**MINUTES**

**FACULTY SENATE**

**May 9, 2016 – 9:00-11:00 am – Business Building Lounge**

**In attendance:** Abhourahma, Anthony, Bennett, Blake, Brechman, Bunagan, Bush-Wallace, Curtis, Dickinson, Domingo, hall, Hirsh, HOlleran, Hughes, Jaksch, Kim, Kravitz, Krstic, LaJevic, Le Morvan, Leonard, McGreevey, Morin, Norvell, Didi-Ogren, Paliwal, Peel, Prensky, Shakow, Steinberg, Vickerman, Weng, Winston.

**Excused:** Benoit, Farrell, Gevertz, Girard, Landreau, Lopes-Murphy, Meixner, Sears

**Absent:** Krimmel

**ROLL CALL**

Laurie Called the Faculty Senate Roll.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the 4/20/16 meeting were approved.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

* Amanda welcomed the new senators, and thanked the senators who had finished their terms.

**REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON NON-TRADITIONAL COURSES AND INSTRUCTION**

* Morton Winston reviewed the charge to the committee and the committee’s process, starting with the findings from the 2015 task force.
* They did a survey of the chairs and received 22 responses. They then reviewed the information on summer and winter session courses garnered from this survey.
* They also reviewed best practices nationwide on compressed formats.
* They presented their conclusions, caveats, and recommendations.
* Questions and discussion.
* Non-Traditional Course Report is attached (**Attachment 1**)

**APPOINTMENTS**

* Amanda presented the slate of recommendations of the Appointments Committee.
* Motion to approve, seconded.
* Passed unanimously.
* List of Appointments attached **(Attachment 2)**

**ELECTION OF SENATE OFFICERS**

* Amanda presented the slate of recommended officers.
* Motion to approve, seconded.
* Passed unanimously.
* List of SEB members is as follows:
	+ Amanda Norvell - President
	+ Brian Girard – Vice President
	+ Regina Morin - Parliamentarian
	+ Mort Winston
	+ Jana Gevertz
	+ David Blake
	+ Manish Paliwal
	+ Glenn Steinberg

**REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

* CAP – Manish Paliwal gave the following report from CAP:
	+ The committee reviewed feedback elicited in the open fora on the Graduate Certificates and Program Approval policies; Change of Major policy; and the Internships policy.

The final recommended policies to be shared with the committee by email, to be voted on at the next committee meeting.

* CFA – Don Hirsh gave the attached report for CFA **(Attachment 3)**
* CSPP – David Blake gave the attached report from CSPP (**Attachment 4**)
* CSCC – Glenn Steinberg gave the attached report from CSCC (**Attachment 5**)

**TRUSTEES REPORT**

* Marcia O’Connell gave the attached Trustees Report (**Attachment 6**)
* Amanda made a motion to thank Marcia for her service, seconded.
* The senate officially thanked Marcia for her service.

**AFT REPORT**

* There was no AFT report.

**PRESENTATION OF THE MILDRED DAHNE AWARD**

* The Mildred Dahne Award was presented to the Department of Counselor Education.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

**Attachment 1**

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON

NONTRADITIONAL COURSES AND INSTRUCTION

 APRIL 2016

# Charge to the Committee

In fall 2015 Faculty Senate President Amanda Norvell established a Faculty Senate committee to investigate “issues surrounding instruction and course design for classes offered outside of the traditional 15-week fall or spring semesters or utilizing new teaching modalities, such as blended learning or exclusively online instruction.” Among the questions the committee was asked to investigate were:

* What have we learned from the classes that have been taught in any of these new formats? What seems to work? What challenges have arisen?
* Are there national best practices for assessing what courses are appropriate for alternate teaching modalities or for compressed timelines?
* Where should the assessment or evaluation of non-traditional courses occur? Who should determine whether a particular course is appropriate for a compressed format or for an alternative teaching modality?
* Do the non-traditional course offerings provide new opportunities for student learning? Can they be effectively utilized to increase retention or improve graduation rates, in particular for at risk students?
* What is the impact on faculty work? Who is teaching in these non-traditional formats? Is there unequal participation across Schools? Are there concerns about pressure for faculty to participate?

The members of the committee (Rebecca Li, Jill Bush, Holly Didi-Ogren, Marla Jaksch, Lisa LaJevic, and Morton Winston) met several times, gathered and studied relevant documents, interviewed members of similar committees that had work on these issues in the past, and conducted an online survey of department chairs to answer a number of the questions related to the charge.

# Recommendations of the Task Force on Instructional Technology

In January 2015 the Task Force on Instruction Technology published its report (see Attachment A). The Faculty Senate Committee read this report carefully and decided to endorse its main recommendations concerning blended and on-line courses. The main recommendations that we endorse are as follows:

1. Initiate steps to provide for a more robust technology infrastructure on campus. This includes faster and more reliable Internet connections; expanded Wi-Fi service; the establishment of a digital video service on campus for recording, editing and storing video; Google tools for faculty, etc.

1. Provide for increased opportunities on campus where faculty, students and staff can see instructional technology in action through guest speakers, educational workshops, and other campus events. We believe our campus would benefit from seeing specific examples of ways in which digital tools can be put to work to further our Signature Experiences.

1. Continue to support faculty pioneers for their leadership with release time, stipends, equipment, or other incentives for integrating innovative approaches to teaching and learning with technology.

1. Review our faculty support in the use of our Canvas Learning Management System. If we are going to increase faculty use of Canvas, we need to be sure we have the support in place to handle the expansion.

1. Review our student support to ensure that TCNJ students are prepared for whatever digital tools they may encounter in the classroom. For students enrolled in blended or online courses, develop visible support channels to ensure success with instructional technology.

1. Continue the strategic offering of blended and online courses in the summer, winter and minimester semesters, when existing TCNJ students and other student populations will appreciate the flexibility of these alternate modes of instructional delivery. Before a blended or online course is offered in a fall or spring term, the justification for offering the specific course in an alternate format must be presented by the host department, the school dean, and the Office of Instructional Design. If it is determined that the course is both suitable for this format and that the alternate delivery mode enhances at least one of TCNJ's Signature Experiences, the faculty member who has proposed the course may apply to work with the Office of Instructional Design to build the course.

1. Require faculty teaching blended and online courses to participate in formal training on best practices through the Office of Instructional Design during the semester prior to the course offering.

1. Require all blended and online courses to go through a rigorous peer review process prior to being offered as part of the curriculum. This would include a department-level review, school-level review, and a College-level review through the Office of Instructional Design.

1. For any required undergraduate courses, students seeking face-to-face courses must always have that option. The election to take a blended or online course should be a student’s choice, not a requirement or an only option.

1. Academic schools should set their own enrollment caps for blended and online courses, but those caps should reflect the best practices supported in the literature. We recognize

the need for a lower course cap for blended learning than traditional classes. As course size goes up, quality of course and student satisfaction goes down. Online and blended courses should not exceed caps that would prevent us from offering students the personalized, collaborative experience they seek at TCNJ.

1. Work with TCNJ’s Office of Records and Registration to establish guidelines for communicating the details of blended and online courses to students. This process will allow students to make informed decisions about their course selections.

1. Review our current course evaluation instruments and develop an equitable instrument for alternate methods of course delivery that addresses features unique to the digital environments.

1. Continue to build the resources available through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the Office of Instructional Design in order to keep faculty current on best practices in the use of digital tools for teaching and learning.

1. Request that the Committee on Faculty Affairs add the use of contemporary/innovative pedagogical tools by faculty as a "plus factor" in the tenure and promotion process.

1. Chart our progress by regularly assessing blended and online courses to ensure they are rigorous, effective and true to our Signature Experiences.

Since this earlier taskforce addressed on-line and blended courses, we decided to focus our study on courses offered in non-traditional semesters. In order to assess perspectives on this topic we designed and administered a survey of department chairs.

# Department Chair Survey Results

The Faculty Senate committee was particularly interested in determining how departments in the various schools were using the opportunities afforded by offering courses, whether traditional, blended, or on-line, during the non-traditional summer, winter and minimesters periods. We prepared a survey for department chairs, administered it in March 2016 and report the main findings and summaries of the results here. (The survey questions are in Appendix A). Responses

We received 22 responses from department chairs representing departments in every school. While the most responses were from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, there was sufficient participation from most of the other schools to convince us that the survey was a representative sampling of opinion across the campus.

## Kinds of Courses Offered

We wanted to get a better idea of what kinds of courses are being offered during the nontraditional terms and framed several questions to get at this information:

**Q2** - **The courses offered by your department/program in the winter break and/or Maymester in the past two years are:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer  | %  | Count  |
| Core courses in your program  | 39%  | 9  |
| Elective courses for majors only in your program  | 9%  | 2  |
| Elective courses in your program open to all majors  | 61%  | 14  |
| Liberal Learning courses  | 39%  | 9  |
| Other (Please specify)  | 22%  | 5  |

**Q3 - The courses offered by your department/program in Summer Session I and/or II in the past two years are:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer  | %  | Count  |
| Core courses in your program  | 64%  | 14  |
| Elective courses for majors only in your program  | 9%  | 2  |
| Elective courses in your program open to all majors  | 50%  | 11  |
| Liberal Learning courses  | 36%  | 8  |
| Other (Please specify)  | 23%  | 5  |

**Q4 - How many courses will your department/program offer in the coming Maymester (May 2016)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer  | %  | Count  |
| 0  | 35%  | 8  |
| 1-2  | 35%  | 8  |
| 3-4  | 26%  | 6  |
| 5 or more  | 0%  |   |
| Not sure  | 4%  | 1  |
| Total  | 100%  | 23  |

**Q6 - How many courses will your department/program offer in the winter break of AY 2016-17?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer  | %  | Count  |
| 0  | 23%  | 5  |
| 1-2  | 64%  | 14  |
| 3-4  | 0%  |   |
| 5 or more  | 0%  |   |
| Not sure  | 14%  | 3  |
| Total  | 100%  | 22  |

**Q7 - The courses your department/program will be offering in the winter break and/or Maymester of AY 2016-17 are:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer  | **%**  | **Count**  |
| Core courses in your program  | 38%  | 8  |
| Elective courses for majors only in your program  | 10%  | 2  |
| Elective courses in your program open to all majors  | 57%  | 12  |
| Liberal Learning courses  | 43%  | 9  |
| Other (Please specify)  | 24%  | 5  |

How do departments decide which courses to offer during the non-traditional terms?

**Q17 - How does your department/program decide which courses are appropriate to offer during the Maymester in a more condensed format?**

**Representative Answers:**

* Generally, we would prefer to offer core courses as they are less advanced. Internships and Independent Studies are also encouraged during this term.
* Whomever expresses interest and courses that traditionally have waiting lists or in high demand during the semester.
* Need and want of students. When faculty are willing to offer.
* They must be non-major courses that we expect to have significant demand.
* We offer courses based on the sequence students need and availability of faculty.
* Courses in which the material can be learned in a short amount of time.
* It is at the discretion of the faculty member teaching the course.

**Q18 - How does your department/program decide which courses are appropriate to offer over the winter break in a more condensed format?**

**Representative Answers:**

* New course goes through curriculum committee and then for vote at department level, Course has also gone to LLPC for designation.
* Generally, we would prefer to offer core courses as they are less advanced. Internships and Independent Studies are also encouraged during this term.
* We do not have specific criteria. If someone wants to teach something and it seems reasonable, we do it.
* Discussion about appropriateness of content coverage and activity/lab needs in the time permitted, can the professor deliver all the material and provide the same learning activities/assignments as during a traditional semester.
* The need for the course and the availability of an instructor are the primary factors. Some courses we offer are required for a minor and cannot fit into the fall/spring teaching schedule or schedule for the students.

**Q19 - How does your department/program decide which courses are appropriate to offer in Summer sessions I & II?**

* No plan to offer summer again. Last year all but one offering was cancelled for low enrollment.
* Starting last summer, we offered one entirely online course, an introductory course. We offered this course again in Winter 2016 and we will offer three online courses, all introductory, this summer. We chose online because of the higher demand for it. Past offerings of in-class courses did not fill. A blended learning course offered once did fill.

We don't have peer reviews for online courses. Records and Registration offers to students a means to assess the course but the turnout of such evaluations is low.

* Generally, we would prefer to offer core courses as they are less advanced. In addition, we may begin to offer mini courses (.25 credit offerings) as well.
* We have certain courses that traditionally run in these sessions and as long as they continue to have high enrollment, we offer them. If there is a required course that a lot of students need and can't take during the year and we have faculty who want to teach it, we try running it.
* In the time permitted, can the professor deliver all the material and provide the same learning activities/assignments as during a traditional semester.
* Past enrollment guides us. We do offer introductory courses, which can count as core, but mostly we offer electives we think likely to fill. We want to have some options for students but also want to support faculty, particularly full time faculty (with first preference) or long-term adjuncts (second-preference) who seek extra income in the summer. We try to space out the timing and topics to get maximum enrollment.

## Impact on Curriculum and Faculty Work

Perhaps the most important set of questions concerned perceptions about how courses offered in the non-traditional terms impact the curriculum and faculty work. Here are the main findings:

**Q22 - In your opinion, how has offering courses in the compressed format in the winter break and/or Maymester impacted your curriculum and faculty work?**

* Not in any significant way, our enrollments were pretty low.
* Expanded student interest. Some really prefer a senior level methods course in Maymester over the standard school year.
* It works for the online courses. However, students who don't start the work right away will have a hard time passing.
* It somewhat lightens the over-enrolled courses in the fall and spring semesters.
* It hasn't impacted negatively. it provides a time to offer courses needed by students to progress through the program. Faculty, primarily not interested in winter-session and now some faculty not teaching summer due to changed time-frame. Impacts family needs.
* While the couple of courses we have offered (so far) in compressed format are taught well by experienced faculty members who really need the extra income, the change in schedule that expanded the winter term & winter break has been very bad overall. Whatever increase in enrollment was produced by allowing more winter session courses to run is producing drops in summer/regular term enrollments and almost certainly no net increase, at least in our department. All the students I've spoken to are unhappy with the longer winter break since they get bored with 5 weeks off but can't get short-term jobs then. The forced cut in the length of the summer break means they have a smaller chance of getting summer jobs and fewer weeks they can earn less money if they do get them. The lack of gap between the end of SS B/II and

the fall term means that neither students nor full-time faculty are happy taking classes then and enrollment drops.

* Some faculty want to work in a compressed format and/or summers for the additional compensation. Others would like to teach in one of these semesters and then have a lighter load in Fall or Spring. Faculty who teach in semester other than Fall and Spring may be less likely to do some of the "service" work that the department needs.

This leaves the uncompensated service to fall to others.

* It has helped out a number of students who were either closed out of or are trying to catch up on classes in the regular semester.
* Few courses have made so it is hard to judge. I think students are not attracted because it costs so much more than doing it elsewhere, despite what we have been told--I have yet to see good market research or justification on this, and the caps are too high now. In terms of faculty work, I think we should be advocating for such courses to count toward load as we are still under contract--that would be a game changer. Right now, I think that it is a distraction and a way for faculty to think they will have income during those times but then disappointing when the classes do not fill. Similarly, it is a way for students to think they can take a course, but then when the enrollments are not there, a disappointment.

**Q24 - In the next few questions, we would like to focus on courses offered in the condensed format over the winter break and Maymester. If your department/program has not offered any courses in the condensed format, why?**

* Most courses are not offered, due to low demand and the compressed time period. We also like to do research.
* We view all summer courses and all Maymester courses condensed. This format is quite intense for students and faculty in core courses. Much tougher on both students and professors. Not all the material gets covered in the same quality as compared to 13-14 semesters.
* We haven't offered any courses in the compressed format yet as it seems like a real challenge to make the course "class" focused instead of "outside-of-class" focused. The college likes to place a lot of emphasis on actual class meetings, when the majority of the learning actually happens outside of class meetings (working independently or in the social learning spaces). In order to teach in a condensed format, the curriculum may need to be revised to allow students time to work and experiment with the concepts - rather than simply trying to "finish" an assignment.
* No upper level courses or significant core courses as there is too much material and one cannot learn it in 3 weeks.

**Q26 - What are some of the concerns in your department/program regarding courses offered in the condensed format over the winter break and/or Maymester?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer  | %  | Count  |
| There has been no concern whatsoever  | 14%  | 3  |
| Three weeks is not enough time to cover/process the material adequately  | 67%  | 14  |
| Students will be too tired after taking courses over the winter break to concentrate in the Spring semester  | 29%  | 6  |
| Faculty will be too exhausted after teaching courses over the winter break to function well in the Spring semester  | 38%  | 8  |
| Difficulty in assuring the quality of courses taught in the condensed format  | 43%  | 9  |
| Difficulty in providing sufficient administrative support  | 10%  | 2  |
| Difficulty in recruiting faculty  | 24%  | 5  |
| Concerned about enrollment  | 52%  | 11  |
| Other (please explain)  | 14%  | 3  |

# Analysis of Survey Results and Discussion

The low number of classes presently being offered at TCNJ during non-traditional semesters has made it challenging to collect good data. There needs to be a more systematic analysis of these classes done with better data on the actual classes that have been offered, and reflections by the faculty members who taught them and the students who took them. This committee has been hampered by lack of access to these data. However, we believe that the results of the chair survey we conducted does provide some useful insights into the reasons why these condensed courses have not been offered in great numbers.

The main reasons given for the low numbers of condensed format courses given during nontraditional semesters are: 1) three weeks is not enough time to cover the course material (67%); 2) Concerns about low enrollment and course cancellation (53%), 3); Difficulty of ensuring quality of courses taught in the condensed format (43%).

The survey also asked department chairs to share their opinion, as someone with a more macro view of the workings of the department, how offering courses in the highly compressed format over the winter break and/or Maymester has impacted their curriculum and faculty work. We find that most department chairs could recognize the need of their colleagues who needed the extra income and how offering these courses helped alleviate their financial pressure. A few chairs also recognized how offering courses over the winter break and/or Maymester can potentially help some students finish their requirements in a timely manner. However, many have expressed concerns regarding impact on enrollment in regular semester and faculty work.

With regard to enrollment, it appears that courses offered often did not run due to insufficient enrollment, causing disappointment on the parts of students and faculty. Some observed that offering the required courses outside the fall and spring semesters merely lower the enrollment of the courses offered during the fall and spring semesters, potentially resulting in low enrollment across the board. If this is the case, it can be quite disruptive to faculty work and problematic for course offering as classes scheduled during the fall and spring semesters within faculty load have to be cancelled due to low enrollment. One chair did point to the benefit of lightening the over-enrolled courses during the fall and spring semesters in their department, pointing to the function of offering winter break/Maymester courses as a way to alleviate pressure from departments with insufficient faculty to offer required courses in the curriculum during the fall and spring semesters.

A number of chairs pointed to the negative impacts of offering courses over the winter break on faculty work. Some mentioned the lack of transition time to start the spring semester as disorienting or exhausting. One chair pointed to the phenomenon of faculty teaching courses outside the fall and spring semesters being less likely to do service for the department, leaving the uncompensated service to their colleagues in the department. It is unclear whether this is an isolated incident or a more widespread phenomenon. If it is the latter, it can have very serious ramification for the culture of the College, negatively impacting morale and collegiality among faculty. This is a matter that certainly warrants further study perhaps by surveying all full-time faculty members. We do recognize that chairpersons have a uniquely macro perspective of the workings of the department and its division of labor, so their observation as expressed in this survey should be taken seriously. A science chair pointed out the lack of time for laboratory equipment maintenance and replacement when courses run all through the summer and winter break. This issue probably is relevant to all disciplines that have equipment maintenance needs and should be addressed with inputs from the departments that are potentially adversely affected.

A number of chairs reported no impact or very little impact largely because their departments offered very few or no courses in these highly compressed time-frame.

## Student Satisfaction Survey Results

The Office of Graduate and Intersession Programs provided the committee with survey results of student satisfaction with various kinds of courses (traditional, blended, and online only) given during Summer 2015 and Winter 2016. Summaries of these surveys are contained in Attachment B.

The responses indicate general satisfaction with these classes, but there is also considerable overlap in the kinds of complaints that students express with those expressed by chairs, most importantly, the feeling that there was not enough time to cover the course material in the compressed format. Student comments also indicate problems with course scheduling, faculty availability, and the variety of course offerings. Most of the classes in this survey were not faculty led foreign study tours, but there are a few comments in the report about these classes. Anecdotal evidence suggests that students are in general very satisfied with faculty led study tours, but there does not seem to be much data available to support this.

## Best Practices in Delivering Courses in Condensed Formats

In a review of the literature related to best practices related to designing and teaching courses in compressed formats, while not extensive, supports the idea that the quality of the teaching/learning experience is comparable to when the same subject matter is taught in a longer format, especially if the quality of the teaching is high. Research suggests that courses taught in a compressed format are not inferior to courses taught in a full-semester format, in fact, depending on the specific context, these courses may be superior. Further, most studies pointed to the use of technology as being a best practice when developing and teaching courses in compressed formats, specifically when the pace of the teaching/learning s increased. Blended and on-line formats open up the possibility of enhancing learning in and outside the classroom.

Best practices for teaching in compressed formats include:

1. Focus on what needs to be covered – teaching a course in a compressed format requires courses to fit the schedule. What can you do in that time?
2. Determine what students need to know – using the concept of “prioritized learning,” – must know, need to know, nice to know. Need to know determination is based on requirements in the discipline, curriculum standards, professional practice, sequencing of courses, etc.
3. Deal with complex and important topics early – need to know comes first based upon pressure building at the end of a course.
4. Modify processes and structures to fit the faster pace – more breaks, shared readings, pre-reading assignments, mixed methods of delivery to vary pace and stimulate interest, including activity-oriented and discussion-focused instruction.
5. Schedule assignments to fit the “rhythm” of the course – take into consideration the various aspects of the compressed schedule – frequency of meetings, limited time between meetings, and capacity to complete certain types of assignments.
6. Deconstruct single longer assignments – create more frequent, shorter assignments, assignments should start ASAP, provide early feedback to enhance motivation and performance.
7. Relocate activities/assignments – moving some assignments to outside of class time, as well as pre- and post-course assignments to spread workload beyond the compressed schedule.
8. Choose assignments that fit the schedule – avoid long papers, complex group assignments, and research involving primary sources. The time required to do these assignments well, in combination with the challenge for instructors to provide substantive feedback make it difficult for all.
9. Plan over a longer time horizon – planning needs to include contingencies, considerations of requirements and differences with a compressed schedule. Good organization is key.
10. Check the pace regularly – Check in with students in a variety of ways about the pace.
11. Coach students on time management – need to remind students about requirements, pacing, beginning work early, and against overextending with other things (work, extracurriculars, etc.).
12. “Clear the Decks” logistically and mentally – instructors need to give full attention during compressed terms. Avoid more than one although this has to do with experience of the instructor, type of class, delivery methods, etc.
13. Take advantage of a continuity of class meetings.
14. Take time to get to know your students – take advantage of smaller, more relaxed session to get to know students and allows for building class community.
15. Be more available to students.
16. Provide support, organizers, and guides.
17. Supply prepared lecture notes.

On the whole, instructors who have been successful teaching in compressed formats highlight that they did not require that they lower expectations, standards, or quality. Rather, these instructors emphasize redesigning courses, with an emphasis on reading requirements and adjusting tests and assignments led to better learning experiences for their students – capitalizing on the differences of teaching in a compressed format.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

Despite the limitations of our study, we believe that our results enable us to draw several tentative conclusions:

1. Some faculty at TCNJ are finding it difficult to teach regular semester long (4 credit) courses in a condensed format in the non-traditional terms. Faculty have noted that not every course is well-suited to a condensed format.
2. While some students do find these courses attractive, many others do not register for them for various reasons, leading to typically low enrollments and frequent cancellations.
3. At present there is scant data on whether the condensed courses given at TCNJ are in fact achieving their learning goals and outcomes and whether they are in fact equivalent to the same courses taught during the regular semesters.

These finding appear to be true when we look only at regular 4-credit courses given in the compressed terms. The important exceptions noted by several respondents are Faculty-led Study Tours, and Internships. There is also some indication that on-line and blended courses might be more appropriate for the compressed time frame, but more research is needed to determine whether this is true. The small number of classed of this kind makes it difficult at this time to draw any robust conclusions about this.

There was one idea that emerged from our discussions that we feel merits further study, namely, the idea of offering “mini-courses” worth 1 or 2 credits during the non-traditional terms rather than trying to condense regular 4 credit courses into this format. Several departments have been experimenting with mini-courses, but mainly these are being offered during the regular fall and spring semesters concurrently with regular 4 credit courses. The advantage of this for students is that they can take these short form mini-courses without paying any additional fees during the regular semesters.

But it is also possible to develop and offer 1 or 2 credit mini-courses during the non-traditional terms, the Winter term, the Maymester, and the Summer Sessions. In this case, students would have to pay extra to take these classes, and faculty members who teach them would receive appropriate overload compensation for them. If mini-courses were developed and offered during the non-traditional terms they could fit better into the time frames allotted for them, offer students an intense and focused learning experience that would not be as exhausting and would allow them some vacation time, and it would provide faculty members with the opportunity to develop interesting and creative short courses on specific topics that would enhance the variety of curricular offerings.

The availability of 1 and 2 credit mini-courses would also allow students who transfer 3 credit courses from other universities to make up the ¼ or ½ credits they need in order to satisfy the 4 credit course standard used at TCNJ. While many such courses would not be suitable for fulfilling major and minor requirements in most departments, some of them might be eligible for liberal learning course credit, and if so, would give students an option for satisfying these requirements outside of the normal semesters. It is also possible to offer 2-credit courses required by majors and minors in two different minimesters, for instance, offer students the first half the course during the January term and the second half in the following Maymester. This would overcome the difficulty of compressing a lot of material into a condensed format, and would perhaps make it possible to adapt more reading and writing intensive courses to the compressed format.

If this suggestion is to be pursued, we recommend that a small group of interested faculty be incentivized to develop such 1 and 2 credit mini-courses through small grants provided by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), and that they be piloted and the results be carefully tracked and analyzed before they are accepted into the curriculum. We also recommend that faculty prepare for teaching compressed courses by enrolling in training sessions similar to the ones now being given for faculty teaching blended and on-line classes, which will acquaint them with best practices for delivering instruction in a compressed format. The CETL has expressed interest in providing such faculty development opportunities next year.

Finally, we urge that departments should consistently collect learning outcomes and assessment data on nontraditional courses and instructional methods in order to determine their comparability to regular semester long courses.

Appendix A

The Faculty Senate committee on non-traditional courses has been charged to examine the issues involving courses offered outside the Fall and Spring semesters. These courses include courses offered in Summer sessions I & II, and condensed courses offered over the winter break (begins immediately after Fall semester ends and ends right before Spring semester begins) and Maymester (begins immediately after final exams end and ends right before Summer session I in early June).

In this survey, the committee would like to invite department chairs and program directors to share your thoughts and experiences on this matter. Your input is crucial for the committee’s effort to put together a comprehensive report on this important matter. The survey data will be kept confidential and used only for the Faculty Senate committee report. Your participation is entirely voluntary and can skip any question(s) you do not want to answer.

The survey should not take more than 15-20 minutes from your very busy schedule. Having the list of courses offered outside the Fall and Spring semesters in the past few years by your department or having your program assistant with you will help you answer the questions in the first part of the survey. Your participation in this survey will be greatly appreciated.

1. The courses offered by your department/program in the winter break and/or Maymester in the past two years are: (Please check all that applies)
	* Core courses in your program
	* Elective courses in your program
	* Liberal Learning courses
	* Other (Please specify)\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. The courses offered by your department/program in Summer Session I and/or II in the past two years are: (Please check all that applies)
	* Core courses in your program
	* Elective courses in your program
	* Liberal Learning courses
	* Other (Please specify)\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How many courses will your department/program offer in the coming Maymester (May 2016)?
	* 0
	* 1-2  3-4
	* 5 or more
	* Not sure
2. How many courses will your department/program offer in the two summer sessions in 2016?
	* 0
	* 1-2
	* 3-4
	* 5 or more
	* Not sure
3. How many courses will your department/program offer in the winter break of AY 201617?
	* 0
	* 1-2  3-4
	* 5 or more
	* Not sure

1. The courses your department/program will be offering in the winter break and/or Maymester of AY 2016-17 are: (Please check all that applies)

* + Core courses in your program
	+ Elective courses in your program
	+ Liberal Learning courses
	+ Other (Please specify)\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. The courses your department/program will be offering in the two summer sessions of 2016 are: (Please check all that applies)

* + Core courses in your program
	+ Elective courses in your program
	+ Liberal Learning courses
	+ Other (Please specify)\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Prior to 2016, has your department/program conducted **any** student course evaluations on courses offered outside the Fall and Spring semesters?
	* Yes, student course evaluations have been conducted in **all** courses offered outside the Fall and Spring semesters
	* Yes, student course evaluations have been conducted in **some** of the courses offered outside the Fall and Spring semester.
	* **No,** student course evaluation has been conducted in courses offered outside the Fall and Spring semesters (please skip the next question)
	* I don’t know

1. If you have conducted student course evaluations in some courses offered outside the Fall and Spring semester prior to 2016, which are they? (Please check all that applies)

* + Courses offered over the winter break
	+ Courses offered in the Maymester
	+ Courses offered in Summer session I
	+ Courses offered in Summer session II

1. Did your department/program conduct teaching observation of instructors in courses taught outside the Fall and Spring semester?

* + Always
	+ Occasionally
	+ Never been done

1. Will the courses taught outside the Fall and Spring semester be included in the student learning outcome assessment of your program?

* + Yes, all of them
	+ Yes, some of them
	+ No

1. If yes, how many of the courses have undergone student learning outcome assessment?

* + 0
	+ 1-2
	+ 3 or more

1. If no, does your department/program have plans to conduct student learning outcome assessment of these courses?

* + Yes
	+ No
	+ It has been discussed but there is no definite plan

1. How does your department/program decide which courses are appropriate to offer over the **winter break** in a more condensed format? (Please describe criteria used and indicate if you are willing to share the document detailing these criteria)

1. Who can offer these courses over the winter break?
	* + Anyone who volunteers
		+ Only full-time faculty
		+ Other (please explain)

1. How does your department/program decide which courses are appropriate to offer during the **Maymester** in a more condensed format? (Please describe the criteria used and indicate if you are willing to share the document detailing these criteria)

1. Who can offer these courses during the Maymester?
	* + Anyone who volunteers
		+ Only full-time faculty
		+ Other (please explain)

1. How does your department/program decide which courses are appropriate to offer in **Summer sessions I & II**? (please describe the criteria used and indicate if you are willing to share the document detailing these criteria)

1. Who can offer these courses in Summer sessions I & II?
	* + Anyone who volunteers
		+ Only full-time faculty
		+ Other (please explain)

1. In your opinion, how has offering courses in the compressed format in the winter break and/or Maymester impacted your curriculum and faculty work? (Please explain in the space provided)

***In the next few questions, we would like to focus on courses offered in the condensed format over the winter break and Maymester.***

1. If your department/program has not offered any courses in the condensed format, why? (Please explain in the space provided)

1. If your department/program has not offered any courses in the condensed format in the past, how many such courses do you foresee being offered per year in the two upcoming academic years?
	* + 0
		+ 1-2 per year
		+ 3-4 per year
		+ 5 or more per year
		+ Not sure

1. What are some of the concerns in your department/program regarding courses offered in the condensed format over the winter break and/or Maymester? (Please check all that applies)

* + - There has been no concern whatsoever
		- Three weeks is not enough time to cover/process the material adequately
		- Students will be too tired after taking courses over the winter break to concentrate in the Spring semester
		- Faculty will be too exhausted after teaching courses over the winter break to function well in the Spring semester
		- Difficulty in assuring the quality of courses taught in the condensed format
		- Difficulty in providing sufficient administrative support
		- Difficulty in recruiting faculty
		- Concerned about enrollment
		- Other (please explain)

1. Has your department/program considered offering partial unit (1/4 or ½ unit) courses outside the Fall and Spring semesters, and why?

* + - Yes (please explain)
		- No (please explain)

1. What school is your department/program in?

* + - Arts and Communication
		- Business
		- Education
		- Engineering
		- Humanities and Social Sciences
		- Nursing
		- Science

 **Attachment 2**

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE**

**FACULTY COMMITTEES**

**Sabbatical**- Three 3-year terms, Business, Education and Humanities

Michele Naples, Stuart Roe, Pierre Le Morvan

**Support of Scholarly Activity**- Four 3-year terms, TWO 1-year replacements

Bethany Sewell, Andrea Salgian, Donka Mirtcheva, Thulsi Wickramasinghe, Sandy Gibson (1-year replacement), SEAT for Social Science is OPEN

**COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEES**

**Steering**- One 3-year term, one 1-year replacement

Wayne Heisler, Michael Robertson (1-year replacement)

**Committee on Strategic Planning and Priorities CSPP**- Two 3-year terms

Robert McGreevey, Janet Morrison

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS CAP**- Two 3-year terms, one 1-year replacement

Matt Hall, Christopher Wagner, Aigli Papantonopoulou (1-year replacement)

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS CFA** –Three 3-year terms

Mike Marino, Manish Paliwal, Cathy Weng

**CSCC**- Two 3-year terms

Suriza Vander Sandt

**PROGRAM COUNCILS**

**Advising and Student Support Services**- Two 3-year terms, one 1-year, one 1-semester

Kathryn Elliott

**Athletics Program Council**- One 3-year term

Sudhir Nayak

**Cultural and Intellectual Community CICPC**- Three 3-year terms

Forest Link, Manuel Figueroa

**Faculty Student Collaboration**- Three 3-year terms (Natural Sci, Business, Humanities)

Curt Elderkin, Lynn Tang

**Global Engagement**- Two 3-year terms

Nelson Rodriguez, Xuefeng Wei

**Graduate Programs**- Two 3-year terms

Jo Carney

**Healthy Campus**- One 3-year term

Anthony Lau

**Honors and Scholars**- Two 3-year terms

Glenn Steinberg

**Liberal Learning**- Four 3-year terms, One 2-year term

Solange Lopes-Murphy, Ann Marie Nicolosi

**Teaching and Learning**- Two 3-year terms

Louise Ammentorp

**PLANNING COUNCILS**

No recommendations

**OTHER**

**First Seminar Coordinating Committee**- Three 3-year terms, one 1-year term

Lincoln Konkle, Leeann Thornton, Kathleen Webber

**Attachment 3**

Date: 05/09/2016

Report on CFA Activities to Faculty Senate

Donald Hirsh

CFA work has focused on two major items:

1. CFA invited representatives of the Sabbatical Committee to discuss CFA's recommendations regarding the Sabbatical RFP form. The Sabbatical Committee revised the form which will be reviewed at the next CFA meeting.
2. CFA continues its revision of the Reappointment and Promotions Document (RPD), formerly PRD, using the feedback gathered at the open forum.

**Attachment 4**

CSPP Report for the Faculty Senate

The Committee on Strategic Planning and Priorities will conclude its year with a retreat that will focus on setting an agenda for the 2016-2017 academic year. The Board of Trustees recently approved the College’s new strategic plan, and CSPP has spent much of the semester considering different implementation and reporting plans. CSPP anticipates taking an even more active role in the revised governance system and expects to hear reports from multiple Cabinet officers each year about their unit’s progress in meeting the strategic plan.

David Blake

May 9, 2016

**Attachment 5**

**CSCC Report**

CSCC held open forums on the Title IX Policy and the Undergraduate/Graduate Student Conduct Code.  The CSCC hopes to have a vote on final recommendations for both those policies before the end of May.  CSCC also reviewed a revision of the Protection of Children on Campus Policy, which addressed most of the original questions and objections to that policy from several years ago (when it was instituted as an interim policy).

**Attachment 6**

Report on the Board of Trustees

April 22, 2016

In preparation for its April meeting the Board of Trustees undertook a thorough review of its Bylaws. The revised version has several changes that were made in order to continually improve the process by which the Board makes decisions. In particular, the four committees that had representation from all stakeholders have been combined to create two committees, so that members of those committees can think more holistically about issues. These are Institutional Primary Purpose (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Enrollment), and Business and Infrastructure (Buildings and Grounds, Finance, Campus Safety, IT). This has also allowed changes to be made to the Board meeting schedule itself, such that more time will be available at the meetings to have substantive discussions.

Respectfully submitted: M. O’Connell