

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, December 3, 2019**

FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS

| Present? | Senator / Representative | Position | Proxy Name? |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Y | Caputo, Cristina | ADMIN; 2nd year senator/Secretary | |
| Y | Kunkle, Alexander | ADMIN; 2nd year senator | Late |
| Y | LaMotte, Phil | ADMIN; 2nd year senator/Parliamentarian | |
| Y | Nava, Vincent | ADMIN; 1st year senator | |
| Y | Le-Nguyen, Janice | ADMIN; 1st year senator | |
| Y | Draper, Christine | AT-LARGE; one-year senator | |
| Y | Bieser, Kayla | LAS; 2nd year senator | |
| Y | Cash, Becky | LAS; 2nd year senator | |
| Y | Howerton, Amber | LAS; 2nd year senator | |
| Y | Meertins, Jasmine | LAS; 2nd year senator | |
| Y | Silva, Nathan | LAS; 2nd year senator | |
| Y | Edmonds, Jennifer | LAS; 1st year senator | |
| N | Haff, Darlene | LAS; 1st year senator | Absent |
| Y | Jewell, Samantha | LAS; 1st year senator | Late |
| N | Tapia, Raul | LAS; 1st year senator | Absent |
| Y | Lutz, Kelly | LIBRARY; 1st year senator | |
| Y | Price, Jessica | PTI; one-year senator | |
| Y | Mari, Vanessa | SOE; 2nd year senator | |
| Y | Beaudry, Christine | SOE; 1st year senator | |
| Y | Jones, Sharon | SOE; 1st year senator | |
| Y | Evanski, Andrew | SON; 2nd year senator | |
| Y | Larocco, Angelo | SON; 1st year senator | |
| Y | Johnson, Michael | SON; 1st year senator | |
| Y | Borines, Zarah | SON; 2nd year senator | |
| 22 | Total Voting Present | | |
| Y | Quorum Met? | | |
| | | | |
| Y | Ballif, Serge | Chair, non-voting | |
| Y | Naumann, Laura | Vice Chair, non-voting | |
| Y | Peters, Abby | Past Chair, non-voting | Late |
| N | Opfer, Nicola | NSSA advisory, non-voting | Noah Maatouk |
| | | | |

GUESTS

- | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Gwen Sharp | 5. Tiffany Garrett | 9. Kimberly Williams |
| 2. Tony Scinta | 6. Kevin Butler | 10. Shartriya Collier |
| 3. Bart Patterson | 7. Vickie Shields | |
| 4. Nathaniel King | 8. Shantal Marshall | |

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

**Tuesday, December 3, 2019
3:45 - 5:45 PM | NSE 105**

All supplementary materials are available on the Faculty Senate Canvas Page under the 'Agendas' Tab.

| Time | Agenda Item | Type of Item |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Est. 3:45 PM | I. CALL TO ORDER | |
| 3:50 PM | II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES Motion: Senator Silva Second: Senator Le-Nguyen Vote: Unanimous | Action |
| | III. OPEN MEETING PRESENTATIONS | |
| 3:50 - 3:55 PM | III. A. Amber Howerton & Shartiya Collier - Curriculum Committee Updates and Early Childhood Education Degree Amber Howerton - Below is an overview of the number of proposals reviewed by the Curriculum Committee to date for 2019-2020: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● September: 2 Degree Proposals ● October: 4 Degree Proposals; 14 Course Proposals; 10 Prerequisite Changes ● November: 10 Degree Proposals; 65 Course Proposals; 12 Prerequisite Changes Shartriya Collier- there is a huge teacher shortage in the state especially for early childhood education and special needs (reference handout) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refer to learning outcomes in attached handout; teachers will receive hands on training through Early Childhood Education Center; multilingual education, etc.; would be qualified to support K-2 - The survey for potential child care services through the early childhood center was sent out; there will be 3 classrooms for students/faculty/community (48 slots available) - There will be tuition/fees associated with the center | Information |
| 3:55 - 4:05 PM | III. B. Janice Le-Nguyen - IDEA Course Evaluation Platform Discussion to change evaluation system. A system demonstration was hosted for the IDEA platform and documents were shared via slack/Canvas page. Questions/Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Edmonds: number of questions in this new system is higher so would that cause more frustration in student responses? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are several options for how we can structure the amount of questions ○ Even have the option to not require responses ● Beaudry: Norm referenced criteria vs. criterion referenced (current structure); what's the rationale for that shift? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Normed: can see comparison to other similar programs/instructors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Senator Beaudry: clarification as demo host shared that you wouldn't be able to compare across the board in a validated manner due to lacking enough data ○ Still discussing what type of criteria will be used in the evaluations ● Howerton: didn't think current LAS evals were criteria-based thought they were norm/peer referenced? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Difference between Dept. Chairs adjusting vs. raw scores from the | Information |

platform

- Jewell: Is it possible to have an example of an evaluation that looks across institutions; what is the timeline for deciding on a new system?
 - Le-Nguyen: The plan is to examine what we're doing currently regardless to make improvements to questions/criteria
 - Shooting for end of the spring semester for a decision
 - Sharp: don't have to commit at the same time of P & T process
- Edmonds: Revising Core Curriculum- consider different evals for Core vs. major courses, etc.
- The IR Office/SandipThanki is open to feedback from faculty

Follow Up Summary Sent By Chair Balliff (via Canvas after meeting):

The Promotion and Tenure Taskforce (which started out as the Standards of Academe Taskforce) has been looking into the possibility of switching our teacher evaluation system from Evaluation Kit to IDEA. We won't be pushing faculty to make a hasty decision, but it is important for faculty to familiarize themselves with the options so that we can have informed discussions in Spring Semester. A video of the demo for faculty is available at <https://nsc.yuja.com/V/Video?v=547991&node=2546474&a=162090503&autoplay=1>.

Here is a brief summary of some of the pros and cons of switching to IDEA (aka Campus Labs).

Pros

- IDEA is a system of standardized and validated questions that allow for comparisons across disciplines. We can also add our own questions on top of the default questions.
- IDEA provides an adjusted score based off of student background preparation, work habits, motivation, and class size to adjust for student and course characteristics beyond an instructor's control.
- IDEA provides actionable suggestions to instructors (based off correlational data) on how to improve their teaching.

Cons

- Switching to a new system creates logistical challenges. The technical backend work is nontrivial, and we would need to figure out how to handle the tenure decisions for faculty that under two different evaluations systems.
 - We aren't using EvaluationKit to its full potential.
 - We haven't changed our questions in years.
 - Evaluation Kit doesn't share the features that were listed as Pros for IDEA, but we do have the ability to change the questions we ask.
 - EvaluationKIT has the capability to force a response and account for our high response rates (85-98%)
 - EvaluationKIT has the option of withholding Canvas grades (which did not garner much support at Faculty Senate when

| | | |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| | <p>presented a couple years back), we did pilot in Nursing courses and did see a drop in response rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reporting within EvaluationKIT can be tailored and benchmarked – How that report is configured, faculty and executive leadership can let the Course Evaluation System admin know, <i>regardless</i> of the system. <p>Faculty are encouraged to post questions and carry out the discussion in the <i>Nevada State College slack workspace in the #idea_demo channel.</i></p> | |
| 4:00 - 4:10 PM | <p>III. C. Gwen Sharp & Vickie Shields - Lecturer Promotion Policy</p> <p>Thanks to those that helped with drafting the policy (see list of the policy contributors). This policy intends to reward/promote faculty and is one piece of several initiatives over the past year to do so. This policy was built from existing promotion language for current faculty and will eventually be wrapped into larger Promotion & Tenure (P&T) policy that is being drafted but serves as a placeholder to give lecturers a pathway for promotion now.</p> <p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommending changing titles in current draft (in order to clarify level/promotion) from Lecturer/Assoc. Lecturer/Senior Lecturer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lecturer 1, Lecturer 2, and Senior Lecturer OR ○ Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Distinguished Lecturer ● Note: “rank” won’t actually change with promotion so that word has to be replaced with “level” in the document (based on feedback from HR) ● This policy looks very similar to the current policy with some differences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The third year review will be optional although highly recommended if going through process ○ Instead of scholarly efforts, one must engage in creative activities or professional development (per committee recommendation). This allows for a wide array of activities within the teaching focus especially since scholarship is not expected of Lecturers. NOTE: Research/publishing can not be used to promote a Lecturer or it would create workload/equity issues, since scholarship is not required in the job description for lecturers. ○ “Promotion Raises” (see document) is still under discussion in order to determine what the criteria or reference groups will be; possibly have to consider a base rate based on mean/median salary data to avoid compression. ○ HR did suggest adjusting policy language in regards to “renewing contracts” in case there are fiscal constraints ● Will be the same cycle as the Promotion & Tenure process starting next year ● Questions/Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Senator Beaudry: If people are eligible for this cycle, will they be allowed to apply directly to the highest rank? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ That is still to be determined and there is lots of discussion about that question ○ Please continue providing feedback in the shared Google document | Information |
| 4:10 - 4:20 PM | III. D. Tony Scinta - Update on Complete College America (CCA) project | Information |

Accreditation process revealed that we need to consistently connect our work back to the larger plan so this update aims to do that.

Metro Momentum Pathways Project (as part of CCA):

- Involved per NSHE participation and focuses on 3 CCA elements which involves areas or goals that we've already identified or are working on at NSC:
 - Gateway Math and English redesign
 - The decision to remove remedial math at NSHE level is a big part of this pathway
 - Proactive advising and degree maps;
 - Starfish will help us do better proactive advising and degree mapping
 - Momentum Year which is defined as earlier career counseling for students to give them a better idea of sooner about degree path options:
 - Students who accrue more credits in their first year have higher retention/graduation rates
 - We need to invest in options that allow for greater or more flexible credit accumulation such as “meta majors” which are broader pathways that allow students to change majors and still apply a majority of previously acquired credits to the new path/degree.
 - Having conversations with LAS about course scheduling/availability in order to provide more class time options for students so they can increase the courses they enroll in. We have to solve scheduling challenges/bottle necks or it undermines the impact of our other efforts and services.
- Questions:
 - Caputo: Is “Metro Momentum Pathways” synonymous with “Complete College America”? Same thing or different?
 - CCA is the larger umbrella initiative; Metro Momentum is specific to the region that our college falls under.
 - Edmonds: are we on this path forever or does it terminate/complete? Is there external funding for this?
 - It's a 3 year project/commitment and we are currently in the 2nd year which is the planning stage. By the end of the 3rd year the goal is to have a solid foundation for the above elements discussed.
 - Yes we receive some funding but, part of the funds are used to consult with CCA. There are no funds available for new programming or services.

4:20 - 4:30 PM

III. E. Bart Patterson - Nevada State University

- Considering changing name from Nevada State “College” to “University”-- Why?
 - Over the years, NSHE Community Colleges have moved solely to “college” in their naming and that has created confusion in the marketplace about who we are/what we do. For example, legislators struggle with understanding that we are a 4-year institution and not a community college.
 - We are forestalling an eventual change that will likely happen as

| | | |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| | <p>we develop more majors and more master degrees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are intended to be a CSU type of institution. Changing our name now does not change our Carnegie classification or mission/teaching focus. It is largely a cosmetic change. ○ Talking internally and externally about this; the Chancellor is not resistant to this change but will speak with Board of Regents (BOR) in the coming week. ○ There will be a ballot change coming in the fall which could impact decision making and could elevate the issue to the BOR as early as March or June. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Questions/Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jewell: will the name be “Nevada State University” or “NS-Henderson”? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It will be NS University. We already use “State” in all our current branding instead of “college” so it fits well ○ Edmonds: Will a name change cause any issues with getting external funding/grant status? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Should not change any of those pieces for accreditation or funding eligibility ○ Ballif: Any push back or possible reasons why this may be a bad idea? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None received so far; the Universities may not be happy about it but it is not their decision to make ○ Borines: Any additional expectations from faculty as a result of the name change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No ○ Caputo: Does the timing of a name change now along with recent admissions changes cause any negative issues or concerns? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Could be positive as it shows that we’re evolving overall and elevating our standards ○ Kunkle: Based on advising sessions with students, students don’t understand that we are not a two year school now so a name change clarifies what we do ○ Sharp: How do we manage the expectation gap of what a “university” means since we’re not in line yet with CSU in terms of services or resources, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Not sure, but we’re seeing confusion on the other side now ■ Will have to decide in the future if we want to apply to carnegie classification under regional comprehensive category; most who apply under that category are universities | |
| 4:30 - 4:35 PM | <p>III. F. Nathaniel King and Tiffany Garrett - No-Cost Textbook Grants</p> <p>Refer to presentation slides</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Since 2017 the initiative has saved students over \$600K in textbook fees ● Based on 2018 institute, students who took reformatted classes had higher grades and lower DFW rates than students who completed the previous course format ● Will expand to a grant program starting in Spring 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Application/criteria will be sent out by end of year via email; looking to target courses with high enrollment ○ Will provide dedicated support for course design and Library and CTLE staff will assist you to design a plan | Information |

| | | |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Usability testing is provided which tracks where students' eyes focus on the course page/etc. ○ Funding consistent with SSI and TFI; must be completed by June 2020 ● President Patterson: We have nominated the Library for a Good Government award for this work | |
| 4:35 - 4:45 PM | <p>III. G. Kevin Butler & Steve Thompson - Campus Parking Refer to presentation slides</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Keep an eye on the number of total parking spaces shown throughout the slides as we have added 410 spaces with temporary lot and total spots will increase once completed ● 7-8 phases of parking changes over the next two years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Following break: temporary lot is now closed so housing contractor can run sewage/water lines; will re-open later in January ○ At 1100 stalls right now; from 12/16-12/31 after finals; education building construction will begin and entire upper lot will go away; temporary lot will still be closed ○ Temporary lot will return at the beginning of January; parking lot on south side of future building will be started yielding 462 stalls ○ By the end of March we will be back up to 1500 stalls ○ Summer starting in June we will lose lower level parking; next fall will have added parking from the housing village resulting in 1600+ stalls ○ When Education building finishes we gain additional parking as well ● Safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Added additional parking lines/lanes on paradise hills; will formally post signs for no parking in the future to reduce walking/street safety concerns ● Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jewell: Clarify where housing will be on map ○ LaMotte: Will parking be enforced at housing? ○ Marshall: Can we encourage students to bike/commute to encourage sustainability? Is there any liability if we provide the means for students to find rideshare options/carpooling ○ Price: paint lines more clearly so people can't take up multiple spots <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ We will repaint after building construction has finished ○ Borines: Nursing faculty member accepted job here because of our parking privileges so it is important to retain adequate parking | Information |
| 4:45 - 4:55 PM | <p>III. H. Vickie Shields - Provost Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accreditation Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Submitted corrections of fact but have not received follow up report back yet ○ Tony and Bart will meet with Commissioners on Jan. 8th ○ Copy of Commission Action letter will be sent to the college following that meeting indicating our status. We can respond/address their feedback in a follow up action letter. ● Faculty Requests/Budget Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attempted initial rankings; have Dean's council meeting next week to continue ranking ○ Will send rankings to Business Office by Jan. 31st. Thanks to the | Information |

| | | |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| | <p>Business Office for providing a more generous timeline than in years past.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are less full time academic faculty requests than last year so this may be the year to emphasize other areas like support service areas. ● Promotion & Tenure Process: : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P & T committee has all materials/files needed. Will have to send recommendations to the Provost by Jan. 3rd. Provost Shields will review and pass on to President Patterson by Jan. 17th and then they will be sent on to Board of Regents. | |
| 4:55 - 5:05 PM | <p>III. I. Laura Naumann - Salary Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gallagher presented preliminary updates to the working group ● Provided recommendations to college; market based adjustments for compression; proposed shadow salary schedule which involves zones/categories based on disciplines ● Takeaways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Zone approach allows us to resolve compression issues; NSC categories/zones vs. the market data ○ Competitiveness of salaries is based on overall averages; not discipline specific, hoping that information will be coming soon ○ There is work/adjustments to be made with some lecturers and administrative faculty pay ● Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bieser: clarifying what data to ignore from Slide 50 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ignore all of it; just an example, not specific to NSC ■ HR intends to give every employee a snapshot of their analysis but that won't happen for quite a while ○ Kunkle: for Admin. Faculty they are looking at splitting up C and D grades into new tiers ○ Bieser: does name change influence peer institutions in salary study or pay comparison? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Patterson: No, colleges weren't used as peer institutions so not an issue ○ Marshall: since comparing us to peers is the zoning suggestion based on peer institutions? If so, are faculty content with that approach? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Naumann: Not clear; but can ask about that ■ Shields: Zones are based on CUPA data | Information |
| 5:05 - 5:15 PM | <p>III. J. Shantal Marshall & Cristina Caputo - Faculty Tutoring Testimonials Positively Impact Student's Perceptions of Tutoring</p> <p>Dr. Marshall partnered with the Academic Success Center (ASC) in Spring 2019 to assess student perceptions of tutoring. Dr. Marshall was coordinating with an ASC Tutor, Eric Monarrez, to provide support for her PSY 210 course. Typically she has course support available from a Course Assistant (CA) for PSY 210 but a CA was not available last spring so she partnered with the ASC for additional support. Dr. Marshall and the tutor observed that students were not utilizing the available tutoring services and coordinated with the ASC Staff to design a study to gauge student's perceptions of tutoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Study Design/Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students were given a survey and asked to answer questions after being shown specific materials. Half were shown the general ASC | Information |

| | | |
|----------------|--|--------|
| | <p>website with information about tutoring services and the other half were shown the website plus faculty bios/testimonials about their positive experiences with tutoring (see sample bios in the above linked presentation slides).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was a small sample size (n=27) but students who saw the faculty bios/testimonials (n=17) were more likely to perceive tutoring as beneficial/positive and more likely to make an appointment at the ASC (statistically significant: $t(27) = 1.42, p = .17$ and $t(27) = 2.13, p = .04$). ○ Faculty testimonials that communicate the benefits of tutoring have the ability to enhance student perceptions and usage of NSC tutoring services. ● Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The ASC is coordinating with the Marketing Office to create formal faculty tutoring testimonials in print and electronic formats in order to normalize tutoring/academic support services. If you are a current faculty member at NSC and tutoring contributed to your success as a student, please contact Cristina Caputo directly. ○ For questions or comments about the study or to coordinate with the ASC on course support for your classes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Please contact Dr. Shantal Marshall or ASC Director Cristina Caputo | |
| 5:15 - 5:25 PM | <p>III. K. Vincent Nava - Senate Bylaws New Chair for Bylaws committee; picking up where senator Bieser left off as previous committee chair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Over the summer the Senate Executive Committee and Bylaws Committee coordinated to identify necessary edits or changes to the bylaws. ● Changes are mostly minor and are related to formatting/phrasing ● Senators please review the proposed changes and provide feedback by February 16th in the linked Google document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can see current by-laws on senate webpage/Canvas ○ For a list/guide to the proposed changes refer to the Key/Overview Document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Bold/Highlighted/Strikethrough/ ● The Bylaws Committee is also seeking feedback from Legal Counsel regarding the proposed edits ● The goal is to vote on the proposed changes in February/March ● Looking for representatives from SOE to participate on Bylaws committee; please contact Vincent Nava or Senate Executive Team if interested. | |
| | IV. CLOSED MEETING PRESENTATIONS | |
| 5:25 - 5:30 PM | <p>IV. A. Kayla Bieser - Faculty Workload Policy Presented as information at November senate meeting (refer to November meeting notes for details).</p> <p>Motion: Senator Howerton Second: Senator Jewell Vote: Unanimous</p> | Action |
| 5:30 - 5:35 PM | <p>IV. B. Amber Howerton - Speech Path Masters Preparatory Plan and Math Concentration Deletion</p> | Action |

Both were presented as information items at the November meeting (refer to November meeting notes for details).

Questions/Discussion:

Speech Path Prep Plan

- Lutz: is that similar to other education post-baccalaureate programs?
 - Not same as other programs but similar. Mostly serves to give a pathway for post-bacc. students to apply to the master's in speech pathology program.
 - It is a pathway but not a degree program and is financial aid eligible; technically it is a post-bacc. program
 - Allows person with a Bachelor's in Education a pathway to get into speech pathology graduate program
- Kunkle: Be aware that "Post-bacc." and "second degree seeking" labels are not used synonymously at NSC (as they sometimes are at other institutions).

Vote:

Speech Path Prep Plan

Motion: Senator Draper

Secon: Senator Kunkle

Vote: Unanimous

Math Concentration Deletion (no questions/discussion)

Motion: Senator Bieser

Second: Senator Kunkle

Vote: Unanimous

V. NEW BUSINESS

5:35 - 5:45 PM

V. A. Serge Ballif - Chair Updates

- Course Fee Issue
 - Need to revamp course fee process as there was an issue with fee errors for several courses. The error has been corrected for the spring and we are currently determining if any fees need to be refunded or reallocated from fall
 - We are coordinating with stakeholders to adjust the process (possibly by tracking in Onbase). More to come in spring to formalize a process/policy.
- BOR meeting: President Evaluations
 - The Board is reviewing the process for evaluating college President's in the NSHE system. Refer to proposed [guidelines](#) and [instrument](#).
 - President Patterson would be up for a Presidential evaluation this year but we have not been asked to do so based on indications that he plans to retire
 - Question: How often is a President supposed to be evaluated?
 - Every 3 years; Patterson was supposed to be evaluated last year but was tabled due to legislative year so contract was extended.
- CORE Overhaul
 - NSC is revising the Core Curriculum in response to our own assessment work and also based on the Strategic Planning

Information

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>process and recommendations from our accreditors. Chris Garrett has been asked to lead the Core Curriculum Committee, and each academic unit has a representative on this committee: Jennifer Edmonds, Amanda Carter, Tiffany Garrett, Chris Harris, Heidi Batiste, Ludy Llasus, and Peter La Chapelle. Faculty Senate will work closely with this committee over the next ~18 months. <i>The Core Curriculum Committee will utilize a Slack channel to communicate and gather feedback from faculty and will provide monthly updates via Faculty Senate meetings.</i> Please help in this effort by being quick to reply with feedback and ideas when you are approached. I am optimistic that we create and maintain a strong Core Curriculum through these efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Suggestion: SOE is piloting an assessment platform that may relate to CORE updates. Also the committee should consult with the FYE committee on curriculum design/requirements that relate to first year experience. | |
| | <p>VI. ADJOURNMENT Motion: Senator Naumann Second: Senator Jewell Vote: Unanimous</p> | |