Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**
**Thursday, April 18, 2013**
**1:30 – 3:00**
**Room 238A Morrill Hall**


Present:      Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman,
              James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Will Durfee, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon,
              Russell Luepker, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Ned Patterson, Rebecca Ropers-
              Huilman

Absent:       Brian Buhr, Elaine Tyler May, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, George Sheets

Guests:       Professor Chris Uggen (newly-elected member of the Committee)

[In these minutes:  (1) committee business; (2) grades in context posting recommendation; (3) smoke-free
campus resolution; (4) graduate student learning outcomes; (5) Faculty Senate docket]


## 1.      Committee Business

        Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 1:30 and began by welcoming Chris Uggen, newly
elected to the Committee for the term 7/1/13 to 6/30/16.  She then reviewed several matters.

-- The animal-care policy the Committee discussed at the previous meeting:  Professor Patterson talked
with Dr. Gillett in Research Animal Resources about a stipulation of a degree requirement for an
attending veterinarian.  Dr. Patterson said that Dr. Gillett reports that the policy follows federal guidelines
and that the individual need not be a licensed veterinarian (because the person is only treating University
animals, not animals brought in by the public for treatment), and that while stipulation of a degree
requirement might be redundant, she would probably find it acceptable.  With the understanding that a
degree requirement would be added to the policy, the Committee voted unanimously to support it.

-- Centennial events:  There were four Senate centennial events during this academic year; Professor
Kohlstedt asked if there should be similar events in the future, perhaps one per year or one per semester,
when a discussion about a major issue could be held.  Doing so would take 45-60 minutes from a Senate
meeting.  Professor Lanyon observed that there are many issues on campus but few places where the
entire University can be involved in the discussion and agreed it would be a good idea to have a
discussion of a significant issue (e.g., graduate education).  Professor Kohlstedt agreed that there is an
advantage to having the venue, the time, and senators who would plan on attending a regular meeting.
She said she would perhaps poll the members of the Senate to learn their views.  Professor Luepker
endorsed the idea as well because there are issues the Senate should discuss and people will feel more
engaged if they can address intellectual issues that affect everyone.  Professor Kohlstedt said she would
proceed.

---

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota
Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they
binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

-- Professor Kohlstedt suggested that it might be useful to have an annual dinner with the senior administrators, just as the Committee does now with the Board of Regents. The event would be primarily social, as with the Board dinner, but could make communication easier and allow people to get to know one another. The Committee agreed that Professor Kohlstedt should proceed with the idea.

-- The Committee voted unanimously to recommend to President Kaler that he nominate Professor Becky Yust to serve as Clerk of the Senate, replacing Professor Stuart Goldstein, who is retiring.

## 2.        Grades in Context Posting Options Recommendation

        Professor Kohlstedt turned next to a draft statement she had prepared concerning posting options to provide contextual information about grades. The final statement, following minor amendments at the meeting, read as follows:

        After consultation with the Faculty Senate and hearing a range of opinions on the matter of grading-in-context for undergraduate programs, the Faculty Consultative Committee recommends to Vice Provost Robert McMaster that the following practice be established: The SCEP Grade Distribution Report, with information down to the program level, should be made available to anyone. This means detailing the %A-range and Average Grade assigned at various course levels (1/2/3/4/5xxx) within each academic program and aggregated at the program level. Starting with fall semester, 2013, the information should be maintained and be available for a five year period. The goal is to provide information at the program level for all viewers who want to understand the grades-in-context in a specific program or compare among programs. This would allow students to establish a context for their own grades at the program level.

        Professor Kohlstedt said she thought the subject had been discussed long enough and proposed that grading data at the program (essentially designator) level be available. (Originally the statement recommended making the data available to anyone with an active X.500 ID; the Committee recommended making the program-level grades available to anyone.) Professor Kohlstedt said this seems to be a middle ground between those who want grades available at the class level and those who want to make nothing available. She reported that she has asked the Registrar, Ms. VanVoorhis, about implementation and was told that this would not be particularly expensive because the data already exist. She also pointed out that the statement refers only to undergraduate grades.

        Professor Durfee asked why only the percentage of A's is being reported; upon being told that is the format used for the reports to the Senate every year, he suggested that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy could take up the question of whether to provide data on the other grades as well.

        Professor Kohlstedt said that it's her view the Committee should take some action now or let the matter rest. She heard the message that people do not want to spend much money on this.

        Professor Pacala asked what the primary purpose of releasing grading information is. To make a statement about grade inflation? To help provide academic rigor? To help students get jobs? There are multiple intents, Professor Kohlstedt said. Professor Bearinger asked if it wasn't the case that a goal of making grades more available was to provide, for example, college admissions offices the opportunity to consider students' grades relative to overall grades in a major or program. Professor Cramer commented

that his college (Science and Engineering) has the lowest GPA's of any college but has students with the highest entrance qualifications.  Is there a disadvantage to making the data public, he asked?  Part of the discussion was motivated by the fact that data at the class level are already available; the University could release the data on its own website to ensure that it is accurate.

Professor Bitterman recalled that there have been concerns about releasing data at the class level because it might be possible to identify students in small classes and because there could be misperceptions about some classes, such as an advanced course in the major, where it would be logical to expect high grades.

Professor Pacala said that in health care there is what is known as the therapeutic gap:  They know what works but they cannot get doctors to change their practices.  For example, it may be the case that about half the patients with hypertension are not being treated optimally.  One practice that changed behavior dramatically was public reporting of outcome data by clinic:  Reporting data has done more to improve health care than most everything else.  The data are public and Minnesota led the way in making them public.  Professor Bitterman agreed that normative data are powerful if they are aggregated accurately.

Professor Hancher said that Professor Kohlstedt's statement reflects what Professor Pacala just said, and is a small step toward what some people wanted.  Perhaps the Committee can take another step next year.

The Committee voted unanimously to bring the statement to the Faculty Senate for action.

Professor Cloyd inquired about the grounds on which Vice Provost McMaster could decline to follow the recommendation.  The group responded that if the faculty control the curriculum and if the Faculty Senate approves the statement, that vote would reflect the will of the faculty.

3.      **Smoke-Free Campus Resolution**

Professor Kohlstedt next noted that in the docket of the University Senate there is no resolution before the body despite a statement from the Committee on Social Concerns and a resolution adopted by the Student Senate.  She reported that she looked at statements by the University's peer institutions and liked the one at the University of Michigan, which included both some exceptions and a statement about compliance.

The Committee has talked about the subject before; it was understood that there seems to be momentum in favor of these taking some action but also genuine concerns about addiction, unknowing visitors or short-term workers and clients on campus, and the matter of policing. The Michigan statement contains exceptions, does not propose a tobacco-free environment, and speaks to enforcement.  She proposed a similar statement for Committee consideration (this version is the one adopted after minor editorial changes at the meeting):

> The Faculty Consultative Committee supports, in principle, a campus-wide commitment to a smoke-free campus environment. We recommend a few exceptions, such as smoking inside a personal vehicle and on sidewalks adjacent to public thoroughfares.  Adherence to the policy is

through voluntary compliance, along with peer and supervisory support, rather than fines or other means of enforcement.

Professor Ben-Ner thought the statement reasonable. So did Professor Cramer. Professor Luepker asked what a "public road" is (the Committee changed it to "public thoroughfare") and whether the term needs a definition. Compliance is voluntary so it will be defined by practice, Professor Kohlstedt said. Professor Luepker agreed that the police should not be diverted to enforcing the resolution.

Once a policy is in place, Professor Kohlstedt said, Boynton Health Service presumably will put up signs in many places and try to create a non-smoking culture on campus. Coupled with an indication of resources available to help people stop smoking, Professor Pacala said. In terms of smoke-free versus tobacco free, the difference is harm to others versus personal, Professor Bitterman noted; the Committee agreed it did not wish the statement to urge a tobacco-free campus.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the statement to the Senate Consultative Committee for placement on the docket of the University Senate for action.

**4.      Graduate Student Learning Outcomes**

Professor Kohlstedt turned next to the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes, which carried an internal header entitled "Six Intellectual Principles of Ph.D./Ed.D./Master's Research Education." The document is appended to these minutes. She noted that the document was the result of a great deal of work by a panel in the Graduate School called the "Graduate Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Committee," and that it had been discussed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP). Formulation of the document is in part related to the upcoming accreditation review of the Twin Cities campus in 2015. She observed that the SCEP discussion had been lively and that not everyone concurred with the principles; has SCEP approved them?

Professor McCormick reported that SCEP approved the direction of the principles but did not act to approve the document yet, since it is still undergoing revision. Provost Hanson has told SCEP that she wished to see progress toward graduate program review, and Vice Provost Schroeder laid out a plan to develop learning outcomes to set a framework for such reviews. There were 3 SCEP members on the 17-member panel that developed the principles. The panel worked during the fall and presented a draft to SCEP in early March; the minutes of the SCEP discussion were widely distributed and feedback was requested. In late March Vice Provost Schroeder returned to SCEP with a revised version of the principles; the panel is continuing to work on them with continued feedback from SCEP and from the larger University community.

Professor McCormick said that the concerns expressed or relayed by certain SCEP members were that if these principles are a good idea at all, they may remove responsibility from the students, and that they may be corrosive to intellectual culture.

Professor Kohlstedt asked what Committee members thought about graduate-student learning outcomes in general. If they are important to state, are these the ones that should be put in place? Would it be better to have elaborated principles or more general statements that let each college and program decide what falls under the rubric of the principles? It appears that the University must have some kind of principles in place for accreditation.

Professor Hancher inquired if the principles have two objectives, assessment of graduate programs and—other reasons?  Professor McCormick said he believed there was one overall objective. Will these principles function as criteria by which to evaluate graduate programs in the near future, Professor Hancher asked?  Do they express aspirations or are they to serve as the basis for judgments?  Is the interest in them as principles and not that they will function as criteria?

Professor Ropers-Huilman said there is a difference between principles and outcomes.  Her understanding is that programs are to use the principles to develop their own implementation and outcomes.  There will be a pilot project with a few departments to implement the principles, and her department has found them useful for program development but not for assessment.

The principles look like the undergraduate student-learning outcomes, Professor Kohlstedt commented.  If the rest of the world is using learning outcomes, are these the ones the faculty want for graduate students?  She said she readily endorses #1, "Scholarly Formation," but for #2-6, where is the responsibility to produce the skills?  In course work?  In training in the programs?  Certainly these should happen at the undergraduate level but she was not sure faculty should be required to address them in graduate courses.  Even if one believes these are a good idea, they should be more general, leaving a mandate for individual programs to flesh them out.

Professor Bitterman asked if the bullet points under each of the principles would raise concerns. Or are these "fill in the blanks," like the 7.12 statements, with each program expected to provide specificity?  Professor Kohlstedt reiterated her point that she would prefer to see something that pulls back from such elaboration; the program can buy into the principles—or not.  For example, a program could say that it does not seek a global context.

Professor Cramer said that he was pleasantly surprised by the principles and that the preamble was well written.  The bullets are examples and each program decides if they apply.  The principles provide a real opportunity for programs to look at what they are doing.

Professor Pacala commented that such principles have existed in graduate medical education for a dozen years; the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education identified six core competencies (they used "competencies" rather than "principles" or "outcomes"), which are similar, such as medical knowledge, communication skills, systems-based practice, and professionalism.   He noted that there is considerable overlap between the competencies and the proposed principles.  In the case of medical education, every resident in the program must demonstrate the core competencies.  The question is whether they have improved physician training; soft evidence suggests they have, and he said he believes they have promoted more rigor in medical education programs.  They are a public declaration, "these are our standards."

Professor Durfee said he was struck by the comparison with the Writing-Enriched Curriculum (WEC).  The beauty of the WEC program is that it starts with nothing and lets the faculty in the program determine what writing abilities program graduates should have and how those abilities should be assessed.  What has been interesting in the WEC program is the diversity of program responses; faculty get on board when they realize it is not top-down.  He said he recommends the WEC approach and believes it would fulfill accreditation standards.  He said he was not against general principles but an itemization can become a check box.

Professor Bearinger didn't agree with Professor Cramer: She said she does not see these as principles; rather, they identify areas for which one could write or define such educational principles and then create outcomes related to each area. For example, Professor Bearinger suggested that "communication" is not a principle nor are the bullet points; it is an area to focus for considering graduate student outcomes. If these are to be used for the accreditation process, she said she would like to see them fleshed out at the Graduate School level as a guide for programs. In the case of #3, none of the bullets related to leadership. Also, a difficulty also arises with applying the same principles to Master's and to Ph.D. programs. She said she also sees nothing about translational research, how to teach students to use their research capacity to sort, critique, and change policies and practices. This document is just a beginning, she concluded.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said she likes the principles and that they fit her department, but she is hesitant about how they might be used in comparisons across the University and in accreditation. She said she does not want to see any further fleshing out at the Graduate School level and prefers that programs identify what they will focus on. She concluded that she would insert "we value" in front of each of the six items, but programs might value them very differently.

Professor Ben-Ner said he regarded the list as common-sense ideas that should be put on a poster and handed to all matriculating graduate students and given to DGSs to say that this is what students are expected to achieve. He does not believe they can be used to measure outcomes at the Ph.D. level. They are very nice; leave it at that and do not try to force units at the University to adjust to them.

Professor Ropers-Huilman asked Professor McCormick if the provost has said that the principles are needed for accreditation. Professor Hancher said the Graduate School is about to begin the process of program review; how are the principles related to that process? Professor McCormick said he has heard that they will flow into the process but has heard no details. So the interest in the principles is not exhausted by accreditation, Professor Hancher concluded, and they have long-term implications. Could they contribute to the Graduate School's initiative to evaluate the strength of graduate programs?

Professor Kohlstedt noted that the principles also do not align with the criteria used by the National Research Council in assessing programs, which is a problem.

Professor Luepker commented that the University went through the dissolution of the Graduate School and the decentralization of graduate programs; now one sees rules coming back (which he does not see as bad). He said they look like the criteria used to accredit Public Health programs and he read them the same way that Professor Cramer did, as very flexible. Can anyone argue that programs should not give students skills in the areas identified by the principles before sending them out into the world? Colleges will modify them as needed.

Professor Kohlstedt agreed and said at the Ph.D. level, the emphasis should be on #1. The others need elaboration at the program level, and she also agreed that the approach should be similar to the one used for WEC.

Professor Bitterman said that the Clinical Translational Science Award is #5. He thought the principles are not bad but suggested removing the bullets. The preamble is good, but the bullets are not needed because the categories will be self-evident for each program.

Professor Kohlstedt asked if the principles should be brought to the Faculty Senate for open discussion.  She pointed out that she and provost are moving forward on a task force or ad hoc committee on graduate education; this Committee has heard much about the problems in graduate education, as has the provost and Graduate School through its survey.  A group jointly appointed by the Committee and the provost can take what has become known and identify priorities, and the group could also take up these principles and modify them before the Committee takes them to the Faculty Senate.  Does the Committee want open discussion at the Faculty Senate?  Does it prefer to endorse the principles?  Or something else?

Professor Durfee said he believes the Faculty Senate should discuss them.  This is a big issue that will affect every graduate program.  Professor Hancher pointed out the footnote excluding creative programs, so the principles as written will not affect every program.  Professor Pacala, responding to Professor Bitterman's suggestion to remove the bullets, urged instead highlighting one sentence in the text:  "Similarly, the bullet points following each principle below are not intended to be prescriptive, definitional or encyclopedic; these are examples to stimulate discussion about program-specific student learning outcomes."

Professor Uggen said he worries that faculty members would see the principles as something to be implemented at the course level; it needs to be made clear they operate at the program level.  He also suggested changing the title because student learning outcomes have a specific connotation in undergraduate programs.

Professor Kohlstedt agreed with Professor McCormick:  She will take the suggestions at the meeting today to the group working on the principles, suggest changes, and will bring the principles to the Faculty Senate for discussion.  The Committee concurred.

**5.       Faculty Senate Docket**

With the approval of the several statements earlier in the meeting, and other regular business on the Faculty Senate docket, the Committee approved it unanimously, after which Professor Kohlstedt adjourned the meeting at 3:00.


-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

**Initial Ideas for Graduate Student Learning Outcomes**

Graduate and professional education at the University of Minnesota is broad, encompassing many different advanced degrees. To define graduate student learning outcomes, we limit the scope to research

degrees (e.g., Ph.D., M.S., M.A., and Ed.D.)[1]. Furthermore, there is a wide range of approaches to graduate education: some programs build on a common set of courses, while others allow students to individualize the course work depending on their research interests. Furthermore, some graduate programs require students to be involved in teaching, research, and outreach, whereas other graduate programs may only focus on research. Common to all research degrees, however, is the emphasis on developing the research ability of a student through a project that is carried out by the student under the supervision of a faculty adviser and that builds on the innate curiosity common to students seeking an advanced degree. Because of the diversity of approaches and the emphasis on an individual research project, developing student learning outcomes solely based on course work would not suffice to capture the student experience and the desired outcomes.

For the first phase of implementation, we propose a faculty-driven approach to establishing student learning outcomes, similar to the approach that was taken to establish the Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC) for Twin Cities undergraduate programs. The WEC approach was successful because of the commitment of faculty for improving the writing and communication skills of our undergraduate students and a well-structured framework for articulating program-specific goals. Establishing WEC goals for programs was furthermore facilitated by making examples available to programs who wanted to join the WEC project. Furthermore, a program-specific approach allows graduate programs to tailor student learning outcomes to the unique professional environment that students will enter upon graduation. As more graduate programs implement student learning outcomes, the implementation committee will revisit whether a centralized approach would be more suitable.

Despite the differences of individual graduate programs, we believe that graduate programs can arrive at a set of common intellectual principles for research degrees. The principles can then serve as a guide for developing program-specific student learning outcomes (SLOs). These SLOs have to be framed in the context of the program's vision and overall goals.

Our discussions were informed by the national discussion on rethinking graduate education, including the book by Walker et al. (2008) on *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*, scholarly articles (Peers 2010), opinion pieces (Glenn 2010), white papers by professional organizations (Baker et al. 2011, UA 2010, EUAC 2010, LERU 2010), and a number of examples of student learning outcomes for graduate education at universities in North America and Europe (California State University System, Cornell University, Kansas State University, Plymouth University, Purdue University, Rutgers University, Ryerson University, Seattle University, Stanford University, and the University of Wisconsin Madison). The discussions were also informed by past efforts at the University of Minnesota to establish a writing enriched curriculum (WEC) and student learning outcomes for undergraduate education.

Six Intellectual Principles of Ph.D./Ed.D./Master's Research Education

The six intellectual principles below are not listed in any specific order, except for the first one that has high priority for all research programs. The remaining five principles vary in importance from program to program, and it is left to each program to weigh the relative importance of these principles. Similarly, the

---

[1] The discussion excludes degrees in creative disciplines, such as creative writing, music, dance, theater, arts, which focus on the creative component of the discipline and may not include a scholarly component, such as reviews, critiques, or scholarly work about creative works or activities.

bullet points following each principle below are not intended to be prescriptive, definitional or encyclopedic; these are examples to stimulate discussion about program-specific student learning outcomes. Each program will need to decide for each principle how and whether it applies to the program, and develop examples that illustrate outcomes specific to the program. For instance, the ability to teach in a formal educational setting (see example under *Communication*) is likely important in many graduate programs, but may not be an outcome that is assessed in some Master's programs where students' are not planning to pursue a career in academia.

1. *Scholarly Formation*
    ○ Acquisition of knowledge of core competences and demonstration of self-directed learning, life-long learning skills, and integrative learning
    ○ Creation of basic or applied knowledge through original research or synthesis that advances the field; demonstration of advanced research skills; dedication to the search of truth; ability to make connections among disciplinary fields; ability to ask fundamental questions and/or solve applied problems
    ○ Sense of responsibility for stewardship in conserving the key ideas of the field while being ready to challenge existing thinking, transmit knowledge to others, and advance the field
2. *Communication*
    ○ Advanced written and oral communication skills
    ○ Ability to teach in a formal educational setting
    ○ Ability to communicate to broad audiences such as educators, policy boards, expert panels, language and culture groups, etc.
    ○ Effective communication in teams
3. *Leadership and Collaborative Skills*
    ○ Skills in team-approaches to problem solving
    ○ Development of integrative skills to improve collaboration and problem solving across disciplines when working in cross-disciplinary teams
    ○ Ability to share knowledge in learning communities where social networking allows for participatory research/knowledge creation/knowledge sharing
    ○ Ability to apply intercultural knowledge in team-building


4. *Global Context*
    ○ Ability to conduct and apply research on global issues
    ○ Ability to pursue scholarship amid fundamental changes in how society interacts, creates, and shares knowledge in a global society that transcends cultures and political boundaries
    ○ Acquisition of multilingual and multicultural competencies to articulate shared knowledge
5. *Professional Responsibility*
    ○ Awareness of civic responsibilities and a broad outlook on societal implications of research

- ○ Ability to conduct research in an ethical and responsible manner, with commitment and integrity
- ○ Development of a professional perspective and scholarly identity, habits of mind consistent with a professionally identity
6. *Personal and Professional Management Skills*
   - ○ Ability to persist in achieving long-term goals
   - ○ Ability to manage projects with uncertain outcomes
   - ○ Ability to be flexible and adaptable in approaching complex and uncertain problems
   - ○ Being self-motivated and autonomous
   - ○ Ability to achieve results with minimum supervision

<div align="center">Challenges</div>

- The current system rewards faculty in research universities for an almost exclusive pursuit of research and scholarship at the expense of mentoring the next generation of scholars
  - ○ Apprenticeship-mentor model (one-on-one) should be recognized as an integral part of graduate education at a research university
- Disciplinary differences
- Diversity of students: background (cognitive academic language proficiency in 1 or more languages), professional goals (preparation for academic versus industry career)
- Accountability
  - ○ Need for commitment to regularly assess SLOs and for value of assessment (development of culture of evidence in a program)
  - ○ Assessment of learning outcomes needs to be thoughtful and valid
    - ■ Use of standards documents for technical quality standards (AERA, APA, NCME Standards, 1999)
    - ■ There will be a need to have experts who help programs to develop program-specific learning outcomes that can be evaluated or are not subjective (what qualifies as evidence, and what are the quality standards for evidence)
- Societal changes in how we interact with knowledge
- How to articulate distinct learning outcomes in each discipline for Masters' and Ph.D. levels
- Institutional response to increasingly collaborative models of learning
- Diversity of learner types provides opportunities and challenges for mentoring and advising
- 

<div align="center">References</div>

Baker, M.J., M.P. Carter, D.K. Larick, and M.F. King. (2011). Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs. Council of Graduate Education (CGS).

European University Association (EUA). Salzburg II Recommendations: European Universities' Achievements since 2005 in Implementing the Salzburg Principles. 2010.

European University Association Council of Doctoral Education News (EUAC). Bridging the Disciplines. March 2010. Issue 7.

Glenn, D. Measurement of 'Learning Outcomes' Comes to Graduate School. The Chronicle of Higher Education. December 1, 2010.

League of European Universities (LERU). Doctoral degrees beyond 2010: Training talented researchers for society. March 2010.

Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2008).The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century (Vol. 11). Jossey-Bass.

Peers, D.M. (2010) Measuring Quality in International and National Contexts: What are We Measuring and Why? (and For Whom?). Pp. 22-27. Global Perspectives on Measuring Quality.

**Subcommittee:**
Andrew McNally
Claudia Neuhauser
Michael Rodriguez
Elaine Tarone