

Faculty Senate Meeting 4/7/2008

Approval of minutes, seconded, approved

Paige Gibbs Report from BOT and IFC

Jim Karam and Ruben King Shaw are appointed. Discussion of increase in student fees for UMD, approved by the Committee on Student Affairs and will be sent forward. Fee increase was approved by the BOT.

Only one of three programs put forward for PhD in practical nursing had been approved. At the BOT meeting all were approved.

Intercampus Faculty Council meeting. The IFC will continue to be an informal organization across the campuses. International program offerings will be linked across campuses.

Dick Panofsky, Report on International Studies Advisory Group

Dick Panofsky, Report from Study Group for Gen-Ed Assessment

Charged with reviewing previous goals and standards, etc. The group attended a conference in Boston on Gen Ed assessment. AACU membership was acquired. The group is moving toward consensus for presentation at the final Senate meeting.

Thus far the group has reviewed gen ed course documentation. Examining which students take which courses to fill Gen Ed requirements. Identifying the core of courses as the focus of assessment. Course level outcomes assessment. Working with instructors of these courses.

Looking at the use of three standardized instruments for evaluating Gen Ed learning. NSSE data about student involvement, etc. Looking at how Gen Ed can be introduced in Orientation and New Faculty Institute.

The committee has also looked at the e-portfolio system, which will be piloted in three majors in the Fall. This is a long term project.

Looking at the need to consider UMass Dartmouth foundational definitions for Gen Ed assessment. Need a conversation across campus about the foundational concept of what an “educated person” at UMass Dartmouth means. From this basis then additional assessment and other activities will occur. This will require a broad based input and support from campus.

Integrated Student Learning Outcomes initiative by Jean Kim. Looking at learning outcomes from UMass Dartmouth campus. The outcomes from SLAGE will be part of this activity as well as input from the Student Affairs side.

Clarifying the role of the Gen Ed committee and how to implement Gen Ed assessment. Strong recognition that assessment activities need support, and the committee may recommend hiring and supporting assessment efforts including a Gen Ed Supervisor.

Discussion:

Gerald Koot: Is the committee also discussing the central part of NEASC assessment, which discusses 40 -45 credits in social sciences, humanities, etc. at present our Gen Ed requirements don't currently do that.

Dick Panofsky: The committee has been looking at that as well as the quantitative elements. We need to see what is being done and what is not.

Jim Griffith: Is the campus dialogue, and I would applaud a broadly based campus dialogue, but I think we need to find a way for any statements made to embody the beliefs across campus.

Dick Panofsky: The committee will think very carefully about how the conversation will be held and it is not a small group of people making decisions. David Milestone and I will be co-chairing ISLO and we hopefully will use that group to accomplish this dialogue.

Ric Golen, Report from the SFAAC

Five recommendations are put forward.

1. A recommendation that students be limited to no more than 6 credit hours during intersession. We propose that a student not be allowed to take more than 6 credit hours during intersession without permission of the Dean.

Motion: To adopt first recommendation of the SFAAC. Moved and seconded.

Discussion:

What is the rationale for the six credit hours?

The committee did hear from students that given the availability of online courses it is possible to take 6 hours without compromising academic quality. The committee also considered the role of advising in recommending the number of appropriate courses.

Clarification: The Dean referred to will be the Dean of the college the student belongs to.

Motion Carries

Jim Griffith: Can we get an accounting of the number of credit hours students are actually taking during intersession? I would like to see a report after two intersessions to see usage rate. Report due Spring 2009

Motion 2: The current withdrawal period of 10 weeks from the start of the semester will remain.

Rationale: The students and the faculty need some time to determine whether or not a student should remain or leave the course. There are no requirements for exams be given prior to a set time frame. There is no requirement for mid-term grades thus many students may not have enough feedback to progress made until the 10th week.

Discussion: I think this is a real quality control problem. What happens routinely is that 20 – 30% of the students withdraw. I would like to get some numbers on withdrawal rates. There is no penalty for this action, the notion that you need 10 weeks to be responsible is simply a charade. There is no reason why we can't require students to stay in their courses after two weeks.

Ric Golen: Perhaps there should be a motion to gather data about the number of courses taken and the number withdrawn from. Give the SFAAC data and we can use data rather than anecdotal data.

Dick Panofsky: There is a lot of data published annually. In that data you can see withdrawing as a factor in the pattern of grading. There is lots of possible analysis that can be done.

Gerard Koot: I would like to make a **motion** that the committee assemble some data from the registrar and take a good look at this question.

Motion is made and seconded. Motion carries.

Motion #3: A student may declare a minor after one semester. The student may remain in the minor after 54 credits with a cumulative grade point average of 2.0000 with a 2.500 grade point average in the major.

Rationale: The current policy is that students must have 54 credit hours with a 2.000 GPA and over all and 2.5 within the major. We just wanted them to be able to declare earlier and then opt to stay in after accruing 54 hours. One of the issues asked of the SFAAC was to approve a minor that was to begin in the Freshman year would not fit with the current minor policy since the students would not be able to join the minor until after 54 hours complete.

This policy would not have to apply to all minors but could be used to apply to minors such as Sustainability, but others could use a more stringent standard.

Motion: Move the proposal forward. Made and seconded.

Motion is carried.

Motion #4: In regard to the charge relating to student participation on committees, the following policy is proposed:

The Student Senate shall have the responsibility for staffing those Faculty Senate Standing Committees and committees mandated by the Faculty Contract in which Student Senate is required to nominate and select student members.

Motion to accept motion #4, seconded.

Discussion: How will this policy be supervised and implemented? I would suggest that the second paragraph of the proposal be amended and some phrase added that the responsibility is for nominee pool development, not specific appointments.

The Student Senate and the faculty have joint responsibility for developing a pool.

Is there anything in the Student Senate bylaws that prevents us from appointing non-student senators? I think it would be great to have an opportunity to appoint students who are not student senators.

One example is the college curriculum committees which require student service. These committees are delineated in the contract.

Motion carried

Motion #5: To modify the grade appeal procedure to allow for grade appeals to be heard and resolved during summers, intersessions, etc.

Rationale: To allow students who are being prevented from registering or graduating to have their appeal heard to allow them to move forward.

What happens when a faculty member is unavailable over the Summer?

The policy says that "it can" be used over the Summer. Which means this policy does not guarantee the student a right to a grade appeal over the Summer.

The policy was an attempt to an opportunity to have a grade appeal heard over the Summer.

Motion: The SFAAC recommendation on grade appeal be adopted. Motion seconded.

Friendly Amendment: Not go over the Summer but have the date of May 31.

Dick Panofsky: This motion is not practical.

Jim Griffith: Motion that can be followed by “assuming the availabilities of the principles”

Amended motion to accept the recommendation.

Motion Carries.

Matt Sylvain: Computer Users Committee

Report on the computer research needs assessment.

Discussion: There is some software that is available but there are not enough licenses. One example is acrobat writer.

Perhaps the list of available software should be on the Provost Resources for Faculty link on the Provost webpage.

Lisa Knauer, University Curriculum Committee

Activities this year:

Election of Chair
Establish Meeting Times

Meet several times to discuss Sustainability Minor proposal.

The UCC voted to approve the minor to sustainability studies minor.

Motion to adopt the recommendation of the UCC regarding the Sustainability Minor, motion seconded

The sustainability committee is lauded for including funding for the library and all of the work on the committee.

Motion carried.

Jim Marlow, Cultural Affairs Committee

There appears to be no budget and a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Student Senate.

We may need to rewrite the charge of this committee. In years past we had a large number of activities on campus of national and international caliber.

We cannot schedule things without a budget. One of the issues we faced is the scheduling of the auditorium. There seems to be no system for scheduling.

Provost Garro: I think that we need to work with the committee and put a group together to schedule events for next year. I think we need to work with the schedule of the auditorium. I need to have a proposal in order to locate funding. If Jim and the committee come up with a proposed program for next year.

Student Senate, and student affairs has a program fund. Dave Milestone offered to act as a facilitator for finding the funding.

In the past there were multiple sources of funding that allowed for the group to bring acts to campus.

Motion to adjourn, motion seconded.

Meeting adjourned 5:12 PM