

ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Salem State University
MINUTES - 15/16:01
October 23, 2015

Convened: Time: 3:00 p.m. Sullivan Building, Room 106

Attending: Joanne Carlson, Clarke Fowler (recorder), Scott James, Raminder Luther, Nancy Schultz (vice-chair), David Silva, Anne Sullivan, Stephen Young (Chair)

Absent: Harry Pariser, Kanishkan Sathasivam, Karen House

Please note: AUC = All University Committee, UCC = University Curriculum Committee, APC= Academic Policies Committee, SAC = Student Affairs Committee

I. Chair's Report

Chair Young welcomed everyone back for the new Academic Year and thanked everyone for volunteering to be on the committee. He noted the new members and made a special welcome to them. Then people introduced themselves.

Chair Young gave a brief description of the charge of the committee. The All-University Committee is the clearinghouse for all governance related material at Salem State University. All Governance-related material is sent to the All-University Committee; the Chairperson then sends the material to the appropriate Standing Committees. If there are no appropriate Standing Committees, then the All-University Committee creates an Ad-hoc committee to handle the material. The committees then review the proposals and either approve them or not. The committees forward their recommendations and approvals via approved committee minutes to the All-University Committee. The All-University Committee will approve or not approve the standing (ad-hoc) committee's recommendations and forward them on to the academic vice president. The academic vice president will then send his/her recommendations on to the president for final approval.

This year, we will continue to review an extensive amount of curricular activity We will also be looking into the General Education Core and coming up with governance structure on how to handle proposals that have the potential of altering the Core. More on that below. The Chair invited members to introduce new items during the New Business portion of the meeting.

A. Rotating Recorders & Meeting Schedule

November 13, 3:00 pm (SB106) – Anne Sullivan

December 4, 3:00 pm (SB106) - Joanne Carlson

December 18, 3:00 pm (TBA) - Scott James

B. General Education Core Course Issues

1. Assessment of the Core

This year we will be discussing how the Core will be assessed and we will be hearing from a variety of people on this issue. More on this under New Business below.

2. Governance Process for Revisions

In addition to discussing how the core will be assessed, more importantly, we will be setting the ground rules on how and when the Core can be altered through governance. More on this under New Business below.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. *University Curriculum Committee*

1. Curriculum Committee 15/16:01

Motion **To accept the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:01)**

Made by: Raminder Luther

Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

Discussion The Chair of AUC gave a review of the minutes:

This meeting started off with the chair’s report where Chair, Elizabeth Coughlan, explained that she created 3 course review sub-committees instead of 4 because UCC is under staffed. Various people are reaching out to faculty for help. Liaisons were established for packets and Megan Miller reminded people about the need for Degree Maps to be created for new programs.

Next under Special Business, the UCC discussed their forms. There were various amendments made to alter the UCC forms and UCC procedures. All

of the amendments to the forms and procedures were unanimously approved. Under Old Business, a package from the Philosophy Department was tabled.

Tad Baker, the General Education Representative, was a guest at this meeting. That was the essence of the meeting.

Chair Young asked if there was any discussion.

Discussion:

One member asked whether all departments are now required to submit degree maps. Provost Silva replied that, currently, degree maps are only required when departments submit a new or changed program to governance. It would be valuable, though, for all departments to have degree maps for each of their programs.

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.
Made by: David Silva Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

Motion **To approve the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:01)**
Made by: Scott James Seconded by: Raminder Luther

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

B. Academic Policies Committee

1. Academic Policies Committee 15/16:01

Motion **To accept the minutes of the Academic Policies Committee (15/16:01)**
Made by: Raminder Luther Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

Discussion The Chair of AUC gave a review of the minutes:

This meeting was the convening meeting of the Academic Policies Committee and it started off with a reflection on their work from the 2014 – 2015 Academic Year. They discussed their work on Academic Integrity and their creation of a new policy that has been signed by Provost Silva, who has asked for a review of the policy in one year. The committee then reviewed their work with the Academic Calendar. A variety of ideas relating to the Calendar were discussed, such as making the Opening Day a 2-day event, planning the academic calendar 4-years out instead of 2 years out, extending the add/drop period, examining whether or not SSU should take both Columbus Day and Veterans Day off, and whether or not to expand spring break from one week to two weeks to allow for travel-learning and other opportunities.

Under Other Business, they discussed course scheduling, and Provost Silva suggested that Salem State rethink the course schedule so seminar days fall on Wednesdays instead of Mondays. Provost Silva recommended that the APC review the advising implementation task force outcomes. And it was noted that Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) results will be ready in November. Peter Walker was elected Chair and Elizabeth Duclos-Orsello was elected as Vice-Chair.

That was the essence of the meeting.

Chair Young asked if there was any discussion.

Discussion:

Why is course scheduling being reconsidered? Because a number of faculty members had multiple concerns about the schedule, including the fact that Community Time has been co-opted by departmental meeting times. This is challenging, though, because we need to be aware that some of our adjunct faculty members teach elsewhere on days when they are not teaching at SSU. One member recommended that any new schedule we adopt include a time for departmental meetings. Megan Miller and others are investigating scheduling options that the University might pursue.

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.

Made by: Anne Sullivan

Seconded by: Nancy Schultz

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

Motion **To approve the minutes of the Academic Policies Committee (15/16:01)**

Made by: Anne Sullivan Seconded by: Nancy Schultz

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

1. Academic Policies Committee 15/16:02

Motion **To accept the minutes of the Academic Policies Committee (15/16:02)**

Made by: Raminder Luther Seconded by: Clarke Fowler

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

Discussion The Chair of AUC gave a review of the minutes:

The meeting was convened by the vice-chair and she welcomed the members and the guests to the meeting. The meeting then reviewed the functions of the various Standing Committees. The Selective Retention Committee meets three times a year to consider student appeals of academic dismissals. The Academic Calendar Subcommittee sets up a structured calendar, usually two years out, which includes the dates of when classes begin, when we have exams, and all of the other particular academic dates.

Under New Business policy (16:034) Requirements for Entry into the Early Education and Care Methods Courses was brought up. Clarke Fowler, Chair of the Childhood Education and Care, provided an overview and rationale of the proposal. The School of Education has undergone many changes. With the combined bachelor's and master's 4+1 programs, the School of Education needed to make additional changes. The plan was to set up several benchmarks that students had to meet before they could enter the early education and care methods courses. Students in the program, therefore, must demonstrate competency before they are permitted to serve as instructors. After some discussion, the proposal passed unanimously. Next policy (16:035) Requirements for Entry into the Early Childhood and Care Practicum Courses was brought up. R. Clarke Fowler (Chair, Early Education and Care) re-emphasized that the School of Education wants to ensure that students are doing quality work before they teach. For the practicum, students are working off

site, often unsupervised. It therefore is imperative that students are well trained and competent. After a brief discussion, the proposal passed unanimously. Next policy (16:036) was brought up. This proposal is for the licensure program in the School of Education. If students decide they do not want to pursue their 5th year and teach, they should still be allowed to get a degree. This path, however, should not be a norm; rather, it is an option for exceptional circumstances that still enable students to receive their bachelor's degree. There was considerable discussion about various aspects of this proposal. Of particular importance is what might happen to graduate coursework credits should a student withdraw from the 4+1 program. The courses were used for the undergraduate degree, but can they also be used in the future for a graduate degree, especially if the student entered a different 4+1 program. It was suggested that greater clarity (i.e. more explicit language) was needed around this kind of issue. J. Cambone (Dean of the School of Education) stated that what is implied is that the credits may not be used for another program *unless* the student is returning to the graduate cohort model from which s/he withdrew. It was also noted that the concerns mentioned are issues that apply to all 4+1 programs at Salem State. It was suggested that language should be added to indicate that if a student withdraws from a 4+1 program and obtains only an undergraduate degree, that person must reapply to the graduate program if s/he decides to return sometime in the future. It was suggested that a broad policy be created about this situation. Concerning policy 16:036, it was passed with 10 in favor and 1 abstention.

The last item to be considered was policy (16:038) Comprehensive Preferred Name Policy. The Director of the Office of Diversity and Multicultural Affairs provided an overview of the proposal where students can have a preferred name used throughout the university system for them, from swipe cards to class attendance lists. There were many guests at the meeting and a number of them expressed the importance of this proposed policy. There are some situations, such as with financial aid where birth name must be used. The motion passed unanimously.

That was the essence of the meeting.

Chair Young asked if there was any discussion.

Discussion:

Chair Young read an email in which Karen House suggested that the University might not yet be ready to have preferred name appear on the

Clipper Card. Scott James noted that the issue here is procedural and that efforts were being made to fully implement this policy as soon as possible. He also noted that SSU, the 141st institution to adopt such a policy, has established procedures that students must follow in order to have SSU use their preferred name.

A number of issues were discussed regarding 4+1 programs, the most prominent being the necessity of having a university-wide policy regarding how to deal with students who do not complete the entire program. For example, how should we deal with students who exit a 4+1 program early due to illness as opposed to poor grades? Under what circumstances may graduate credits earned during undergraduate years be applied to later graduate work?

Chair Young will ask the Graduate Education Council and the APC to work together to develop a policy to address this issue.

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.
Made by: Scott James Seconded by: Nancy Schultz

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

Motion **To approve the minutes of the Academic Policies Committee (15/16:02)**
Made by: Nancy Schultz Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

III. Old Business None

No Old Business

IV. New Business

Governance Process for Revisions the General Education Core

Chair Young noted that the UCC had recently discussed a proposal to add a new category to the General Education Core. He then told the AUC comments made by Kanishkan Sathasivam (who served on various committees working on the creation of the General education Core) In his e-mail to the Chair, “Kani stated that: ‘Many ideas for what the new Gen Ed should include were brought up in the PACCC and debated in detail. Everyone had their chance to push their ideas. But at the end of the day some ideas just did not convince a majority of folks on the PACCC. I felt this was a backdoor effort to get something that was rejected in the PACCC deliberations.’ He further stated that we should let the Core run for a few years and then assess it and make changes.”

Chair Young then asked whether the University should establish criteria for considering such proposals. After some discussion, members agreed that it would be best not to set such criteria, but rather to let the governance process work as designed. Members also agreed that it is necessary to have a long-term plan for assessing and, if necessary, revising the core. The next logical opportunity for doing so will occur in conjunction with the 2019 NEASC accreditation.

Motion To adjourn.
Made by: Scott James Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at: 4:00 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Clarke Fowler