

INSTRUCTION COUNCIL

MINUTES

June 7, 2018
204 Whitehurst
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

In attendance: Laurie Beets, Aaron Christensen, Cynda Clary, Richard Frohock, Margi Gilmour, Jeff Hartman, Carol Johnson, Susan Johnson, Diane Jones, James Knecht, Christine Ormsbee, Shiretta Ownbey, Rita Peaster, Kyndal Roark, Adrienne Sanogo, Randy Seitsinger, Jean Van Delinder, Tom Wikle and Pamela Fry, Chair.

1. Colleges' Initiatives to Support Student Retention (General Discussion to Share Ideas)

P. Fry began the Instruction Council (IC) meeting by initiating a conversation regarding retention efforts of the individual colleges. Multiple retention efforts were discussed:

- College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (CASNR) – C. Clary shared that late in the fall semester colleges received a list of students who had not registered for spring. Efforts were made to contact students via advisors and/or instructors. However, the First Year Success (FYS) office was contacting the students as well, giving them the impression of feeling badgered. C. Clary emphasized the importance of connecting to the FYS office to coordinate efforts, as well as strengthen relationships.
- College of Human Sciences (CoHS) – S. Ownbey explained that CoHS connected to the FYS office to coordinate efforts. CoHS developed a new plan for at risk freshmen – which included creating a group of Freshmen Scholar Leaders and an incentive for specific grades. FYS was very helpful and responsive with those students.
- CEAT – R. Seitsinger mentioned that his college was trying to get engineering experiences somehow included in the first two years of college to develop a certainty of major.
- C. Clary suggested focusing on first-generation college students. P. Fry added that the strongest correlate with retention is parent expectation.
 - i. Faculty / student mentoring initiative
 - ii. Increased visibility of faculty and staff who were first generation college students – perfect role models – to create a connection
 - iii. Importance of one meaningful relationship – getting students to develop relationships with fellow students
 - iv. Continuation of living learning communities
 - v. CoHS has a short career development questionnaire centered around the clarity of the students intended careers and how confident they are that they are in the right major. CoHS monitors those scores closely and intervenes when needed.

P. Fry emphasized that each college should be able to articulate initiatives to strengthen retention from freshmen through graduation. It is more important now than ever before to make the case for investing in an OSU degree. Recently, the Wall Street Journal polled a group of adult Americans, and currently 49% of the individuals polled felt that a college degree was worth it, while 47% did not believe that a college degree was worth it. Five years ago, this same poll revealed 54% in support of a college degree, while 40% did not.

L. Beets expressed her appreciation with the resources and efforts from each college to find funds to support these students, especially the out of state students.

2. State Department of Education's Presentation on Individual Career Academic Plan Initiative – Pamela Fry

Refer to Higher Ed Presentation PowerPoint, which was discussed at the State Regents meeting in May. This initiative is tied into real world experiences – helping students identify their careers and majors early in their education careers.

OSU-Tulsa has 18 transfer maps with OSU Stillwater, with several more in their final stages. Marketing has created cover sheets to accompany the transfer map that can be easily utilized as career maps. This idea ties into the thought that the college experience is not just about a degree – it's about a career. The transfer maps can also describe graduate programs as part of the pathway. A MAP acronym has been developed – find your **M**ajor, **A**pply your courses, reach your **P**rofessional goals. The ultimate goal for the transfer student is maximum applicability of coursework. It is important for OSU to develop a strategy to address the increasing number of concurrent students.

P Fry will submit the OSU-Tulsa transfer maps to members of IC via email.

3. Summer Withdrawals – Rita Peaster

Refer to Summer Withdrawals document. In 2010 the withdrawals process was reviewed with the goal of removing some of the burdensome steps that students were expected to take to withdraw from the university. Considering that summer semester is not a required term for continuous enrollment, it did not make sense to force the students through the process of a withdrawal form. A simple drop/add card could be used for withdrawing from summer term courses. During the Banner implementation, some of the summer withdrawal processes reverted back to the previous practices. Having realized this, the Registrar's Office is returning to the practice of no required withdrawal form for students withdrawing from all courses during the summer semester.

Members of IC also determined that students attending summer semester should be allowed to drop their last class online. No withdrawal form will be required. If an advisor wishes to place a hold on specific students prior to their dropping of their final class, they may do so, and the students would be prevented from dropping final courses without approval of the advisor.

4. Grade Appeals Policy Update – Candace Thrasher and Pamela Fry

Refer to OSU Policy and Procedures Appeal of Final Grade Not Involving Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity 2-0821 Academic Affairs document. Revision to section 2.02 refers to updating how ad hoc board members are selected in the event of a decision appeal or an appeal involving a current member of the Grade Appeals Board. This measure was approved by Faculty Council in May 2018. J. Van Delinder emphasized the importance of drawing membership from a larger pool.

The motion was made to accept the grade appeals policy updates and approved.

5. Other

- P. Fry announced that there have been multiple changes to the Fall 2018 Instruction Council meeting schedule. Refer to the updated Fall 2018 Instruction Council schedule. The decision was made by members to conduct the December meeting on Wednesday, December 12 from 8:30 – 10:30 to avoid a conflict with Council of Deans meeting scheduled on December 13.
- R. Seitsinger – CEAT department heads are concerned about the low response rates from the student survey of instruction (SSI) that instructors are receiving. Some ideas were discussed:
 - Offer a small extra-credit incentive
 - Encourage in-class time for completing the survey
 - Offer something that is not faculty driven
 - Drawings for prizes

- Offer an informal midterm survey and then implement some of the suggestions offered through the survey
- T. Wikle explained that when the College of Arts and Sciences switched from paper to electronic, the quality of the information decreased considerably. The Geography Department moved back to paper, and quality improved significantly. There has to be way for better quality of surveys. When everyone takes it at the same time, history has proven that that works well. However, when students are offered an incentive, they do not take the survey as seriously as they should. T. Wikle also suggested a much more formal survey where another instructor or graduate student presents the survey to the students during class time. The class instructor would not be present for the completion of the survey.
- R. Frohock mentioned that occasionally students electronically enter the survey information for the wrong instructor, whereas the paper survey during class time completely eliminates this problem.
- P. Fry announced that the SSI that UAT recently conducted will be presented to the deans at the June Council of Deans meeting and will be presented to Instruction Council at a future meeting.
- Parent/Guardian Survey changes have been made and will be presented to parents in mid June.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.

Minutes were recorded by Kyndal Roark