

Augustana College

Rock Island, IL

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 29, 2011
Hanson Science Building, Room 102
11:30 AM**

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by the chair, Randy Hengst. Roll call was taken by Katie Hanson.

Members unable to attend: Lendol Calder, David Ellis, Darrin Good, Dave Hill, Mariano Magalhaes, Charlie Mahaffey, Norm Moline, Paul Olsen, Jayne Rose, Mike Schroeder, Lori Scott, Heidi Storl, Cecelia Vogel

Members excused: Doug Parvin, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson, Peter Xiao, Cyrus Zargar

2. **Approval of minutes from the September 8, 2011 meeting of the 2010-11 Senate**
Motion-Varallo, Second-Wegman-Geedey
“To approve the minutes from the September 8, 2011 meeting of the 2010-11 Senate.”
MOTION CARRIED

3. **Approval of Consent Agenda**

Randy Hengst announced that the Consent Agenda is approved.

4. **Motions**

4.1 Motion-Honor Council [Farrar]

“ To approve the amendments to the Honor Code as outlined in the “Honor Council Amendment Proposals” document, specifically Sections 2.3, 2.9, 4.0, and 6.4 and Honor Code section renumbering.”

Discussion:

Eric Pease, co-chair of the Honor Council summarized that the Honor Council is streamlining the process for members to reapply for Honor Council. Returning members would forgo the application process and submit only one letter of recommendation instead of two. A change is also being proposed for the Council to meet formally once instead of twice per term (in addition to any hearing), to review policies and procedures and discuss any concerns. Section 4.0 has been amended to clarify the procedures for proceeding with cases where there has been difficulty coming into communication with a student accused of a violation.

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion – Honor Council [Farrar]

“To approve additional amendments to the Honor Code as outlined in the “Additional proposals to amend the Honor Code” document, specifically Section 3.2.”

Margaret Farrar highlighted the first change to Section 3.2 which adds “staff and administrators” to the category of people enabled to report honor code violations. The second change in Section 3.2 clears up language that could mean the difference between a zero for an assignment and 49%, which could impact whether or not the student fails only the assignment or the class as well. Faculty

members need guidance as to which standard more accurately reflects the intention of the Honor Code.

Brian Katz asked if it is allowable, as a teaching tool, to ask a student to make corrections on an assignment that was cited for academic dishonesty, making it a separate learning experience for credit. Margaret indicated that the code prohibits faculty from giving credit on any assignment cited for academic dishonesty, and the student cannot rewrite that assignment. She suggests giving them a separate assignment. Tom Bengtson inquired about protocol in the case of one assignment with multiple parts, but only one part was associated with academic dishonesty. Margaret Farrar replied each part should be assigned and graded separately, as Honor Code mandates no credit for the entire assignment in this case.

MOTION CARRIED.

5. Reports

Routine reports from different committees will be a part of the agenda in this year's Faculty Senate meetings. Randy Hengst invited all senators to let their faculty senate steering representative know of any current topics they would like reported on at future Faculty Senate meetings.

5.1 RISE (Refocus to Invest in Student Engagement) Report

Pareena Lawrence reported on information from the RISE steering committee and SLG1 and SLG2 regarding curricular reform, credits and graduation requirements as they pertain to the Higher Learning Commission and the Department of Education guidelines. Federal guidelines say that students are awarded credit for classes on the basis of the Carnegie Unit, which defines a semester credit as equal to a minimum of 3 hours of work per week for a semester. A unit of credit equates to 3 hours of student work per week; typically 50 minutes to one-hour lecture plus 2 hours of homework or out-of-class work. Students at accredited institutions must have a minimum of 120 credits to graduate. The curricular model passed in May 2011 meets/exceeds the number of credits (35 courses x 4 cr. = 140 credits); however it increases seat time by 750 minutes over the term or 75 minutes a week. In order to get the same number of periods in, MWF classes would begin at 8:00 AM and finish at 5:40 PM (150 min. classes). TTh classes would start at 8:00 AM and end at 5:15 PM (150 min classes). Our trimester calendar makes this change extremely difficult to accommodate.

To convert classes without additional adequate class time, would require a full-scale review of courses and pedagogy used with extensive documentation, requiring each course offered at the college to be reviewed and re-justified. Adding the necessary seat time would require a full-scale revamping of the schedule for classes, reducing the number of teaching periods unless we go further into the active time for extra-curricular activities. Unique constraints at Augustana are that we have a 10-week term, as opposed to 15 weeks, convocation time, an 8:30 AM start time and a 4:00 PM finish time. The opportunity cost, resources, and faculty workload makes the conversion to a 4-credit model extremely difficult and labor intensive for Augustana.

While it is true that Knox and Carlson may have less seat time and still receive the 4-credit approval, they were accredited before the Higher Learning Commission and the Department of Education became more stringent on its rules and regulations.

Pamela Druger stated that in RISE, SLG1 and SLG2's initial conversations regarding implementation, it became clear that the 4-credit curricular realignment vote did not result in a calendar that most

people anticipated. An overhead of a draft daily schedule incorporating the 4-credit model was shown, and comments were welcomed. Pamela Druger asked if anyone was in favor of pursuing this longer daily schedule. There was no show of hands.

Dave Dehnel commented that the enforcement of these credit standards is completely new, as he knew of institutions that transitioned through this not too long ago that did not have to go through this. He asked if the committees have anticipated the “dust settling” a year from now, and are we doing all this work because we feel like we have to. Pareena Lawrence replied that according to outside liaisons, the dust will settle on the side of more accountability.

Tim Bloser asked if more student work could be added to classes. Dr. Lawrence indicated that though the possibility exists, every course would undergo much scrutiny and there is no guarantee. Chris Whitt asked if there was any combination of slight increase of class time to take some of the pressure off. Pamela Druger indicated there was an alternate proposal, but before she presented that she felt it important that the faculty understood that the RISE, SLG1 and SLG 2 committees did not intentionally dismiss the needs or desires of the faculty for the 4-credit course proposal.

Pamela Druger said that the three committees decided that other options should be presented to the faculty. A 3.5 credit per class proposal was then shown on overhead which adhered exactly to the 750 minutes. Start of class would be 8:00 AM and go until 4:30 PM. MWF would have 90-minute classes, and TTh 135 minutes. If this model was chosen, classes would be 3.5 credits, not 4. Requirements would be met for seat time exactly and reviewing and justifying each course would not be necessary. This is an in-between proposal which meets the exact letter of the law of 75 minutes per week for 10 weeks which equals the Carnegie unit.

A third proposal was displayed which is the one RISE is supporting. This proposal is 685 minutes, just shy of 22 minutes a week. The 4.0 scale proposal came shy 75 minutes a week. RISE thought the HLC might be able to be convinced that while we have not quite met the Carnegie unit, we have active learning that will get us there. This model starts at 8:00 AM and ends at 3:20 PM on MWF (80 minutes) and starts at 8:00 and ends at 3:45 on TTh (120 minutes). There is a risk factor with this proposal. We may have to re-evaluate every single course on campus and justify it. Pareena Lawrence said, however, this in some ways is less risky than other models because we are only 22.5 minutes short. The spreadsheet she provided explained how pedagogy will change. It is five additional minutes a day, but over 10 weeks it is 150 minutes of added to a course.

Each department will be asked to talk about how we can engage in more active learning in each course with this additional time. We will need to provide additional documentation but not to the extent we would need if we had 75 minutes. The risk is much more limited, and a convincing argument can be made for our case.

Pamela Druger encouraged the faculty to provide feedback on these proposals. The 4 credit model passed in May could have faculty teaching four days a week and possibly going into finals week. There are all sorts of other alternatives, but we cannot proceed with the one passed in May.

Tim Bloser suggested the math would be easier if a 15-week semester were put on the table. Because the faculty must revisit the vote anyway, now is the optimal time to investigate alternatives.

Pamela Druger said that a faculty forum might be in order to open up discussions with the full faculty again. Presenting the different models at today's meeting was one way of getting the message out that pursuing the 4.0 model will not work.

Jon Hurty asked if our position as an outlier with a 3.5 versus a standard 4-credit system, was a problem in ways other than how credits are calculated. Pareena Lawrence indicated that the language we would be using would be different. The term "credits" will be used by registrar's office for transcripts, but our language about courses and graduation will change when we talk about 35 "units" to graduate. This would not be unique to our school, however, as Knox and Carlton use this same terminology.

In response to Bob Tallitsch's question about why we are avoiding class time beyond 4:00 PM, Pamela Druger replied that it is out of respect for extracurricular activities. Bob Tallitsch added that currently students in labs must stay beyond 4 PM, to which Pamela Druger responded that the 8:00 AM time was suggested to avoid as many after-class-conflicts as possible, but that an 8:30 start time could be considered. Jon Hurty indicated that music would have significant problems with the later starting time, as finding time for all the ensembles is already a problem with TTh. The later the day ends, the greater the problems are.

Jeff Strasser offered the following statements:

1. This proposal brings Augustana close to what Knox and Carlton are doing right now. Each school is on 10-week terms. We do not want to be in a situation where we claim a course at Augustana is worth more credits than a comparable course at Knox.
2. There was a perception last spring when the faculty voted on the earlier proposal, that the reduced number of courses might reduce faculty workloads. That is certainly not the case because in this proposal there will be increased work in individual courses. It might be a little less hectic for some individuals.
3. One big issue especially in the sciences that still needs resolution is how teaching credits are awarded to faculty members for labs.

Chris Whitt commented that one possibility was a four-day teaching schedule which he believes is worth visiting. If there is a MW and TTh schedule, Friday would be available for labs or other things.

Pamela Druger asked the senators if there is consensus to call a faculty forum to further discuss the calendar issue. All in attendance agreed that additional discussion would be beneficial. She then asked the senators to share their ideas with their colleagues, and to also share this conversation that the calendar that RISE is proposing is not going against the faculty's 4-credit calendar, rather it is keeping in the faculty's best interest. If more copies of the proposed calendars would be helpful, people can ask Pamela for additional copies.

5.2 Higher Learning Commission

Dr. Lawrence reported that Augustana College will have its next accreditation in 2015-2016. Part of the accreditation process that has changed is the criteria. There is increased emphasis on academic program evaluation and improvement, which means that every academic program needs evidence of student learning. We will be asked to choose one project to work on that we can show improvement in. This will need to begin in 2012-2013 so that two to three years of work can go into it. We will then report on what it was that we worked on to improve. We must include the following areas of improvement: diversity, increased intercultural competence and active learning. There are

multiple things we could do. At this year's faculty retreat diversity was mentioned—increasing intercultural competence in our students or something related to active learning. Steve Klien asked if the curricular realignment process would qualify as project. Margaret Farrar replied that the difficulty in that would be that actual outcomes would need to have been documented by the time of the visit.

5.3 Report from EPC

Mike Wolf reported that in addition to course evaluations, EPC has been focusing on service learning designations for courses. Guidelines to follow when creating a service learning course will be available on the website. Courses receive this designation if vetted through Darrin Good and EPC. A service learning designation will be attached to the course; however, this will not appear on transcripts at this time. Essentially, service learning requires 20 hours of community work. The possibility of Contract Minors has been brought forward to EPC and is currently being discussed. EPC has also been discussing blended learning and on-line courses. EPC will be preparing a philosophical statement or policy statement about what can be used as a guideline. If a policy statement is put forth by EPC it would go to faculty senate for approval and become part of the faculty handbook. A number of Augustana faculty incorporate blended learning in their classes and EPC encourages this type of activity. At the present time EPC does not feel that on-line teaching is appropriate; however, they are discussing a rationale for why it would be important for summer school. Mike Wolf ended his report by reviewing the role of the GPG (Governance Prep Group) which was approved by Faculty Senate in 2009. Membership of this group is the Chair of EPC, Chair of Gen Ed, Chair of Faculty Senate, the Registrar and the Academic Affairs Associate Dean. This group reviews and has authority to approve course proposals that are submitted too late to get through the normal governance process on a one-time basis.

5.4 Report from AS&D

Liesl Fowler named the members of the AS&D committee and the committee charge. Typically the committee deals with petitions and waivers from students for things that deviate from the catalog. They also bring the candidates for graduation forward each term for approval. They also consider grade change requests. She reported on a recent challenge and trend of the increase in the number of students matriculating with dual enrollment and AP credits. There has been a huge increase in the number of students able to graduate one term early. One student had 23 credits of AP. In response to this, the registrar's office has tightened up the number of AP credits it accepts. A form is now in place that indicates if students have more than 18 AP credits, they must declare which 18 they want to apply to their transcript. These students will be encouraged to have conversations with their advisors to see what the implications of their choices might be. This trend raises questions. Is this a national trend or something unique to Augustana? Liesl Fowler reported that she took an informal poll and was disappointed that other schools like Augustana have not seen an increase in this and the reason for this is that they are on semesters. Do our academic and administrative policies encourage or discourage early graduation (AP, transfer, residency, gen ed, major requirements, SI, calendar, etc.)? Are students who obtain a degree in less than 12 terms less prepared than their peers who complete in 4 years? Liesl Fowler asked Mark Salisbury that question and he told her he does not know; it is an important question, and he is interested in looking into what the answer might be. Are we financially modeled to absorb more early graduates? We are not modeled to lose 24 students one term early. What does this mean in terms of how departments and general education should approach curricular reform? We do not want to develop something RISE puts together that will increase this number. What can we do as an institution to continue to

effectively recruit these students without helping them leave sooner? Find a way to make it attractive to bring AP credit to Augustana, but not too attractive.

In response to Dell Jensen's question if students in three-four programs are included in these statistics, Liesl replied that they are not. Steve Klien commented that Tim Bloser's earlier comment should be underscored. Faculty need to think about revisiting the question about semesters, as reasons keep presenting themselves to take the semester model. Dara Wegman-Geedey said there are students who could have graduated early, but decided to stay to double major or to take advantage of Augie Choice.

6. Announcements

Randy Hengst reminded the senators to take note of the announcements listed on the agenda. He opened the meeting up for questions.

Steve Klien requested an update on the information that was asked for in the form of a motion at the last senate meeting. Has faculty senate made inquiry with the Dean's and President's Offices regarding the feasibility of a course release for a Faculty Welfare committee chair? Pareena Lawrence replied that conversations are still ongoing and no determinations have been made yet.

Chris Whitt announced that the weekend of October 20, 2011 a group of faculty and administrators will be in Atlanta at the Institute for Teaching and Mentoring recruiting minority graduate students in all fields. Any faculty member at Augustana who has open positions, potential positions, or thoughts or comments was invited to contact either him, Margaret Farrar, Mike Egan, Darrin Good.

Sharon Varallo commented that if a faculty forum is held without knowing where people's thoughts are beforehand, a positive outcome is not likely to occur. She suggested coming up with a way to focus the meeting, even something like a straw poll to come up with four possible options to discuss at the forum. Randy Hengst announced that RISE meets every Wednesday. Any faculty member may report their thoughts through RISE committee members: Kurt Christoffel, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson, Randy Hengst, Pamela Druger, Taddy Kalas, Allen Bertsche, Pareena Lawrence. Pareena Lawrence emphasized that she welcomes hearing from anyone who supports the 4-credit semester model or another model, as it would take time to create one, but added that if more than a handful of different proposals come forth, it would be very difficult to create models for so many.

Tim Bloser asked that since the faculty did vote for a trimester calendar with 4-credit courses, it might make sense to see how far we can go with that model. He said that since the entire faculty is not aware of the complications with that model, this would be a good model for the first forum to show everyone the challenges and to see how well we might make it work or not. From there, if there is a sense that faculty want to reintroduce the semester option, that can be discussed at another forum.

Randy Hengst reminded everyone that division meetings were scheduled for next week, where this discussion could also take place.

Sharon Varallo asked everyone to think carefully about what process this discussion should take. Every time this is brought up at senate, will a faculty forum need to follow? Perhaps if this is

discussed fully in the faculty forum, a decision could be brought to Faculty Senate. She wants this process done right, rather than done quickly.

Brian Katz recommended Friday Conversations and faculty workshops as good venues. Jon Hurty added that an online forum to discuss this might be beneficial because only a few people can speak at forums, whereas online everyone can present ideas at a time convenient to them. Randy Hengst and the senate steering members agreed to work on arranging something like this.

3. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski
Academic Affairs