

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 4, 2014

Present: Kim Gainer, Margaret Hrezo, Rhett Herman, Brent Harper, Rodrigo Hernandez, Paul Thomas, Jennifer Resor-Whicker, Amy Van Kirk, Eric Du Plessis

Grade issue (brought up at faculty senate retreat):

- Rhett contacted institutional research and Damian Allen replied, said to have chairs contact him to get grade distributions for their department. Rhett will send this email to Kim. Kim will use this as the basis for her email to Damian. (Letting Damian know that they should be letting the deans and chairs know that this is available to them.)
- Should this go further or be in hands of chairs? Think a lot of chairs didn't know they could get this. First step is to let them know. If in a couple of years if this is still an issue, then it can be pursued.
- First step is for Kim to contact Damian and ask him to let the chairs and deans know this is available. Then we will wait and see.
- Might want to get chairs feedback to see if this info was useful. Will evaluate this in a year or two, looking at classes that we know have issues. We will be able to get the average GPA for certain classes. It would have to be something that is taught across campus, several sections. Cannot get data that would identify a certain class, only 1 section.

Went over charges for the current academic year:

1. Review and make recommendations with respect to the proposed revisions to the assessment plan for Goals 5-10 of the core curriculum. Makes sure a new assessment plan is approved for Goal 11 once the revisions to the goal are finished (see item 2).
2. Ensure that the Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Revise the Goal and Outcomes for Area Eleven of the Core Curriculum completes its business in the fall semester. That ad hoc committee should submit revisions to CCAC early in fall, and thereafter the curriculum committee should review and if appropriate send a motion of support to Faculty Senate.
 - a. Not finished last year. Sent to CCAC, and then CCAC sent it back and could not pull together another face to face meeting to finish this.
 - b. New ad hoc committee has been formed. Margaret will chair this committee. Kim will cover ENGL. Paul will cover philosophy and religion. Margaret will contact others. Might be better to start over.
 - c. Need to find actual complete draft from last year then can send it to new committee. Kim will look for this.
3. Clarify oversight of online courses. Concerns raised in committee and elsewhere show that considerable confusion exists among faculty members about who is and how they are monitoring issues relating to online courses. Faculty Senate can determine who has purview over each such issue and ensure that these standing committees acknowledge the charges.

(Discussion on online education ensued. Highlights below.)

- a. Accelerate classes (from August 2014) are currently getting reviewed
- b. Made up 3 member teams from CITL. They are going to see if they meet quality matters (QM) standards. 3 classes are being reviewed. Then the university will select 2 classes to have a real QM review in order to get QM certification.
- c. Once they go through with this then everyone will meet with the reviewers to go over what the standards are to bring everyone up to standard.
- d. Someone has already made a decision on oversight – seems to be coming out of CITL. Came from provost because there were complaints about classes during Wintermester
- e. QM is only design and content of course – not about grading or assessment
- f. Rodrigo was on a committee a few (?) years ago that looked at taking students assessments for online classes. Nothing was done about it. Rodrigo will send it to Kim. The committee came up with forms and questions. Bethany has a copy. Didn't implement because it was never approved.
- g. There is still some resistance to online courses. Some faculty are afraid that online courses will replace them. There may need to be a cap on how many online courses students can take.
- h. Need guidelines that make faculty play large role in these online courses. Make them initiate that human contact
- i. Make online courses demanding courses, solid courses
- j. Lots of best practices that need to be followed
- k. Create circumstances that prevent online course from overrunning the university
- l. Some members would like to address the issue of the extent that we should be offering online classes – role that online learning will play in student's education. Specific discussion started on limit to online classes/hours to earn a degree from RU. Conversation should take place about this. Entire senate should weigh in on this over a couple of meetings with time limit. 20 minutes per meeting. Should courses be ID as online on transcript? Who decides percentage? Faculty or admin – must be faculty – they have control over curriculum. Larger than the charge. Do we want to take this on as a charge? Should we try to get a forum going on this? What is future of online education at RU? Eric will come up with a motion to concerning online education addressing these concerns.
- m. Online is not observable like face to face is – easier to observe faculty neglecting a face-to-face class than an online class
- n. In relation to this specific charge, there are three issues to consider:
 - i. First issue is structure: CITL is scoping out required segments for online courses – use of news, welcome message, etc.

- ii. Second issue is actual conduct of course
 - iii. Third issue is content of course – should be faculty prerogative
- 4. Follow up on dialogue regarding institutional priorities on university curriculum matters. Curriculum committee should be prepared to participate as necessary in following up on conversations regarding the curricular priorities of the university administration.
 - a. Not discussed
- 5. Meet with the members of the Provost office responsible for implementing the proposed changes to high impact practices and consider the development of a policy or statement addressing the best practices for integrating co-curricular, high-impact practices into academic departments and department based curriculum
 - a. Not discussed

Adjourned at 4:44 pm; motion by Jennifer - seconded by Rodrigo

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 18, 2014
Heth 239

Present: Kim Gainer (chair), Jennifer Resor-Whicker (secretary), Rhett Herman, Margaret Hrezo, Paul Thomas

Absent: Brent Harper, Rodrigo Hernandez, Amy Van Kirk, Eric Du Plessis

I. Called to order at 3:30 pm

II. Approval of minutes – approved with addition of meeting location

III. Old Business

- a. Report on Chair/Dean access to grades (Gainer)
 - i. Kim went to her chair and watched as she went through the system. Got in using her RU username and password. Kim will go ahead and communicate this information to the Deans who can then tell their chairs.
 - ii. Kim will ask the Deans if the chairs know this is available, and will suggest that the Deans discuss how this info can be used.
- b. Report on progress of CORE Goal 11 Ad Hoc Committee (Hrezo)
 - i. Margaret sent out revised Goal and outcomes for CORE Goal 11. Proposed goal and outcomes are as follows:
 1. Radford University students will understand how social and cultural (for example, political, historical, economic, environmental, religious, or geographic) forces shape experiences in the global setting. Radford University students will:
 - a. Identify how different perspectives shape human life around the world
 - b. Recognize social and cultural forces that affect relationships between cultures in the world
 - ii. Everyone was happy with the changes.
 - iii. Margaret sent it to Bethany to deal with a question – Bethany wrote back, didn't say they were ok, but didn't raise any red flags. Margaret will send it to CCAC. It will then come back to us and then go to the senate.
 - ii. Margaret sent it to Bethany to deal with a question – Bethany wrote back, didn't say they were ok, but didn't raise any red flags. Margaret will send it to CCAC. It will then come back to us and then go to the senate.
- c. Oversight of online/hybrid courses (Hernandez)
 - i. Tabled until Rodrigo is here to discuss it

IV. New Business

- a. Core Curriculum Assessment Plan (Gainer)
 - i. Written by the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee (Subcommittee of CCAC)
 - ii. Need more data than one year to make revisions – should not do it after one year
 - iii. Margaret moves to add “as indicated” whenever the words “revisions to area and courses appear” or “results reviewed

and changes implemented,” seconded by Paul – motion passed

- iv. Motion: FSCC recommends that Faculty Senate adopt this plan with the change that every time “revisions to area and courses appear” or “results reviewed and changes implemented,” appear as indicated be added.
- v. Rationale: As stated in the Core Curriculum charge, the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee (CCAC) is responsible for the development of an overall assessment plan for the Core Curriculum program at Radford University. SACS requires institutions to have such assessment plans. Because of recent revision of outcomes under goal 5-11, data collection will not begin any earlier than Wintermester 2014-2015.
- vi. Paul will amend the chart to reflect the following changes:
 - 1. Make 2 columns under Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 for the Areas 5-11 section. Under Fall 2014 list the plan development. Under Spring 2015 it will say: Data collection to occur no earlier than Wintermester 2014-2015.
- vii. Motion to send this motion to FSEC passes

- V. Charge: Follow up on dialogue regarding institutional priorities on university curriculum matters. Curriculum committee should be prepared to participate as necessary in following up on conversations regarding the curricular priorities of the university administration.
- a. Need to find avenue to get in on this conversation
 - b. We are reactive and cannot get ahead of these issues
 - c. Having an administrator pick faculty to sit on a committee – not generally representative of faculty. We want faculty to choose which faculty sit on these committees
 - d. We find out about programmatic decisions after the fact – this needs to stop
 - e. What happens with recommendations from the colleges? Seems like they are not heard.
 - f. We need transparency. Need to know why were changes made so we understand the process. We need to know what is going on. Jerry needs to go and ask for seat at AALT meetings
 - g. Faculty Senate president should be invited to academic affairs leadership team meetings so he can make a case for transparency
 - h. Resource decisions are curriculum decisions. We should have a say when it comes to decisions that affect resources since we make decisions about curriculum.
 - i. Why do we set priorities if the deans are going to change it at the AALT meetings?
 - j. Do the president and Mr. Alvarez make the decisions in the end?
 - k. Make Faculty Senate president a non-voting member of AALT. There is a precedent for this. Provost’s intern goes, Laura Jacobsen has been, etc.

- l. AALT seems to be an ad hoc committee – recommend that Jerry insist on being on this committee
 - m. Move to send a letter to the FSEC about this. Wording options as follows:
 - i. We recommend that the president of Faculty Senate interact with the president, provost, and the AALT to talk about mechanisms for selecting faculty, to make a case for better transparency, and on being consulted on curricular changes and the development of new programs that affect resources.
 - ii. We recommend that the Faculty Senate president ask to be included in AALT meetings where decisions about these curricular matters and resource allocation that affects curriculum are being made.
 - iii. FSCC recommends that Faculty Senate be charged with the selection of faculty representatives
 - iv. Recommend that faculty members choose who represent them on groups that are formed on an ad hoc basis to make what are ultimately curricular changes
 - v. Ad hoc committees, commissions
 - vi. Faculty involvement in choosing their representatives
 - vii. Recommend fuller representative faculty representation for committees that are convened to make curricular changes
 - viii. All constituencies need to be represented – needs reflect the judgment of the faculty
 - ix. We need to let the provost know that ad hoc committees should be representative of and chosen by the faculty.
 - n. Will discuss further next time
- VI. Charge: Meet with the members of the Provost office responsible for implementing the proposed changes to high impact practices and consider the development of a policy or statement addressing the best practices for integrating co-curricular, high-impact practices into academic departments and department based curriculum.
- a. Similar to previous charge, want to be in on the conversation
 - b. Believe it is just limited to training though
 - c. We will generate a list of questions and invite Jeanne Mekolichick-Jakouvek to a meeting to discuss this. We want to meet with her the 3 meeting from now
- VII. Announcements
- a. Deans and chairs strongly urge us to attend the BOV reception this afternoon.
- VIII. Adjournment 4:43 pm

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting
Thursday, October 16, 2014
Heth 239

Present: Kim Gainer (chair), Jennifer Resor-Whicker (secretary), Rhett Herman, Paul Thomas, Brent Harper, Amy Van Kirk, Eric Du Plessis

Absent: Rodrigo Hernandez

- I. Call to order by Kim at 3:30 pm
- II. Approval of the minutes of September 18, 2014
 - a. Approved with no additions
- III. Old Business
 - a. Oversight of online/hybrid courses (Hernandez: 2 documents)
 - i. Held until next time
 - b. Charge: Follow up on dialogue regarding institutional priorities on university curriculum matters. Curriculum committee should be prepared to participate as necessary in following up on conversations regarding the curricular priorities of the university administration. **Given that changes to the academic calendar may have curricular implications, discuss possible Curriculum Committee involvement in decision-making process.**
 - i. FSEC asked Jerry to ask the UEC to hold off on the 2 calendar motions.
 - ii. No action will be taken – there will be further discussion about it. Sam Minner and Bill Kennan have stopped the 2 calendar motions.
 - iii. Likely will go back to FIC, however don't believe this conversation should happen without us.
 - iv. Faculty Senate approved the motion for Fall Break last year. Implications weren't really discussed. FIC had sent out survey last year before motion was introduced. Survey got mixed results.
 - v. Many assumed that we would have a say in how the motion was applied – we did not.
 - vi. AP and staff wanted Labor Day holiday – we knew nothing about this when we introduced motion for Fall Break.
 - vii. Kim will contact FIC chair and let them know that when the calendar issue is taken up we would like a joint meeting concerning it.
 - c. Charge: Meet with the members of the Provost office responsible for implementing the proposed changes to high impact practices and consider the development of a policy or statement addressing the best practices for integrating co-curricular, high-impact practices into academic departments and department based curriculum (Gainer).

- i. Waiting to see when Jeanne Mekolichick-Jakouvek can meet with us.

IV. New Business

- a. Motion to Approve Revised Goal 11 Outcomes (Hrezo)
 - i. Core Curriculum Advisory Committee has approved this
 - ii. This motion will be taken to FSEC to put on agenda for next Faculty Senate meeting
- b. Motion to Expedite Approval of Syllabi for Courses Receiving Core Credit (Gainer)
 - i. **Amendment** – where it says syllabi insert official detailed course description – this is the preferred language. Kim will change the name of the motion and make the changes reflecting the preferred language.
 - ii. **Amendment** – The rationale should end after the second paragraph – removing history section of rationale.
 - iii. The approval of this pathway has resulted in the Senate being called upon to “rubber stamp” what in some cases are minor changes to syllabi, such as the renumbering of courses. Perhaps, as part of IG reform, the pathway should be revisited to address what may have been an unintended consequence; in the meanwhile the motion above is intended to eliminate redundant voting and an accompanying expenditure of time and effort.
 - iv. This is concerning the official syllabi – not the one you give to the students every semester that you make little changes to
 - v. This motion is to expedite the process to approve official syllabi changes
 - vi. **Amendment** – Instead of outcomes say learning outcomes in first sentence of first rationale paragraph
 - vii. Jennifer called the question – vote was taken – passed unanimously

V. Announcements

- a. What type of fall break would work?
 - i. There are very few labs on Fridays. A Friday break would cause less disruption than a Monday break.
 - ii. Labor Day question might require us to start semester on previous week. Any Monday off messes with the labs. AP and staff on UEC will want the Labor Day holiday.
 - iii. Could a skeleton staff work on Labor Day? Offer those who have to be there comp time holiday. Students and T&R faculty would be here. AP and classified could be off with a skeleton staff working what needed to be done.
 1. Only certain departments could take advantage of this. Dining services, custodial staff, etc. could not operate on a skeleton crew.
 - iv. Start school 2 days earlier and give a Thursday and Friday in

October.

- v. If we start a whole week earlier then having Labor Day off is not an issue.
 - 1. If we start early though the dorms will have to be opened earlier. That does increase cost, but could close down the dining halls (on Labor Day and Fall Break?) since it's an official break.
 - 2. SGA will not like this (coming to school a week earlier). However, this is an academic decision, and not their call.
 - 3. However, if we do come in a week earlier we're still only holding 14 weeks of classes. It will just be spread out over 15 weeks.
- vi. Maybe Thanksgiving week should be shortened
 - 1. Taking away 2 days from Thanksgiving break seems the only option. That would give us 2 days for a Thursday and Friday for Fall Break.
 - 2. Some faculty were cancelling classes for that week anyway. This makes it hard for other faculty that want to hold classes.
 - 3. You are supposed to fill out a form when a class is canceled, but chairs would have to enforce it. It's not widely enforced.
- vii. Could go further into December
 - 1. Would be approaching the week of 25th. Some sciences could have issues with this. Some math classes have finals on Saturdays.
 - 2. Wintermester is also an issue (not all of it is online).
- viii. Could do complete shift. Move Wintermester later, start spring later and end spring later
 - 1. Problem is with summer sessions (Maymester, Summer I-III, Accelerate) would have to be moved too.
 - 2. Accelerate is all online, might not be an issue. Starting early should not matter concerning Accelerate. You don't need class space for it.

VI. Adjournment at 4:23 pm motion by Rhett, seconded by Eric