Academic Standard Committee Meeting Minutes
October 17th, 2017

Present:
- Gena Givens
- Mary, Pat Bigley
- Rebecca, Boncoddo
- Ely, Cairn
- Paul, Hapeman
- Steve Kirstukas
- Marjani, Sadie
- Rick, Roth
- Julie, Schnobrich-Davis
- Wangari Gichiru
- Patrick, Tucker
- Carmela Pesca

Minute 1:
- The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Minute 2:
- Rick moved to approve minutes, Mary Pat Seconded

Minute 3: Committee Reports:
- The chair asked Paul if the online committee had had a chance to meet.
- He said yes and that they had a vote to recommend the continued use of course evaluation systems for online courses for the 2017-2018 school year and that the previous night there had been a call for an emergency vote to recommend a one-time raise in the cap for Fall 2017 for the number of courses to 50 from 40 to accommodate the students from Puerto Rico. He also added that one thing that had been on their list but had not discussed it yet, was trying to figure out ways to go about training faculty to be able to teach online and build up their quality of teaching, so trying to find money to see how they get to train people. That some of that, was they were starting to look at the development money that goes into a unique online course...they are going to start looking wondered whether maybe shouldn’t that money be have been spent elsewhere.

- Carmela asked if we were going to have an online evaluation for the on-ground courses, because we worked on part of a pilot last year.

- Paul Hapeman said there was a discussion about that and that one of the things people suggested was that they want to do that. The other thing is that course evaluation system is per student basis, it is the way it is sort of charged, so if all of a sudden everyone wants to do on the ground courses, that would cost a lot of money. So they are trying to figure out if they
could work something out with that because he had a feeling that that would ultimately determine the direction this was going to go, just how to get there and it can’t be done at once but if she had an interest like he had, they could find out how she could let them know if we can make that happen, hoping not everyone would try to do that at once.

- Carmela asked if we should be prepared to go back to the regular evaluation
- Paul said he would get the answer next business meeting.

**Minute 4: unfinished business**

- The chair said that we did not have any

**Minute 5: The Website:**

- The chair asked Mary Pat if she had a question about the website. She mentioned that the specific website for this committee was not active anymore and that was why Mary Pat saw the 2013 or 2014 dates which was when it was last active. So, any of the minutes or new proposals approved go up into the faculty Senate, because they have to get approved by the faculty Senate, so that they are up on their Agenda. Other details in our minutes are not provided anywhere.

- Mary Pat asked if we can do it because it was active and she could see it there
- The chair said that she could see it there but there was no way to make changes. And Fred never got back to the chair about updating it…

- Mary Pat asked if she had asked Mark McLaughlin’s office
- The chair said she had not because she gives all of her stuff to the faculty Senate committee
- Julie said if we wanted to have our own website we would have someone who would…. 
- Mary Pat said that we already had out own website
- Julie said when she went to the website she was re-directed to something else.
- Mary Pat said she wasn’t directed elsewhere when she checked
- Patrick Tucker and Julie then tried to log on or pull up the website
- The website was pulled up and Chair said it was last updated two years ago.
- Mary Pat said was going to help the secretary – Wangari- to work on the website
- The chair mentioned that she had all the previous minutes from the last year
• A member then mentioned that Fred had all the other minutes because he had been chair of the committee.

• Mary Pat said that she and Wangari would work on it.

• The chair said she would send her all the minutes.

• The chair also added that between all of us, we could get enough minutes up there to make it current.

• Mary Pat said that would make everything so much easier if one was looking for it.

Min. 6: New Business: Proposal to revise the residency requirements.

• The chair said that came from NEASC steering committee. The chair asked if anyone had questions about that.

• Rick said that the only issue he saw was in the last two sentences. That English 99 and Math 99 are redundant. An English professor looked at that and said that she thought that the wording of those sentences should be made into one sentence, as opposed to a sentence fragments, though the content was fine. He suggested a sentence like, ‘English 99 and Math 99 are 3 credit courses that did not count towards students’ graduation but which are computed into the students’ GPA.’

• Mary Pat said that she knew that the part that was an issue to NEASC as far as the committee that she was chair of, is that it’s got to be a percentage. She also mentioned that last time, she was not proposing anything about the 12 credits at the 300 or 400 level, that it was a new concept to her. She also added that she thought that in her school it was fine because they had professional program admissions but she didn’t know about…

• Rick said his Dean’s office was happy to see that because it meant that they got to get submit into the residency, so a person who transferred in with only 100 and 200 level courses, take 100 level and 200 level possibly unless they were specifically required if they come from a community college for example, they could have 100 and 200 level courses and if it was possible to get through a major without any upper level courses, that this would preclude that.

• Mary Pat said that that seemed wrong because if the curriculum did not require 300 or 400 level classes, yet the member was arbitrarily saying that…

• Patrick Tucker said that he was looking at examples and it seemed there was a couple of them that you could sweep through without 12. He said he was just concerned that she had said that Stephen kind of addressed one of these questions.

• Julie said she had asked him how he had come to the conclusion that substantial advanced work equates to a minimum of 12 credits at the 300 or 400 level and if he had a list of the majors that came with 120 credits. His response to her was “my thinking of substantial
advanced work was not very sophisticated. I assumed that advanced meant junior senior level and in the number of credit I assumed that the average major is about 40 credits probably a low estimate, 9 credits is less than 25% of the major which does not seem to be substantial and 15 credits might cover the entirety of the residency requirements of the major which might be too restrictive. so, I settled on 12 and so I thought of specifying the percentage of the total credits of the upper level for the major rather than a fixed number but that seemed like it was overly complicated, so as far as I know...it does not define substantial, so if academic standards feel like a different number can be defended as being substantial...like 12, but we do need a number that we can defend. Otherwise a student could not be able to do any upper level work in a major.”

Patrick had a concern and asked, “should we share this with curriculum first, and just make sure that representatives look at it? I would hate to have something that would have an impact on the program without realizing it.” He said we could still pass this in time to become effective next fall, but maybe we ask curriculum to review it and their departmental representatives for their programs just to make sure there is no… He said he was trying to look through to make sure that there was none of the issues, but he certainly goes through all

Rick added that that concern came from our Dean’s offices

Patrick added that we just needed to identify programs where it was currently possible to complete this request that this threshold and how that may impact advising

Rick said as he ‘thought out loud’ “what if you had a person, a transfer student who is taking up courses and only needs 15 credits in residency…and already has the 300 or 400 level courses on transfer?” This would require the way it is written, 12 more credits of additional upper level work

Sadie said we have a couple of 200 level courses in biology that were required that they will not be able to transfer in. So, they would have to take those to meet out major requirements on that.

Julie said that second part of it is having the 120 credits or having 25% of everyone’s major be within the university be taken in residence

Patrick said that’s very straight forward since the exception is a handful of programs that need 120 and they are all in the school of engineering science and technology

Julie said that he gave a list of what they were actually offering: Computer Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Manufacturing Engineering, Mechanical and Robotics Engineering all have 130 or more than 120 credits.

Julie asked whether these would stay at the level that they are at.

Patrick said it was his understanding that the requirement as long as there is some kind of exception to the board requirement, as long as there was some kind of reasonable reason why, such as, external accreditation.
• Julie then said that changing the NEASC to say that there has to be a ¼ of their… and then each program can then figure out the number of credits for their programs.

• Patrick said the degree would then take the majors 130 credits then multiply this by 25% their residency requirement to get 33.

• Julie asked whether we wanted break the proposal into two, pass one and send the other one to curriculum for review, or whether we wanted to put everything into curriculum for review and then have everything brought back to us.

• Mary Pat said she would like that. That this was the standard that she was chair of and it did say that the one fourth we have to do, that but the other we don’t, it just says ‘advanced or substantial.’

• Patrick said that that could be enforced in one of two ways: a) There could be a universal statement like this, or b) it could just be a charge to curriculum that every program has a review process of substantial work requirement.

• Rick said that most programs define how many credits they need at the upper level. He said he was concerned that if a person is bringing in a lot of them have… that might not be the rule but it could be...

• Julie asked if we could make a motion.

• Mary asked what can we do because Steve Cohen was not here to respond to it. She asked if we could split it without his input.

• Julie said yes, we can but that if we wanted to pass the whole thing back to curriculum, we could do that too.

• Rick asked what part of this would satisfy NEASC.

• Mary Pat said it was the one quarter.

• Rick Roth added that as the chair of that subcommittee, could we break it up and pass the beginning of it, the one quarter, and then see where the rest of it goes? That would make life easier for her subcommittee.

• Mary Pat said that just beginning part is essential, the rest was not essential. She added that she was a little uncomfortable with the second part, especially with what Sadie had said with the Biology majors, that it could really impact students.

• Julie said she thought the curriculum committee should look at it because it impacts other programs.

• Rick said that he ran this by the Deans committee and were ok with it.
• Patrick said for example if we looked at Geography it appeared that students could just take 6 credits of 300 or 400 level, that there was room for electives

• Julie asked if anyone else has another way of defining substantial advance but it’s along the 400 level. It could be programs where at least the student work without getting that upper level credits.

• Julie asked if there was another way of rewording, understanding what substantial level of work means?

• Rick asked who wrote it

• Mary Pat said it was Steve Cohen

• Julie asked how many other programs don’t have a minor

• Roth said not all but there are some that have electives within the major such as theater. A couple of Art and Design have an option between a minor or direct 18 credits within a major.

• Carmela mentioned that the minor would not be required to have a 300 or 400

• Carmela asked that for courses taken abroad if the university would count that as in residence.

• Julie said yes.

• Rick said that there were some minors in CLASS that did require …and some that do not.

• Rick said it does not change anything.

• Julie said that one had to have to have 9 credits now.

• Roth said that it was really just that one sentence or half a sentence that is different from what we have.

• Julie said at least 15 credits in the major and at least 12 in 300 or 400 level.

• Paul proposed that we cut it in pieces and then approve on one because it is clear cut and send the other to curriculum.

• Julie asked if Paul was making a motion to break the first part and the second part up so that we are dealing with the percentage of total credits required and then dealing with the substantial advanced work as a separate issue.
• Julie reiterated that the motion was being made for the proposal to be broken into two: the first part being effective for all students matriculating on or after Fall 2018 for residency requirement for earning a degree from CCSU have a minimum of one fourth of the total credits required for the undergraduate major which must be completed in residence.

• Mary Pat mentioned that some of the stuff was already in policy and that we were proposing to vote on the very first sentence.

• Julie said that although the programs in the school of business require that at least 50% of the business credits needed business degree be earned and completed at CCSU.

• Mary Pat said that that was already policy.

• Julie said but should we not make sure that the first one does not supersede the 50% because the 25% is less than the 50% to make sure that it maintains the status quo?

• Rick said that that made sense.

• Mary Pat said that that was already policy.

• Julie asked if that would include that sentence as well.

• Rick asked what about the next sentence.

• Julie said, … a minimum of one year at the time of graduation? …to do 30 credits at the minimum you would have to be matriculated.

• Rick said it was a kind of redundant sentence.

• Julie said it does not have to be consistent it can be a semester full time, a semester off, and then another semester full time. And the same thing completing program requirements during the catalogue year or any other year that they became matriculated is redundant as well. So, it would just be the school of business 50% and then the first sentence.

• A member asked if we needed to specify the major and minor so that we are just talking about the 12, the 300 and 400 level?

• Julie said that that was the part we were going to take out for the second motion and bring that to curriculum to review and make sure there aren’t any programs that have been impacted on. So, if they have programs or majors that someone would potentially…

• Mary Pat said that what we could do was just propose the change from the first sentence as it exists to this first sentence and then just leave the rest of it. Because right now the policy form the website said, “a minimum 30 credits in residence is required for a bachelor’s degree.” If we just replace that sentence with this sentence with this sentence, then everything else stays the same.

• Roth asked if this was going to create a problem if Steve wanted to pursue the rest of us if we make a change and then change what we have changed if there is a decision in curriculum?
Sadie asked there would be a pushback from curriculum if we sent the whole thing forth in this context.

Patrick said that there were two issues at play. They want to have something in writing to show that we are doing something. But from a functional perspective, it does not need to be approved until February which is the deadline for the new catalogue. We have time to send it as just one proposal to curriculum but in terms of our internal catalogue deadlines, but if they want to show that we are making progress this Fall semester for NEASC, then we could say it was approved by senate in October instead of February.

Julie mentioned that NEASC doesn’t start reviewing until next Fall

Julie repeated the motion which was to break the two parts was that all-in favor because we had now discussed it. Do members want to take it into two parts or do they want to leave it as it is.

Roth clarified that Julie proposed that we put it through just changing that first sentence and leaving the rest where it is. And then, perhaps if somebody wants to bring another amendment to that later, basically the parenthesis, that could be done as a separate action prior to catalogue deadline.

Mary Pat said it was basically what Paul had been suggesting.

Rick said, approve the way it is in the catalogue without the parenthesis.

Julie said, so take what he added in terms of 12 of which must be the 300 or 400 level.

Rick said then if Steve or someone wants to pursue it, they could bring it as separate action or separate motion. He added that he thought that the parenthesis we discussed might have trouble getting through

Paul said which is why curriculum should see that part of it.

Julie said Steve would have to make a separate proposal to us and to the curriculum committee

Rick said that is what he thought. And if he did not, we have done what we needed to do.

Carmela asked whether this meant that we did not agree to the 12 credits at the advanced level which she did not think it was the case. She said we did want students to have advanced...

Roth said not necessarily because the way it was worded they have to do 12 credits of upper level work in residency. If there are transfer students who bring in a substantial number of advanced work they may have already fulfilled the requirements of their major and they may just have to fill in some other courses.

Julie but according to NEASC, students complete at least one fourth of their undergraduate's credits including the substantial advanced work in the major or
concentration at the institution awarding the degree.

- Rick said … but they haven’t defined what ‘substantial’ is.

- Julie said that it was being defined as the 12 upper level credits.

- Rick said that he knew some 200 level courses that could be 300 level easily.

- Julie moved the following motion and it was approved:
  "To take first sentence and approve that and then to send the rest to curriculum to review and comment on it and then it will come back to us decided whether they can approve that or not."

- Julie said she would send the rest to Steve with the comments and hopefully ask him to send it to Beth for a curriculum committee review.

- Julie asked if there were any other discussions besides what we have defined as substantial advanced work besides what is defined as upper level work.

- Julie said that she thought that was a question that came up with the curriculum committee. If we do not define it as upper level courses, then substantial upper level work would mean what. And at some point, we were going to have to make a decision about what we agree as substantial advanced work. She asked if anyone had any ideas of how they might want to define that.

- Carmela said it may depend on department, that it may differ from department to department

- Paul asked if it was possible not to have that wording.

- Julie said that that was what was on NEASC, that it included substantial advanced work in the major at the institution awarding the degree.

- Mary Pat quite honestly, students did that. Because the number was concrete but for the other stuff we can just say ‘we require substantial advanced work’

- Mary Pat what we have done so far has helped a lot with NEASC. The other part we can take more time to review it more thorough

Julie asked if there was any other discussion. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 3:46pm