

1. Approve minutes

Motion to approve minutes. Seconded. Minutes approved.

2. Faculty Assembly President's Report (Jim Morley)

- a. At the Board of Trustees meeting, President Mercer reported that Governor's Task Force on Higher Ed has announced there will be no cuts in higher ed funding and no tuition caps, hence no jobs are at immediate risk.
- b. FAEC has been talking to Provost Barnett to talk about the issue of 3 hour classes, and will get back to Faculty Assembly about this in future.
- c. The Task Force on SBR under Sam Mustafa is getting going.
- d. Deliberations about winter break and deadline for grades continue. At some point, there will be open discussion at Faculty Assembly on this question. A schedule task force may be called for.
- e. The Faculty Governance Review Committee is working on proposed amendments to the by-laws. This will be discussed at the next Faculty Assembly. Jim notes there is a major problem of low faculty turnout and effect on validity of votes, as well as weakening the faculty voice. It is especially important that faculty vote on the amendments to the bylaws.
- f. FAEC needs input from faculty regarding the Faculty Conference Days in May.
- g. Reminder that we are very close to probation from Middle States and so we need to act expeditiously and decisively in order to meet the demands of Middle States, including on the topic of assessing the Course Enrichment Component.

3. College Wide Assessment Committee Report (Eric Daffron)

- a. This past Fall, the college launched its new assessment efforts by asking for learning outcomes, curriculum maps, and assessment plans for two or more outcomes as part of 2-3 year assessment cycle. Nearly 100% of programs on campus submitted all three of these documents.
- b. Every program is actively engaged this spring in implementing assessment.
- c. By June 1, all programs must submit their assessment reports stating their findings as well as what they plan to do with the data. There are various levels of support and feedback from different sources. He applauds the work of CWAC.

4. GECCO Report (Rob Mentore)

- a. GECCO has collected 200 papers from across Gen Education, 100 from first year and 100 from non-first year at the 200 and 300 level. They are now being scored; all scores should be in over spring break, at which point GECCO will its begin data analysis.
- b. GECCO would also like to implement a syllabus audit for the same courses from which they sampled papers. They have encountered challenges communicating with faculty who teach in Gen Ed and plan to address Faculty Assembly in April about these issues.
- c. Assessment of mathematic skills is next on the agenda. A quiz will be given to 20 courses out of 47 in this part of the Gen Ed curriculum.
- d. GECCO is developing the learning objectives for Gen Ed, and hope to have that process completed soon so they can be assessed during Fall 2011.
- e. Discussion of at what point assessment will be used to determine reforms to Gen Ed. Currently, Gen Ed is in the midsts of a 4 year assessment plan, so presumably after that. What Middle States needs is a plan for full assessment of Gen Ed and ongoing implementation of elements of the plan each semester.

5. Design Team Report (Melissa Van Der Wall, Maya Poran)

- a. 23 members of community were appointed by to the Design Team by Beth Barnett, including faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The team was charged with surveying the community regarding CEC/experiential learning.
- b. 936 individuals responded to the Design Team's Qualtrics survey, which also held several focus groups. On February 23, they submitted their report to Provost Barnett. Major findings include both frustration with how CEC has worked in the past combined with hopefulness about what can be done with CEC in future.
- c. Immediately after today's Faculty Assembly, there will be an open forum to discuss the Design Team report and findings. The report includes recommendations that will also be addressed at the open forum.

6. ARC items: (Emma Rainforth)

(All ARC items are available on the ARC webpage)

- a. Announcement that course proposal will be due earlier in the Fall semester (October 1 rather than December 1). This change will be reflected in the updated ARC manual posted at the end of Spring 2011 semester.
- b. Decision item - Criminology Minor (Emma Rainforth):**
 - i. The Sociology convening group has submitted a proposal for a new minor in Criminology, which would be available to students outside of the Sociology major. The

program proposal may be found on the [ARC website](#). The proposed minor utilizes existing courses in sociology, law and society, and psychology. ARC supports this new program.

ii. Motion to approve. Moved and seconded.

iii. Total Faculty Voting N = 89

88.76 % yes

6.74 % no

4.49 % abstain

Motion carries.

c. Decision item – Writing Across the Curriculum – Program Revisions (Emma Rainforth, James Hoch)

i. The Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (Chair: James Hoch), working through the ARC, has developed a proposal for the revision of the WAC program. The seven major changes proposed pertain to the structure of the program, its oversight, and implementation. The two key pieces are the restructuring of the program into two sections (WAC in General Education and WAC in the Schools), and the establishment of a standing committee that will report to ARC and FA. Vetting of Writing Intensive courses is also addressed. The ARC commends the committee on the report (which can be found on the [ARC website](#)) and its recommendations, and recommends the acceptance of the report and the adoption of its recommendations.

ii. In Q&A, Hoch clarifies that these revisions reshape the process for determining the writing curriculum, not the content of that curriculum.

iii. In Q&A, faculty express their hope that the administration will provide sufficient support the continued work of the WAC Committee, particularly by granting course releases to CWAC chairs.

iv. Motion to approve. Seconded.

v. Vote to approve.

Total Faculty Voting N = 89

96.63% yes

2.25 % no

1.12 % abstain

Motion carries.

d. Decision item - Online manual (Emma Rainforth)

i. This is a manual for online courses and will be folded in to the full ARC manual. The “online manual” addresses both fully online and hybrid courses, including issues of administrative support as well as faculty and student obligations.

ii. Motion to amend #1 (Jill Weiss): Section 4 specifies that approval of dean is necessary to offer online courses. Jill notes what courses faculty offer is not usually a question left to purview of dean, but rather to convening groups. She proposes changing the language to state that deans should be notified when a faculty member plans to offer a course online (rather than “with approval of the Dean”). She also raises the concern that the current language leaves unclear whether a dean could ever require a faculty member to offer a course in an online format. Seconded.

iii. Discussion ensued as to whether this is a logistical change over how deans approve course schedules now. The point is raised that if convening groups want control of this question, they might be placed in the position of having to say no to colleagues who want to teach all their courses online.

iv. Our contract appears to be silent on the question of whether deans have control of this issue.

v. Motion to amend #2 (Jill Weiss): The “online manual” states that faculty are required to prove sufficient demand for an online course before offering it. Jill proposes that it should only be necessary to prove there is demand for the course number (regardless of format in which it is offered). Seconded.

vi. Motion to table discussion of proposal of amendment 2 until next Faculty Assembly.

vii. Motion to oppose tabling discussion. Seconded.

viii. Parliamentarian Alex Olbrecht explains appropriate procedure.

ix. Vote on motion to table discussion of Amendment 2.

Total Faculty Voting N = 83

30.12 % yes

59.04 % no

10.84 % abstain

Motion to table fails.

x. Motion to table discussion of Amendment 1 until next Faculty Assembly. Seconded.

xi. Vote on motion to table discussion of Amendment 1.

Total faculty voting N = 83

33.73 % yes

57.83 % no

8.43 % abstain

Motion to table fails.

xii. Motion to table discussion of online manual. Seconded.

xiii. Vote on motion to table discussion of online manual.

Total Faculty Voting N = 82

19.51 % yes

69.51 % no

10.98 % abstain

Motion fails.

xiv. Discussion of Amendment 2. Emma Rainforth proposes simply striking any requirement that faculty demonstrate student interest in any course. This isn't necessary because courses without sufficient interest (ie. enrollment) will be canceled.

xv. Motion to extend time. Seconded.

xvi. Vote to extend time.

Total Faculty Voting N = 70

50 % yes

50 % no

Motion fails.

xvii. Vote on Amendment 2 to online manual:

Total Faculty Voting N = 74

59.46 % yes

29.73 % no

10.81 % abstain

Motion to amend carries.

xvi. Vote on Amendment 1 to online manual:

Total Faculty Voting N = 70

61.43 % yes

28.57 % no

10 % abstain

Motion to amend carries.

xvii. Vote on online manual as amended:

Total Faculty Voting N = 74

73.97 % yes

12.16 % no

14.86 % abstain

Motion to approve online manual as amended carries.

d. Discussion item - Course Enrichment Component Policy and Procedures (CEC)

(Emma Rainforth)

i. ARC is charged with drafting policy based on the Design Team's report. Their policy proposal was presented to unit councils last week, and will be voted on by the Faculty Assembly on March 23. It is time-sensitive because of Middle States, which requires that the policies be in place by the end of Spring 2011 semester.

ii. Feedback on [Policy and series of Procedures](#) (available on the ARC website) should be sent by March 21 to unit ARC reps or Emma Rainforth. Feedback will be compiled and posted on the ARC website, and ARC will bring a revised document to the Faculty Assembly on March 23rd. After that, if approved, it goes on to the Provost's Council.

iii. The proposed policy states that CEC has to be addressed in syllabi and described therein – not just a blurb stating it is required but rather describing what is expected, what the student will generate, what learning objective(s) it serves, and how it will be documented or assessed.

iv. ARC is working on developing learning objectives that can be used broadly to address the role of CEC in courses.

v. This Policy and Procedures document was based on Design Team report and drafted with input of co-chairs of Design Team.

vi. Jim Morley notes this has the support of the Faculty Executive Committee.

vii. Discussion regarding the necessity of communicating expectations about CEC to adjunct faculty, a responsibility that has to be borne by both administrators and faculty.

7. Discussion Item - May 18-19 Faculty Conference (Jim Morley)

i. Tabled.

ii. May have to be rescheduled due to construction on campus.

iii. Call for faculty to think of ideas for panels/best use of conference time.

8. Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Unanimously Approved.

Next Faculty Assembly meeting: March 23-2011, 11:30-1pm.