

Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, October 10, 2011
Misner Room, Collins Library

Senate members present: Bill Barry, Kris Bartanen, Kelli Delaney, Fred Hamel, Susannah Hannaford, Alisa Kessel, Kriszta Kotsis, Marcus Luther, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Steven Neshyba (chair), Amy Spivey, Keith Ward, Ross Singleton

Visitors present: Julie Nelson Christoph, Kent Hooper

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Minutes from the September 26th meeting were approved with minor revisions.

Announcements

- I. Neshyba summarized some of the issues brought forward on the faculty governance listserv since the Senate's last meeting:
 - a. There has been a good deal of discussion on the listserv regarding a proposal to change from a 3/3 to a 3/2 teaching load at Puget Sound. Discussion was sparked by the question of whether our faculty salary scale is competitive with our Northwest peer schools, given that all of our peers have moved to a 3/2 teaching load. As an aside, Neshyba noted that members of the Faculty Salary Committee want to visit the Senate. Ward commented that, through the discussions, we are learning that the change to a 3/2 load also includes transitions to other kinds of systems. For example, what does it mean in terms of other duties faculty members have outside of teaching? It can mean different things at different institutions. Neshyba commented that at some point the Senate may be asked to form an ad hoc group to investigate the possibility of a move to a 3/2 teaching load.
 - b. There has also been some discussion on the listserv related to comments from Dean Bartanen at the last faculty meeting about the School of Education and its budget. One of those comments was construed by some members of the faculty to mean that the School of Education is running a \$400,000 budget shortfall. Another comment on the listserv implied that Education pays rent to the university for use of their office space, which prompted questions from users of the listserv. Bartanen clarified that the School of Education is not running a \$400,000 budget shortfall. The Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program has a target of 44 students, but due to the current hiring climate, they only have 27 students enrolled. Bartanen said that the university budget needs to be reduced to bring the target enrollment to a more-feasible 32 MAT students rather than the current target of 44, and that it was this budget reduction that she had been discussing in the faculty meeting. Bartanen also clarified that the "rent for office space" mentioned on the listserv was merely the School of Education's portion of the indirect costs shared by every department on campus for infrastructure-related expenses. Hooper mentioned that grants from the National Endowment for the

Humanities include indirect costs. Hamel clarified that state education budgets are challenging right now, impacting hiring; therefore, prospective teachers are thinking twice about doing Master's degrees. Economics could shift, and there is currently an MAT task force addressing these enrollment issues. Bartanen commented that the MAT program is a great program, and everyone should encourage their students to check it out.

- II. Neshyba noted that he has received a couple of e-mail messages from faculty regarding strengthening the accounting program in the School of Business and Leadership.
- III. Neshyba asked if Senate members felt it was useful to "take the pulse" of the faculty members by summarizing traffic on the listserv during Senate meetings. There was mild consensus in the affirmative. Kessel commented that there is a certain amount of exploration of ideas on the listserv that may not be important to keep track of, but that larger trends were probably worth noting. Neshyba agreed to filter out some of the more exploratory comments and emphasize topics that were garnering the most interest.
- IV. The Senate Executive Committee has begun to contact their counterparts in leadership at other NIC (Northwest Independent Colleges) schools regarding the tuition exchange program. Ward said that he had contacted people at Lewis and Clark. Their governance system is different than ours, so it's not immediately clear whom to contact. Kessel noted that Tiffany MacBain (who was not yet present) had contacted Mark Beck at Whitman College. Whitman has a tuition exchange working group that is investigating options. They are gathering information at this stage and want to encourage communication between themselves and faculty at other NIC schools. Spivey asked whether the Senate Executive Committee plans to put its contacts at the other NIC schools in touch with the members of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Education Benefits here. Hannaford commented that that sounded like it would be useful. Kessel mentioned that MacBain originally got Mark Beck's name from a member of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Education Benefits.

Discussion of resolution regarding Senate liaisons

Ward moved (and Segawa seconded) that the Senate adopt the following resolution:

The Senate shall adopt the following guidelines regarding roles of Senate liaisons:

Senate liaisons have two functions. First, in accordance with the Bylaws, a liaison shall act as a convener for each standing committee during the first month of the fall semester (Article V, Section 2). Second, the liaison will serve to promote good communication between standing committees and the Senate. How this good communication is maintained is left to the discretion of each liaison and committee chair, but some consistent method should be adopted between both.

To ensure good communication between the Faculty Senate and its respective governance committees, Senate liaisons should work closely with the chairs of the governance committees to which they are assigned. If a governance committee wishes to pursue something that does not fit into an existing charge to the committee, the chair should inform the Senate liaison to bring it to the Senate for consideration as a new charge.

The Senate liaison will not serve as a chair of the governance committee for which it is a liaison.

Discussion:

Barry suggested the addition of “in accordance with the Bylaws” between “convener” and “for each” in Paragraph 1. There was general agreement. He also commented that “chair” in Paragraph 3 could be changed to “chair or member”.

Some discussion ensued about how this resolution would apply (or not apply) to the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC). Spivey suggested the addition of some language exempting the FAC from the resolution.

Neshyba said that the purpose of the resolution was to clarify the role of the liaisons. Hamel commented that the resolution also concerns the chairs of the committees, and asked what would be happening with the resolution and how formal it was intended to be. Barry asked whether the resolution could be added to the Bylaws as an Addendum, to make it more permanent than the current Senate membership. Ward commented that the resolution was not intended to be that formal, and that its purpose is really to clarify what the liaisons’ role is supposed to be. Singleton said that we may not want to bind future Senates to this model, and that he would advocate for not making the resolution permanent. Bartanen confirmed the relative informality of the liaison system, indicating that it was set up by a Senate chair, Barry Anton.

Singleton also expressed concern about the last sentence in Paragraph 2 regarding a new charge. He commented that this would add a level of bureaucracy to faculty governance that would impede committee activity. He went on to note that the current Bylaws give the committees some latitude, which is good. The committees need some freedom, Singleton noted, and the last sentence in Paragraph 2 suggests a constraint on committee actions.

Hamel agreed with Singleton and suggested that the last sentence in Paragraph 2 be changed to be primarily about what the liaison should do, and not what the chair of the committee should do.

Singleton commented that a liaison’s sole duty should be to keep the Senate informed, and that the language in Paragraph 2 about requesting a new charge seems contrary to the Bylaws.

Neshyba reminded everyone that the resolution came partly out of last year’s situation in which the Senate rescinded an academic policy change enacted by one of the standing committees, leading to unhappiness on the part of the committee. Barry noted that, in that instance, better

communication would have improved the situation. He suggested removal of the phrase “to bring it to the Senate for consideration as a new charge” from the last sentence of Paragraph 2.

Hannaford suggested changing “if” to “when” at the start of the last sentence in Paragraph 2. She also advocated cutting the language about what the chair should do out of Paragraph 2. She proposed that the second sentence in Paragraph 2 should read, “When a governance committee wishes to pursue something that does not fit into an existing charge to the committee, the liaison should notify the Senate.” MacBain expressed concern that this proposed change would put a lot of pressure on the liaison to track the Senate’s charges to the committee and make a decision about whether the committee’s proposed action fell within the committee’s charges. Speaking against the amendment, she suggested that, if kept well informed, the Senate as a body could decide if a committee’s proposed actions fall within that committee’s charges.

M(Kotsis)/S/P: Kotsis moved that we alter the language of the resolution to read, “When a governance committee wishes to pursue something that does not fit into an existing charge to the committee, the chair should inform the Senate liaison.” Hamel commented that that language would again be dictating what the committee chairs should do. Neshyba responded that the committees are standing committees of the Faculty Senate, and so it is within the purview of the Senate to provide direction for the committees. Ward said that the language about the chair should be retained in order to encourage the committee chairs to foster communication with the liaisons. Barry called the question on the Kotsis amendment, which passed.

M(Barry)/S/P: Discussion reverted back to the resolution. Barry moved to change “chair” to “member” in the last sentence of the resolution. This change was voted on and passed.

The revised resolution was voted on and passed, as follows:

Resolution:

The Senate shall adopt the following guidelines regarding roles of Senate liaisons:

Senate liaisons have two functions. First, a liaison shall act as a convener, in accordance with the Bylaws (Article V, Section 2), for each standing committee during the first month of the fall semester. Second, the liaison will serve to promote good communication between standing committees and the Senate. How this good communication is maintained is left to the discretion of each liaison and committee chair, but some consistent method should be adopted between both.

To ensure good communication between the Faculty Senate and its respective governance committees, Senate liaisons should work closely with the chairs of the governance committees to which they are assigned. When a governance committee wishes to pursue something that does not fit into an existing charge to the committee, the chair should inform the

Senate liaison. The Senate liaison will not serve as a member of the governance committee for which it is a liaison.

Continuing discussion of the motion to endorse the revised rubrics for the freshman seminars brought by the Burlington Northern faculty working group (see Appendices 1 and 2)

Spivey distributed copies of the current rubrics for the Writing and Rhetoric and Scholarly and Creative Inquiry freshman seminars (see Appendix 3). It was noted that the revised rubrics are on the agenda for the October 12th faculty meeting.

Barry discussed the fact that two changes had been made to the rubrics since the Senate's last meeting. One change addressed Singleton's concern at the last meeting and included the addition of the phrase "appropriate to the skill level and preparation of first-year students" to Guideline 2(b). The second change involved the addition of the sentence reading, "These seminars may be taken only to fulfill core requirements" (see Appendix 1).

Hooper commented that the working group's goal all along has been to revise the rubrics using feedback from each faculty group that reviews them. That is happening. In this way, by the time the rubrics come before the full faculty, the hope is that any problems would have been worked out. Hooper urged the Senate to endorse the new rubrics.

Singleton commented that right now, the content of the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminars reflects the passion and expertise of the faculty member teaching the seminar. He asked whether that aspect of the seminars is retained under the new rubrics. Christoph answered that, yes, the content will be determined by the faculty member for both Seminar I and Seminar II under the proposed rubrics. Singleton said that it seems that the content piece needs to be there. He also said that he is currently teaching as a senior seminar and expressed concern about time constraints in the course given the requirement in Seminar II of the substantive research paper. He asked whether there would be class time left for content. Christoph commented that much of the course content can be moved to the students' own work. The course will be a bit different for each student because of that. Hooper added that the hope is that a lot of the research skills students need will be developed in the first year so that teaching a senior seminar will be easier. He added that hopefully the new rubrics for the freshman seminars will make all faculty members' lives easier. Kotsis concurred with Hooper. She said that she has students in her Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar do a research paper, a time-consuming project, but she breaks it into parts. By the end of the semester, her students will have been through the process of writing a research paper. She commented that it's not so much about learning art history as it is about learning how to learn.

Segawa brought up the question of teaching critical thinking, as some of the university's promotional materials tout. He said that the critical thinking piece in the rubrics seems to be in the argumentation. He asked whether critical thinking rises above argumentation. He pointed out that the learning objective in the proposed rubrics don't really mention critical thinking, to connect to Puget Sound's mission. Spivey commented that Guideline 1 involves students learning "how to frame a problem or question, how to develop a thesis, how to defend their thesis effectively," all practices which involve critical thinking. Bartanen commented that some

aspects of argument are discipline-specific and some go beyond disciplinary boundaries. Our Puget Sound commitment, she said, is a commitment to developing students' writing skills. MacBain pointed out consistency between the learning objectives and the guidelines and mentioned that the learning objectives contain more mention of critical thinking. Christoph commented that evaluating sources (Guideline 4(a)) involves critical thinking. In addition, she pointed out that other core areas also help students develop their critical thinking skills.

Hamel suggested that the current Writing and Rhetoric seminar rubric gets at some of these issues in Guideline 1.3. Barry and Hooper both indicated that the goal of the new rubrics was to remove some of the discipline-specific jargon that appears in the current Writing and Rhetoric seminar rubric. Christoph concurred and pointed out that the new rubrics are less discipline-specific.

Barry returned to the question from Singleton regarding the topical content of the seminars. He suggested the addition of some language at the start of Paragraph 2 of the learning objectives (taken from the current Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar guidelines) that would emphasize that each seminar is organized around a focused topic. Singleton said that he was still concerned about Seminar II in that there wouldn't be time for students to get a deep exposure to a topic and do the research project. It would take too much time to do it all. Hannaford also expressed concern about Seminar II, in thinking about adapting her current Scholarly and Creative Inquiry course. Kotsis commented that even though students are working on a research project, in class they can keep getting deeper into the topic. If the research project is scaffolded, with multiple deadlines, they can read each other's proposals and revisions, she suggested. Christoph commented that there are ways to enable students to share resources that they have found and to work on evaluating them together. She talked about the Sharepoint site that is being set up as a resource for faculty members teaching the first-year seminars.

Hooper said that when he started teaching his freshman seminar, he started out being too ambitious in terms of content. Over time, he has cut out a lot of the material in his syllabus, but part of that process involved thinking about what was appropriate for first-year students. Compared to more senior students, he said that he found that freshman could still do good work but that it is different from what an upperclassman would be able to do. He said that the new proposed rubrics will make for better courses and for a coherent first-year experience for students.

Neshyba asked about assessment of the first-year seminars and whether we will have ways of knowing if the new rubrics represent an improvement. Christoph commented that there is a longitudinal study about writing at Puget Sound that will continue and that focus groups with students can be conducted.

Neshyba also asked whether there would be workshops for faculty members teaching the seminars to help them adjust to the new rubrics. Christoph replied in the affirmative. In addition, she said, the Collins librarians were prepared to do more work with faculty around the information literacy pieces of the new rubrics. There will also be the Sharepoint site where faculty members teaching the freshman seminars can share syllabi, course materials and tips.

Luther commented that the new rubrics (specifically the sequencing) would help students to be more confident when it comes to doing research. He was strongly in favor of the proposed rubrics.

M (Barry) S/P to call the question. Motion to call the question passed.

The motion to endorse the new proposed rubrics for the freshman seminars passed. All members voted in favor of the motion except two who abstained (Singleton and Hannaford).

The meeting adjourned around 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Spivey
Scribe for the Day

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Secretary

Appendix 1 – Proposed rubrics for the freshman seminars.

Appendix 2 – Justification document to accompany the proposed rubrics

Appendix 3 – Current rubrics for seminars in Writing and Rhetoric and Scholarly and Creative Inquiry.

**Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry I and II
Proposed Objectives and Guidelines**

October 1, 2011

Learning Objectives

The First-Year Seminars at Puget Sound introduce students into an academic community and engage them in the process of scholarly inquiry.

In these discussion-based seminars, students develop the intellectual habits necessary to write and speak effectively and with integrity. Students increase their ability to develop effective arguments by learning to frame questions around a focused topic, to assess and support claims, and to present their work to an academic audience both orally and in writing. As part of understanding scholarly conversations, students learn to identify the most appropriate sources of information and to evaluate those sources critically. Over the course of two seminars, students—with increasing independence—contribute to these conversations and produce a substantive scholarly project.

In the first Seminar in this sequence, students engage challenging texts and ideas through guided inquiry led by the faculty member. Students begin to develop the academic abilities of reading, writing, and oral argument necessary to enter into academic conversations. Assignments in this seminar largely involve sources prescribed by the instructor, rather than sources students search for and identify themselves. In Seminar II, students build on and continue to develop the academic abilities introduced in Seminar I. The seminar culminates in independent student projects that incorporate sources beyond the instructor-prescribed course materials.

These seminars may be taken only to fulfill core requirements.

Guidelines:

1. These seminars teach students how to frame a problem or question, how to develop a thesis, how to defend their thesis effectively, and how to think critically about arguments—their own and those of others.
2. These seminars address important conventions of written argumentation (including audience, organization, and style), as well as approaching writing as a process.
 - a. In Seminar I, assignments focus on material largely provided by the instructor.
 - b. In Seminar II, students produce a substantive scholarly paper or project, appropriate to the skill-level and preparation of first-year students, that involves independent research.
3. Each seminar requires students to present arguments orally through discussion and more structured presentation.
4. Concepts and practices of information literacy including issues of academic integrity are integrated into these seminars.
 - a. In Seminar I, students learn to distinguish between different types of information sources (for example, scholarly vs. popular, primary vs. secondary) and learn to evaluate sources of information for biases, reliability, and appropriateness.
 - b. In Seminar II, students learn to craft research questions, search for and retrieve information, and seek appropriate assistance in the research process.

To: Curriculum Committee and faculty members at the University of Puget Sound

From: Burlington Northern First-Year Seminar Faculty Working Group (Bill Barry, Derek Buescher, Peggy Burge, Julie Nelson Christoph, Andrew Gardner, Kent Hooper, Renée Houston, Priti Joshi, Kriszta Kotsis, Sunil Kukreja, Julie Neff-Lippman, Eric Orlin, Amy Spivey, Ariela Tubert)

Purpose

This memorandum accompanies the proposed new rubrics for the first-year seminars (FYS) at the University of Puget Sound. It

- explains the background and process behind creation of the proposed new FYS rubrics;
- explains the strengths and weaknesses of the current FYS structure; and
- explains how the proposed change alleviates the weaknesses of the current FYS structure.

Background

Assessments of the Writing and Rhetoric and Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminars over the past eight years have revealed consistent support for the basic concept of the seminars – as well as some consistent strains of dissatisfaction among faculty and students alike about the clarity and feasibility of course objectives. The regular review of core areas by the Curriculum Committee (as reported in the Curriculum Committee Working Group *Report on Freshman Seminars* of April 21, 2010) reports on the survey of and discussion with faculty teaching the FYS. The report notes that the majority of faculty who provided feedback were satisfied with their delivery of specific seminars. However, the report acknowledged a number of weaknesses in the current system, which are detailed below. In student focus groups as part of *The Study of Writing at Puget Sound* (2007), Puget Sound seniors reported their perception that the student experience of the FYS was highly uneven from section to section.

After meeting during 2010- 2011 in one-on-one informal interviews and open invitation focus groups with faculty members teaching FYS, Julie Christoph proposed and received a Burlington Northern grant for two summer workshops focused on reviewing assessments and considering structural and/or curricular revisions to the seminars. Workshop participants included faculty members from a variety of disciplines who teach FYS as well as librarians from Collins Library. Workshop participants met for three days in June and three days in August 2011, reviewing Puget Sound assessments of the FYS and the first-year experience in residential seminars and information literacy, longitudinal assessments of writing over the four years at Puget Sound, as well as staffing trends in the seminars over the past eight years (attending to department and to ongoing vs. contract faculty). The two workshop groups also looked at models for first-year academic programs at all of our comparison institutions, reviewed relevant best practices statements by the Council of Writing Program Administrators and by the American Library Association, research on adolescent brain development, and longitudinal studies of college student writing development. The workshop culminated in the writing of the proposed new rubrics.

Strengths of the Current FYS Structure

The Burlington Northern First-Year Seminar Working Group notes the following strengths of the current FYS structure:

- small classes that provide high levels of interaction between students and faculty and among students;
- the opportunity to academically examine topics to which students otherwise might not be exposed; and
- development of skills pertinent to academic inquiry—argument analysis and production as well as reading, writing and speaking ability.

Weaknesses of the Current FYS Structure

The Curriculum Committee Working Group *Report on Freshman Seminars* reports the following from their survey of faculty members teaching FYS:

- **Too much content**: "many [Writing and Rhetoric] faculty noted that balancing and doing justice to all three learning objectives as well as adequately covering the substantive topic of the seminar was difficult in the time they had."
- **Preparation differentials in students**: "a smaller number of [Scholarly and Creative Inquiry] faculty noted that inadequate knowledge of the topic and the variability in the level of preparation among some students tended to adversely affect the intellectual quality of the seminar experience."
- **Spring term variance of student preparation**: Faculty members teaching both types of seminars reported challenges teaching in the Spring semester because of variability in delivery of and preparation provided by Fall semester seminars. (See the *Report on Freshman Seminars* and Curriculum Committee minutes of November 9, 2009).

The Burlington Northern FYS Working Group also discussed the weaknesses of the current FYS system noting that, while the current system provides several pedagogical benefits, both student learning and faculty delivery may be enhanced with a number of changes. The primary weaknesses identified include the following:

- **Lack of connection across semesters**: There is currently no relationship between the Writing and Rhetoric (WR) course of study and the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry (SCI) course of study. This lack of relationship is exacerbated by the lack of sequencing in the current FYS structure. The SCI and WR seminars do not function together to provide a coherent and consistent introduction to academic inquiry nor do they provide a logical development of skills necessary for participation in that inquiry. In particular,
 - the lack of "flow" between terms increases student perception of the FYS as "hoops" to be jumped through, and
 - offering both types of seminars in each term means that faculty have no consistent foundation upon which to build in the Spring term. The result is that faculty may be repeating material and/or simply attempting to cover too much.
- **Insufficient information literacy training**: Information literacy is a central component of entering an academic community and the working group believes that it should be incorporated into the FYS experience in a consistent way—not only to serve student needs, but also in response to accreditation requirements. Results from the "Research Practices Survey," a national instrument taken by our entering first-year students since 2006, show that most of our students begin college with little experience with research and demonstrate little understanding of basic research terms, tools, and strategies:

- 92 percent indicate that Google was their primary research tool
- Only 57 percent had ever used an online library catalog
- Only 50 percent had ever used a subscription database
- Just 21 percent could correctly define a peer-reviewed journal
- When shown three citations, 59 percent could correctly identify a book, 23 percent a journal, and 12 percent an essay within a book
- Moreover, once students do arrive on campus, they receive inconsistent levels of information literacy instruction; a Puget Sound academic review of the library during the spring of 2011, as well as the NWCCU Evaluator's Report of April 2009, specifically noted the lack of a systematic integration of information literacy into the curriculum.

Benefits of the Proposed FYS Rubrics

Under the new proposed rubrics, the seminars would be taught as a two-semester sequence with explicit attention to academic tools in each semester, moving from more instructor-guided assignments in the first semester to more independent assignments in the second semester. The proposed rubrics offer the following benefits:

- Retains small class size: The proposed rubrics maintain both the small class size and the ability of individual instructors to select a topical focus, resulting in a higher level of interest for the faculty members teaching and the students taking the course.
- Retains emphasis on academic abilities: The proposed rubrics retain the emphasis on argument production and analysis and critical reading, writing, and speaking appropriate to an academic context, but the expectations for explicit instruction in these academic abilities is more clearly spread across both semesters.
- Sequencing benefits for students: Sequencing the seminars will assist student learning and development as they enter the academic community. For example, students will learn to analyze texts and other sources provided by the instructor before they are asked to find sources of their own using library resources.
- Culminating research project: Sequencing the seminars offers a culminating research project for all first year students. This project will ensure that all first year students will gain an introduction to basic research skills as preparation for their ongoing academic careers. The sequencing and final project develops an appreciation for the challenges and rewards of academic inquiry.
- Sequencing benefits for faculty: Sequencing the seminars provides faculty a clearer understanding of both what to offer students in each term and what students should have received in each term, Sequencing the course objectives means faculty may devote appropriate time to appropriate material with less concern about student preparation (understanding, of course, that students learn at different rates and come to campus with a variety of preparatory backgrounds).
- Greater faculty accessibility: The guidelines in the proposed rubrics are more broadly accessible to faculty members across the disciplines than those in the current WR and SCI rubrics.
- Addresses information literacy: To address the lack of uniformity in information literacy training being received by Puget Sound students, the guidelines in the proposed rubrics include specific language about the information literacy skills recommended for first-year students by the Collins Library librarians.

Appendix 3 – Current rubrics for seminars in Writing and Rhetoric and Scholarly and Creative Inquiry. (from the University of Puget Sound web page, October 10, 2011)

Seminar In Writing and Rhetoric

Rubric

Learning Objectives

In each Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric, students encounter the two central aspects of the humanistic tradition of rhetorical education: argumentation and effective oral and written expression. Students in these seminars develop the intellectual habits and language capabilities to construct persuasive arguments and to write and speak effectively, and with integrity, for academic and civic purposes.

Guidelines

1. Through their introduction to argumentation, these seminars address:
 1. the value of pro/con reasoning and the need to approach a controversy from multiple perspectives;
 2. issues and questions that organize a particular controversy;
 3. standard argument forms and other persuasive strategies (for example, traditional and contemporary models of reasoning, narrative); and
 4. methods of evaluating arguments (including evidence evaluation and identification of logical fallacies).
2. Through their introduction to effective expression, these seminars address:
 1. important elements and conventions of standard written English;
 2. the range of lexical and stylistic resources available to speakers and writers (for example, appropriateness, audience, tone, voice, and other aspects of a message's verbal texture); and
 3. various oral and written composition strategies, including approaching composition as a process (including purposeful drafting, revising, and editing).
3. These seminars address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.
4. These seminars may be organized around topics, themes, or texts; in each seminar the material must be appropriate and accessible for meaningful work by first-year students.

Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry

Rubric

Learning Objectives

The purpose of this core area is to introduce students to the processes of scholarly and creative inquiry through direct participation in that inquiry. Students in a Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar gain a degree of mastery that comes with deep exposure to a focused seminar topic. They increase their ability to frame and explore questions, to support claims, and to respond to others' questions and differing opinions. Finally, students develop and demonstrate their intellectual independence by engaging in substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects, employing good practices of academic integrity.

Guidelines

1. Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminars examine a focused scholarly topic, set of questions, or theme.
2. Since seminars in this category are taken in the student's freshman year, they are designed to be accessible and appropriate for the accomplishment of meaningful work by students without previous preparation in the course's field. This requirement informs the choice of topic or theme of the course, the choice of texts or materials to be treated in the course, and the design of assignments for the course.
3. Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry require substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects and include significant intellectual exchange both between the instructor and the students and among the students. Careful, sustained, and recurrent examination of ideas and sources (broadly defined to include data, texts, media, and/or other visual, aural, or graphic material) play a central role in the course. Pedagogical methods take advantage of the opportunities provided by a seminar setting.
4. Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.