

MBIA
M66

CONSECUTIVE MEETINGS OF:

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
THE FACULTY SENATE**

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2006

2:30 - 5:00 P.M.

**Coffman Theatre--Twin Cities Campus
308 Selvig Hall--Crookston Campus
Kirby Student Center Garden Room--Duluth Campus
Prairie Lounge--Morris Campus**

This is a concurrent meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate. There are 250 voting members of the University Senate and 160 voting members of the Faculty Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

**1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS
Information**

University Senate

Statement on the Regents Policy on Investments Social Concerns

Approved by the: University Senate April 6, 2006

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

Resolution on a Vendor Code of Conduct

Approved by the: University Senate April 6, 2006

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

Faculty Senate

Constitutional Amendment (Definition of faculty and faculty-like academic professionals)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 11, 2006

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

2010-11 Crookston and Duluth Calendars

Presented for information to: Faculty Senate April 11, 2006

Approved by the: Administration – no action required

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the 2007-08 and 2008-09 Morris Calendars

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 6, 2006

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2009-10 and 2010-11 Morris and 2010-11 Twin Cities Calendars

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 6, 2006

Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

George L. Adams
Professor
Otolaryngology
1941 – 2006

Kimberly M. Dippo
Adjunct Instructor
Family Medicine and Community Health
1972 – 2006

Marie J. Eller
Assistant Professor
Library Central Technical Services
1919 – 2006

Stuart W. Fenton
Professor
Chemistry
1922 – 2006

Heinrich Fleischer
Professor
Music

Michaeleen Fox
Director
Planning and Academic Affairs
1945 – 2006

Kamal Gindy
Professor
Psychology - Duluth
1929 – 2006

John L. Kroening
Professor
Physics - Duluth
1934 – 2006

STUDENTS

David T. Chung
College of Liberal Arts

3. CLERK OF THE SENATE REPORT

**Nominating Committee Election Results
Information for the Faculty Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill one vacancy on the Nominating Committee, Professor Erdman were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2009). The members of the Nominating Committee for 2006-07 will be:

F. Ronald Akehurst, College of Liberal Arts
Arthur Erdman, Institute of Technology
Catherine French, Institute of Technology
Gary Gardner, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences
Judith Garrard, School of Public Health
Jean Quam, College of Human Ecology
Nelson Rhodus, School of Dentistry
Leslie Schiff, Medical School
W. Phillips Shively, College of Liberal Arts

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**4. CLERK OF THE SENATE REPORT
Electronic Vote Results
Information for the Faculty Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

Following the April 6, 2006, Faculty Senate meeting, an electronic vote was taken to pass one proposed constitutional amendment (Item #18) and one proposed bylaw amendment (Item #19). At the end of the three working day voting period, Item 18 received 125 votes in favor of and 6 votes opposed and Item 19 received 127 votes in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention. These motions were approved. Item 18, which is a Constitutional amendment, will now be presented to the President and the Board of Regents for approval.

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**5. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
2006-07 Election Results
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election for executive committee members and senators, the following people were elected:

- Chair – Jacqueline Cottingham-Zierdt
- Vice Chair – Stacy Doepner-Hove
- Benefits and Compensation Subcommittee Chair – Frank Douma
- Communication Subcommittee Chair – John Borchert
- Professional Development and Recognition Subcommittee Chair – Pam Stenhjem
- Representation and Governance Subcommittee Chair – David Bernstein

- Senators – Lynn Burbank, Wendy Friedmeyer, Erin George, Jim Hildebrand, Barbara Jensen, Mary Laeger-Hagemeister, Colleen O’Neill, Jill Trites

**JACQUELINE COTTINGHAM-ZIERDT, CHAIR
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

**6. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Vacation Policy for Academic Professionals and 12 month Faculty
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

The Benefits and Advisory Subcommittee on the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators would like to thank the Faculty Affairs Committee for their work this semester on the following vacation policy recommendations for academic professionals and 12 month faculty.

Vacation Policy Recommendations

Background

As stated in the draft Strategic Positioning Report, “The University of Minnesota: Advancing the Public Good: Securing the University's Leadership Position In the 21st Century” the goal for the University over the next decade is to become one of the three best public research institutions in the world. One of the five action strategies cited in the strategic plan is to “recruit, mentor, reward and retain outstanding faculty and staff”. Salary and benefits play an important role in the ability of the University to recruit a competitive work force.

CAPA believes the current vacation policy for full-time, academic employees is inadequate and must be revised for the following reasons:

1. The University is not as competitive as it needs to be in comparison to our peer institutions (see attachment).
2. The policy is outdated, as it was written for eleven-month appointments, although twelve-month appointments are the norm for P&A employees.
3. The policy does not fully support a healthy and rested work force. Employees may not accrue anything beyond the current cap of 22 days, unless at the discretion of individual departments or units. Increased workload and job requirements can interfere with employees being able to take time off from work. This results in an exhausted workforce and employees occasionally even “losing” their earned vacation days when they are near their accrual cap. This situation is counterproductive and seems to contradict steps the University has taken to promote a healthy and balanced workforce by investing in a Wellness initiative.

Recommendation

CAPA recommends that the vacation policy for P&A employees with 12-month appointments at 67% time or greater be changed to the following:

- Employees will accrue 24 days a year at the rate of 2 days/month.
- The maximum accrual will be 48 days.
- Upon termination from the University, employees will be paid up to a maximum of 24 accrued days.
- Notice of the vacation accrual and payout policy will be included in the employee’s appointment letter.
- The waiting period for new employees to begin utilizing their accrued vacation will be one month.

- Employees will receive the standard university holidays plus one personal floating holiday a year.
- Tracking of vacation will be required and will be done using PeopleSoft.
- Vacation and sick time will remain separate and not combined into a Paid Time Off policy.

**FRANK DOUMA, CHAIR
CAPA BENEFITS AND COMPENSATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

**7. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

On February 18, 1999, in adopting a policy on "Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements," the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was required to provide to the Senate "data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and overall collegiate grade point averages . . . for grades awarded each Fall Semester." The policy also provides that "data should be reported for all undergraduate students."

COMMENT:

These data will be distributed at the meeting.

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**8. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**9. INTRODUCTIONS
Dean, Minnesota Extension Service; Dean, School of Nursing
(10 minutes)**

**10. MINUTES FOR APRIL 6, 2006
Action by the University Senate
(2 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate and Faculty Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/060406sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

11. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
(10 minutes)

12. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT
(10 minutes)

Questions to the President should be submitted in writing to the University Senate office no later than Tuesday, May 2, 2006.

13. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

**THIS CONCLUDES THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BUSINESS.
THE SUBSEQUENT ITEMS ARE FACULTY SENATE BUSINESS ONLY.**

15. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction
Action by the Faculty Senate
(20 minutes)

MOTION:

To supercede current Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction with the revised version that follows.

Draft Policy and Protocol on the Evaluation of Instruction
February 15, 2006

PREAMBLE

The University of Minnesota seeks to achieve instruction of the highest quality so that students learn to their maximum potential. The evaluation of instruction is one way to help ensure excellence in instruction, so the Faculty Senate adopts the following policy and protocol on evaluation of instruction.

There are at least three reasons to evaluate instruction: (1) to improve instruction, (2) to provide information for (a) salary and promotion decisions based on merit and (b) faculty tenure decisions, and (3) to assist students in course selection. This policy and protocol is intended to meet all three objectives. With respect to the second, the purpose of this policy and protocol is to define what shall constitute adequate documentation for student and peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching contributions.¹

¹ In this policy and protocol, the term "instructor" includes all who deliver instruction regardless of academic rank, appointment status, and so on. At some points in the policy, there will be a distinction between (1) tenured and

The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student evaluation of teaching. Academic units must make provisions for peer review for faculty being considered for tenure, promotion, and salary increases, and for other instructional staff being considered for reappointment, promotion, and salary increases. The peer review information for individuals is to be supplemented by information from student evaluations of all their courses.

Students must be made aware that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions. A small number of questions, common to all courses throughout the University, will be used in the student evaluations of instruction. The use of common questions provides one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness University-wide and allows calculation of statistical norms. This type of information can be used with other types to identify very good instructors who deserve rewards as well as instructors who may need assistance in improving their classroom effectiveness. This information does not have the resolution necessary to allow fine discrimination between instructors in intermediate categories. In addition to questions that request a numerical response, survey forms must include provisions for written comments by students.

POLICY

--Every course with a University course number shall be evaluated by the use of student rating forms every time it is offered, except that thesis-only credits, directed or independent study, internships, and classes with fewer than five students shall not be evaluated using such forms. **[Note: The Senate Committee on Educational Policy will appoint an ad hoc subcommittee to develop guidelines for departments to evaluate small classes, internships, directed/independent study, and so on. Those guidelines do not have to be in place to adopt this policy.]** A department that wishes permanently to exempt a course or courses from use of the standard student evaluation form must receive written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.²

Data and information from student evaluations shall not be used in isolation from peer evaluation and (for faculty) research and service in evaluating faculty and instructional staff.

The directions for students written on the student rating forms should stress the three purposes of the form: evaluation of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in selecting courses (the "student release" questions). The instructions should be written in a manner that will motivate students to complete the forms. The instructions should explain why demographic data are being collected.

The student rating forms shall be anonymous. Instructors may require students to participate in course evaluations but any system for gathering student evaluations, whether paper or electronic, shall include an opt-out provision allowing students to decline to respond to questions,

--Students may not be required to fill in a student rating form for any course. This provision applies to all courses at the University, including multiple-instructor courses that are otherwise covered by a different evaluation protocol.

tenure-track faculty, and (2) all others who deliver instruction; in the latter case, the language will refer to faculty and instructional staff.

² This policy and protocol shall apply to student evaluation of courses having no more than two instructors. In other cases departments and/or colleges that wish to develop alternative evaluation procedures must seek written approval from SCEP. SCEP is open to discussion with units in which student evaluation procedures must meet national accreditation standards.

--The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation. This policy and protocol applies to all instructors regardless of whether they are tenure-track/tenured, term/P&A, or adjunct faculty or hold any other kind of teaching appointment at the University. Specific provisions are noted for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

--Personnel decisions (e.g., merit and salary reviews, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty) for all faculty and instructional staff whose salary is based in any part on teaching shall include review by appropriate department, college, and University officers, as set forth in pertinent rules and policies, all numeric data from the teaching evaluation forms from their courses.

--For tenured and tenure-track faculty, faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, theses and dissertations, and examples of graded student work in order to measure their quality and appropriateness. Faculty and instructional staff must do the same for all other instructors who are not tenured or tenure-track faculty. Peers must also assess the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions, such as development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques. Peer review could also include assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline), survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction, or assessment of an instructor's classroom performance via personal visit or videotaping of the class.³

--The information collected pursuant to this policy to evaluate teaching effectiveness for personnel decisions remains confidential.⁴ The results must be shared with the faculty member being reviewed. Access to information on a specific instructor must be restricted to those responsible for decisions on reappointment (where applicable), promotion, tenure (where applicable), and salary adjustments.

--Faculty must always be allowed to respond to student rating results when those results are used for performance evaluation; faculty members must be permitted to add written comments to their files

--All student evaluation data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data.⁵

--Responsibility for implementing the provisions of this policy and protocol rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, deans and department heads, all of whom must clearly convey to faculty the emphasis being placed on teaching in decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and merit-pay increases.

--Department heads and chairs should be evaluated in part on the extent to which they effectively implement this policy and protocol.

PROTOCOL

³ It is to a faculty member's benefit to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during his/her evaluation. This policy is not meant to exclude continued use of other mechanisms for peer review that may already be in place in academic units, such as classroom visitation.

⁴ As required by Minnesota state law at the time this policy is adopted.

⁵ The Senate Committee on Educational Policy is concerned about the very low response rates when students are asked to fill out evaluation forms on the web, outside of class.

--Department heads and tenure and promotion review committees will be provided with comprehensive information on the interpretation and use of student rating data (including questions of reliability and validity) in making personnel decisions, and information on practices of peer evaluation of instruction.⁶

--The student rating form shall contain the following questions, with the verbal anchors as identified:

How would you rate the instructor's overall teaching ability?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's respect and concern for students?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How much would you say you learned in this course?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Almost Nothing Amount Expected An Exceptional Amount

--All student rating forms shall have spaces for two questions permitting open-ended comments: "Describe things about the course that you found helpful" and "What suggestions do you have for improving the course?"

--The disposition of written comments on student evaluation forms shall be decided by each college or campus.

Faculty and departments are free to add additional open-ended questions to the required form, but such questions will be in addition to rather than replace the required questions.

--Directions given on student evaluation questionnaires will include the following statement:

"Your responses to this questionnaire are important because they will be used in tenure, promotion and salary decisions for your instructor. Your thoughtful written comments are especially requested, and may help your instructor improve future course offerings. The results of this evaluation (including the evaluation forms) will not be returned to the instructor until after the final grades are submitted for this course."

--The evaluation form will ask for information on the student's major, GPA and class year, as well as whether or not the course is in the student's major and whether the course is required or elective for the student. There will also be a request, marked optional, for information on the student's age, gender, and race or ethnicity. [Note: Information about the class size and type (lab, lecture, seminar, etc.) will be included, but this information will be compiled elsewhere.]

⁶ Responsibility for providing this information rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the chancellors, and the deans. Training for new department heads/chairs and for deans should include this information as well.

⁷ Age/gender/ethnicity information shall be requested because the information obtained can be useful to instructors in demonstrating how different groups respond to his/her teaching; problems with different race/gender/age groups can be identified and addressed. Other personal information--class year, GPA, major, and whether the class was

--The following question shall be included in the demographic section of the student evaluation form. The data from this question shall be linked to specific building and room numbers and the summary data by room number shall be provided to the chief academic officer and appropriate classroom management office on each campus to help guide decisions on facilities resource allocation.⁸

How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, especially the classroom facilities, including the effect of the environment on your ability to see, hear, concentrate, and participate?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Poor		Satisfactory				Exceptional

-- The instructions on the evaluation forms shall state that harassing comments or comments on irrelevant factors are not helpful for evaluation of instruction. Faculty should be provided with guidelines on how to process and interpret open-ended student comments, particularly those that are inappropriate.

-- Administering student evaluations will be the responsibility of each instructional unit. Student evaluations used in promotion and salary decisions will be administered at the beginning of a class period, during the last two weeks of instruction for the term. The instructor may give instructions but must not be present while the forms are being completed and collected. The evaluations will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box. It is suggested that a student be asked to hand out and collect the forms. Each instructional unit shall develop its own practices for ensuring that the completed forms are delivered to the appropriate office. If the forms are delivered to the department office, the department should deliver the envelopes to the data processing center without opening the envelopes. The instructor must never touch or see completed forms until after grades are turned in.

--Each campus will determine the appropriate manner of administering and evaluating student evaluation forms. To facilitate tabulation of the results of standardized questions on the student evaluation forms, each campus administration will provide the instructor and the unit chair/head with a summary of the data; the original questionnaires will be returned to the instructor. This summary will include appropriate statistical characterization of the responses to each question and, where a statistically meaningful data base exists, comparison to the responses for the same question on a campus, college, department, and program basis. To make comparative analysis more meaningful, there will also be comparisons on the basis of class type (e.g., large lecture, small discussion, laboratory, upper or lower division, elective, needed to meet university or major requirements). As resources permit, other types of statistical processing and comparisons may be added at the request of faculty or instructional units.

-- Every instructional unit shall have a policy on peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases. Each unit shall determine what documentation will be used for peer review, and (for faculty) how to evaluate theses and dissertations as well as (for all instructors) samples of graded student work. The documentation is to be used as a basis for evaluating the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter as well as the quality of the instructor's instructional activities. Each unit shall determine who shall have access to the

elective or required—will be requested (not marked optional) because these factors have been shown in prior research to have an effect on student evaluations.

⁸ Variants of this question should be developed for classes that use multiple rooms, for field study class, for on-line classes, and for other classes that differ from the lecture-in-one-room format.

documentation for purposes of peer review, and which materials will be retained for future reference.

The documentation shall reflect what each unit determines to be an appropriately cumulative record of the instructor's contributions to the instructional mission of the University. It is the responsibility of the instructor to update the documentation regularly. It is the responsibility of the unit to retain appropriate portions of this material, including cumulative summaries of student evaluations of the instructor's courses. Each unit shall assume responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of commentaries or conclusions based on the contents of the documentation.

The documentation for each instructor shall contain an appropriately cumulative listing of courses taught by the instructor, a comprehensive syllabus for each course, and examples of exams, assignments and handouts prepared by the instructor. Units may also wish to include, where appropriate, a listing of undergraduate and graduate students undertaking independent study under the supervision of the instructor, information about student performance on certification exams, and a listing of other activities that pertain to the teaching mission of the unit (e.g. participation in teaching-related committee work or curriculum development, publication of textbooks or study guides, participation in educational development programs, etc.) Documentation may also include a one- to-two page self-assessment of the instructor's teaching strengths and weaknesses. Instructors have the option of adding any other materials they believe are indicative of their contributions to teaching.

--Instructors are encouraged to adopt a mid-semester course evaluation process so that the course can be improved as it is delivered.

--The student evaluation form shall also include the following questions, the responses to which shall, with the consent of the instructor, be made available to students.⁹ The responses to these questions may not be used in any reappointment, promotion, salary, or (for tenure-track faculty) tenure decisions.

[NOTE: The Senate has delegated to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy final authority to approve new questions to be used; they will be inserted here.]

--In addition to the questions required by the preceding sections of this policy, a question bank will be provided for the student evaluation process.¹⁰ The questions would be supplemental to the required questions, would be selected by the instructor, and would be used primarily for improving teaching. Because the supplemental questions from the question bank are to be used for improving teaching, summary results should go to the instructor only. Use of supplemental questions from the question bank is optional. Provision will be made for instructors, should they choose, to add a reasonable number of custom questions that are not included in the bank.

Departments or schools may also require questions from the question bank or from other sources to be used on all forms used in their area. These additional required questions could be used either for evaluation of instructors or for improving teaching, courses or programs. If for the evaluation of instructors, summary results should go to the department. If for improvement of teaching, courses, or programs, summary results should go to the instructor only if the results are to be used by the instructor, or to curriculum committees if the results are to be used for program improvements. Data from questions that are to be used only for improving teaching should not be released by the University to anyone other than the instructor. Data from questions that are

⁹ On the web, for instance.

¹⁰ The University administration will provide the question bank on a website.

to be used for program improvements may be released to department heads and curriculum committees.

--Departments shall develop and make available to instructors a written policy that defines (1) which data from student rating forms will be used for personnel decisions and available to department heads and committees charged with reviewing instructor performance, and (2) which data will be made available to curriculum committees for improving courses and programs. (It is assumed that all information from the four required questions will be used for personnel decisions; the written policy required by this section refers to any additional questions that a unit may require on the evaluation forms.)

--Department and college administrators should be held accountable for timely assessment of the evaluative materials assembled for each faculty member. However, for peer review of the documentation for the purpose of promotion or of teaching-related merit pay increases, the faculty in each unit should be free to decide whether they want their dean or head or chair to take responsibility for assessing the quality of teaching, on the basis of the materials, or whether they prefer that the evaluation be done by an advisory group from within the unit or college.

--Each semester, an appropriate University administrator should send a message to every instructor who is receiving data from a course evaluation with a request to make the release questions available to students.¹¹

When adopted, this policy and protocol replaces all earlier policies, protocols, and questions approved by the University or Faculty Senates.

COMMENTS:

Following discussion at the December 1 and March 2 Faculty Senate meetings, this policy is being brought today for action.

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

16. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members (2 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation approve the following slate of nominees to fill four 2006-09 Twin Cities faculty vacancies on the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval. Once the slate is approved, a ballot will be distributed for voting.

FIRST PAIR

KUMAR BELANI: Professor of Anesthesiology, Medical School. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

¹¹ Reminders each semester coupled with a very easy method to grant permission should increase the number of instructors who choose to release their data. The course release information should be cataloged by course along with instructor and should have a link at the entry for the course in the on-line Course Guide. This will make it easier for students to find information about a course.

J. MICHAEL OAKES: Assistant Professor of Epidemiology, School of Public Health. University Senate member: 2004-07. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

SECOND PAIR

CLAUDIA NEUHAUSER: Professor of Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, College of Biological Sciences. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Educational Policy, 2005-08.

MICHAEL SADOWSKY: Professor of Soil, Water, and Climate, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences. University Senate member: 1995-98. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Faculty Affairs, 1192-95; Judicial, 1996-2002, 2003-06.

THIRD PAIR

PRISCILLA GIBSON: Associate Professor of Social Work, College of Human Ecology. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present):.

ALLEN LEVINE: Professor of Food Science and Nutrition, College of Human Ecology. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present):.

FOURTH PAIR

KATHLEEN KRICHBAUM: Associate Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 1998-00, 2003-2006 (Chair, 2004-06).

TOM SCOTT: Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1982-85, 1995-96. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 1987-90 (Chair, 1988-90); Consultative, 1990-92 (Chair, 1991-92); Judicial, 2003-09; Facilities Management, 1985-88 (Chair, 1986-88); Finance, 1981-84, 1986-88.

FOR INFORMATION:

The Faculty Senate Bylaws specify that the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall elect by written ballot faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Committee on Committees from a slate of candidates provided by the Nominating Committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted. The elected Twin Cities faculty members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2006-07 are:

David Born, School of Dentistry
Anna Clark, College of Liberal Arts
Robert Gehrz, Institute of Technology
Gordon Hirsch, College of Liberal Arts
Joan Howland, Law School
Mary Jo Kreitzer, School of Nursing
Perry Leo, Institute of Technology
Carl Rosen, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences

**W. ANDREW COLLINS, CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

17. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS REPORT
Discussion by the Faculty Senate
(5 minutes)

18. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

19. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

20. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2006

11:30 A.M. - 1:30 P.M.

**Studio C, Rarig Center--Twin Cities Campus
106 Sahlstrom Conference Center--Crookston Campus
410 Library--Duluth Campus
7 Humanities and Fine Arts--Morris Campus**

This is a meeting of the Student Senate. There are 42 voting members of the Student Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

1. MINUTES FOR APRIL 6, 2006

Action

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/060406stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**2. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**3. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES
(5 minutes)**

**4. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE UPDATE
(5 minutes)**

**5. UPDATE ON SPRING STUDENT SENATOR PROJECTS
Discussion
(10 minutes)**

**6. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Student Senate Bylaws Amendment
(5 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend Article V, Section 1 of the Student Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~). As an amendment to the Student Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Student Senate (22) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Student Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

...

D. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

...

Membership

The Student Consultative Committee shall be composed of:

- one student from the Crookston campus
- one student from the Duluth campus
- one student from the Morris campus
- five students from the Twin Cities campus, as follows:
 - In 2004-05, and every other year thereafter, there shall be three undergraduate students and two graduate/professional students. In 2005-06, and every other year thereafter, there shall be four undergraduate students and one graduate/professional student.
- the chair and vice chair of the Student Senate

Student members shall be elected and/or appointed in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses' student constituencies, subject to the following provision: at the time of their election, Twin Cities undergraduate students shall be members of the University Senate. A student member will relinquish their seat in the University Senate upon election to the Student Senate Consultative Committee.

Student vacancies shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses for the balance of any unexpired term until the next regular election.

The chair of the Student Senate shall also serve as the chair of the Student Consultative Committee. The vice chair of the Student Senate shall also serve as the vice chair of the Student Consultative Committee. Chair and vice chair elections should be subject to the following provisions:

- If either the chair or vice chair has already been elected to the Student Consultative Committee as a regular member, he or she must concede his or her prior position to another student, to be chosen as soon as possible by the appropriate student constituency.
- The chair and vice chair shall not be from the same campus. In the event that no one is nominated for the vice chair position from a separate campus, the position will be open to all qualified members of the Student Senate.
- The chair of the Student Senate shall be elected by the Student Senate in accordance with the Senate Constitution, Article 5, Section 3 (a).
- The vice chair of the Student Senate shall be elected by the Student Consultative Committee in accordance with the Senate Constitution, Article 5, Section 3 (a).
- The chair and vice chair are eligible for re-election to these positions.

The seven members who serve on the Senate Consultative Committee shall be composed of:

-
- one student from the Crookston campus

- one student from the Duluth campus
- one student from the Morris campus
- three students from the Twin Cities campus, as follows:

In 2004-05, and every other year thereafter, there shall be one undergraduate student and two graduate/professional students. In 2005-06, and every other year thereafter, there shall be two undergraduate students and one graduate/professional student. The undergraduate students shall be elected by the committee from the eligible members.

- the chair Student Senate

...

COMMENT:

Last year the Student Consultative Committee approved this procedure to determine which students would serve on the Senate Consultative Committee. This procedure was used to allocate students this year. This motion just incorporates this procedure into the charge for the committee.

**JOSHUA BREYFOGLE, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**7. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Student Senate Bylaws Amendment
(5 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend Article V, Section 1 of the Student Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~). As an amendment to the Student Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Student Senate (22) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Student Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

**ARTICLE V. STUDENT SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS
(Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Student Senate)**

1. Membership

For the purpose of electing representatives and alternate representatives, if any, to the Student Senate, qualified students shall vote within each of the following units of the University:

TWIN CITIES: ~~Agricultural, Food, & Environmental Sciences; Architecture and Landscape Architecture;~~ Biological Sciences; Continuing Education; Dentistry; Design; Education and Human Development; Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences; ~~General College;~~ Graduate School; ~~Human Ecology;~~ Law; Liberal Arts; Management; Medical School; ~~Natural Resources;~~ Nursing; Pharmacy; Public Health; Technology; Veterinary Medicine

CROOKSTON

DULUTH: Business and Economics; Education and Human Service Professions; Fine Arts; Liberal Arts; ~~Medicine; Pharmacy;~~ Science and Engineering;

MORRIS

...

COMMENT:

The Twin Cities collegiate changes are being proposed based on the results of the Strategic Positioning process. The Duluth changes are being proposed based on the fact that these colleges have been merged with the colleges in the Twin Cities. Representation for these programs has been assured through changes with GAPSA.

**JOSHUA BREYFOGLE, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

8. STUDENT SENATE STIPENDS

**Action
(5 minutes)**

MOTION:

The Student Senate Stipend Review Committee has reviewed the performance of the following stipend-receiving students: Matt Painschab, Student Affairs Committee Chair; Joshua Breyfogle, SSSC/Student Senate Chair; and, Rick Orr, SSSC/Student Senate Vice Chair. The recommendation from the committee is that:

- Matt Painschab receive \$515.00 of the \$515.00 spring semester portion of his stipend
- Joshua Breyfogle receive \$257.00, which combined with what he received fall semester would fund his position at the Vice Chair level
- Rick Orr receive \$1802.00, which combined with what he received fall semester would fund his position at the Chair level

The Student Senate Stipend Review Committee felt that the effort exhibited by Joshua Breyfogle, the SSSC/Student Senate Chair, was more equivalent to the role of the Vice Chair, and that the effort exhibited by Rick Orr, the SSSC/Student Senate Vice Chair, was more equivalent to the role of the Chair. The committee therefore recommended switching the total stipend amounts for these two people.

**TIMOTHY TANGEN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE STIPEND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

9. STATEMENT ON GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENT HOUSING

**Action
(5 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following statement.

Statement on Graduate and Professional Student Housing

The Student Senate recognizes that there is a lack of graduate and professional student housing on both the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses.

The Universities of Minnesota has a responsibility to its graduate and professional students to provide an adequate amount of graduate and professional Student housing that is accessible to campus. This housing should be developed in a way that fosters community, which in turn will improve the culture of the University of Minnesota graduate and professional schools.

Therefore, be it decided that the Student Senate supports any efforts by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA) and the University of Minnesota – Duluth Student Association (UMDSA) to urge the University of Minnesota Administration to create more graduate and professional student housing on both the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses.

**RICK ORR
AUTHOR**

**10. RESOLUTION TO CREATE TEST-OUT PROCEDURES FOR CLASSES
FOR WHICH IS IT FEASIBLE
Action
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

**RESOLUTION TO CREATE TEST-OUT PROCEDURES FOR CLASSES
FOR WHICH IS IT FEASIBLE**

Whereas, many students are required to enroll in classes which cover material that the student already has a proficiency in; and

Whereas, very few courses give students with the above mentioned proficiency the ability to “test out” of courses which provide no progress in education; and

Whereas, some student do not attend lecture and suffer falling grades because of it, often because they can’t learn what they already know and don’t want to waste their valuable time; and

Whereas, many student are double majors with similar required classes and often have difficulty making one of two of the classes count for both requirements; and

Whereas, this addition should be helpful in lowering loans from taking fewer semesters, raising the four-year graduation rate, and gives those students without access to AP or PSEO the opportunity to be released from classes (though without getting credit); and

Whereas, the acquisition of knowledge is the essential goal of every University course; therefore be it

RESOLVED, Student Senate will lobby the University administration and University Senate to end the continued practice of unnecessary class enrollment by aiding departments in the creation of a “test out” process similar to the process of the Language Proficiency Exam (LPE).

**KEVIN WENDT
AUTHOR**

11. RESOLUTION TO REMOVE LECTURE ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS

**Action
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

RESOLUTION TO REMOVE LECTURE ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS

- Whereas, students understand that they are expected to know all pertinent material presented in lecture or assigned readings; and
- Whereas, students understand that all pertinent material presented in lecture or assigned readings may be legitimately included in all evaluation tools (homework, testing, etc.); and
- Whereas, students understand that evaluation of their performance is not based on the actual reading of a required reading, but upon the student's knowledge of the material contained within that reading, regardless of how that knowledge is obtained; and
- Whereas, many students are required to enroll in classes which cover material that the student already has a proficiency in; and
- Whereas, current policy allows evaluation to be based on participation in or attendance at lecture rather than simply on the knowledge and mastery of material presented in lecture; and
- Whereas, pop-quizzes are regularly used as a measurement of attendance, not a measure of grasp of the quizzed material; and
- Whereas, many classes have a better mechanism for un-scheduled mid-semester quizzing by announcing quizzes on specific material one lecture prior, a practice well-received by students of all learning styles; and
- Whereas, some student do not attend lecture and suffer falling grades because of it, often because they can't learn what they already know and don't want to waste their valuable time; and
- Whereas, dropping the attendance requirements can not hurt these students more than they are already hurting themselves; and
- Whereas, students possess many diverse learning styles; and
- Whereas, students understand that courses heavily reliant upon the discussion of course material contain discussion sections which may be a suitable tool for evaluation; and
- Whereas, students understand that discussions, laboratory sections, and the other section classifications are often a necessary component of courses separate from lecture sections; therefore be it

RESOLVED, in the absence of such a “test out” process being implemented, Student Senate will lobby the University administration and the University Senate to support student rights and diverse learning styles by disallowing evaluation based on lecture attendance or participation for those student maintaining an A or B grade; and be it further

RESOLVED, this resolution applies only to lectures sections with designations LEC or LET; and be it further

RESOLVED, courses which rely heavily on discussion as the process of learning and understanding be appropriately labeled as seminars (SEM) or colloquium (COL).

**KEVIN WENDT
AUTHOR**

**12. ELECTION OF 2006-07 STUDENT SENATE/
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR
Election by 2006-07 Senators Only
(15 minutes)**

**13. ELECTION OF 2006-07 TWIN CITIES UNDERGRADUATE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBERS
Election by 2006-07 Twin Cities Undergraduate Senators Only
(15 minutes)**

14. OLD BUSINESS

15. NEW BUSINESS

16. ADJOURNMENT

Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution by Campus

Fall 2005

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

Campus	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
<u>UMNCR</u>	2899	2.71	34.91%	563	2.35	27.00%	1695	2.95	43.19%	204	3.04	38.73%	11	3.84	90.91%
<u>UMNDL</u>	19885	2.76	33.65%	5763	2.78	30.14%	9318	2.98	36.89%	3698	3.24	47.94%	881	3.24	55.05%
<u>UMNMO</u>	3581	3.01	45.35%	1066	2.98	37.15%	1550	3.27	48.13%	735	3.42	47.62%			
<u>UMNTC</u>	53794	2.99	37.36%	8011	2.89	35.74%	41337	3.15	43.78%	14766	3.14	42.42%	6114	3.28	49.97%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Academic Group**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

[Back to Report by Campus](#)

University of Minnesota, Crookston

Academic Group	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
Acad Aff	2899	2.71	34.91%	563	2.35	27.00%	1695	2.95	43.19%	204	3.04	38.73%	11	3.84	90.91%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: Academic Year**SCEP Grading Distribution**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Crookston
UMC-Academic Affairs[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ABUS															
ACCT				94	1.59	7.45%	14	1.87	28.57%	11	2.48	0%			
AFEE															
AGEC				19	3.39	47.37%	28	3.10	46.43%	11	3.27	36.36%			
AGRO	41	2.97	34.15%				34	3.56	61.76%						
ANSC	53	2.13	18.87%	39	3.03	35.90%	61	2.95	36.07%						
APLS															
ART	23	3.33	69.57%	14	3.83	85.71%									
AS															
ASM	34	2.68	32.35%				42	2.87	19.05%						
AVIA	21	3.26	28.57%												
BIOL	198	2.27	15.15%	41	2.40	17.07%	21	2.08	9.52%						
BM							36	3.51	69.44%						
CA	532	2.72	35.15%												
CHEM	67	2.28	13.43%	10	3.33	60.00%									
COMM							25	3.68	72.00%						
COMP	504	2.95	37.50%	11	2.79	45.45%	73	2.38	21.92%						
CRJS							39	2.21	12.82%						
CS				13	3.23	61.54%									
ECE				15	2.40	20.00%				42	3.04	45.24%			
ECON				91	1.63	2.20%									
ED							62	3.39	54.84%						
EDPA															
ENTR				35	2.43	25.71%									
EQSC	31	2.84	32.26%	42	3.16	50.00%	22	3.74	86.36%						
FSCN	40	2.73	35.00%				11	3.32	45.45%						
GBUS							47	2.87	29.79%						
GEOG	26	1.69	11.54%												
GEOL	20	2.80	50.00%												
GFTS															
GNAG				36	3.58	83.33%	158	3.69	83.54%	24	3.61	66.67%			
GNED	35	3.17	40.00%												
HIST	54	2.42	20.37%												
HLTH	49	3.26	55.10%												
HORT	39	2.56	35.90%				16	3.04	50.00%						
HRI	23	2.57	17.39%	37	1.72	10.81%	58	2.32	13.79%	30	2.52	13.33%			
HSM							29	3.66	75.86%	22	3.59	59.09%			
HUM	31	2.58	29.03%				18	2.89	22.22%						
ITM				37	2.53	29.73%	29	3.52	62.07%	11	2.73	18.18%			
LIT	36	3.30	50.00%				26	2.87	50.00%						
MATH	320	2.82	41.88%												
MGMT							354	2.99	39.55%	13	3.15	53.85%			
MKTG							118	3.00	31.36%	22	3.05	27.27%			
MUS	68	3.23	67.65%				27	3.67	81.48%						
NATR	60	2.40	15.00%				105	2.56	24.76%						
PER	47	3.87	93.62%												
PHIL	31	2.62	32.26%												
PHYS	36	2.76	19.44%												
PIM				17	2.24	5.88%	35	2.10	20.00%						
POL	20	2.62	25.00%												
PSY	138	2.46	24.64%				17	3.18	47.06%						
PUBH															
SOC	54	3.10	44.44%				11	2.45	27.27%						
SOIL	36	1.81	13.89%				27	2.44	11.11%						
SPAN	44	2.81	31.82%												

SPCH	131	2.75	27.48%	26	3.58	73.08%
SRM	21	2.86	38.10%	47	3.26	44.68%
SWM				42	2.42	30.95%
TH	19	4.00	100.00%			
WCFE						

[Back to top](#)

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group

 Fall 2005
 University of Minnesota, Duluth

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Campus](#)

Academic Group	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
<u>Accad_Supp</u>	972	3.43	54.63%				78	3.88	94.87%						
<u>Bus/Econ</u>	960	2.39	12.71%	1331	2.58	22.54%	2356	2.88	18.55%	855	2.95	29.94%			
<u>Cont Ed</u>															
<u>Ed/Hum_Srv</u>	2853	2.93	41.61%	1233	3.02	42.09%	2676	3.07	46.94%	1055	3.70	68.63%	307	3.59	78.50%
<u>Fine Arts</u>	3481	2.93	42.40%	468	2.86	35.68%	526	3.26	58.37%	420	3.46	68.57%	78	3.39	58.97%
<u>Lib Arts</u>	6919	2.91	33.60%	1138	2.86	31.90%	2571	3.11	41.66%	546	3.17	37.18%	265	3.20	41.51%
<u>Medicine</u>													42	2.56	23.81%
<u>Pharmacy</u>	14	3.09	50.00%												
<u>Sci/Eng</u>	4684	2.48	22.25%	1593	2.65	24.36%	1111	2.87	26.28%	818	3.02	36.43%	188	2.95	40.96%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Duluth
UMD-Acad Support and Stu Life

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
SSP	972	3.43	54.63%				78	3.88	94.87%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Duluth
UMD-Business & Econ, School of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ACCT				567	2.31	14.46%	246	2.72	21.54%	54	2.93	18.52%			
BLAW				268	2.65	25.00%	32	2.64	15.63%						
ECON	850	2.38	13.29%	221	2.81	30.32%	211	2.71	23.70%	78	2.79	28.21%			
FMIS				275	2.87	30.55%	1063	2.64	17.69%	91	3.26	48.35%			
HCM										33	3.47	60.61%			
LSBE	110	2.46	8.18%												
MGTS							804	2.73	17.54%	599	2.89	26.71%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution by Subject

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Duluth
UMD-Educ/Hmn Srvc Prfsn, Coll

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
CC							125	3.39	52.00%						
CSD				165	3.44	67.88%	92	3.50	58.70%	66	3.70	77.27%	27	3.09	48.15%
ECH				139	3.44	74.82%	63	3.65	76.19%	95	3.93	61.05%			
EDSE							111	3.62	82.88%	236	3.70	64.83%	80	3.75	81.25%
EDUC	608	3.22	44.41%				137	3.34	54.01%	154	3.77	83.12%	85	3.47	77.65%
EHS															
ELED	50	3.60	68.00%				212	3.82	88.21%	212	3.87	68.87%			
ENED							36	3.52	72.22%	54	3.30	53.70%			
ESAT				51	2.83	27.45%	139	2.97	40.29%	80	3.54	65.00%			
HLTH	913	3.21	50.27%	93	2.13	9.68%	213	3.55	65.26%	10	3.96	90.00%	49	3.73	89.80%
HPER							38	3.21	36.84%						
PE	342	3.64	66.67%	11	3.56	63.64%									
PEP	103	2.95	39.81%				113	3.03	35.40%						
PSY	766	2.39	15.01%	774	3.00	35.27%	1295	2.70	29.34%				19	3.54	73.68%
REC	71	3.35	56.34%				38	3.50	55.26%						
SPED							64	3.88	93.75%	143	3.60	67.13%	42	3.83	85.71%
SW															

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Duluth
UMD-Fine Arts, School of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ART	1086	2.89	33.06%	163	3.03	46.63%	245	3.49	68.98%	162	3.43	54.94%	74	3.39	60.81%
ARTH	80	2.76	28.75%	137	2.51	16.79%	63	2.27	9.52%						
DN	135	3.34	60.00%				13	3.99	100.00%	13	3.92	100.00%			
MJ	1443	2.87	49.76%	152	2.92	35.53%	129	3.37	62.79%	187	3.75	86.63%			
TH	737	3.04	40.03%	16	3.79	87.50%	76	3.10	50.00%	58	3.10	41.38%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Duluth
UMD-Liberal Arts, College of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AMIN	113	3.54	72.57%				43	3.76	79.07%						
ANTH	418	2.60	24.40%				47	3.21	57.45%	46	3.08	39.13%			
CLA	321	3.53	70.72%												
COMM	1184	2.77	23.40%	137	2.91	31.39%	451	2.98	28.38%	80	2.95	16.25%	27	3.06	3.70%
COMP	988	2.88	30.16%				570	3.20	49.47%				25	3.40	72.00%
CST	217	3.06	34.10%				119	2.76	43.70%						
ENGL	389	2.93	41.39%	37	3.41	64.86%	192	3.07	39.06%	36	2.72	11.11%	131	3.10	34.35%
ES	53	3.64	71.70%	40	2.95	25.00%									
FR	54	3.54	68.52%	16	2.98	25.00%				10	4.00	100.00%			
FST	124	3.39	50.00%	54	3.17	12.96%	35	2.94	8.57%				16	4.00	100.00%
GEOG	484	2.77	17.98%	120	3.01	37.50%	38	2.84	34.21%	71	3.02	28.17%	25	3.18	36.00%
GER	53	2.87	35.85%	23	3.15	43.48%	16	3.23	37.50%						
HIST	441	2.65	21.54%	224	2.63	21.88%	235	3.00	31.91%				10	2.53	40.00%
INTS										10	3.67	70.00%			
IS															
ITAL	23	3.00	43.48%												
JOUR				42	3.08	50.00%	44	3.32	61.36%	32	3.08	28.13%			
LANG															
LING	50	3.09	34.00%										21	3.29	47.62%
PHIL	423	2.86	29.79%	86	3.14	43.02%	91	3.24	42.86%	21	3.03	38.10%			
POL	407	2.79	29.98%				163	3.03	34.36%	22	3.67	72.73%			
RUSS	21	3.43	47.62%												
SOC	734	3.03	37.74%	264	2.67	27.27%	370	3.15	45.95%	162	3.33	43.83%			
SPAN	254	3.19	42.91%	64	2.91	34.38%	23	3.35	43.48%	39	3.16	48.72%			
WS	164	3.41	56.71%	27	3.30	55.56%	126	3.40	52.38%						

[Back to top](#)

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Duluth
Univ of MN Med School Duluth

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
MICB															
PHCL															
PHSL													35	2.40	11.43%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Duluth
UMD-Pharmacy, College of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
PHAR	14	3.09	50.00%												

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution by Subject

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Duluth
UMD-Science & Eng, College of

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AIR	19	3.02	57.89%				11	3.78	27.27%						
AST	302	2.59	20.86%												
BIOL	813	2.63	23.12%	423	2.70	24.35%	210	2.81	11.90%	207	2.93	26.57%	28	3.41	67.86%
CHE	37	3.58	81.08%	47	3.04	57.45%	79	3.16	40.51%	96	3.37	48.96%			
CHEM	714	2.41	17.23%	485	2.57	23.51%	20	0.00	0%	239	3.07	41.84%			
CS	411	2.42	18.98%	64	2.31	20.31%	67	2.70	25.37%	19	2.86	36.84%	62	2.92	40.32%
ECE	117	3.13	46.15%	75	2.77	24.00%	73	2.84	21.92%	16	2.85	56.25%	22	3.04	31.82%
EMGT										29	3.14	27.59%			
ENGR				130	2.64	26.15%				11	3.48	36.36%			
GEOL	308	2.70	22.40%	76	2.69	23.68%	16	3.70	75.00%				10	3.29	60.00%
IE	27	3.10	48.15%				166	2.94	21.69%	21	2.94	23.81%			
LIM															
MATH	1601	2.33	20.49%				308	2.71	30.52%	41	2.62	26.83%	36	2.43	27.78%
ME				35	3.21	28.57%	39	3.13	33.33%	115	3.03	37.39%			
PHYS	290	2.55	24.83%	204	2.48	10.29%				17	2.29	17.65%			
STAT	45	2.75	28.89%	48	3.33	54.17%	120	2.95	36.67%				17	2.85	17.65%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Academic Group**Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Morris

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Campus](#)

Academic Group	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
<u>Acad Aff</u>	452	3.27	49.34%	19	3.41	42.11%	79	3.74	27.85%						
<u>Elm/Sec Ed</u>	267	3.50	33.33%	166	3.18	46.39%	127	3.62	54.33%	418	3.69	50.96%			
<u>Humanities</u>	1386	3.16	57.00%	290	3.33	50.00%	442	3.40	58.82%	76	3.30	40.79%			
<u>Sci/Math</u>	714	2.71	29.83%	376	2.79	28.99%	225	3.00	36.89%	167	3.07	40.72%			
<u>Social Sci</u>	762	3.01	40.55%	215	2.70	26.51%	677	3.22	46.09%	72	3.45	50.00%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Morris
UMM-Academic Affairs

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
IS	423	3.27	49.41%	19	3.41	42.11%	74	3.74	24.32%						
ITAL	29	3.32	48.28%												
LAAS															

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Morris
UMM-Elem & Scndry Educ, Div of

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ARTE															
ED	52	3.62	73.08%	48	3.51	35.42%									
ELED							122	3.61	55.74%	242	3.71	52.07%			
ENGE										12	3.88	91.67%			
LANE															
MTHE															
MUSE										12	3.61	66.67%			
SCIE															
SEED										113	3.62	32.74%			
SSCE										14	3.90	100.00%			
WSS	215	3.38	23.72%	118	3.12	50.85%				10	3.52	50.00%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: Academic Year**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Morris
UMM-Humanities, Div of

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ARTH	91	3.07	52.75%				52	3.37	53.85%						
ARTS	125	3.23	39.20%	31	3.41	48.39%	26	3.48	53.85%	10	0.00	0%			
CHN	14	3.57	57.14%												
DNCE	37	3.64	16.22%												
ENGL	197	2.63	26.40%	125	3.28	52.00%	97	3.25	48.45%	18	3.50	61.11%			
FREN	30	2.66	33.33%	15	3.67	60.00%	39	3.62	66.67%						
GER	13	2.80	38.46%	10	3.57	70.00%	14	3.67	78.57%						
HUM	18	3.53	77.78%												
MUS	588	3.65	78.40%	17	3.43	58.82%	60	3.49	75.00%						
PHIL	42	2.86	28.57%	45	3.29	42.22%	10	3.10	30.00%						
RUSS	10	3.80	70.00%												
SPAN	120	3.09	48.33%	23	3.22	34.78%	71	3.45	59.15%						
SPCH	42	3.72	71.43%				51	3.39	56.86%	34	3.19	44.12%			
TH	59	3.37	50.85%	24	3.25	50.00%	16	3.33	62.50%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution

by Subject

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Morris
UMM-Science & Math, Div of

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
BIOL	46	2.66	30.43%	138	2.77	34.06%	66	2.86	30.30%	92	3.01	31.52%			
CHEM	136	2.49	16.91%	125	2.41	14.40%	60	3.27	45.00%	14	3.25	78.57%			
CSCI	46	3.03	47.83%	17	3.04	23.53%	20	2.82	30.00%	38	3.09	36.84%			
GEOL	63	2.54	23.81%												
MATH	161	2.71	31.06%	69	3.11	37.68%	38	2.94	39.47%						
PHYS	104	2.71	28.85%				14	2.90	35.71%	10	3.37	40.00%			
STAT	158	2.91	37.34%	25	3.21	52.00%	20	3.28	35.00%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Morris
UMM-Social Sciences, Div of

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ANTH	37	3.08	32.43%	69	2.89	24.64%	24	3.65	70.83%						
ECON	92	2.63	21.74%				108	3.11	37.96%	13	2.87	23.08%			
GEOG				20	2.85	25.00%									
HIST	173	2.95	31.79%				108	3.43	60.19%						
MGMT				66	2.36	24.24%	109	3.02	41.28%						
POL	127	2.95	37.80%				66	3.34	51.52%	32	3.43	46.88%			
PSY	238	3.04	45.80%	29	3.04	31.03%	162	2.99	33.95%	22	3.61	63.64%			
SOC	68	3.36	64.71%	31	3.08	32.26%	100	3.43	55.00%						
WOST	27	3.56	77.78%												

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

[Back to Report by Campus](#)

Academic Group	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AHCS	88	3.53	75.00%												
Bell Mus															
CALA	553	2.97	30.74%				639	3.13	34.59%	614	3.09	30.46%	103	3.57	50.49%
CBS	2588	2.63	22.02%	483	2.86	42.65%	1264	2.86	31.25%	1058	2.83	31.66%	99	3.02	29.29%
CCE	22	3.65	72.73%				399	3.49	61.15%	615	3.32	52.52%			
CHE	1010	3.00	32.87%	691	3.12	37.34%	737	3.13	38.40%	632	3.20	36.71%	222	3.12	47.75%
CLA	25645	3.16	42.55%	193	3.76	80.83%	23299	3.16	44.38%	3567	3.17	45.92%	1612	3.26	51.67%
CNR	374	3.30	49.47%	56	3.10	35.71%	518	3.06	38.03%	119	3.27	50.42%	51	3.12	37.25%
COAFES	2651	2.97	33.20%	232	2.99	34.91%	1624	3.14	42.55%	751	3.25	41.01%	70	3.37	52.86%
CSOM	512	3.71	18.95%	1017	3.16	48.87%	4330	3.33	51.71%	1525	3.41	53.44%	686	3.27	58.02%
Dent				72	3.22	37.50%	229	3.04	37.12%	115	2.88	47.83%			
EHD	2814	3.37	64.21%	225	2.98	40.89%	2237	3.33	52.93%	930	2.92	36.99%	1648	3.53	60.38%
GC	4341	2.74	31.28%	69	3.35	55.07%									
Health Sci	68	3.72	80.88%										136	3.53	46.32%
HIPA	57	3.67	78.95%				33	3.55	69.70%	57	3.26	45.61%	19	3.57	47.37%
IT	11567	2.69	24.54%	4658	2.75	30.25%	3118	2.81	28.74%	3304	3.00	38.04%	1240	3.09	36.13%
Med	141	2.57	9.22%				1608	2.95	37.69%	587	2.88	23.00%	106	3.19	4.72%
Nursing	81	4.00	34.57%	115	3.10	36.52%	259	3.50	59.46%	838	3.56	62.65%	17	0.00	0%
Pharmacy	597	3.36	62.65%				45	3.44	48.89%				65	3.27	58.46%
Pub Health	281	3.32	56.58%				468	3.00	41.03%						
Stdnt Dev							12	3.86	91.67%						
TEVP	215	3.62	49.77%	23	3.33	8.70%	94	3.56	53.19%	33	3.51	33.33%			
VMed	29	0.00	0%	174	2.53	18.39%				17	3.35	52.94%			
VP Sys Adm	74	3.49	72.97%				215	3.68	74.42%						

[Back to top](#)

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Academic Health Center Shared

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AHS	88	3.53	75.00%												

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution by Subject

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Arch & Landscape Arch, Coll of

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ARCH	440	2.97	29.77%				561	3.07	31.02%				588	3.08	29.76%
DESI													26	3.32	46.15%
LA	113	2.99	34.51%				78	3.56	60.26%				35	3.46	34.29%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)**SCEP Grading Distribution**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Biological Sciences, Coll of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
BIOC	33	3.05	39.39%	38	2.57	13.16%	507	2.85	32.74%	265	2.71	27.92%			
BIOL	2555	2.63	21.80%	445	2.89	45.17%	643	2.88	30.02%	489	2.88	37.01%			
EEB							36	2.98	41.67%	129	2.68	25.58%	47	3.06	27.66%
GCD							78	2.77	26.92%	153	3.47	28.76%	25	3.44	56.00%
PBIO										22	2.53	13.64%	16	2.45	6.25%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

SCEP Grading Distribution**by Subject**

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Continuing Education, Coll of

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ABUS										225	3.24	50.22%			
CMGT							94	3.52	70.21%	220	3.31	53.18%			
EHS							50	3.51	56.00%						
HSM							23	3.23	39.13%	19	3.61	73.68%			
INET										67	3.15	37.31%			
LS															
PIL							19	0.00	0%						
RC							42	3.09	45.24%	40	3.77	82.50%			
RTT							93	3.72	77.42%	27	3.64	70.37%			
TRIN	14	3.62	71.43%				55	3.41	58.18%						
UC							23	3.78	78.26%	12	0.00	0%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)**SCEP Grading Distribution**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Human Ecology, College of[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
DHA	575	2.98	27.83%	399	3.19	39.85%	258	3.22	42.64%	354	3.25	33.90%	167	3.08	44.91%
FSOS	396	2.97	35.35%	205	2.67	19.51%	343	2.92	24.49%	256	3.05	35.16%	17	3.31	41.18%
HE	39	3.74	82.05%				25	3.63	64.00%						
SW				21	3.60	66.67%	82	3.58	68.29%				19	3.20	57.89%
YOST				66	3.56	68.18%	29	3.27	58.62%	17	3.94	100.00%	19	3.33	68.42%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Liberal Arts, College of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AAS	71	3.48	45.07%				13	3.50	61.54%						
AFRO	54	3.57	72.22%				416	3.12	40.87%						
ALL	86	0.00	32.56%				209	0.00	49.76%				23	0.00	43.48%
AMIN	158	3.46	66.46%				286	3.47	60.84%	15	3.24	26.67%			
AMST	133	3.10	50.38%				429	3.38	43.82%	39	3.24	48.72%			
ANTH	716	2.89	20.53%				420	3.17	40.71%	109	3.44	59.63%	30	3.57	66.67%
ARAB	84	3.30	51.19%				77	3.03	42.86%						
ARTH	227	3.28	45.81%				635	2.96	34.49%				72	2.61	19.44%
ARTS	1091	3.32	49.59%				481	3.40	40.54%				231	3.54	61.90%
CAS															
CHIC	76	3.41	68.42%				121	3.64	68.60%						
CHN	150	3.50	58.00%				95	3.18	51.58%						
CLA	408	3.46	18.87%				17	0.00	0%						
CNES	522	3.17	42.91%				127	3.05	34.65%				16	3.31	37.50%
COMM	768	3.45	59.51%				1567	3.12	36.76%	92	3.24	47.83%	180	2.85	24.44%
CSSL	932	2.94	30.15%				878	2.92	32.69%				51	2.92	31.37%
DAN	17	3.56	70.59%												
DNCE	587	3.55	59.28%				213	3.42	54.46%	30	3.49	56.67%	91	3.64	73.63%
DTCH	23	3.45	65.22%												
EAS							61	2.92	27.87%						
ECON	1759	2.81	32.12%				286	2.58	28.67%	445	2.71	29.44%			
ENGC	1813	3.33	49.59%				87	3.60	70.11%						
ENGL	1240	3.29	44.84%				1303	3.28	46.28%	19	3.39	68.42%	14	3.40	57.14%
ENGW	433	3.48	60.97%				136	3.53	64.71%				21	3.38	47.62%
ESL							77	3.14	16.88%						
FIN	20	3.55	75.00%												
FOST							15	3.58	60.00%						
FREN	916	3.12	36.03%				293	3.31	46.76%	12	3.53	66.67%			
FRIT															
GEOG	682	3.15	39.59%				734	3.01	31.74%	52	3.42	65.38%			
GER	613	3.37	55.79%				208	3.48	60.58%				13	3.49	53.85%
GIS															
GLBT	28	3.54	60.71%				19	3.46	68.42%						
GLOS	100	3.20	50.00%				420	3.11	35.95%	132	3.71	74.24%			
GRK	31	2.48	29.03%				29	3.46	55.17%						
GSD							29	3.47	58.62%						
HEBR	20	3.22	55.00%				63	3.47	57.14%						
HIST	963	3.11	36.97%				1559	2.95	32.20%	66	2.99	50.00%	13	3.62	76.92%
HMNG	71	3.64	73.24%				20	3.84	90.00%						
HNDI	40	3.61	70.00%				17	3.80	76.47%	13	3.70	76.92%			
HSEM	43	0.00	0%	93	3.72	77.42%	111	3.83	86.49%						
HUM	111	3.07	37.84%				66	3.19	50.00%						
ID	191	3.60	76.44%				178	3.82	84.27%						
ITAL	610	2.95	30.98%				36	3.24	55.56%						
JOUR	544	2.95	31.25%				1582	3.24	41.91%	408	3.49	55.15%	267	3.22	45.69%
JPN	148	3.02	47.97%				126	3.05	34.13%	19	2.90	26.32%			
JWST	27	2.93	25.93%				49	3.05	42.86%						
KOR	75	3.58	73.33%				48	3.58	60.42%						
LAS							24	3.10	29.17%						
LAT	120	3.10	47.50%				99	3.11	34.34%						
LING	74	3.10	39.19%				135	3.21	45.19%	13	2.93	7.69%	38	3.50	60.53%
MDGK	25	2.94	24.00%												
MELC															
MEST							27	3.02	37.04%						
MUED	37	3.39	70.27%				130	3.77	85.38%				12	3.65	66.67%

MUS	1246	3.38	59.23%				1391	3.66	89.50%	69	3.05	34.78%	139	3.88	94.96%
MUSA	261	3.83	87.36%	43	3.88	93.02%	76	3.93	97.37%						
NOR	50	3.83	74.00%												
PHIL	752	2.92	32.18%				345	3.15	40.00%	89	3.07	39.33%	22	2.87	40.91%
PLSH							14	3.55	57.14%						
POL	1200	2.85	24.08%				795	3.05	34.47%	742	2.91	30.05%			
PORT	29	3.40	48.28%				33	3.54	60.61%						
PSY	1271	3.10	41.70%				2547	2.93	35.41%	247	3.60	73.68%	109	2.98	31.19%
RELA	50	3.13	46.00%				41	3.11	39.02%						
RELS							21	2.75	19.05%						
RUSS	69	3.39	57.97%				101	3.35	54.46%						
SALC							22	3.82	86.36%						
SCAN							142	3.31	40.14%				15	3.64	73.33%
SCMC	64	3.04	20.31%				80	3.00	27.50%				17	3.37	52.94%
SLHS	248	3.20	47.98%				301	3.01	36.88%	72	3.27	54.17%			
SOC	651	3.27	46.85%				1277	3.07	43.77%	583	3.15	41.17%			
SPAN	1952	3.15	35.04%				936	3.44	55.66%						
SPPT															
STAT	264	2.83	28.79%				551	2.97	38.84%	34	3.24	50.00%	96	3.01	36.46%
SWED	56	3.39	53.57%												
TESL							54	3.41	53.70%				19	3.20	36.84%
TH	545	3.34	49.54%	57	3.71	77.19%	385	3.31	34.81%	181	3.41	60.22%	44	3.47	63.64%
TURK															
URBS	48	2.40	6.25%				182	2.95	32.97%						
URDU															
VIET	20	3.45	50.00%												
WOST	107	3.28	55.14%				230	3.47	56.96%	23	3.93	95.65%			

[Back to top](#)

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

SCEP Grading Distribution

by Subject

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Natural Resources, College of

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
BP	61	3.64	14.75%				124	3.17	45.16%	19	3.08	31.58%			
ENR	79	3.15	58.23%				232	3.01	39.22%	58	3.58	70.69%			
FR	79	3.30	49.37%				151	3.09	31.79%						
FW	153	3.35	58.17%	56	3.10	35.71%				40	2.92	32.50%	44	3.06	29.55%
RRM															

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: Academic Year**SCEP Grading Distribution**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Agric, Food, & Envir Sci, Coll[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AGRI	48	3.76	79.17%				23	3.91	91.30%	54	3.40	57.41%			
AGRO	94	3.12	34.04%	10	3.03	20.00%				20	3.71	45.00%			
ANSC	291	3.05	28.18%	149	3.19	46.98%	181	3.05	36.46%	82	3.50	36.59%			
APEC	425	2.83	33.88%				250	2.64	21.60%	45	3.06	26.67%			
BAE										13	3.14	30.77%			
ENT							13	2.72	46.15%	33	3.20	36.36%			
ES	86	2.74	13.95%				38	3.11	23.68%	40	3.30	45.00%			
FSCN	839	2.81	30.51%				347	3.24	46.40%	290	3.23	42.76%			
HORT	196	2.78	27.55%							103	3.11	29.13%	38	3.15	42.11%
PLPA	56	3.02	26.79%				12	3.31	58.33%	16	3.71	81.25%			
RHET	590	3.22	41.19%				736	3.26	47.83%	44	3.38	40.91%			
SOIL	26	2.61	15.38%	73	2.69	12.33%	24	3.52	62.50%	11	3.71	63.64%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

by Subject

Fall 2005
 University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 Mgmt, Curtis L Carlson, Sch of

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ACCT				597	3.07	43.22%	413	2.94	30.75%				417	3.13	47.72%
BA	444	3.42	7.43%				598	3.64	80.27%	27	3.91	100.00%			
BLAW							122	2.89	29.51%						
FINA							365	3.02	30.41%	594	3.29	44.28%			
HRIR	14	3.71	71.43%				435	3.53	61.61%				43	3.75	81.40%
IBUS							11	3.85	100.00%						
IDSC							431	3.47	54.99%	69	3.42	60.87%			
INS													159	3.64	77.99%
MGMT	54	4.00	100.00%				921	3.50	60.26%	363	3.51	59.78%	66	3.61	60.61%
MKTG							673	3.16	31.95%	472	3.43	56.36%			
OMS				420	3.29	56.90%	361	3.38	55.12%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Dentistry, School of

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
DH				72	3.22	37.50%	229	3.04	37.12%	115	2.88	47.83%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

SCEP Grading Distribution

Data as of 1/27/2006

by Subject

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Education & Human Devel, Coll[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ADED													15	3.44	73.33%
AFEE	48	3.77	87.50%	29	3.57	68.97%							17	3.80	94.12%
ASL	480	3.09	40.42%				314	3.06	29.94%						
BIE							104	3.42	58.65%				169	3.57	69.23%
CI	77	3.46	74.03%										280	3.85	43.93%
CPSY				186	2.87	33.33%	145	3.19	46.21%	867	2.94	37.60%	52	3.79	69.23%
EDHD	38	3.61	63.16%				10	0.00	0%				325	3.52	69.54%
EDPA	60	3.56	75.00%				41	3.96	100.00%				22	3.95	100.00%
EPSY							176	3.14	47.73%				254	3.63	69.69%
HRD							90	3.29	47.78%				207	3.31	50.24%
HUMF							21	3.90	95.24%						
KIN	117	3.12	50.43%				953	3.37	57.08%	56	2.63	25.00%	198	3.22	50.51%
LASK	167	3.18	50.90%												
MTHE							25	3.68	76.00%						
PE	1746	3.68	71.02%												
REC	29	2.98	41.38%	10	4.00	100.00%	56	3.42	55.36%				67	3.22	49.25%
SPST	49	3.94	93.88%				198	3.43	42.93%						
WCFE							96	3.85	90.63%				37	3.65	72.97%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
General College

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
GC	4341	2.74	31.28%	69	3.35	55.07%									

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

**SCEP Grading Distribution
by Subject**

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Health Sciences, Sr VP

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

Data as of 1/27/2006

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
CSPH	68	3.72	80.88%										136	3.53	46.32%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Humphrey Inst of Publ Aff

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
PA	57	3.67	78.95%				33	3.55	69.70%	57	3.26	45.61%	19	3.57	47.37%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

SCEP Grading Distribution

Data as of 1/27/2006

by Subject

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Technology, Institute of[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AEM				343	2.71	29.74%	180	2.61	17.78%	287	3.16	51.57%	15	3.24	40.00%
AST	608	2.76	27.30%	45	2.47	11.11%				21	3.20	52.38%			
BAE	14	0.00	0%												
BMEN				99	3.43	57.58%	180	3.19	54.44%	72	3.67	79.17%	119	3.24	33.61%
CE							571	2.89	30.12%	471	3.05	38.43%	34	3.23	35.29%
CHEM	2722	2.58	21.01%	1722	2.75	28.40%	212	2.39	13.68%	243	2.94	36.63%	75	2.71	18.67%
CHEN	33	0.00	0%				76	3.28	35.53%	354	2.97	30.79%	25	3.17	32.00%
CSCI	515	2.98	37.86%	212	2.73	27.36%	83	3.12	36.14%	370	2.64	16.49%	185	3.03	31.89%
EE	71	3.07	43.66%	511	2.73	40.90%	779	2.62	24.52%	602	3.01	40.86%	81	3.32	44.44%
GEO	907	2.81	26.35%	60	3.03	28.33%	42	3.26	47.62%	63	3.15	39.68%			
GEOE															
HSCI	176	3.07	28.41%				127	3.25	47.24%						
IE										115	2.81	18.26%	149	3.26	39.60%
IOFT	219	2.75	21.46%												
MATH	4226	2.50	21.98%	1091	2.70	28.69%	126	3.06	43.65%	201	2.93	39.30%	339	2.92	34.51%
MATS				135	2.35	11.85%	162	2.49	14.81%	66	2.79	21.21%			
ME				210	3.20	30.48%	520	2.74	24.42%	225	3.32	49.78%	185	3.21	43.78%
PHYS	2073	2.97	29.43%	222	2.78	34.68%	49	3.42	59.18%	202	2.96	47.52%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Medical School

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
BINF															
BPHY															
CAPY													86	0.00	0%
HMED							173	3.23	43.93%						
INMD							286	2.79	31.47%						
MEDT	21	0.00	0%							287	2.87	20.91%			
MICB							123	2.62	20.33%	230	2.76	17.83%			
MORT							303	3.17	36.96%						
NSC													12	3.28	25.00%
NSCI							82	2.51	15.85%	54	3.70	42.59%			
OPH	23	0.00	0%												
PHCL										15	3.53	66.67%			
PHSL	50	2.57	26.00%				641	3.04	45.24%						
PMED	47	0.00	0%												
RSC															

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Nursing, School of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
NURS	81	4.00	34.57%	115	3.10	36.52%	259	3.50	59.46%	838	3.56	62.65%	17	0.00	0%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
 University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 Pharmacy, College of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
MEDC															
PHAR	597	3.36	62.65%				45	3.44	48.89%				63	3.25	57.14%

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Public Health, School of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
GERO															
PUBH	281	3.32	56.58%				468	3.00	41.03%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
 University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 Student Development & Athletics

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AIR							12	3.86	91.67%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)**SCEP Grading Distribution**

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Executive Vice President

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
AIR	93	3.91	33.33%				17	3.65	70.59%						
MIL	82	3.76	86.59%				36	3.52	63.89%						
NAV	40	3.10	12.50%	23	3.33	8.70%	41	3.55	36.59%	33	3.51	33.33%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.



Prompt Path: Academic Year

SCEP Grading Distribution

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

by Subject

Data as of 1/27/2006

Fall 2005
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Veterinary Medicine, Coll of

[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
CMB															
CVM	29	0.00	0%												
VBS				174	2.53	18.39%									
VCS										17	3.35	52.94%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

Prompt Path: [Academic Year](#)

Report Run Date: Tuesday, 4/25/2006

SCEP Grading Distribution

Data as of 1/27/2006

by Subject

Fall 2005

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
System Administration, Sr VP[Back to Report by Academic Group](#)

Subject	1000 Level			2000 Level			3000 Level			4000 Level			5000 Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's
ARGN	29	3.67	75.86%				36	3.50	61.11%						
DIS															
FLOR	45	3.39	71.11%				75	3.83	84.00%						
LNDN							90	3.61	70.00%						
TLDO							12	3.92	100.00%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.