

Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2010-11)

Committee:	Academic Affairs Committee	Prepared By:	Adrienne Lane	Date:	4/06/11
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	---------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	B. Reigle, Nelson Horseman, Teresa Roig-torres, A. Lane (Chair) Guests: Olga Hart (Libraries), William Fant (Pharmacy)
--	---

Topics Discussed:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The minutes from the 03/08/11 were approved as distributed via email. A. Lane will have posted to FS website. 2. Information and Media Literacy—Implications for Gen Ed.—Olga Hart from Libraries and Bill Fant from Pharmacy were invited to the meeting to share their concerns related to Information Literacy and Student Code of Conduct. Both had previously notified A. Lane regarding their concerns and their desire to have FSAAC involvement with resolution of the issues. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bill shared his insights related to student cheating, the impact of social media, the honor code, etc. He also shared the issue of faculty responsibility for ‘closing the door’ on processes that allow cheating. He expressed an interest in including information related to this issue in Orientation Week at the University. He reported that Pharmacy has added 5 new sections to their syllabus that deal with testing and misconduct. He posed the question ‘should the university have a council to deal with violations of a ‘code of conduct’? His desire is that FSAAC begin an ‘academic’ discussion related to these issues...the discussion may include students. Components of related action could include faculty development, faculty orientation, student orientation, student education and ultimately an update to the code of conduct. b. Olga shared an overview of work that has been done by a Libraries committee...she will forward the report to A Lane. She stressed that there are many faces of academic violations. She suggested the need to include information literacy into each course...specifically the ethical and legal use of information. She reported highlights from the library report which included a campus-wide initiative, a portal for IL for both students and faculty, and a tutorial much like the one at Indiana.edu. She shared that confounding factors include collaborative learning, social media, instability of posting via wiki, lack of personal authorship, etc. Her desire is to have a conversation that comes not from the top down. She suggested possible use of focus groups. c. Key points of this discussion included it is a losing strategy to focus on Don’t Do...the focus should be on Positive Aspects/Value of Academic Integrity, must include international students in this conversation particularly due to impact of culture, the cost and risk associate with violation of the Honor Code should be sufficient to serve as a dis-incentive, the current code of conduct needs revised, the course at CoM on Research Integrity may serve as an example, and the conversation might best be accomplished through collaboration among FS, UG Student Government and Grad Student Government. d. The focus on the May FSAAC meeting will be to develop a charge for a formal action plan to present to FS for support at the May meeting.
--------------------------	--

	<p>3. NG and New OBR rule—Adrienne shared that last evening she received notification from Rich Harknett that Kristi Nelson and a team had forwarded their recommendation for Senate support regarding the new OBR rule that beginning Fall 2011 a component of state subsidy would be linked to ‘completion’ of courses. Given this information Kristi’s team had recommended that the NG grade be closely reviewed and that, in fact, the grade be only awarded by the Registrar not faculty. Data show that if the new rule were retroactively applied to 2005 to 2010, UC would have lost \$3.1 million dollars. Since 2005 the number of NGs remaining per year number from over 700 to over 1000...these are NGs not resolved. In 2003 the FS resolved that all course instructors have a responsibility to submit grades for every student using only UC approved grades. After discussion the FSAAC stated we would recommend that FS support a PR campaign that reaffirmed the 2003 FS resolution, restated the approved UC grades, and shared the new OBR rule and impact on economics. Additionally the FSAAC discussed the need for more data regarding this issue...why are NGs given and the need to unit head oversight of and/or reminders for faculty awarding NG grade. The FSAAC reaffirmed that grading was within the purview of faculty. Also the FSAAC believes the 2003 Grading document needs to be revised, particularly in light of semester conversion. Adrienne will share these comments with FS Cabinet on 4/7.</p>
--	--

<p>Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background</p>	
---	--

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
	<input type="checkbox"/> By Faculty Senate <input type="checkbox"/> By Cabinet <input type="checkbox"/> Others (List-)
Next Meeting Date? Uptown TBA	

When complete, save your report with the committee name and report date as the file name. Please send the file to Faculty Senate (Faculty.Senate@uc.edu). Thank you!