

11-20-2013

Scholastic minutes 11/20/2013

Scholastic Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 11/20/2013" (2013). *Scholastic Committee*. 54.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/54

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholastic Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

**Scholastic Committee
2013-14 Academic Year
November 20, 2013
Meeting Eleven Minutes Approved**

Present: Jennifer Goodnough, chair, Brenda Boever, Chad Braegelmann, Jennifer Herrmann, Steve Gross, Judy Korn, Hilda Ladner, Marcy Prince, Laddie Arnold, Roland Guyotte, Saesun Kim, Jess Larson, Nic McPhee, Peter Wyckoff

Absent: Andrew Sletten, Clare Dingley

1. October 23 minutes, post Dean's review

Motion to approve, seconded. Yes 11. No zero. Abstention one. Passed.

November 6 minutes

Motion to approve, seconded. Yes 12. No zero. Passed.

2. Chair's Report

Scholastic Committee (SC) members were copied on the Chair's memo to the Steering Committee in regard to Writing for the Liberal Arts (WLA) general education requirement. (See Addendum One.) The Chair met with Chancellor Jacqueline Johnson, Dean Bart Finzel, and Tammy Berberi, chair of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has decided to create an ad hoc committee to review the implementation of WLA. The Steering Committee will present its plan at the December 2, 2013, Campus Assembly meeting.

Herrmann shared that the Chancellor described the transfer review policy at her former institution. It is the same as the University of Minnesota's procedure.

Korn was contacted by a Morris student who is transferring to Minnesota State University Moorhead next semester. He asked how ENGL 1601 differs from the two college writing classes that he completed before enrolling at Morris. The Moorhead transfer evaluation coordinator denied credit for ENGL 1601 stating that it is a repeat of the first college writing courses he completed.

ENGL 1601 is too much like writing courses at other colleges. The Curriculum Committee would have to address. Peh Ng, member of Curriculum Committee, had hoped to have WLA added to the agenda.

Boever notes that SC will be receiving two more WLA petitions and one nonWLA petition. If the nonWLA petition is not received by early next week, the SC will not meet on November 27, 2013.

3. SCEP Report

McPhee updated the SC on changes made since the last Campus Assembly meeting when Ng provided information as a member of the Faculty Senate. (See Addendum Two.) There are no profound changes. We have an opportunity to discuss before a late spring semester. It is still unknown how much data will be released. It is hard to separate the course from the professor at Morris. The TC is not concerned. Currently, the discussion is being driven by legal council.

Peh Ng provided a correction to the earlier Campus Assembly conversation: You cannot opt out.

Work is ongoing to move to an online system rather than paper. The software has been purchased. There is concern about return rates. The returns for pilot projects have been abysmal. A bribe may be needed to get students to fill out the online evaluation: no access to grades until the evaluation is complete. With low rates, the numbers are likelier to represent angry people. We need a good return rate for the tenure process. How many hours spent on the course has been dropped. If goes away at TC, Morris still has right to add questions, including the environment question. SC could make a recommendation. It is the Dean's decision.

The course guide is going away or radically changing. It is not used.

SCEP discussed the academic calendar. The Twin Cities has a summer school, May and summer overlap. Does SC need to revisit the issue of summer credits especially for students on probation? Students need six credits for financial aid. Morris could shift the sessions down. Overlap has been a serious problem.

4. 2012-13 probation and suspension review

The SC reviews probation and suspension graphs each fall. Last year, the committee noted the higher number of men versus women on probation and suspension. This is not unique to UMM. The director of admissions was asked to provide more information on men and women admit profiles, of which there is a difference, especially in high school rank. Conversation included the following comments.

- Every college can be more selective with women, because of the increase in number of women attending college.
- Men react differently than women to being put on probation. Men often withdraw. Women go with action items. Could our probation letter better serve our men students by including very specific action items?
- Men often are less likely to take advantage of campus resources.
- There's evidence that the students selected for admission drive the results, but we need to balance the population.
- Disproportionately, men perceive employment as possible without a degree.
- We should explore data on men and women of color. We have to work to retain men of color.
- Some students leave to support their families.

The percent of Morris students suspended is three percent, which is low.

The SC will request more information on men and women admits, as well as students of color.

5. Petitions

Motion to add WLA petition to the list of those tabled, seconded. Yes 12. No zero. Passed.

Petition #1219 tabled until after December 2 Campus Assembly meeting

Exception to a GER due to meeting the spirit of the requirement

Petition #1221 tabled until after December 2 Campus Assembly meeting

Exception to a GER due to meeting the spirit of the requirement

Petition #1224 tabled until after December 2 Campus Assembly meeting

Exception to a GER due to meeting the spirit of the requirement

Petition # 1225 tabled until after December 2 Campus Assembly meeting

Exception to a GER due to meeting the spirit of the requirement

Petition # 1226 tabled until after December 2 Campus Assembly meeting

Exception to a GER due to meeting the spirit of the requirement

Petition #1227 tabled until after December 2 Campus Assembly meeting

Exception to a GER due to meeting the spirit of the requirement

Petition #1228 tabled until after December 2 Campus Assembly meeting

Exception to a GER due to meeting the spirit of the requirement

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Korn
Scholastic Committee Executive Staff

Addendum One

Memo

To: Steering Committee
From: Scholastic Committee
RE: Review of transfer courses for general education requirements in general and WLA in particular
Date: November 15, 2013

Background information

- The Curriculum Committee determines which general education requirement, if any, is satisfied by a Morris course.
- The Scholastic Committee determines which transfer courses, if any, satisfy Morris general education requirements.
- The Discipline determines if a transfer course substitutes for a Morris course.

Spring 2013, the Dean asked the Scholastic Committee to postpone review of transfer courses for Writing for the Liberal Arts general education requirement (WLA) until fall 2013. The Scholastic Committee agreed to do so. The transfer evaluation coordinator and writing coordinator were identified as future reviewers in Campus Assembly meetings and the Dean's April 2013 email prior to spring/summer registration.

In October 2013, the writing coordinator determined that TC WRIT 1301 course was not a substitute for UMM ENGL 1601 as it did not fulfill the ENGL 1601 criteria.

The students who submitted syllabi for TC WRIT 1301 review individually petitioned the Scholastic Committee for "Spirit of the Requirement" for WLA general education fulfillment. The Scholastic Committee heard the petitions at its October 30, 2013, meeting. The committee was informed of the writing coordinator's evaluation of UMM ENGL 1601 criteria compared to TC WRIT 1301 criteria. In addition, WRIT 1301 ECAS* and information from the syllabus were reviewed. The Scholastic Committee did not act on the petitions. Rather, a motion was made, seconded, and passed to accept that the goals of TC WRIT 1301 fulfill the goals of the WLA general education requirement.

Catalog as implementation guide

The Morris 2013-15 Catalog guides the UMM process in determining which transfer courses satisfy Morris general education requirements. The following is the Catalog text pertinent to the implementation of the Writing for the Liberal Arts general education requirement.

Goals of the General Education Requirements

...

II. A. Writing for the Liberal Arts: To learn the general conventions of academic writing, including analysis and argumentation; lay the foundation for learning conventions specific to individual disciplines; practice the writing process, especially revision; develop information literacy and understand research process.

...

Provision i

... The requirements may be met not only through UMM courses, but also by transfer of credit, examinations for proficiency or credit, assessment of prior learning, individual projects, and other means. For details, students should consult with their advisers.

...

Provision ii—Goals will be used to match courses to general education requirements (see below).

....

Suggested discussion items

If there is disagreement that the goals of WRIT 1301 match the stated goals of the WLA gen ed, the Scholastic Committee would welcome a discussion on this goal/gen ed evaluation. The ECAS for WRIT 1301 is included below to illustrate how closely the goals of WRIT 1301 match the goals of the WLA gen ed stated in the catalog.

If there are concerns about WRIT 1301 matching the goals of the WLA gen ed, the Scholastic Committee shares those concerns.

It is beyond the purview of the Scholastic Committee to endorse potential next steps. But having discussed potential consequences of the Writing for the Liberal Arts general education requirement implementation for nearly a year, we offer the following as starting points for discussion which will lead to a resolution on how to move forward. Each has timing and potential implementation issues which would need to be addressed.

If Morris does not want the WLA gen ed to be met with transfer credit:

- change the catalog in regard to Provision i/WLA gen ed; or
- change the goals of the WLA gen ed such that no transfer course can meet them.

If Morris does not want the WLA gen ed to be met with concurrent enrollment (commonly called College in the Schools or PSEO) transfer credit:

- change the catalog in regard to Provision i/WLA gen ed; or
- change the goals of the WLA gen ed such that no concurrent enrollment transfer course can meet them.
- Note that in general on transcripts colleges/universities do not make any distinction regarding online, on-campus, concurrent enrollment, PSEO, etc.

If Morris wants every student to take the course ENGL 1601, then make it a program requirement – i.e. majors could have 64 credits and all would include ENGL 1601.

***From the TC WRIT 1301 ECAS:**

Catalog Description: Drafting, revising, editing. Academic genres. Critical reading, rhetorical analysis for principles of audience, purpose, and argumentative strategies. Emphasizes electronic/print library. Critical analysis, annotated bibliography, research paper.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Student in the course:

- Can locate and critically evaluate information

Please explain briefly how this outcome will be addressed in the course. Give brief examples of class work related to the outcome.

Students complete a research assignment requiring the use and evaluation of secondary sources found via the University Libraries. The assignment includes scaffolded steps (e.g. topic proposal and preliminary annotated bibliography, direct instruction in finding, evaluating, incorporating, and documenting sources, instructor feedback on preliminary draft, University Library “Unravel the Research Process” workshops).

How will you assess the students’ learning related to this outcome? Give brief examples of how class work related to the outcome will be evaluated.

Students’ researched assignments are evaluated using criteria created by the instructor. “Unravel the Research Process” workshops include a quiz.

- Can communicate effectively

Please explain briefly how this outcome will be addressed in the course. Give brief examples of class work related to the outcome.

The course is dedicated to introducing students to university-level writing. All major assignments (e.g. annotated bibliography, research paper, critical analysis of a text or texts, evaluative summary) and other course activities are in service of the course description: “Drafting, revising, editing. Academic genres. Critical reading, rhetorical analysis for principles of audience, purpose, and argumentative strategies. Emphasizes electronic/print library. Critical analysis, annotated bibliography, research paper.”

How will you assess the students' learning related to this outcome? Give brief examples of how class work related to the outcome will be evaluated.

Student writing is evaluated using criteria created by the instructor. Students also self-assess through meta-cognitive activities such as reflective writings and revision conferences.

Addendum Two

Recommended Changes to the Student Rating of Teaching Form Senate Committee on Educational Policy 13 November 2013

Overview of the proposed revision:

- Make the results of six items from the revised SRT available to students
- Retain six core items from the current SRT; add five additional items
- Incorporate, as far as possible, questions similar to those in the current Student Release Survey
- Eliminate the Student Release Survey and release a subset of SRT results (questions 7-11) for all courses and instead identify a subset of SRT results that will be released to students without violating the Minnesota Data Practices Act.

Revised SRT

1. The instructor was well prepared for class.
2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.
3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance.
4. The instructor treated me with respect.
5. The instructor set high expectations for learning the content.
6. I would recommend this instructor to other students.

Course related items 7-11 will be released to students

7. I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course.
8. My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course.
9. Instructional technology employed in this course was used effectively (1 2 3 4 5 6 N/A).
10. The grading standards for this course were clear.
11. I would recommend this course to other students.

WRITTEN COMMENTS SECTION

- What did the instructor do that most helped your learning?
- What suggestions do you have for improving this course?