

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: February 27, 2003

PRESENT: George Benedict
Sandie Rietz
George Madden
Randall Gloege
Mark Hardt
Matt Redinger
Janie Park (ex-officio)

Doug Brown
Audrey ConnerRosberg
Keith Edgerton
Alan Davis
Connie Landis
Dan Zirker (ex-officio)

ABSENT: Paul Bauer – *excused*
John Cech (ex-officio)
Randy Rhine (ex-officio)
Nichole Alley (ex-officio)
Curt Kochner (ex-officio)

Joe Michels (ex-officio)
George White (ex-officio)
Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)

PRESIDING: Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. on February 27, 2003, in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The February 20, 2003, meeting minutes were approved.

I. NEW BUSINESS

A. Revised Charge to Academic Computing and Allied Technology Committee (ACAT Committee) Concerning Online Courses and Class Size. It was stated that the committee won't really know what their charge should be until they start exploring the Online program. It was also noted that before this time, the ACAT Committee was mainly concerned with computer technology, and had nothing to do with the Online Program. It was noted that as the exploration of the program progresses, Randy Rhine, Marlow Ockfen, and Kirk Lacy should all be involved with the committee's work.

B. Streamlining Academic Senate Forms – Keith Edgerton. Dr. Edgerton noted that, as stated at the last Senate meeting, the New Course Form seems to be the least useful and most daunting of the forms. He whittled away many of the questions down to six

questions. It was noted that the Senate should know both who is qualified to teach a course and who will actually be teaching it. It was also noted that if other departments are involved, the results of the discussion between departments should be noted on the form, not just whether the department has been notified or consulted.

It was stated that the Senate should know what students are affected or served by a course—not necessarily a number, but a population. It was then cited that students served is more important in a new program, but not necessarily a new course.

It was noted that probably the most important question on the old form: *What is the rationale for offering this course?* needs to be included. That is the only place where the course proposal is actually explained

It was stated that there should be a question about duplication. A new course should not duplicate another course in a different department or program.

It was then noted that, since it is coming soon, perhaps asking for an outcomes assessment on the New Course Form would be in order. That way, the faculty member can decide the outcomes at the beginning, rather than working backward later. It was then cited that no one really knows what “outcomes” are, except for testing and grading, and that is not what Northwest will be looking for. It was noted that syllabi usually have the objectives listed in them. It was cited that not all departments require objectives to be listed on the syllabus.

Dr. Edgerton stated that he will revise this form with the Senate’s suggestions, and will bring it back next week for further discussion.

C. Senate Policy on “T” Grades – Keith Edgerton. Dr. Edgerton stated that he would like to implement this policy:

A grade of “T” (denoting “continuing” or “work in progress”) may be given by the instructor to indicate that an advanced undergraduate student’s work in a course is in progress and the requirements of the course are of such a nature that the assignment(s) could not be completed by the end of the semester of enrollment. An advanced undergraduate is a student who has accumulated at least 90 credits, or has achieved senior-level status in his or her program of academic study.

“T” grades will be allowed for only the following courses: Internship, Independent Study, or Capstone.

All work for removal of the “T” grades must be completed before graduation. A “T” grade will not be included in the computation of the GPA.

Karen Everett, Registrar, had stated (in a past Senate meeting) that the “I” grade works for undergraduate students. It was noted, however, that the “I” is pejorative. More programs are requiring internships, and a “T” grade would be useful for more flexibility.

It was cited that there is a problem with Financial Aid and the “T” grade, though the exact problem was not remembered.

The Senate decided that Karen Everett should be invited to the next Senate meeting to explain the financial aid problem. If the problem can be worked around, a notation will be put into the catalog, stating that students may lose some of their financial aid as a result of a “T” grade.

D. New Rubric – Keith Edgerton. Dr. Edgerton stated that several faculty members are interested in teaching Archeology courses, but there is no current, appropriate rubric for an Archeology course. It was noted that to create a new rubric, it needs only to be noted on a New Course (or Change Course) Form. The credits of any course follow the instructor of the course, regardless of department. If a faculty member in the College of Business is teaching Archeology, those credits will follow that faculty member.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

rjrm