

Honors Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 3, 2016

Crane Room ~ 12:00 – 12:50 p.m.

Members Present: Andrew Herbig, Dmitri Nizovtsev, Emily Engler, Jean Sanchez, Jennifer Ball, Jennifer Jenkins, Kelly Erby, Zach Johnson (replacing Malcolm Mikkelsen as WSGA rep.), Martha Imparato, Meghan Salisbury, Michael Gleason, Michael McGuire – Chair, and Vanessa Steinroetter

Call to Order

- I. Minutes from November 4, 2015: Approved
- II. Welcome and Introduction of Dmitri Nizovtsev and his role as Gen Ed Committee Rep
- III. Unfinished Business
 - A. Revised qualifications for being admitted into Honors (will Table for April's meeting)
 - B. Appeals Policy (will Table for April's meeting)
- IV. New Business
 - A. Creating process to comply with gen ed
 1. Provide an honors addendum with SLOs and rubrics to instructors teaching honors courses. Michael McGuire will create, distribute to members of the curriculum subcommittee including Dmitri to review, and, once approved for distribution, will distribute to faculty teaching honors courses.
 2. In the addendum, three SLOs will be listed instead of two. Furthermore, the three must constitute 30% of a grade for a given course.
 3. Here are the three SLOs and associated assessment tools (specific assignments are left to the instructor but must be specified prior to accepting submitted courses as honors):

- a. Select, analyze, interpret, and evaluate a range of source materials for assigned project(s). Assessed using the Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric.
- b. Evaluate available written and/or visual information, evidence, and argument for reliability and authority/usefulness (e.g.; observation, testimony, measurement, experiment). Assessed using the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric - Evidence Criterion. The Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric was created by the AAC&U.
- c. Construct a well-supported, clearly articulated argument to support a stance and use it to justify one or more conclusions. Assessed using the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric - Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) Criterion.

B. Creating rubrics for admission application and scholarship application.

- 1. The scholarship and admissions subcommittee created a weighted system to determine admission into honors as follows:

HS GPA = 20%, ACT = 15%, Resume = 35%, and Essay = 30%

- a. HS GPA Values and associated weights are as follows after reviewing the academic scholarship grid:

| GPA Range | Points |
|-------------|--------|
| 3.0 – 3.20 | 4 |
| 3.21 – 3.40 | 8 |
| 3.41 – 3.60 | 12 |
| 3.61 – 3.80 | 16 |
| 3.81 – 4.0 | 20 |

It should be noted that currently policy allows students to be admitted in they only meet one of the following two critieria: HS GPA of 3.5+ or ACT of 28+, which is why the GPA Range has such a low anchor.

- b. ACT Values and associated weights are as follows:

| ACT Range | Points |
|-----------|--------|
| 21 – 22 | 1 |
| 23 – 24 | 3 |
| 25 – 26 | 5 |
| 27 – 28 | 7 |
| 29 – 30 | 9 |
| 31 – 33 | 12 |
| 34 – 36 | 15 |

- c. Ideas for assessing Resume
 - 1) Weight service separately
 - 2) Take into account distinction between service and participation or participation versus leadership
 - 3) Is resume work versus school? Be sure to request a specific type of resume for future applications.
 - d. Ideas for assessing Essay
 - 1) Look for citations
 - 2) Note two similarities between applicant and honorable figure
 - 3) Evaluate strength of argument(s)
 - e. As noted above, there's still work to be done but we do have a 100 points scale.
2. Michael M. tasked the subcommittee to come up with 100-point system for scholarship applications as well.

VII. Announcements

- A. Spring Banquet: Tuesday, March 29, 6:00 (BTC)
- B. Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 2, 12:00 – 12:50 (Crane)