For instance, some of her own GTF’s were on the picket line.
3. The particular action in her department of an associate dean taking over as instructor of record and assigning final grades raised several issues. Professor Mann reported that this resulted in 70% of students over 7 classes receiving higher grades than their work warranted. In addition, this raises questions about who is and should be an “instructor of record” (See Appendix H for University policy on Instructors of Record).
4. Professor Mann expressed concern over the apparent expectation that strict obedience to administrative directives is a condition of being a department head. Such an expectation is unrealistic and undesirable if the university wants to attract the best candidates to department head roles. In addition, it ignores the question of how to resolve deep disagreements over administrative actions that have ethical consequences, and potentially damaging consequences to the communities in our respective spheres.

Key Findings

The Academic Council draws the following conclusions from its deliberations:

1. Earlier consultation about academic continuity with Senate bodies charged with oversight of academic matters could have prevented at least some of the contentious outcomes related to the GTFF strike. Several administrators stated that then President Gottfredson's delay in putting plans in motion led to deficient planning and consultation.
2. There is a lack of clarity about department heads' roles and responsibilities related to overall university functioning and decisions. In addition, there is lack of clarity about how to reconcile the legitimate ethical positions of department heads in response to administrative decisions.
3. There is a lack of clarity regarding lines of authority and the responsible offices regarding university business continuity, which includes academic continuity.
4. Ambiguity in the collective bargaining agreement between the university and United Academics regarding faculty's obligations during a strike by another union created confusion about what faculty could and could not do. As such, there was inconsistency in faculty response to the strike and the academic continuity plan across campus.
5. In a university, issues will arise in which there is a complex overlap between administrative matters and academic matters. How can we reconcile the potential tensions between the pragmatic decisions that have to be made to ensure the functioning of the university and our core academic principles and values? In the rare case that an administrative decision conflicts with strongly held beliefs about academic matters, deep consultation should occur and the best possible solution should be arrived at collaboratively whenever possible.

Summary and Charge of Academic Council

This summary captures the main events during that time but not the many nuances of the situation. The GTFF strike and responses to the strike raised legitimate questions on all fronts - highlighting the inherent tensions between administrative matters, academic matters and shared governance, especially where administrative and academic matters overlap. Discussions in the Academic Council on April 16, 2015 with Andre Le Duc of EMC Aid were very helpful in understanding the events leading up to and during the GTFF strike. Jim Brooks of Financial Aid clarified the challenges regarding final grades and Federal Financial Aid regulations, making clear his perspective that there is no easy, structural way to avoid such challenges in the future.

The Academic Council makes the following recommendations:

1. The Academic Council, under its charge (APPENDIX G), shall be included in campus-wide decision-making on academic matters that do not fall under existing Senate committees or councils. The Academic Council will be one of the first bodies consulted by the university President or designee when a process for making campus academic decisions begins. The Provost will ensure that Enterprise Risk Services or any other group charged with creating continuity plans will engage the Academic Council to review current plans and amend as necessary. The Provost will also ensure that the Academic Council is engaged during an emergency or in preparation for emergency situations that call for academic decisions to be made.

2. The provost will ask the Deans to consider a letter of appointment for department heads and other academic leadership roles that clearly outlines the responsibilities of the role under conditions of academic continuity. This is to help faculty make informed choices about whether to accept such a role or not, and to provide more predictability for administration regarding expected actions of those in academic leadership roles. The caveat here is that setting these expectations out clearly prior to an appointment may result in some faculty not accepting these roles.

3. The administration will work with United Academics to gain more clarity about faculty's rights and responsibilities during a strike by another union on campus.

4. The Academic Council will discuss how these complicated situations intersect with academic freedom and how to manage the situation of faculty who, in a strike or other controversial situation, may have ethical decisions to make. Academic Council will also discuss how these questions intersect with the pragmatic decisions that have to be made for the functioning of the University.



UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

MEMORANDUM

DRAFT

April 15, 2015

To: Academic Integrity Task Force
From: Andre Le Duc, Executive Director, Enterprise Risk Services
Krista Dillon, Assistant Director, Emergency Management & Continuity
Re: Continuity of Operations Planning and Academic Continuity at UO

The purpose of this memorandum is to: 1) provide an overview of business continuity planning, 2) describe past applications and examples of academic continuity, and 3) provide an overview of the academic continuity planning team and process used for the 2014 GTFF strike.

Continuity of Operations and Business Continuity Planning at the University of Oregon

The Office of Emergency Management & Continuity (EMC) coordinates business continuity planning efforts at the university. The goal of a business continuity plan is to provide a plan of action that, in the event of disruption or emergency, specifies the key resources and staff, as well as a process and procedures for re-establishing critical services and functions. Continuity plans are designed to assist staff during incidents when standard operating procedures are no longer sufficient to support the continuation of your operational functions. Continuity planning is designed to cover a broad range of potential impacts, not just one specific scenario. Power outages, snow/ice storms, or a gas leak can be just as disruptive as a major emergency. The continuity planning process involves:

1. Taking a snapshot of your operations; defining your critical services and functions.
2. Conducting an impact assessment and determining “Maximum Allowable Downtime”.
3. Developing coping strategies to manage the “What If?” questions.

To assist campus in developing continuity plans, EMC developed OregonReady, which is an on-line planning tool. The OregonReady system allows departments to create a continuity plan that will assist with prioritizing actions to take before, during, and after any disruption. The ultimate goal is to facilitate the department resuming the critical services functions in a shorter amount of time. Plans will include:

- A prioritized list of the department’s services functions and their respective details, including criticality
- A list of Action Items that you create to help your department prepare before a disruptive occurs
- Information and strategies that will help during and after any disruptive event
- Department-specific sections on information technology (IT) continuity
- Instruction continuity for academic units
- A repository of key documents, such as contact numbers...??

Applications and examples of Academic Continuity

The following is a brief timeline and summary of instances where disruptions or emergencies have caused the university to begin to develop academic continuity strategies.

- **Spring 2009, H1N1:** Facing the potential for an H1N1 pandemic flu outbreak, the university developed a pandemic flu plan that addressed academic continuity.
- **December 2013, Winter Weather:** Campus was impacted by a snow and ice event. Classes and events on the Friday of Dead Week were cancelled after 2:00 pm. Monday finals occurring at 8:00 am and 6:00 and 7:00 pm were rescheduled later in the week.
- **February 2014, Winter Weather:** Campus was impacted by a snow and ice event. Classes and events on Friday, February 7th were cancelled all day, Saturday and Sunday classes and events were cancelled until noon.
- **December 2015, GTFF Strike:** The GTFF strike occurred during dead week and finals. An Academic Continuity plan was implemented to address potential teaching disruptions. More information on that process is provided below.

In addition, there are many lessons that can be learned from other campuses that have experienced full campus disruptions that resulted in the need for detailed academic continuity plans. For example, in 1994 Cal State Northridge was directly impacted by an earthquake causing the campus to be closed for several weeks and upon reopening, classes were held in fields and in temporary trailers. There is an excellent video highlighting their experiences with academic continuity: <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/emergency/aftershocks.shtml> Tulane University closed their campus and dispersed their students to other universities following Hurricane Katrina. And, the University of Canterbury in New Zealand's offered community service credits to students who assisted the community clean up during their campus closure following their 2010 earthquake.

GTFF Strike Academic Continuity Planning

In anticipation of the potential strike, the Interim President established an Academic Continuity Team (ACT) to develop academic continuity strategies. That team included representation from: Academic Affairs, Student Life, Research, Emergency Management & Continuity, CAS Dean's Office, Graduate School, General Counsel, Human Resources, Public Affairs Communication, Registrar, Institutional Research, Information Services, and Library Academic Technology. ACT met weekly through the fall to assess potential impacts. An academic, research and administrative survey was distributed in early September to departments to identify specific classes and support functions covered by GTFs or GRFs. To further identify impacts, EMC conducted one on one meetings with all CAS department heads as well as other academic departments outside CAS and interested administrative programs in late October and early November. The survey, one on one meetings, and input from the Registrar on downstream grade impacts assisted in identifying areas of concern and potential coping strategies. ACT recommended a series of acceptable coping strategies based on the surveys and meetings that Schools/Colleges and/or departments could choose to implement. Those recommendations included:

- extending the grading deadline for all courses
- canceling some or all class hours in dead week that were not tied to exams to free faculty time to focus on creating/revising finals
- expediting grading, which may include modifying finals for some or all courses
- where applicable, providing students the option to forgo the final and take their current grade

- where applicable, increase grading capacity through increased FTE of existing staff or hiring staff who were not employed.

The coping strategies were recommendations and implementation was at the discretion of the Deans or their designees to approve and apply in consultation with department heads and faculty. The goal of the academic continuity strategies developed at the department level was to provide a final grade by the time grades are due to diminish the impact to students.

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

Opposition to Efforts by Academic Affairs to Dilute and Degrade Academic Standards in the Event of a Graduate Teaching Fellows Strike

Number: US14/15-20

Date of Notice: Tue, 11/11/2014

Legislation, Resolution, or Policy Adoption: Legislation

Current Status: Approved on 11/19/2014

Motion:

Section I

1.1 WHEREAS Section 1.3 of the University of Oregon Constitution states “Sole faculty governance authority at the University of Oregon resides in the Statutory Faculty. This authority extends to all academic matters as commonly understood in higher education. The Statutory Faculty may delegate its authority but must retain oversight responsibility.”

1.2 And WHEREAS the choice of assignments, the methods of testing and the assignment of grades are clearly academic matters under the sole governance authority of the faculty;

1.3 And WHEREAS the faculty have historically maintained such standards in an open transparent way, as demonstrated for example by the public operation of the Committee on Courses, the UO Senate, the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, and when necessary the UO Faculty Assembly;

1.4 And WHEREAS on October 24 2014 the University of Oregon Administration undermined the faculty’s sole authority over all academic matters by sending a memo to Deans and Directors suggesting the weakening of these academic standards by administrative fiat, for administrative convenience in dealing with a potential strike by the university’s graduate student fellows;

1.5 And WHEREAS this memo suggested pedagogically questionable approaches faculty might take in event of a GTFF strike, such as replacing written essay exams with multiple choice exams with “an equal level of rigor”, or simply skipping finals and giving course grades based on incomplete work;

2.4 And WHEREAS the memo was not sent to faculty, but rather was stamped as confidential,” presumably to hide it from the faculty;

Section II:

2.1 BE IT THEREFORE MOVED that the Senate, as the legitimate representative body of the faculty, reject on behalf of the faculty, this confidential memo, the secret process by which it was written, and the dilution and degradation of academic standards it suggests;

2.2 And BE IT FURTHERMORE MOVED that the Senate directs Interim President Scott Coltrane and his administrators to work openly, publicly, and transparently with the UO Faculty, through the UO Senate in accordance with the UO Constitution, to determine how the University will maintain its academic standards in the event of a strike by the GTFF.

Financial Impact:

Cost neutral

Sponsor:

Monique Balbuena (Senator, Clark Honors College)

Jane Cramer (Senator, Political Science)

John Davidson (Senator, Political Science)

Diane Dugaw (Senator, English)

Deborah Olson (Senator, Education)

Gina Psaki (Senator, Romance Languages)

Gordon Sayre (Senator, English)

DRAFT

APPENDIX C
Legislation to Establish an Academic Integrity Task Force from
Existing Senate Committees

Number: US14/15-23

Maker of Motion: Michael Dreiling

Date of Notice: December 3, 2014

Legislation, Resolution, or Policy Adoption: Resolution

Motion:

Section I

1.1 WHEREAS the Senate wishes to restore trust and confidence in the academic mission of the University of Oregon;

2.4 AND WHEREAS, the State of Oregon, beginning with the University of Oregon Charter and subsequent amendments [Section 14, 1876 (ORS 352.010, 352.004, 352.006)], provides

that the faculty “have the immediate government and discipline of the public university and the students therein;”

1.2 AND WHEREAS, the Constitution of the University of Oregon (2011), via ratification by the statutory faculty, delegates said authority (Section 1.5) to the University Senate;

1.4 AND WHEREAS, the University Senate passed a legislative motion [US14/15-20] on November 19, 2014 that “directed Interim President Scott Coltrane and his administrators to work openly, publicly, and transparently with the UO Faculty, through the UO Senate in accordance with the UO Constitution, to determine how the University will maintain its academic standards in the event of a strike by the GTFF;”

1.5 AND WHEREAS, the Interim University President has authorized the implementation of an “Academic Continuity Plan” that bypassed that legislative directive;

2.4 AND WHEREAS the University Senate strongly objects to the implementation of a strike plan that: assigns non-academic staff to the role of monitoring activities in University courses; establishes grounds to discipline department heads and faculty for refusing to issue grades based on incomplete or nonassessed coursework; and makes significant alterations to grading procedures and course assignments without consulting the University Senate;

Section II:

2.1 BE IT THEREFORE MOVED that the Senate directs the Senate President to convene an emergency joint meeting of the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council, and the Committee on Courses;

2.2 AND BE IT FURTHER MOVED that at this meeting an Academic Integrity Task Force be established to evaluate the Academic Continuity Plan that has been developed by the university administration via their Academic Continuity Team (and apparently a group of outside consultants and attorneys) and Mreport thereon;

2.3 AND BE IT FURTHER MOVED that the AITF consult faculty, department heads and administrators to develop and implement plans to preserve academic integrity during interruptions of normal academic activities, such as the university is currently experiencing with the GTFF strike.

2.4 AND BE IT FURTHER MOVED that, in order to restore trust and confidence in the university's academic integrity, the meetings and decisions of the AITF be open and transparent.

DRAFT

APPENDIX D
Report of Academic Integrity Task Force
Ron Bramhall, Joe Lowndes, Frances White
12/6/14

The Academic Integrity Task Force (AITF) was formed by Senate legislation on 12/3/14 to respond to the University's Academic Continuity Plan and its infringement on academic integrity and shared governance. The task force consists of the chairs of the Committee on Courses, the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council.

The charge of the AITF was to evaluate the Academic Continuity Plan that was developed by the university administration via their Academic Continuity Team and report thereon, and to consult faculty, department heads and administrators to develop and implement plans to preserve academic integrity during interruptions of normal academic activities.

To that end, AITF consulted with members of the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council and the Committee on Courses. The AITF also consulted with administrators from Academic Affairs, CAS, the Registrar and Financial Aid. That consultation resulted in the development of the following basic principles of academic integrity and recommendations to faculty for managing final grades.

Principles

The task force agrees with the following statement Interim President Coltrane made to the Chronicle of Higher Education on Nov. 20, 2014 (emphasis added):

*“Every effort is being made to ensure that **the needs of our undergraduates are met** and that we maintain our **high degree of academic rigor** in our programs. **Faculty will maintain control** over how term end activities will occur with university options and support.”*

Based on this statement and consultation with faculty on elected Senate bodies, the task force developed the following principles to both guide the submission of grades and preserve academic integrity. These principles reflect faculty views on academic integrity – they do not attempt to, nor should they attempt to, speak to how to resolve administrative problems.

Principle 1 – *The true instructors of record (i.e., faculty and GTFs) should maintain control and choice over how to manage their courses, assignments, final exams and grades. This includes submission of final grades.*

This principle is a bedrock of academic freedom, academic integrity, and professional ethics. Unilateral administrative decisions to replace true instructors of record with others who have had no involvement with courses amounts to academic malpractice. We can imagine few scenarios where a University of our stature could recommend or condone taking from faculty their fundamental right of control over their courses. The GTFF strike is not one of those scenarios.

Principle 2 – *No faculty member will be disciplined for refusing to engage in behavior that would violate her or his academic integrity.*

We are both alarmed and troubled by reports that faculty and department heads who refuse to compromise their academic integrity by submitting grades based on incomplete information or submitting grades for courses in which they are not the true instructor of record will be disciplined. This is both unethical and contradictory to Interim President Coltrane's statement above.

Principle 3 – *Faculty will not be asked to compromise their academic integrity to solve administrative problems or to support an administration negotiation strategy.*

Academic integrity is a principle we will not sacrifice for administrative convenience or to support an administration negotiation strategy. If the maintenance of academic integrity by faculty creates administrative problems then those problems require administrative solutions.

Recommendations

Given the principles above and information gathered by administration, the AITF offers the following options for true instructors of record. Faculty who have incomplete information to assign grades due to striking GTFs may choose to do one of the following:

1. **Submit a provisional / best approximation of grade / grade of material graded to date.** Duckweb will be changed to acknowledge for both submitting instructors and students viewing grades that the grade in the class is provisional, is a best approximation of the grade, and the student's grade may change with final grading. Once all final grading has been completed, this message will be removed. This allows a true instructor of record to designate that the grade is preliminary but that the student has completed all required work.

By our best understanding, this satisfies requirements related to financial aid. This will no doubt cause confusion for many students, as provisional grades will in many cases be much higher or lower than the ultimate final grade. We do want to acknowledge the added burden this presents for instructors as they respond to dozens, if not hundreds, of student inquiries about grades.

We could not have supported a provisional grade that does not reflect the full body of work without clear communication to students that the grade was not final. We appreciate the willingness of the Registrar to offer to make this change to Duckweb.

2. **Give students the option of accepting the grade they have to date and forgoing a final.** For these students, faculty may submit the grade to date. We can support this option if, in the professional judgment of the true instructor of record, not the administration, this approach will result in a fair and accurate accounting of a student's work as opposed to a convenient administrative fix.

3. **Not submit grades.** This will result in an “X” grade in the system. While instructors are entirely free to take this option should they perceive it as the only one that preserves academic integrity, it is not without potential consequences. The AITF was informed by Financial Aid that there are potential logistical challenges for the Financial Aid office should they be overwhelmed with “X” grades.

Financial Aid typically process about 200 of these a term. If that number rises into the thousands, the Financial Aid office reports the possibility there would not be enough qualified staff to process those in time for students to receive their financial aid. Again, this is an administrative problem requiring administrative solutions, but we believe faculty should have this information to make an informed choice.

None of these approaches are ideal – the only ideal solution is an agreement that ends the GTFF strike. These approaches, if they are the choice of the true instructor of record and not the administration, offer the best available options for managing final grades in the absence of GTF support. The AITF does not necessarily recommend any particular approach – it was our charge to offer guidance that preserves academic integrity. Rather, we offer this information so that the true instructors of record, who must retain choice and control over their courses, can make the best choice possible given their own moral and practical position.

We also realize that administrative challenges remain for courses in which a GTF is the sole, true instructor of record. We maintain that the principles in this document also apply in that situation, and that any administrative solution to this scenario not violate those principles.

Finally, we encourage faculty whose courses are not dependent on GTF support to submit grades as they normally would – to do otherwise jeopardizes undergraduates and, by our understanding, exposes the faculty member to potential disciplinary action. In addition, to aid the Registrar and Financial Aid in doing their work, we encourage faculty to process and submit their grades as soon as they are able. This could help avoid potential backlogs for those offices should the strike continue.

Future Planning

The AITF appreciates the cooperation of administrators from CAS, the Registrar and Financial Aid. They provided much needed information that was previously unavailable, helping the task force determine the best possible recommendations given the short timeframe.

Regrettably, consultation of the relevant Senate committees by the administration came much too late in the process – too late to provide the kind of clarity that faculty have been asking for. In addition, the administration’s Academic Continuity team failed to engage our elected bodies of shared governance – the very bodies charged by our Constitution with protecting the academic integrity of the University. Had these bodies been consulted earlier, as they should have, we are confident that much better solutions could have been developed, and we could have had broader buy-in of those solutions by faculty.

This crisis has revealed that the University lacks clear protocols for engaging the Senate and its committees on academic matters that affect the entire campus, especially in unusual circumstances. We recommend that during Winter term 2015, the Senate President convene the Academic Council and charge that body with developing, in consultation with Academic Affairs and the President's office, clear protocols for the involvement of the Senate and the relevant Senate committees in campus-wide academic planning and decision-making.

DRAFT

APPENDIX E
Legislation to Investigate Grading Irregularities

Number: US14/15-26

Date of Notice: Wed, 12/10/2014

Legislation, Resolution, or Policy Adoption: Legislation

Current Status: Approved on 12/10/2014

Motion: The Senate charges the Academic Integrity Taskforce to conduct an investigation of the alleged grading irregularities in the philosophy and other departments during Fall 2014, and any other cases during Fall 2014 that are brought forward.

Sponsor: Jennifer Freyd (Psychology), Senator

DRAFT

APPENDIX F
Legislation to Investigate Alleged Disciplinary Procedures

Number: US14/15-27

Date of Notice: Wed, 12/10/2014

Legislation, Resolution, or Policy Adoption: Legislation

Current Status: Approved on 12/10/2014

Motion:

BE IT HEREBY MOVED that the Senate charges the Academic Integrity Taskforce to conduct an investigation of the alleged plans to establish the groundwork for disciplinary procedures or other action against department heads or others in relationship to the Academic Continuity Plan of the administration in Fall 2014.

Sponsor:

Jane Cramer (Political Science), Senator

DRAFT

APPENDIX G

Academic Council Charge and Membership

Brief Description:

The Academic Council was established by the Statutory Faculty Assembly at its 19 May 2010 meeting as part of the New Governance Constitution that was approved and adopted at that meeting. The role of the Academic Council is to discuss and review academic issues and present recommendations for action to the University Senate.

Background:

This Council emerged from discussions of the Internal Governance Committee which met during the 2009-10 academic year to develop a new Constitution.

Charge and Responsibilities:

The Academic Council is charged with bringing issues relating to academic mission to the Senate with recommendation(s) for action as needed.

The Academic Council shall act on request by any of the committees it represents, or on request by the Senate or on its own initiative. In addition, the Academic Council shall be responsible for vetting Senate motions that may affect academic excellence.

Membership Requirements:

Membership of the Academic Council shall include a Chair or designee from each committee that has responsibilities covering academic issues, such as Academic Requirements, Committee on Courses, Graduate Council, Scholastic Review Committee, Undergraduate Council, and University Library Committee, Senate Budget Committee and Faculty Personnel Committee. The committees represented on the Academic Council shall be determined by the Senate and be subject to change by that body. The Provost, Senior Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, and Senate President [or designee] shall be ex-officio non-voting members. Consultation with relevant members of the central administration and related committees (e.g. Academic Infrastructure Committee, Enrollment Management Council) shall be sought as appropriate. The Academic Council shall designate its chair, who shall sit on the Senate Executive Committee and shall have a seat in the University Senate. The Academic Council shall adopt its own internal rules and procedures.

Reporting Deadlines:

The Academic Council shall make a report to the University Senate. At a minimum this report shall be in the form of an annual written report submitted by the Committee Chair to the Senate President and the Senate Executive Coordinator no later than the final University Senate meeting in May. The committee shall also make additional written or oral reports to the Senate as necessary.

APPENDIX H

University Policy on Instructors of Record

<http://registrar.uoregon.edu/faculty-staff/academic-scheduling/instructors-of-record#who-should-be-listed-as-an-instructor-on-a-course>

Instructors of Record

It's important to know when to – and when not to – add GTFs and faculty as instructors in Banner. First, being listed as an instructor allows an individual access to FERPA protected information about students in a course, information that should only be available to an instructor with a legitimate educational need to know. Additionally, the list of instructors in Banner determines 1) who has the ability to assign and change grades and 2) who students will be asked to evaluate at the end of the term. Both of these processes are governed by faculty policy, and in the case of course evaluations, by state OARs. For these reasons, it is important to list instructors accurately. Please review the information below, and make any changes necessary to your courses currently in Banner through week 8 of the term.

Who should be listed as an instructor on a course?

Academic Affairs defines an instructor of a course as someone actively engaged in delivering course content and assessing students for a grade. An instructor or GTF must be directly involved in the delivery of instruction during class in order to be listed as an instructor for that course in Banner.

Some Common Situations, and How to Address Them

- How should instructors/GTFs be listed on linked lab/discussion and lecture courses?
 - List only the GTF or instructor actually teaching the specific section of the course, on that section of the course.
 - Do not list any or all GTFs teaching labs/discussion sections on the related lecture, unless the GTFs are delivering instruction in the lecture itself.
 - Do not list an instructor of a lecture on related lab/discussion sections, unless the instructor is delivering instruction within those sections.
 - Do not list an instructor of a lecture on related lab/discussion sections **in place of** the GTFs actually teaching those sections, regardless of whether the instructor supervises the GTFs.
 - GTFs who deliver instruction **must** be listed as instructors on course sections. Instructors who **do not** deliver instruction in those sections **must not** be listed as instructors.

- Some departments or programs have been listing the department or program head on all courses in that area. Do not list any individual on any course, unless that individual delivers instruction in that course section.
- Professors occasionally ask that their GTFs be added as an instructor to a course, so that the GTF can enter grades for them. Under no circumstances should a GTF be added as an instructor for this purpose. To do so gives that GTF access to FERPA protected information, and violates university policy by allowing someone other than the professor of the course to enter grades. Professors are required to grade the courses they teach.

Evaluating Non-Teaching instructors or GTFs

There are currently no available options to evaluate non-teaching instructors or GTFs. These individuals should NOT be entered into Banner as instructors in a course, and should **not** be evaluated. GTFs who mentor, help students outside of class, participate in discussions, or meet with students during office hours are not considered to be delivering course content or assessing students for grades, and should not be added as instructors to a course.

Evaluating Using Alternate Methods

University policy prohibits instructors, programs, or departments from administering additional, optional, or alternative evaluations of their own, outside of the approved, online system. UO's current system is set up to assure that everyone adheres to university policy and state employment law. It is not acceptable to administer evaluations outside of the approved, university system, regardless of whether those evaluations are administered in an alternate online format or as paper evaluations passed out in class. Because of the related legal issues, violations of this policy must be referred to Academic Affairs 541-346-3081 for follow-up.

