ASCRC Minutes 4/26/162:10 GBB 202

## Call to order

Members Present: D. Coffin, C. Chestnut, I. Crummy, J. Eglin, C. Greenfield, B. Hillman A. Lawrence, T. Manuel, M. Nelson, M. Semanoff, G. St. George, E. Uchimoto G.G. Weix   
Ex-Officio Present: N. Lindsay J. Hickman  
Members Excused: M. Boller T. Bundy, E. Engebretson, B. French B. Holzworth

The minutes from 4/12/16 were approved.

## Communication

* Chair Manuel reminded the committee of the changes to the BOR curriculum review process. He has been in contact with Jasmine Zink in the Provost’s Office for clarification. The Provost sent a message to Department Chairs last week and communicated the changes to the Faculty Senate. The changes are intended to improve communication across the system in regard to new programs. We have always had to have our ideas of new programs on a list for OCHE in advance (up to 3 years) of the proposal. This list will now need to include a brief paragraph, followed by the Intent to Plan Form. The forms are considered by the Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) of the MUS each month. The Intent to Plan Forms can be submitted anytime throughout the year but must be submitted by April 30th to be considered for the next fiscal year. Thus, forms must be submitted by April 30th for items that need to move through the system next fall. This step allows for system-wide conversations to take place earlier in the process and allows for collaboration among the campuses. Once approved by the CAOs, programs have 18 months to fully develop the proposal and get campus approval. The Provost’s Office submits the proposal to the Board of Regents for final approval. Along with these changes, Level II proposals can now be approved at one BOR meeting rather than two, and Level I proposals can now be submitted more frequently. One of the goals of the changes is to prevent problems with proposals arising at a late stage in the approval process. It would be helpful to have a flow chart so faculty understand what is required of them and when.
* Chair Manuel presented the IB letter to the Faculty Senate at the April meeting. The IB letter engendered a lengthy discussion about the pros and cons of IB and other means for high school students to obtain college credit. The IB subcommittee has expanded significantly and includes Associate Provost Zagalo-Melo, Associate Vice President Sharon O’hare, Dean Brock Tessman, Beverly Chin, Lucilla Rudge and Nikolaus Vonessen as well as the original members from ASCRC. The subcommittee has discussed the IB math curriculum. Unfortunately, Missoula High Schools do not offer higher level IB math courses. The Math department is working on potentially increasing acceptance of IB credits, but this is complicated by variations in the math curricula offered in high schools. The subcommittee has asked for as many exams as possible, and will be meeting with the IB Coordinators from the High Schools. The higher level English exam correlates well with two of our general education courses. A score of 4 on an IB exam is the standard minimum for college credit, and it is thought to equate to 50% of correct questions on the IB exam.  
    
  Professor Lawrence indicated that Professor Rudge is creating an IB training certificate to train high school teachers. An IB group will be on campus this summer. She noted that IB is designed to provide an integrated curriculum so parsing out course equivalencies is difficult.   
    
  Professor Crummy visited the French IB Instructor at Hellgate High and learned that the IB students are not in a separate class. The language department has initiated discussions about accepting IB language classes for credit, but a decision will not be made by the end of the semester. The IB students at Big Sky are in separate courses according to Professor Hillman who recently visited the high school.   
    
  The subcommittee should consider suggesting departments contact their counterparts at MSU. ASCRC continues to believe that the departments need to determine what is appropriate. At the same time we want to send a clear message to encourage IB students to come to UM. The subcommittee believes it is making good progress. It has also been suggested to standardize acceptance of IB, AP, and CLEP credits statewide. The Provost is willing to bring the issue up with the CIOs and Deputy Commissioner, but is waiting for a specific request from ASCRC.

## Business Items

* The following language course changes were approved. The Acting Dean, Jenny McNulty, of the College of Humanities and Sciences did not approve the credit changes for Greek and Latin. She felt the College needed to have more discussion about reducing the credits from 5 to 3. Professor Ausland has asked to meet with her.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course Number | Course Title | Change |
| GRMN 311 | Introduction to German Literature | Change title and description |
| ITLN 101 | Elementary Italian I | Change credits from 5 to 4 |
| ITLN 102 | Elementary Italian II | Change credits from 5 to 4 |
| RUSS 101 | Elementary Russian I | Change credits from 5 to 4 |
| RUSS 102 | Elementary Russian II | Change credits from 5 to 4 |

Acting Dean McNulty is concerned about having a difference in credit requirements for different language courses. Students do not learn to speak Greek or Latin, so less time and fewer credit hours may be required. The Classics Department is hoping to make the course more convenient for students to take. The current 5 day a week often conflicts with other courses. The amount of credits required for Greek and Latin courses varies nationwide.

* The General Education Consent agenda was approved after a lengthy discussion. Chair Manuel was concerned about having upper-division General Education courses. The Committee argued that foundational courses are not necessarily at the 100 or 200 level. Students should not be discouraged from challenging themselves in upper-division General Education courses. Some students spread general education courses throughout their four years and they may wish to have upper division General Education courses available.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Title | Gen Ed Group |
| PHL 363 | Ancient Greek and Roman Philosophy | Historical and Cultural |
| GPHY 121 | Introduction to Human Geography | Indigenous and Global |
| HSTR 303 | Ancient Athenian Social History | Indigenous and Global |
| NRGY 101 | Introduction to Sustainable Energy | Natural Science |

* The Chair of the Writing Committee, Megan Stark, presented the revisions to the Writing Course Guidelines. The main substantive change is to the page requirements for Intermediate and Advanced Writing courses. the requirement now specifies new content. Of the 16 pages required for Intermediate Writing Courses, 10 pages must be new content. For Advanced Writing Courses, 13 out of 20 must be new content. The change is an attempt to ensure students get more practice writing. The page totals may be across multiple assignments. Students’ experience varies across the different intermediate and advanced writing courses. It was suggested that a standard word count per page be included in the document as well as additional examples throughout for clarity. Professor Coffin indicated that sometimes a concisely written piece is more difficult than a lengthy paper so quantity of writing does not always equate to quality of writing skills.

The Writing Committee discussed ASCRC’s request to consider enforcing prerequisites to ensure writing courses are taken in the correct sequence. In theory everyone on the Committee supports enforcing prerequisites, but there are concerns about unintended consequence and bottlenecks. For instance, there are some large sections of intermediate writing courses, such as LIT 110 and Ways of Knowing, which are offered fall semester. With the prerequisites many sections of these courses may have to be shifted to the spring, creating an imbalance in the need for graduate teaching assistants between the two semesters. The impact of the layoffs of the Technical Writing adjuncts is also not yet known. It is presumed the demand for WRIT 201 will increase. The alphabetical rotation for WRIT 101 enrollment is in place to manage the teaching assistants’ schedules. The new Director of Composition will likely make some changes to WRIT 101. The current learning outcomes are broad. This may help to clarify the progression from WRIT 101 to Intermediate Writing. UM’s additional writing requirement sets us apart from the other campuses. In another issue, common course numbering has created confusion with students because the CCN equivalency does not extend to writing classes. Thus, a student transferring in a course marked as equivalent to LIT 110L by CCN will receive the L, but will still need to take an Intermediate Writing Course. Often students don’t realize this and it leads to confusion. The Committee expressed the need for good advising of transfer students in these situations.

Ideally students should be able to complete the writing program in order. All the concerns regarding enforcing the prerequisites are resource related. The Writing Committee brought a motion to enforce the Intermediate Writing Prerequisite for Advanced Writing Courses. The motion failed to pass ASCRC because of fear of creating bottlenecks, a lack of data on the number of students affected, and related concerns with the recent Teaching Assistant reductions. Individual course instructors may however choose to enforce the prerequisites. The recent change to the course labels has only been in effect for a year and the catalog indicates the courses should be taken in sequence. The Writing Committee will monitor the situation. Chair Manuel suggested ASCRC bring a proposal to the Provost next year asking for resources to eliminate or reduce the concerns with prerequisite enforcement.

* The Writing Committee has also created a Data Management Plan for the University-wide Program-Level Writing Assessment. Chair Stark spoke with a number of people including ECOS, Legal Counsel, IT, and the Registrar regarding the draft. The plan ensures responsible stewardship of the data, which is decoupled from the students’ identity. Students complete a survey prior to uploading their writing into Moodle. This data is linked to the writing along with the student’s demographics. Ideally the campus should have a general procedure in place to ensure the appropriate use of student data. The Writing Committee has already received inquiries to use the data and external stakeholders may submit requests to use the data. Chair Stark welcomes feedback on the document.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.