Minutes
May 15, 2014

Senators in Attendance: 42

Absent: Ross (FPPC), Prue (SAC), Mierse (Art), Eastman (CDAE), Liptek (Chemistry), Vizcarra (Economics), Smith (Education Rep. 1), Welch (English Rep. 1), Rayback (Geography), Mehrtens (Geology), Esselstrom (History Rep. 2), Okech (Leadership and Developmental Sciences), Light (Libraries Rep. 1), Weiss (Medicine Rep. 1), Hehir (Neuroscience Rep. 2), Tyzbir (Nutrition and Food Science), Nelms (Ortopaedic Rehabilitation), Wilcox (Pathology Rep. 1), Ambaye (Pathology Rep. 2), D'Amico (Pediatrics Rep. 2), Headrick (Physics), Stratton (Plant Biology), Burke (Political Science), Naylor (Psychiatry Rep. 1), Green (Radiology), Wu (Rehab and Movement Science), Jones (BSAD Rep. 1), Witkin (Sociology), Adams (Surgery Rep. 1), Schapiro (Anesthesiology).

Meeting began at 4:04pm

1. **Approval of the Minutes.** The minutes of April 7, 2014 were approved.

2. **Senate President's Remarks.** President Roberts took this time to thank the Senators for their service over the past academic year. She also wanted to extend a special thanks to the Executive Council and Stephanie Kaza, Vice President of the Faculty Senate.

   President Roberts announced that the Faculty Senate will be running an election for the next Senate President when school starts back up in the fall. If you are aware of colleagues who would excel in this role, please think of nominating them in September. Additionally, President Roberts would be happy to discuss this position with anyone who is interested.

   Finally, President Roberts wanted to remind faculty that David Carlson is the Coordinator of Student Veteran Services on campus and should be used as a resource when support is needed for veterans on campus.

3. **Degrees.** It was moved, seconded, and voted that the following numbers of graduates be recommended by the Senate to the President for the awarding of the appropriate degrees or certificates as authorized by the Board of Trustees. Individual names of the graduates are recorded with the Minutes of this meeting in the permanent Senate records.

Agriculture and Life Sciences	289
Arts and Sciences	802
Business Administration	152
Education and Social Services	191
Engineering and Mathematics	152
Environment and Natural Resources	115
Graduate College	226

Honors College	97
Medicine	109
Nursing and Health Sciences	170
Honors	259

4. **The General Education: Diversity.** Eileen Cichoskikelly and Jackie Weinstock presented the progress of the Diversity Committee of the General Education initiative. They thanked the committee for all of their hard work this year, and then gave an overview of the work the committee had done. Highlights of the presentation included the committee's collaboration with the Diversity Curriculum Review Committee (DCRC) and the construction of one set of competencies. The committee hopes to meet one more time this academic year to further refine the competencies in hopes to bring them back to the Faculty Senate for the fall. Next academic year, once the competencies have been defined clearly and accepted by the Faculty Senate, the committee will begin to design and plan for assessment.

5. **Open Discussion of Student Course Evaluations.** President Roberts gave an update on where the progress of the Student Course Evaluations were in process. The project has been held up due to the fact that once a vendor was selected to go ahead with the 2 year trial period, the vendor that was chosen went bankrupt. A report from Brian Reed that outlined the next steps was circulated prior to the meeting for review. President Roberts opened the floor up for questions from the Senators regarding the report or the project itself. There were some questions from the Senate floor regarding the use of Blackboard as the University is already paying for it. Other questions were based on the actual content of the evaluations themselves. It was noted that the Faculty Senate did not vote to move to a set of common questions, rather only a trial period of delivering course evaluations electronically. Some units on campus are already conducting course evaluations online through blackboard, connectEDU, or limesurvey. Of those units, it was discussed how the two major issues they see are: identifying the best time to send the evaluations, and how many times to remind students to complete them. It was suggested that we reflect on what faculty envision the online course evaluations to look like, and what information they would like to get from them. This will be an issue that will require work throughout the fall semester with a hopeful implementation goal of December 2014.

6. **Science Admission Requirement.** There was a proposal to change the admissions requirements as they pertain to science coursework. The current admission requirement states that applicants must have completed 2 years of natural sciences including 1 year of laboratory science. The proposal would change this to require 3 years of natural sciences with 1 year of laboratory sciences. This would bring UVM's requirements in line with most other institutions, and reflects a reality that most of our applicants already have as this is a part of the "common core" curriculum many states have already adopted. It is important to note that exceptions may be made for students that come from school systems that aren't able to offer 3 years of science to their students. If approved this will be sent out with the application materials and on the website with enough time to warn applicants for the 2015 application deadline. When put to a vote, the proposal passed with one abstention.

7. **Curricular Affairs.** Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee, Cathy Paris presented the following proposals for Senate approval and/or notification:

   a. **Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health.** The first item for consideration was a Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health. This certificate is very similar to the Certificate of Graduate Study in Public Health, and it was noted that it wouldn't be advisable to get both. The funding model for this certificate is the same as the one in Public Health that had previously been approved. Both certificates and the Master's program in Public Health will be sharing resources. When put to a vote, the Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health was approved.

b. **Name Change Request: Department of Pathology.** The second item of business proposed was a name change for the Department of Pathology. The department would like to change their name to the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine. Within Fletcher Allen Health Care and the UVM Medical Group the department already goes by this name. Recognizing this name change will allow the mission and activities of the department to be accurately represented. The Faculty Senate voted to approve the Name Change request.

c. **New Curricular Entity: Undergraduate Certificate.** The third item of business was to create a new curricular entity which would be an Undergraduate Certificate. This is not to be confused with a minor as it has an experiential learning component & capstone experience attached to it. There aren't any proposals currently being considered, however, there has been interested in creating them (CESS, Global Studies, etc.). No unit could require an Undergraduate Certificate, and students would only been granted admission by application and there wouldn't be any added cost to the student. The protocol for proposal is parallel to Appendix A. There was an important distinction that came out of the discussion that outlined how this would be different from a certificate offered by Continuing and Distance Education. This particular curricular entity will only be available to matriculated undergraduate students. The proposal to create Undergraduate Certificates as a new curricular entity was approved unanimously.

d. **Name Change Policy.** The fourth item of business comes in the form of a report out to the Faculty Senate. This was a newly proposed process for department name change requests. The proposed process would have the department, program, major, minor and tagged degree name changes be approved by the Curricular Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate Executive Council, and the Faculty Senate. After the name change has been approved by these groups, it will be passed along to the University President for final approval. It is important to note that in order for these changes to be reflected in the course catalog, the name change would have to be brought to the CAC for consideration by December of the previous year. There was one stipulation added to the proposal: that the President & Provost have 30 days to respond to this request (this is standard practice for all other proposals that go to them for approval).

e. **Course Approval Process.** The fifth item of business for the Faculty Senate was another report out regarding the new course dispute process. This process starts by bringing the dispute to an ad hoc subcommittee of the Curricular Affairs Committee that will be chaired by a faculty representative from the libraries (because they have no curricular offerings). If the dispute cannot be resolved in the ad hoc subcommittee, it should be brought to the Curricular Affairs Committee for discussion. The final decision of the CAC is binding and will be reported out to the Provost's Office. Based on that decision the Provost's Office will either forward the Course Action Forms to the Registrar, or return them to the department for revision.

f. **Transfer Credit Policy.** The sixth and final item of business and report out from the Curricular Affairs Committee, was a proposal to add Vermont Law School to the transfer credit institution list within the Transfer Credit Policy. This change will specifically state that the credits to be transferred will be strictly related to the 3 + 2 program.

8. **Committee Reports.** The committee reports are now posted on the Faculty Senate website for review.

9. **Academic Calendar.** The Academic Calendar vote had been postponed until this meeting due to a request for more information. The following options were put together and presented to the Faculty Senate based on the previous discussion:

a. **Current Calendar.** This option would maintain the academic calendar structure as it is now. This includes no fall break, 5 days off for Thanksgiving break, and 1 reading day following the last day of classes.

b. **Fall Break & Short Thanksgiving Break.** In this version of the academic calendar, there would be a 1 day Fall Break in October, 3 days off for Thanksgiving, and 1 reading day following the last day of classes.

c. **Fall Break & Long Thanksgiving Break.** The last option for the academic calendar would have a 1 day Fall Break in October, 5 days off for Thanksgiving, and no reading day following the last day of classes.

When the Senate voted on the academic calendar, the initial vote was split such that Option A held 26% of the vote, Option B held 24% of the vote, Option C held 48% of the vote, and 2% of voting members abstained. The Senate decided to re-vote, which resulted in the future academic calendar to show a 1 day Fall Break in October, a 5 day Thanksgiving Break, and the elimination of the last reading day before classes (65% of Voting Senators in support).

10. **New Business.** Vice President Stephanie Kaza wanted to express her appreciation for all of the hard work President Roberts had put in this year.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Annual Faculty Senate Committee Reports

2013-2014

2013-14 Academic Year Report to the Faculty Senate on the UVM Athletics Program

Robert Manning
Professor
Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources
UVM Faculty Athletics Representative

Barbara Arel
Associate Professor
School Of Business Administration
Chair, Athletics Advisory Board

This report highlights and summarizes important activities and accomplishments of the UVM athletics program in the 2013-2014 academic year. The focus of the report is on matters that are most relevant to university faculty and the Faculty Senate. The report was prepared by Robert Manning and Barbara Arel who have faculty-based oversight and advisory responsibilities for UVM athletics. Robert Manning is the UVM Faculty Athletics Representative, appointed by the President, and responsible to UVM and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) for oversight relating to matters of academic integrity and student-athlete wellbeing. Barbara Arel is Chair of the UVM Athletic Advisory Board (AAB), a group of faculty, staff, students, and alumni who have broad advisory responsibilities to the President and the Director of Athletics.

The members of the Athletics Advisory Board in 2013-14 were Barbara Arel, (chair), Robert Manning, Susan Lakoski (College of Medicine), Judith Shaw (College of Medicine), Patricia Boldwin ((Nursing and Health Sciences), Andrew Bowen (student representative) and William "Chip" Mason (alumni representative).

1. UVM student-athletes continue to perform at a high level in the classroom. In the fall 2013 semester, the combined grade point average of student-athletes was 3.135. This was the 22nd semester in a row that student-athletes attained a grade point average of 3.0 or better; 65% of UVM student-athletes had a GPA above 3.0 and 44 student-athletes (10% of varsity athletes) had a GPA of 3.8 or above. UVM tied for third in the 2012-13 America East Academic Cup competition. America East is the primary athletic conference in which UVM competes. The Academic Cup is presented to the member university whose student-athletes receive the highest collective grade point average. UVM has won a conference-best eight Academic Cups, won the award seven years in a row prior to 2012 and also took home the award in its inaugural year (1995-96). The NCAA recognized three UVM athletic teams (men's basketball, men's cross country and women's skiing) that earned Division I Public Recognition Awards which honor teams with Academic Progress Rates (APR) in the top 10% of each sport. Academic majors

of UVM student-athletes generally reflect those of the student body as a whole. Student-athletes consistently have a higher graduation rate than the overall student body.

2. The AAB met with the coaches of selected teams during its monthly meetings this year. Coaches were asked to describe their team philosophy, and AAB members followed up with questions and comments. Much of the discussion was directed at the academic achievement of student-athletes and matters relating to their well-being. This year, the AAB also met with the leaders of the Student Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) to discuss matters influencing student-athletes directly.

3. This past year, the Athletic Department (including over 400 student-athletes, coaches, and administrators) continued its long tradition of active service in the community providing over 700 hours of volunteer time. This year's activities were highlighted by school programs where various teams partnered with local schools, visiting regularly and developing relationships with the students. Other community service activities included volunteering for Green-Up Day, Special Olympics, the Ronald McDonald House, sports clinics, and blood drives.

4. The AAB continued to implement the "faculty engagement" initiative inaugurated during the 2008-09 academic year. The AAB developed a "fact sheet" (attached) on the UVM athletics program, and AAB members continue to deliver short reports on UVM's athletic programs to their home departments, colleges and constituent groups. The Athletic Department also hosted an inaugural Faculty Appreciation Night this year in which members of SAAC and team captains were allowed to invite their "favorite" professor to a dinner to thank them for their support of student-athletes. Where appropriate, faculty are offered tickets to games to support student-athletes from their home departments and colleges.

University of Vermont
Intercollegiate Athletics Program

Status: UVM participates at the NCAA Division 1 level, the highest level of collegiate competition.

History: UVM has sponsored intercollegiate athletics for well over 100 years. In the late 1800s, the program consisted of baseball, men's basketball, men's tennis, and men's track and field. Beginning in the 1960s, the UVM Women's Recreation Association began sponsoring several women's intercollegiate teams that were ultimately integrated into the university's program of intercollegiate athletics. Program offerings and conference affiliations have evolved over the years, but intercollegiate athletics remains an important part of the university, encouraging excellence in athletics and academics and providing a common focus among students, faculty, staff, alumni, and friends in Vermont and beyond.

Number of varsity sports: UVM fields varsity teams in 18 sports (men's and women's basketball, men's and women's cross country running, men's and women's ice hockey, men's and women's lacrosse, men's and women's skiing, men's and women's soccer, men's and women's track and field, field hockey, women's swimming).

Number of student-athletes: Approximately 386 UVM students participate in intercollegiate athletics, of which about 60 percent receive some level of athletics-related scholarships.

Athletic conferences: UVM is a member of three athletic conferences: America East, Hockey East, and the Eastern Intercollegiate Skiing Association.

Mission statement: The intercollegiate athletics program at UVM facilitates the personal growth and education of young men and women through their participation in a comprehensive program of NCAA Division I sports. As an integral part of the university, the intercollegiate athletics program actively promotes equity and diversity, fosters the pursuit of academic and athletic excellence, and provides community enrichment.

Academic integrity: UVM student-athletes consistently maintain a higher GPA and graduation rate than the general student body. Student-athletes have posted a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher for the last 22 semesters, have won the America East Conference Academic Cup seven of the last nine years, and all teams exceed NCAA Academic Progress Report standards. Academic majors of student-athletes reflect those of the overall student body.

Academic support: UVM offers student-athletes academic support services through the Department of Athletics' Office of Student-Athlete Services that operates in conjunction with the UVM Learning Cooperative and student support personnel in academic units.

Student-athletes participate in a Life Skills program that includes a mandatory course for all first year student-athletes emphasizing academic excellence, personal and career development, and community service.

Student governance: The Student-Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) provides a means of communication between student-athletes and the administration of the Athletics Department. The UVM Student-Athlete Code of Conduct, signed each year by all student-athletes, codifies expectations in the areas of athletic excellence, academic integrity, sportsmanship, and citizenship in the campus and larger communities.

Community service: The Athletics Department encourages community participation for all student-athletes and personnel. During the 2013-14 academic year, over 400 student-athletes, coaches, and staff were involved in service activities benefiting UVM, Burlington, the state, and beyond. Activities range widely, including Special Olympics, Green Up Day, sports clinics, blood drives, and fund-raising for cancer research.

Benefits of intercollegiate athletics program: UVM's intercollegiate athletics program encourages excellence in athletics, academic success, health, and personal development among its participants. Competitive success is a source of recognition and pride for the student body, faculty, staff, alumni, and Vermont, and this contributes to the university's initiatives in student recruitment, fundraising, "branding" of UVM, and Vermont relations.

Faculty/staff/student/alumni involvement: Faculty, staff, students, and alumni can become involved in athletics through the Athletic Advisory Board, SAAC (noted above), and attending athletic events.

Tickets to athletic events: Tickets are required for men's and women's hockey, men's and women's basketball, men's and women's soccer, and men's and women's lacrosse. UVM students receive free tickets to all home athletic events. The Ticket Office is located on the balcony at the main entrance to Patrick Gymnasium, or call 656-4410.

Budget: The FY '14 budget for UVM intercollegiate athletics, physical education, and recreation is $17.8M, and this includes salaries, benefits, scholarships, and operating funds. Most of the budget ($13.3M) is derived from a combination of ticket sales, fundraising, marketing, student fees, and university financial aid.

More information: For more information on UVM's intercollegiate athletics program, please visit https://www.uvm.edu/athletics or call 656-3075.

Education and Research Technology Committee
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
May 5, 2014

The Committee (ERTC) will have met 6 times during the 2013/2014 academic year.

Mara Saule: UVM Align, IT Planning Report. Mara Saule introduced herself as the new UVM Chief Information Officer. Saule gave a brief summary of what she hopes to see happen at the University as she settles into the role as CIO. Saule reported that a priority is to work with the President to get a clear rationalization of distributed IT at UVM; what IT looks like within the units and their relationship to central IT on campus (ETS, Center for Teaching & Learning, Media Services). A committee been formed to work on carving out a process for doing such an assessment. It was agreed that this information will be especially helpful as the University begins its transition toward an Incentive Based Budget. Mara advised the ERTC that their input will be helpful throughout this process. The ERTC meeting for January, 2014 was dedicated to a trial run of the Align IT focus group process.

Larry Kost: VDI. Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) is beginning to be used across campus, Physical Labs, Virtual Labs. Kiosks, the Library and classrooms. A small classroom test project is underway including two classrooms in Vote and three in Perkins. Larry Kost provided the committee with a demonstration of this new technology. Advantages of this technology, especially in the classroom setting includes processing speed superior to many of the PC's currently in these rooms, they can be controlled and maintained centrally which makes fixing issues and installing software much easier and doesn't require physically visiting the classrooms affected, the life cycle of a VDI client is greater than the standard lifetime of a desktop, the power consumption is significantly less and VDI machines can be accessed from almost any device which has Internet capability. At present the cost of VDI and the current system are comparable, but it is expected that VDI will eventually be less expensive. The only noticeable downside to VDI is the requirement of Internet capability with sufficient bandwidth. While this isn't, at present, available campus wide, improvements are moving forward.

Keith Williams & Gail Starks: Advisor Notes Demo. Keith Williams, Registrar, and Gail Starks, Associate Registrar, provided the committee with a demonstration of the new advisor notes capability within the portal. The committee had several questions, most of which were answered and several suggestions which were to be taken under consideration.

Keith Williams Expanded Section Descriptions. There was a brief discussion of ESD's and some of the perceived deficiencies in the current system, like not being able to roll-over descriptions from semester to semester. Keith noted that the present implementation was developed by customizing a Portal feature which was not intended for this purpose. He suggested that it might be time to revisit this and to consider developing a system specifically for this purpose.

David Feurzeig: Office Telephones. David Feurzeig spoke to the committee about telephone lines in campus offices at UVM. With the University budget being discussed people are assessing where cuts can be made to save money. It was suggested that perhaps phone lines in all on campus offices were no longer necessary. Randy Spooner, from Telecom advised that it is the data which costs the most; the phones aren't necessarily the expensive part so getting rid of them would be minimal cost savings. In order for this to be cost effective the University would have to move completely over to wireless, but there is not the infrastructure to support this on campus. As of right now, getting rid of a phone in an office would mean giving up an internet port and this is not a feasible solution. Residential Life already unbundled their phone and internet and now pay per internet port in the dorm rooms. This potentially could happen on the rest of campus, but it would need to be assessed if this would be a significant saving. Again, with IBB on the horizon, there is a real question as to how services like telephone and internet will be financed.

Mike Austin. Mike Austin reported that he has approval from the Provost to proceed with the project of choosing and implementing a new University-wide Email and Calendaring system, and is hoping to start deployment of the new system over the summer. Based on the RFPs submitted for consideration, there are three vendors being considered. They are Zimbra, Google, and Microsoft Exchange. There will be a concerted effort to engage as much of the entire University community as possible in the final decision. The committee was asked to do whatever they could to encourage their constituents to participate by attending the on-campus demos and voicing their opinions and concerns. The committee agreed that one of the most important factors to consider must be the impact of the change on Faculty, Staff and Students. Every reasonable effort should be made to make the transition as transparent as possible.

Report submitted by Larry Kost, Chair of the Educational and Research Technology Committee, May 5, 2014.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT
Faculty Senate Financial and Physical Planning Committee

To: Julie Roberts, Senate President
From: Cathy Beaudoin, Interim Chair – Financial and Physical Planning Committee
Date: May 5, 2014
Re: Annual Committee Report

The following major issues were addressed by the committee during the academic year:

Budget Specific Discussions

1. Monitoring of 2013-2014 budget to actual results.
    a. Understanding the primary driver of the current (i.e., 2013-2014) budget shortfall. Related to the shortfall, the committee received several updates from Richard Cate and enrollment management personnel regarding the composition of net tuition dollars. Understanding net tuition projections versus actual is a key metric to follow since enrollment targets were reached but the financial aid requirements of the composition of the freshman class was higher than originally budgeted. The higher amounts of financial aid reduced net tuition receipts.
2. Understanding the components of 2014-2015 budget projections.
    a. Received several updates from Richard Cate regarding big ticket items of concern in the next budget cycle. Those items include dealing with increasing health care costs including pending $1 million fee related to new healthcare legislation, costs associated with STEM building project, projections associated with decreased NIH funding and on-going concerns with financial aid projections.
3. Received updates on transition to IBB.
    a. The Provost provided the committee an overview of the IBB process.
    b. Received updates from representatives of the IBB steering committee regarding the major categories of revenues and expenses that flow back to the academic units.
    c. Was consulted by the budget office regarding input regarding the strengths and weaknesses specific to the information provided to the FPPC as well as academic unit level improvements that FPPC members may view as important.

Other Financial Discussions

1. Received updates on the Delaware study.
    a. The Delaware Study provides a comparative analysis of faculty teaching loads, instructional costs, and scholarly activity at the grouping of comparable universities.

b. The sense is that ultimately the Delaware study may be used to help assess the revenues and cost structures of academic units once IBB is implemented.
2. Received periodic updates from the Board of Trustees Meeting. Those updates from the Audit Committee of the BOD.
3. Received periodic updates related to administrative reviews and benchmarking administrative costs against peer institutions.
4. Received an overview of the internal audit function and how the responsibilities around internal controls and risk management have shifted over the past several years.
5. Received an update on the commitment and mechanisms expected to be used to fund the "gen ed" writing initiative which becomes effective for the next academic year.
6. Received an updated analysis of the UVM financial statements prepared by Rudy Fichtenbaum.
7. Celebrated the long service and retirement of Albert Joy!!!

Physical Plant Discussions
1. Received updates on campus-wide physical plant projects
   a. Received updates on on-going projects in process around campus.
   b. Received updates on current activities in process around the proposed STEM project.

General Education Committee, 2013-2014

Co-chairs: Susanmarie Harrington (English) and Charlotte Mehrtens (Geology).

Members: Dan DeSanto (Libraries); Jane Petrillo (CDAE); Binta Colley (Education); Judith Cohen (Nursing); Amy Seidl (Natural Resources); Lauck Parke (Business); Alison Pechenick (CEMS); Brian Reed (Associate Provost); Julie Roberts (Linguistics/Faculty Senate).

Many thanks to Ashley Clark and Mandy Russin of the Faculty Senate office for their excellent staff support during the year.

This was a very productive year for the General Education Committee. This report presents highlights of our year.

Foundational Writing and Information Literacy: under the direction of Interim Director Professor Nancy Welch, faculty and curricular development in support of a foundational writing and information literacy requirement continued. Highlights of foundational work included:

- 15 TAP faculty participated in a three day First-Year writing Institute
- August workshop on integrating *The Ghost Map* into TAP and using this book to promote writing and literacy outcomes.
- Spring assessment activities for ENGS 1 and TAP, leading to further revisions of the ENGS 1 assignment sequence and TAP faculty development plans
- HCOL held a series of faculty meetings to further develop HCOL 85 to promote foundational goals
- May institutes for 11 TAP and 1 HCOL faculty, and (separately) for 5 English instructors new to English 1
- By end of summer 2014, creation of a website with information and resources for students, faculty, and advisors concerning foundational writing and information literacy in ENGS 1, HCOL 85, and TAP.

A challenge on the road to implementation of a foundational writing and information literacy requirement is how a program's ongoing faculty and curricular development and assessment activities should be supported. However, the Gen Ed Committee (as well as the English department composition faculty) are enthusiastic about four finalists found in a national search for a First-Year Writing Director, and we are optimistic that with this hire appropriate resources and commitments can be secured and that the foundational program's implementation will proceed in ways that support faculty and students. (more information about participants in the foundational work can be found on the

committee's website.)

Writing and Information Literacy in the Disciplines (WILD). **WILD**
This year, we turned our attention to implementing a pilot of WILD. Two
particularly exciting happenings: 4 departments stepped forward to serve as WILD
pilot participants (Romance Languages and Linguistics, Community Development
and Applied Economics, Anthropology, and Nursing), and the Davis Foundation
awarded the general education committee a $292,000 grant for up to 3 years of
further work with departments.

The WILD pilot has taught us much about the necessity of adapting the WILD
process to the culture and rhythm of each department. We have outlined a four-
stage process, beginning with surveys of faculty and students (and perhaps
community partners), and ending with the creation of departmental assessment
and implementation plans for writing and information literacy outcomes in the
major. Each department participating this year has raised interesting new issues
(such as what are the role of such outcomes in the minor? what is the relationship
between graduate and undergraduate curricula?). Various challenges in
launching the WILD surveys in the fall delayed our efforts somewhat, but each of
the 4 pilot departments is ready to move forward to its own next stage in the fall.
We are currently seeking additional departments to join the WILD process in the
fall, working around issues of librarian sabbaticals.

Shared governance. This process continues to involve a high degree of
cooperation and collaboration with the Provost's office.

Looking ahead: The committee anticipates another productive year as the Davis
Foundation-funded WILD pilot gets underway and as the foundational writing and
information literacy program begins to take shape.

Ad hoc Senate Library Advisory Committee
Report to the Faculty Senate
Co-Chairs: Jennifer Sisk, English
Peter Spitzform, Bailey/Howe Library
May, 2014

Committee members: Alison Armstrong, Nancy Bercaw, Marianne Burke, Selene Colburn, John Franklin, Charles Goodnight, Wolfgang Mieder, Nicole Phelps, Lee Rosen, Mara Saule, Jennifer Sisk, Peter Spitzform

The Library Advisory Committee met once during the fall semester to discuss new and ongoing issues, and to consider the nature of the committee and its pattern of future meetings. Committee members agreed that it is of the utmost importance to maintain the committee to provide an open channel of communication between the libraries and the faculty and to ensure the existence of a body to advocate on behalf of the Libraries best interests. It was also agreed that for now it makes sense for this committee to maintain its ad hoc status and to meet at least once each semester. The committee would like to see the addition of a few additional members from the College of Medicine and the College of Nursing and Health Sciences.

At the December meeting the committee discussed the Libraries budget and considered how budget trends at UVM are affecting the libraries. This fiscal year the library received only a 2.08% increase to its materials budget, and we have learned that next year the budget is level funded with no increase at all. Over the past decade, the libraries' materials budget saw increases of about 5%. Meanwhile, particularly with journals, prices have risen above our budget increase. This has required making the first cuts in the Libraries collection since 2000. Although the FY15 acquisitions are slated to be level funded, focus must necessarily shift to collection maintenance.

In December the committee also initiated what will most likely be ongoing discussion of three large questions:

1) How will Incentive Based Budgeting affect the Libraries? (At present this is unclear.)
2) How will the implementation of the General Education outcome on Writing and Information Literacy impact the Libraries? (It will probably increase the need for library computer classroom space, but at present it is unclear where funding for these spaces will come from.)
3) What will the role of "digital humanities" be under the new leadership of the Humanities Center, and how will it involve and impact the Libraries?

The May LAC meeting has not yet taken place at the time of the submission of this report, but items on the agenda for that meeting include:

1) Current staffing issues within the Libraries, given current faculty and staff vacancies in key position, and how this will affect departmental liaison and instruction work
2) Strategizing for the Billings Library Renovation

3) Planning for space renovations in the Bailey/Howe and Dana libraries.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Sisk and Peter Spitzform
May 5, 2014

Faculty Mentoring Program
2013-2014 Annual Report

Submitted to: Julie Roberts, Senate President
Submitted by: Lisa Holmes, Director, Faculty Mentoring Program
Date: May 5, 2014

This is my second year of service as Director of the Faculty Mentoring Program. The main focus has been continuing the core functions related to faculty mentoring that have historically been achieved through this program. The key activities of the Faculty Mentoring Program this year were as follows:

- I attended new faculty orientation in August of 2013 and made a brief presentation on faculty mentoring. Mentor applications were included in the faculty orientation materials, which greatly expedited the ability of new faculty to request mentors.

- Matches were made for all requests for mentors from new faculty, or any faculty requesting a mentor. For the 2012/2013 academic year, I matched 13 requests for mentors from faculty across many colleges and academic units. Although most of the requests came from new hires at the Assistant Professor level, requests also came from lecturers and a clinical instructor.

- Two RPT workshops were organized and hosted by the Faculty Mentoring Program in February of 2014. These well-attended workshops brought together faculty with relevant experience in the RPT process from across the university to provide advice and answer questions from faculty in attendance.

- Faculty Mentoring Program updated and revised. The "Tips for Preparing for RPT Review" document that is posted on the Faculty Mentoring Program website (http://www.uvm.edu/~mentor/) underwent some modest updating with input from members of the Contract Administration Committee of United Academics.

One major responsibility for this program next year will be updating the RPT Tips document in response to any relevant changes in the Full-Time Collective Bargaining Agreement. I am also interested in beginning an effort at extending mentoring activities to better address the needs of mid-career faculty, especially those looking forward to promotion to Full Professor. One challenge seen this year was a higher proportion of faculty who were approached about becoming mentors not being able to take on that additional responsibility in already over-

committed schedules. Moving forward, this may prove to be a continuing concern and challenge for the Faculty Mentoring Program.

That said, many faculty from across the university have agreed to participate in the Faculty Mentoring Program this year, from acting as individual mentors to participating in RPT panels to providing more individualized advice to me or to faculty with a variety of concerns or issues requiring attention. This program would not be able to function without the enthusiastic and invaluable assistance from these colleagues. I thank all those who have participated in what the Faculty Mentoring Program has done this year, including Ashley Clark and Mandy Russin, and look forward to continuing these collaborations in the future.

UVM Faculty Senate
Ombudsperson Annual Report
May 2014

I have been in contact with twenty-three people since the last report. Most of these were represented by United Academics, but had concerns not addressed in any union contract; some were faculty not represented by United Academics.

Two people were referred to Human Resources for mediation.

As of the writing of this report (4 May 2014), four of the cases are unresolved.

In addition, a faculty member from the University of Delaware asked for information about the ombudsperson program at UVM. She received an account of how the office works here as well as some information about programs at other universities. For details, any interested person can see the ombudsperson report for AY 2013.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Saylor Rodgers

Professional Standards Committee Report to Faculty Senate May 2014

Committee Membership: Dan Archdeacon (CEMS, Spring Semester), Daisy Benson (LIBR), Carolyn Bonifield (BSAD), Sid Bosworth (EXT), Michael Giangreco (CESS), Bill Keeton (RSENR, Fall Semester), Peter Moses (COM), Bob Parsons (CALS), George Pinder (CEMS, Fall Semester), Robert Rodgers (CAS, chair),, Kennith Sartorelli (COM), Sondra Solomon (CAS), Burt Wilcke (CNHS)

The committee met once in July 2013, once in August, once in November, once in December, and weekly during most of the current Spring Semester. We anticipate an additional meeting before the semester's end.

Cases for Sabbatical Leave: According to CBA protocols, the PSC advises the Provost only in those cases where some difficulty or uncertainty has arisen. In Fall 2013 we reviewed 3 such cases (one each from CALS, CEMS, CESS).

Cases for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure: The PSC reviews the dossiers and evaluations made at the department and college/school level, advising the Provost on all decisions for second reappointment, promotion and tenure. Since May 2013 we have considered the following:

BSAD   1 case
          (promotion and tenure)
CALS   7 cases
          (1 reappointment, 2 promotion and tenure, 1 promotion/senior lecturer, 3 promotion/professor)
CAS   23 cases
          (3 reappointment, 9 promotion and tenure, 5 promotion/senior lecturer, 6 promotion/professor)
CEMS   7 cases
          (1 reappointment, 2 promotion and tenure, 2 promotion/professor, 2 administrative hires with
          tenure/professor)
CESS   5 cases
          (1 reappointment, 3 promotion and tenure, 1 promotion/senior lecturer)
CNHS   5 cases
          (2 reappointment, 3 promotion/professor)
COM   27 cases
          (4 reappointment, 3 promotion and tenure, 19 promotion/professor, 1 initial hire with
          tenure/professor, 1 administrative hire with tenure/professor)
LIBR   0 cases
RSENR 5 cases
          (1 tenure, 1 promotion/senior lecturer, 3 promotion/professor)

As reported last year, in an effort to bring consistency and transparency in those cases where administrative hires involve tenure in academic units, the PSC has participated in a routine review of the academic credentials of all finalists for such positions. The standard greensheet process is, of course, followed for the successful candidate, ideally including a face-to-face meeting with the departmental faculty in the academic unit where the administrator will hold the rank of tenured professor. We are grateful for the opportunity to have reviewed the materials available for those who were finalists in this year's search for dean of the Rubenstein School of the Environment and Natural Resources.

Report (2013/2014) of the Research, Scholarship and
the Creative Arts Subcommittee
UVM Faculty Senate
April 28, 2014

Membership of the Committee:

The Committee membership included Breck Bowden, Chris Burns, Kevin Chiang, Paul Deslandes, Richard Galbraith (Chair), Juliet Halladay, Sharon Henry, Daniel Hudson, George Osol, George Pinder, Alice Schermerhorn, and Feng-Qi Zhao. In addition, many of the meetings were attended by the President of the Faculty Senate, Julie Roberts, the Vice President for Research, John Evans, and the Dean of the Graduate, College Cindy Forehand.

The Committee met on 6 occasions, the first being September 19, 2013 and the last being May 15, 2014.

- <u>Vice President for Research</u>. The new Interim Vice President for Research, John Evans, met with the Committee to introduce himself and his plans. Evans reported that he would like to take a look at all the spaces on campus that support scholarly and research efforts at UVM. Some of these spaces were scheduled to be improved by the new STEM facility, but some spaces such as art studios where many undertake scholarly activity were fairly marginal. Evans would like help from the RSCA in identifying the spaces that could use attention. He also reported that he would like to do an analysis of core facilities on campus.

  John Evans asked the Committee if they had any issues that they would like him to look at. One item that came up was the lack of consistency for replacement of computers including laptops for faculty across different units in different colleges. It was also suggested that faculty in the Arts and Humanities often do not seek out grant opportunities due to a perceived or real lack of support from SPA for the kinds of grants that need to be submitted in the Arts and Humanities fields.

- <u>The composition of the RSCA Committee</u>. It was suggested that the Committee change its membership requirements to having three representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences; one member from social sciences, one member from the creative arts and one member from the humanities. Galbraith and President Roberts met with the College of Arts and Sciences to discuss the Committee composition and reported back to the RSCA. Changing the membership for the Committee was approved by Joel Goldberg, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Faculty Senate Bylaws change was sent out to all the faculty for a vote. The motion to add a third member from Arts and Sciences to RSCA was approved following a ballot which closed on January 24, 2014. The Arts and Sciences Dean's Office will put this change into effect for the Spring elections.

- <u>URECA</u>. The Committee discussed the URECA Awards and issues that have been arising regarding how these awards are implemented and evaluated. Ann Kroll-Lerner from the Honors College sent the Committee an e-mail which outlined some suggestions that had come out of a sub-committee that met to discuss the URECA Awards and possible procedural changes. After extensive discussion, the Committee decided to recommend the following to the Honors College:

  1. Dissolve the URECA Program entirely and move the funding to the Summer Research Awards or any other appropriate program in the Undergraduate Research Office.

2. That the Committee that makes decisions about the Summer Program on behalf of the Undergraduate Research Office should be broad and representative of all disciplines on the campus including science, scholarly pursuits, and the creative arts.

3. The Committee was also curious to know to what extent, if at all, the Undergraduate Research Office interacts with the Office of the Vice President for Research.

These findings were communicated directly to the Honors College and subsequently accepted by Dean Abu Rizvi.

- <u>Effort Reporting System</u>. Mike Meunier, Assistant Controller presented the Committee with a brief update on the implementation of the Effort Reporting System. The system consists of two components. One is effort management; the second is certification. Meunier explained that he has been working with the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences on piloting the new system and hopes the entire University will be using the system by the Summer of 2014.

- <u>Custodial Services and Research Labs</u>. Leslye Kornegay, Director of Custodial Services, returned to give an update on changes that have occurred. There has been a reduction in labor positions within Custodial Services. Following a survey administered to the laboratory community to assess custodial needs, the following changes were made:

  1. All custodians in the lab are now required to speak English.

  2. All individuals servicing laboratories are trained to be working in those types of environment.

  3. Although there has been a cutback in the number of personnel, efficiency has increased.

- <u>Electronic Theses</u>. Cindy Forehand updated the Committee about the switch from paper to electronic theses in the Graduate College. The Committee supported and endorsed this change.

- <u>Burak Lecture Nominations</u>. The Committee reviewed the Spring 2014 Burak Lecture Series nominations. There were an unusually low number of applications. There were only five applications for ten available slots. The Committee discussed this lamentable situation and once again made the suggestion that perhaps there should be fewer slots available, and have only two to three lectures a year that could be better publicized, better spaced out in the calendar, and better attended. A letter to this effect was sent to the President.

- <u>Graduate Research Assistants and Grants</u>. Cindy Forehand met with the Committee to report the Graduate College's recommendation to charge a flat fee for tuition on all grants and to charge a fringe rate on grants. The proposal is for 24% - 25% fringe rate on graduate students on grants which will cover health insurance and recover about 20% of tuition. It was moved that the Committee endorse the framework that Forehand had put forward and this motion passed.

- <u>Student Government Association</u>. A request was received from the Student Government Association to appoint a non-voting representative to the RSCA. The Committee endorsed this request and has invited a representative from both the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Senate to attend meetings.

- <u>University Distinguished Professor</u>. Gayle Nunley attended to hear the many concerns of Committee members concerning the nomination and selection process for UDP. Nunley agreed to consult with the Provost who has decided to appoint no UDPs this year and to revise the entire program over the summer.

Respectively submitted,
Richard Galbraith
April 28, 2014

_____

Policy V. 2.28.2

Responsible Official: Provost and
Senior Vice President

Effective Date: January 16, 2013

Transfer Credit – Undergraduate Students

Policy Statement

The University of Vermont will consider credits in transfer from all courses taken through an accredited College or University when it can be shown that each course considered has been satisfactorily completed with a grade of C or better, and that the course was comparable in content, nature, and intensity to course(s) offered at the University of Vermont. Grades attained at another institution are not transferable and are not used in computation of the Grade Point Average (GPA) at the University of Vermont.

Reason for the Policy

To set forth the criteria the University uses in determining acceptability of credits taken at other colleges and universities.

Applicability of the Policy

This policy applies to any student who has taken credits at another college or university.

Policy Elaboration

I. Factors which determine the acceptability of transfer credit:

I.A.   The educational institution from which course work is being considered for transfer credit must be accredited by a regional, professional or national institutional accrediting body.

    1. United States:

        a. Accrediting bodies must be recognized by the American Council on Education in consultation with the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

b. Course work from institutions which have only candidacy status with a Regional Accreditation Body and carry no other acceptable form of accreditation, will not be acceptable for transfer.

c. The review by Professional Accreditation Bodies extends to courses taught in the discipline of the professional accreditation.

d. The following are National Institutional Accrediting Bodies recognized by the University of Vermont:

- Accrediting Commission for Career Schools and Colleges of Technology

- Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools

- Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education

- American Chemical Society

- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association

- American Psychological Association

- AACSB International — The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business

- American Bar Association, Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar

- Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Programs

- Council on Social Work Education

- Vermont Department of Education

- Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

- ABET - Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.

- National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Science

- Joint Review Committee on Education Programs in Nuclear Medicine Technology

- American Dental Association

- National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission, Inc.

- American Physical Therapy Association

- Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education

e. Education in a foreign country provided by an accredited American college or university is governed by the American school's accreditation.

2. International:

The Foreign government or state governmental agency of a foreign country must formally recognize an educational institution as offering post-secondary school instruction leading toward a degree or diploma comparable to that offered at the University of Vermont.

a. Education in a foreign country sponsored by an accredited American college or university is governed by the American school's accreditation.
b. Credit will also be considered for transfer when the University of Vermont has been affiliated with an independent academic program through a formal inter-institutional agreement.

I.B   The determination of the comparability of course work in content, nature, and intensity to courses offered at the University of Vermont.

1. Equity will be maintained between transfer credit and resident credit.

2. When reviewing a course for content, a 2/3 yardstick is used. Therefore, in most cases, if a course contains 2/3 of the material of a similar course at the University of Vermont, the courses will be judged to be comparable. Courses which must contain very specific topics to prepare students for a particular function or for further study may be reviewed by the faculty of their discipline for comparability determination outside of the 2/3 guideline.

3. Credit is transferred on a course by course basis. Courses which are less rigorous than the minimum offering in the corresponding discipline at the University of Vermont will not be eligible to transfer.

It is possible for a combination of courses from another single institution to present the same material as in a single course at the University of Vermont. Upon appeal of an original course by course denial of credit, a review of the presenting institution's course

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

syllabi and sequencing will be made by the Chairperson of the appropriate discipline in conjunction with Transfer Affairs. Credit may be transferred in an amount equal to the corresponding University of Vermont course(s) when the review yields a sufficient degree of comparability in content, nature, and intensity between the combination of the presenting institution's courses and the corresponding courses at the University of Vermont.

A formal appeal of a credit transfer decision should be brought to the Office of Transfer Affairs. The Director of Transfer Affairs in consultation with the faculty of the appropriate discipline will judge the comparability of the courses for transfer credit in all appeal reviews. A written response will be delivered to the student in a timely manner once the Director of Transfer Affairs and the appropriate faculty have reviewed the course materials, past practices, and the student's specific circumstances.

A student may ask for further consideration of a denied appeal by presenting all pertinent information, in writing, to the Registrar who will determine acceptability of course work for transfer. This written appeal should contain a complete accounting of all reviews and decisions up to this point. An appeal of the Registrar's decision is to the Provost who should be provided with written documentation of the process thus far. The Provost will review the materials and render the final decision.

I.C   The determination of the level of accomplishment attained in each course.

1. The level of achievement for any course must be equal to or above a grade of C on an 'A' to 'F' scale, 2.0 or better on a 1 to 4 scale or 75 or better on a 1 to 100 scale for the course to be eligible to transfer. Grades of C- or lower are not accepted for transfer credit.

2. Courses from institutions which do not utilize one of these grading scales are reviewed individually relying on subjective evaluations of the instructing faculty member. Whenever possible, the institution is asked to state that the quality of the course work completed was at least equal to a C or better.

3. Grades of 'P' (Pass) or 'S' (Satisfactory) will be accepted only with official documentation verifying that they represent successful completion of a specific course at or above C or better.

4. It is the responsibility of the Office of Transfer Affairs to determine that the level of achievement of all course work presented for transfer consideration is equal to or above a grade of C or better.

II.   CREDIT CONVERSION

II.A   The University of Vermont is on the early Autumn semester system. All academic course work accepted for transfer will be converted into semester hours of credit by the Office of Transfer Affairs.

II.B   Quarter hours will be converted to semester hours using a 2/3 (.67) conversion factor unless otherwise prescribed by the presenting institution.

II.C   In all cases, the transcribing institution's recommendation for semester credit conversion will be given serious consideration.

III.   EXAMINATION CREDIT

III.A   The following American and foreign standardized examinations which test postsecondary school knowledge are recognized for transfer credit consideration by the University of Vermont. The current list of recognized sources can be found online at http://www.uvm.edu/registrar/?Page=transferringcredit/t_creditbyexam.html&SM=t_menu.html

- Advanced Level General Certificate of Education

- Examinations of the British Examination Councils

- The Advanced Placement Examination of the College Board (AP)

- The College Level Examination Program of the College Board (CLEP)

- The Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES)

- The German Abitur

- The International Baccalaureate higher level examinations (IB)

- The Scottish Certificate of Sixth Year Studies

Additions to this list shall be made by the Registrar in consultation with the Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

III.B   The standards of performance required for transfer credit consideration are as follows:

1. General Certificate of Education Examinations of the British Examination Councils:

A Levels Passes of A through E will be considered for up to one year of course credit in a corresponding discipline.

2. Advanced Placement Examinations of the College Board (AP)

    a. Credit is considered for all exams administered. Scores of 5 earn credit in all areas. Scores of 3 and 4 earn credit as determined by annual faculty review.

      b. Credit is granted for specific University of Vermont courses as determined by the faculty of the discipline governing the subject content of the Advanced Placement Examination.

3. College Level Examination Program of the College Board (CLEP)

      a. Only CLEP scores comparable to a B or higher in the national norm sample will be accepted for credit.

      b. Students may not have been exposed in a previous college level course to more than 10% of the material covered by a particular CLEP exam. More than 10% duplication renders the student ineligible.

      c. CLEP examinations are comparable to freshman/sophomore level credits numbered 1 to 99 at the University of Vermont. Juniors and Seniors who are eligible to take courses at the lower level may utilize the CLEP option.

4. The Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES)

      a. A specific DANTES exam must carry a standard code equal to or above the 70th percentile.

      b. DANTES Subject Standardized Tests which are comparable in the nature and scope of material examined to courses offered at the University of Vermont will be considered for transfer credit.

5. The German Abitur

Credit will be considered for the 4 subjects of the Abiturprufungen (final examination) portion of the Abitur. Each exam presented for credit consideration must carry a grade between 1 and 3, or their equivalent.

6. The International Baccalaureate (IB)

Credit will be considered for the individual exams in the Higher Level subjects only for grades of 5, 6 or 7, with a maximum of 30 credits.

7. Scottish Certificate of Sixth Year

Students earning passes of A, B or C on the Scottish Certificate of Sixth Year Studies will be considered for one year introductory credit in the appropriate discipline.

III.C   A re-evaluation of the standards of performance considered for credit from the preceding examinations will be performed periodically by the Office of Transfer Affairs in conjunction with the faculty of appropriate disciplines.

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

III.D   Internal College or University challenge examinations

Credits earned through the internal credit-by-examination program of an accredited College or University are eligible to transfer providing:
1. The course which was challenged would be eligible to transfer under normal classroom circumstances.

2. Evidence that the exam was passed at a level of competence equal to or greater than that of students who achieve a grade of C in the course being challenged.

III.E Obtaining an adequate grade on a UVM institutional Credit by Examination test

If you are a degree student at UVM, you may attempt, for a fee and with the approval of your advisor and college, to receive credit for a specific course by taking a special examination. To read more about the specific conditions under which you may request credit by examination, visit the **Online Catalog** or download the **Credit by Examination** form.

IV. COLLEGE COURSE WORK DURING HIGH SCHOOL

IV.A   The University of Vermont will accept courses taken prior to high school graduation for transfer credit when all of the following stipulations are satisfied.

1. The course(s) must be approved and monitored by an accredited college or university and be eligible for credit towards a degree program at that sponsoring college or university.

2. The course must carry a grade of C or better and be similar in content, nature and intensity to courses offered at the University of Vermont.

3. The course must be presented on an official transcript issued by the sponsoring college or university.

IV.B   Credit may also be obtained by:

1. Passing a CLEP (College Level Examination Program) exam;

2. Obtaining a sufficiently high grade on an AP (Advanced Placement) exam

For requirements of these and other international examinations leading to transfer credit, see section "Examination Credit" above.

V.   UVM student-athletes will receive credit (Physical Education) for participation in varsity or clubs ports when the activity is transcribed with credit.

VI.   NON-STANDARD POST SECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

VI.A U.S. Armed Service Instruction

Instruction received through the Armed Services is considered for credit in transfer based on the course descriptions provided by the various branches of the Service and the American Council on Education.

1. Instruction which is comparable in content, nature and intensity to undergraduate courses at the University of Vermont may be granted credit if it carries the American Council on Education's credit recommendation. Credit award for any single course will not exceed the credit value of the comparable course at the University of Vermont.

2. Credit transfer requires presentation of form DD Form 295 (Application for the Evaluation of Learning Experiences During Military Service) or DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge From Active Duty), the AARTS (Army/ACE Registry Transcript System) transcripts, or SMART (Sailor/Marine American Council on Education Registry Transcript) transcripts. Military course numbers must appear on the service record.

3. Course work taken at an accredited college or university, while in any of the branches of the Armed Services, will be considered under the accreditation of the college or university.

VI.B Online courses offered by colleges and universities which are accredited by the appropriate regional institutional accrediting body will be considered for transfer providing they carry a letter grade of C or better and are comparable in the nature and scope of material examined to course offerings at the University of Vermont.

VI.C Employer-Sponsored Instruction

Various companies, corporations and organizations which offer internal courses for their employees have had their curriculum reviewed by the American Council on Education for the purpose of recommending credits to degree granting colleges and universities. The University of Vermont will consider this type of course for credit under the following conditions:

1. The course must be similar in content, nature and intensity to courses offered by the discipline at the University of Vermont.

2. The course must carry a grade comparable to at least a C or better.

3. The course must carry a credit recommendation from the American Council on Education.

4. The amount of transfer credit will not exceed the credit value for a comparable University of Vermont course offering.

VI.D Learning experiences occurring outside the purview of an accredited academic institution

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

8

and outside the evaluation scope of the American Council on Education are not eligible for credit consideration.

VI.E   Work experience, sponsored under a cooperative education program, is not eligible for transfer credit.

VI.F   Continuing Education Units (CEU's) are not accepted in transfer for credit

VII   ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

VII.A Vermont Law School/University of Vermont (VLS/UVM 3+2 program)

1. Transfer credit from the Vermont Law School will be considered for transfer only when courses are taken as part of the VLS/UVM 3+2 articulation agreement. Courses from the Vermont Law School will transfer as GNRL XXX when applicable if passed with a grade of C or higher. Any law course taken outside of this formal institutional articulation agreement is not eligible for transfer credit at the University of Vermont.

Definitions

Accreditation: a system for recognizing educational institutions for a level of performance, integrity and quality that entitles them to the confidence of the educational community and the public they serve. Recognition is extended either by a system of nongovernmental voluntary institutional or professional association or by a governmental board or agency.

College: degree granting post-secondary school offering formal educational instruction.

Content: information contained or covered within a specific course, period of instruction or period of directed self-study.

Course: a structured supervised learning situation under the sponsorship of a recognized educational institution. Examples of supervised learning situations that are considered to be courses are lectures, laboratories, studio studies, performance studies, independent studies, guided readings and research and internships.

Credit: official recording of the work of a student in a particular course of study, used herein to indicate only post-secondary school learning.

Credit-by-Examination: earning degree credit for a body of knowledge in an existing college course by taking a comprehensive examination without experiencing the classroom instruction.

Early Autumn Semester: slightly shorter than the standard 15 week semester. Still utilizes the semester credit hour system.

Education: learning produced by instruction or guided study entailing, in part, theory and history of the subject being taught.

Equity: the type and nature of course presented for transfer must be comparable to the type and nature of courses offered for credit at the University of Vermont. Intensity of instruction must be comparable for credits to transfer at par.

Formal recognition: acknowledgement by public voluntary educational standards boards or governmental agencies of a level of educational performance, quality and integrity which entitles the institution in question to a confidence expressed by the educational community accreditation.

Institution: educational organization sponsoring post-secondary education.

Intensity: depth and breadth of the subject covered within a given time period.
Nature: type, kind, or unique direction or purpose of particular education for instruction.

Physical Education Activities: physical endeavors under the guidance of one trained in a particular physical skill or sport aimed at improving physical health and performance in the particular skill area. The instructor must be on the faculty of an accredited college or university.

Resident credit: credits earned through study at the home college or university, herein, the University of Vermont.

Transcript: formal printed record of a student's learning issued by the teaching or sponsoring institution including subjects studies, level of achievement reached, time and duration of learning.

University: a post-secondary educational institution of the highest level, comprised of more than one college and authorized to grant both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

University of Vermont: the divisions and colleges comprising the undergraduate degree environment of the total institution. (Does not include any courses or programs ineligible for degree credit.)

Procedures

TRANSFER PROCESS

A.   The Office of Transfer Affairs, a division of the Registrar, evaluates all undergraduate, post-secondary school education presented from outside the University of Vermont for acceptance to the University.

B.   The Academic Advisor for a student determines the appropriateness and applicability of accepted courses to a specific degree program. The Dean of the College or School has the ultimate approval of applicability toward the degree requirements

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION FOR TRANSFER CREDIT CONVERSION

A.   All course work presented for transfer must appear on an official transcript sent directly from the original teaching institution to the office of the Registrar at the University of Vermont.

B.   Copies, facsimiles or student carried transcripts will not be accepted.

C.   All foreign transcripts, not issued in English, must have an accompanying translation certified by the original transcribing institution, the governmental education agency of the host country, the American Embassy of the host country or a professional translation service approved by the University of Vermont.

D.   Foreign institutions that provide only one original document certifying attendance, course of instruction, and achievement should be asked to mail the certifying documents directly to the University of Vermont. The originals will be retained until credit transfer has been completed. Certified copies will be retained for the student's record, and the originals will be returned to the student.

Forms

None

Contacts

Questions related to the daily operational interpretation of this policy should be directed to:

Office of Transfer Affairs
360 Waterman Bldg.
85 S. Prospect St.
Burlington, VT 05405
(802) 656-0867
Fax: (802) 656-8230

The Provost and Senior Vice President is the official responsible for the interpretation and administration of this policy.

Related Documents / Policies

None

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

Effective Date

Approved by the President on January 23, 2013

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

Procedure for Resolving Curricular Disputes between Academic Units

According to the UVM Course Action Process adopted by the Faculty Senate on January 14, 2013, in cases where two or more units enter into a dispute about a proposed course action and cannot resolve it among themselves, the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) will arbitrate the dispute; its decision will be binding. This document describes the arbitration process.

Several times per year, the Provost's Office posts a batch of recently received Course Action Forms (CAFs) for public review. The review period for each batch is approximately four weeks. In cases where a conflict is noted, the following procedure is employed:

1) Units send concerns to the Office of the Provost, Attention of the Assistant Provost.
2) The Assistant Provost informs all relevant units of a question/concern and indicates that they should be working things out.
   a) The units should meet to seek resolution within 10 business days, or no later than 10 days after the final review period for the year. If no resolution occurs, the dispute will proceed to the CAC. (Days 1 – 10)
3) The dispute will be assigned to an *ad hoc* subcommittee of six voting faculty members of the CAC. No members will be from the schools or colleges involved. A CAC member from the Library – which does not offer courses - will serve as a "permanent" subcommittee chair.
4) The parties will have five days to write a summary of no more than two pages that will be submitted to the Provost's Office and posted on CourseLeaf so all parties and the subcommittee can review the materials. (Days 11-15)
5) The parties will have five days to rebut information provided in the summaries. The rebuttals (≤two pages) should be submitted to the Provost's Office for posting on CourseLeaf so all parties and the subcommittee can review the materials. (Days 16-20)
6) The subcommittee will work from written materials provided by the parties and can request additional materials as necessary. It has 10 business days to complete its review. (Days 21-30)
7) If the subcommittee requests, a final review and decision may be requested for the next CAC meeting.
8) The decision is reported by the CAC chair to the parties, the Provost's Office, and the Senate Office.
9) Based on the decision, the Provost's Office will either forward the CAF to the Registrar's Office for entry into the Student Information System (e.g., Banner) or return the CAF for revision.

Notes: Courses that are under dispute may not be offered as Special Topics courses until the dispute is resolved, nor can they be withdrawn for later resubmission.

Academic Department and Program Name Changes: Proposed Approval Process

Process and Rationale: A proposal to change the name of a UVM department or program is initiated within the unit in question and is subsequently approved by the college or program curriculum committee and the dean. It is then transmitted to the Faculty Senate via the Provost's Office and is reviewed by the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee. Historically name-change proposals were approved by the Senate and then by the President and the Board of Trustees. However, in 2009 the Board delegated its authority in such matters to the President. It is now unclear where the review process stops. (Is it with the Curricular Affairs Committee, who then reports the action to the Senate? This is how substantial changes to programs are reviewed under the Appendix B process. Alternatively, should name changes come to the full Senate for a vote, as new program proposals do?) This document clarifies the process around name changes and establishes policy governing such actions.

Proposed Approval Process: We propose that henceforth department and program name changes as well as the names of majors, minors, and tagged degrees be approved by the Curricular Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC), and the Faculty Senate. The President of the University will consider the action following approval at the previous levels.

Actions to be taken by the Department Initiating the Change:

1 – Determine at the Department/Program level the names that are to be changed. Changes could include:

> Name of Department or Program
> Name of Major
> Name of Minor
> Name of Tagged Undergraduate Degrees
> Name of Tagged Graduate Degrees
> Subject Prefix

2 – Clear the proposed changes with the Registrar's Office before department- or program-level action is taken. This is to ensure that the proposed new name/prefix hasn't been used in the past.

3 – Obtain departmental- and college-level approval of the proposed name change; submit approved request to the Faculty Senate via the Associate Provost for Curricular Affairs.

4 – Obtain Curricular Affairs Committee, Faculty Senate Executive Council, and Faculty Senate approval of the name change. Proposed changes must be approved by the Faculty Senate by its last meeting of the fall semester (usually early December) to be effective the following academic year.

5 - The Faculty Senate Office will send a transmittal form to the President's Office. Once the President and Provost have signed the transmittal, notify the Registrar's Office. The new name will be entered in the student information system (e.g., Banner) and, as appropriate, the new subject prefix will be created in the student information system and the catalogue management software (e.g., CourseLeaf).

6 – For Subject Prefix Changes:

A - A spreadsheet must be created to map each course under the old prefix to the new prefix. Some courses may be deleted and not replaced with the new prefix; some courses may receive a new number in addition to the new prefix; and some courses may retain their number under the new prefix. (See sample spreadsheet at the end of this document.).

B - The spreadsheet should be attached to one of the electronic Course Action Forms (CAFs) in the catalogue management software.

C - All of the courses with the existing prefix must be deleted (via CAFs in the catalogue management software).

D - New courses must be created with the new prefix (via CAFs in the catalogue management software).

E - The deleted and new courses must be submitted to the catalogue management software in pairs: a course under the old prefix cannot be deleted until its counterpart in the new prefix has been created.

F - Courses in other departments that include courses with the old prefix in their pre- or co-requisites or cross-listings must be updated via CAFs in the catalogue management software. The department initiating the prefix change should initiate these CAFs.

G - Course changes that are limited to re-numbering or prefix changes will not be submitted for the public review period of the Course Action Process.

H – Confirm that the correct course list (driven by subject prefix) will display in the next version of the Catalogue.

7 – For Department/Program, Tagged Degree (Graduate and Undergraduate), Major, Minor Name Changes:

Update names in the Catalogue

Department/Program Names:
- on left-hand navigation bar for the college/school
- on the department/program page

Tagged Degree Names:
- on the department/program page (major tab)

Major and/or Minor Names:
- on the University list of majors/minors
- on the college list of majors/minors
- on the department list of majors/minors (major and minor tab)

- on the major/minor page itself

8 – Notify other Administrative Offices as appropriate including Admissions, Student Financial Services, the Office of Institutional Research, the Business Process Re-engineering Team (for PeopleSoft updates for department name changes), and University Communications (the web team).

Sample Spreadsheet

Course Title	Existing Prefix and Number	New Prefix and Number	Delete (no part in new curriculum)
History of the Babylonian Empire	AAA 001	BBB 001	
History of the Roman Empire	AAA 002	BBB 002	
History of the Byzantine Empire	AAA 003		X
History of the Ottoman Empire	AAA 004	BBB 050	
History of the British Empire (new course)		BBB 123	

Memo To: The Faculty Senate
From: The Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, Cathy Paris, Chair
Date: April 16, 2014
Subject: Approval of Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health

---

The action recommended in the following memo was unanimously approved by the Curricular Affairs Committee at its meeting of April 10, 2014.

I. Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health

The Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee received a request from the College of Medicine, the Graduate College, and Continuing and Distance Education to create a new **Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health**. The Department of Medicine in the College of Medicine will be the responsible academic unit. Dr. Jan Carney, Professor of Medicine and Associate Dean for Public Health in the College of Medicine, will be responsible for ensuring the academic integrity of the program. Department of Medicine Chair Dr. Polly Parsons will be responsible for ensuring the quality of the faculty teaching courses in and for the program.

Oversight An advisory committee including the program director, advisors from Continuing and Distance Education (CDE) with expertise in health programs and distance education, and identified faculty who are currently teaching courses in Public Health will oversee the certificate program. In addition, meetings of all faculty teaching courses in the certificate program will be convened at least twice a year to discuss best practices in online education, quality measures, faculty development, needs for additional courses, and progress towards meeting program goals and objectives.

Rationale The proposed online Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health (CGSEPH) has been developed in response to an urgent need to improve public health and to better prepare students in the health professions and professionals already practicing in the field to meet the health-related needs of diverse populations in a changing health care system. To meet this need requires changes such that public health can become an added path of study during medical school, and an additional option for study for other graduate students and for professionals already practicing in the field. It is also clear that greater emphasis is needed on population health and on prevention at the individual and population levels if we are to meet the national goals and objectives of "Healthy People 2020." The proposed CGSEPH is designed to help meet these needs by providing current medical students, graduate students in other health-related graduate programs, Public Health employees in state and local agencies, and employees in other neighboring states and across the country, the opportunity to study public health issues

and earn a certificate credential.

Strengths of the Proposed Program

- The rationale for the program is well supported by evidence of national need established by a market survey process through CDE.

- Local interest in the current Certificate of Graduate Study in Public Health (CGSPH) is strong, as demonstrated by letters of support from the Department of Public Health.
- The goals of the program are well aligned with the mission and mission and long-range plans for the COM and the University.
- The program is well positioned to meet the needs of the surrounding and broader community for education in environmental public health.
- The proposal enjoys the support of collaborating units within UVM including the Rubenstein School.
- The program is multidisciplinary in its development and implementation, with participating programs, departments, schools, and colleges including COM, Department of Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, College of Nursing and Health Services, UVM Extension, and Vermont Department of Health.

II. Relationship of the Proposed Certificate Program to UVM's Existing Public Health Offerings

The CGSEPH differs from the recently (May 2012) approved CGSPH in that it provides the opportunity for students to focus coursework on environmental aspects of public health (12 credits) while requiring of them two courses, Epidemiology and Public Health & Health Policy, that ground them in traditional aspects of the Public Health discipline. The CGSEPH, like the CGSPH, is designed as a stand-alone program, however all of the credits are transferable to the Master of Public Health (MPH) program should the student decide to pursue that degree in the future.

III. Requirements for the Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health

Admissions Requirements: To enroll in the CGSEPH, students are required to have a Bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university and to have taken at least one semester of college biology or other science and one semester of college mathematics or statistics.

Certificate Requirements: The CGSEPH will require the completion of 18 credits of coursework, four required courses in Environmental Health and two electives that can be chosen from a defined selection of environmental public heath and general public health courses. **Required Courses:** PH 301, *Public Health and Health Policy*; PH 302, *Epidemiology 1*; PH 304, *Environmental Public Health 1*; PH308, *Environmental Public Health 2*. **Electives currently offered:** PH 312, *Food Systems and Public Health;* PH 314, *Environmental Risk and Risk Communication;* PH 319, *Environmental Public Health Law, Ethics, and Policy.* Additional elective courses are planned or are under

development.

IV. Resources

Dr. Carney, Program Coordinator and Faculty Director, will be paid through contract with CDE, approved by the Department of Medicine. Continuing Education will pay a part-time curriculum coordinator and will provide staff support. All of the core courses and three of the electives are currently being offered. Additional course offerings are to be paid for through CDE.

All faculty will receive training from CDE and the Center for Teaching and Learning to prepare them for online teaching. The resources for this training are to be made available by these two units, with no additional expense requested to cover these costs. Overall, funding for this proposal is to come from tuition dollars generated by student enrollments. CDE will be responsible for costs associated with faculty compensation and program development.

V. Assessment

The program will undergo UVM Academic Program Review on the standard eight-year cycle.

VI. Review Process and Recommendation

A subcommittee of the Curricular Affairs Committee considered the proposal for the establishment of Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health. The full committee received an electronic copy of the subcommittee's report prior to their meeting of April 10, 2014, as well as a set of questions raised by the review subcommittee. These questions were addressed to the satisfaction of the subcommittee, who recommended approval of the new certificate program. The Curricular Affairs Committee unanimously approved this request to establish a Certificate of Graduate Study in Environmental Public Health.

Memo To: The Faculty Senate

From: The Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, Cathy Paris, Chair

Date: May 8, 2014

Subject: Approval of a proposal to change the name of Pathology to Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

---

The Curricular Affairs Committee at its meeting of May 7, 2014 unanimously approved the action recommended in the following memo.

The Department of Pathology in the UVM College of Medicine (COM) requests approval to change its name to Pathology and Laboratory Medicine. Within Fletcher Allen Health Care and the UVM Medical Group, the department is *already* known as Pathology and Laboratory Medicine. Having the same name for the department in all of the institutions of which it is a part makes good sense. Pathology and Laboratory Medicine is a name used by comparable academic pathology departments at institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania, UCLA, Brown University, and Boston University. The College of Medicine Advisory Council unanimously supports this proposal, as does the Pathology Department Executive Committee.

Recognizing that the proposed new name accurately reflects the department's mission and activities, and agreeing that it is logical that it have the same name in the various organizations of which it is a part, the Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the name change at it meeting of May 7, 2014.

A prefix change is not requested at this time: PATH will continue to be used.

Proposal to Faculty: The Vice President for Enrollment Management and Director of Admissions request the Faculty of the University of Vermont consider raising the minimum entrance requirement in science from its current minimum of two years to a minimum of three years, with a one year laboratory expectation for students applying for admission to UVM beginning with spring semester 2016.

Current Admissions Policy:

The 2013-14 Catalogue lists the following high school courses as the required minimum for entry into a degree program:

4 years of English
3 years of mathematics (Algebra I, geometry, Algebra II or equivalent course)
3 years of social sciences
2 years of natural or physical science, including a lab science
2 years of the same foreign language (American Sign Language meets this requirement)

Proposed Admissions Policy:

4 years of English
3 years of mathematics (Algebra I, geometry, Algebra II or equivalent course)
3 years of social sciences
3 years of natural ~~or physical~~ science, including a lab science
2 years of the same foreign language (American Sign Language meets this requirement)

Timeline:

March 2014 – proposal will be shared with Brian Reed as well as the Faculty Senate president and the chair of the Student Affairs committee

April 2014 – proposal will be voted on by the appropriate Faculty Senate body

Summer 2014 – announcements are added to the UVM website

Fall 2014 – Admissions staff begins sharing the change and timeline with high schools

April 2015 – information will be added to the 2015-16 catalogue

Summer 2015 – publications and Common Application information updated reflecting change for students applying for spring semester 2016.

Rationale:

A review of past undergraduate catalogues archived in Special Collections at Bailey-Howe Library finds that these general requirements have remained essentially unchanged since the 1961-62 academic year. An additional year of math and two years of social sciences have been added. The only change to the minimum science requirement, however, has been language added that one science course must have a laboratory component.

Thus, in over 50 years, in spite of major advances in science and technology, students entering UVM are not expected to present more than two years of science – at a minimum.

It should be noted that four of our seven undergraduate colleges and schools – CALS, CEMS, RSENR, and CNHS – do require science course work beyond the two year minimum. CESS requires biology for Human Development & Family Studies and Social Work majors, and recommends additional math and science course work beyond the minimum. CAS recommends 'course work across the span of liberal arts

Additionally, although the Admissions Office doesn't collect data about the exact number of units in core subjects presented by applicants, anecdotally, admissions officers report that the majority of successful applicants to UVM have exceeded minimum requirements in most areas. We do not appear to run a danger of turning away otherwise qualified applicants by raising the bar in the natural and physical sciences.

Finally, the state high school graduation requirement in all New England states (except Maine which requires two years and Rhode Island that does not specify the spread of courses; most public high schools require 3 science courses), as well as New York and New Jersey. Our Vermont high school counselor advisory board was in full support of this change.

We believe that increasing the required units of natural and physical sciences sends a positive message to our prospective students about expected academic rigor at the University of Vermont.

Sampling of Science Requirements for Admission – Public Flagships

Italics indicate those institutions requiring two years of science; several of these specify two laboratory sciences, so are more rigorous than UVM's minimum standard.

Institution Name – Public Flagships	Minimum Entrance Requirement in Natural and Physical Science
University of New Hampshire	3 years of science, two laboratory
University of Massachusetts/Amherst	Natural Science (2 labs): 3
University of Connecticut Storrs	*2 years of a laboratory science*
University of Rhode Island	*2 in a physical or natural science*
University of Maine Orono	*Variable by program; 2 on average*
University of Delaware	Science Years Required – 3 (2 laboratory science)
Binghamton	Difficult to find: appears to be five units of math and science, with certain programs requiring specific courses
Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey	*2 years*
University of Maryland, College Park	Three years of science in at least two different areas, with at least two lab experiences
University of Virginia	No stated requirement: Take the best program available to you in your core subjects.
University of North Carolina System (including Chapel Hill)	3 course units in science (must include a biological science, physical science, and at least one laboratory course)
University of Georgia	4 Required units (OS students may use their 8th grade science as the 4th science
University of Florida	3 years (2 units must include laboratory)
Pennsylvania State	Three units of science are required
The Ohio State University	3 units of science with significant lab experience
University of Michigan	3 units for all colleges or divisions; 4 units for engineering and nursing
University of Minnesota	Science – 3 years
University of Wisconsin/Madison	Not strictly required but 3-4 years recommended for student to be competitive
Indiana University	6 credits (semesters) of sciences, including at least 4 credits of laboratory sciences – biology, chemistry, or physics
University of Tennessee	1 unit of biology, 1 unit of chemistry or physics, 1 unit of additional science
University of Illinois	*2 years required minimum; 4 years recommended*
University of Kansas	Kansas Board of Regents Curriculum: Natural Science: 3 units required
University of Missouri	Three units (not including general science), one of which must be a lab
University of Arkansas	Natural Sciences – 3 units
University of Iowa	Liberal Arts & Business: 3 years, including one year from at least

	two of these areas: biology, chemistry, and physics
University of Texas - Austin	Texas's Uniform Admission Policy requires 4 credits of science
University of Oklahoma	3 units of laboratory science (4 recommended)
University of New Mexico	Recommended: Physical Science – 3 units: 2 should be a laboratory science such as Biology, Chemistry, or Physics
University of Arizona	Laboratory Science 3 units/years. ACT scores of 20+ on science section or 600+ on SAT Subject Tests may substitute
University of Utah	3 years, two of which are requirement to be taken from the following: chemistry, physics and biology or human biology
University of South Dakota	3 years of laboratory science
University of Montana	*Two years of laboratory science*
University of Colorado at Boulder	Natural Science (3) as mandated by the Colorado Department of Higher Education
University of Wyoming	4 years Science
UCLA	*Laboratory Science: 2 years required; 3 recommended (University of California minimum admission requirements)*
University of Oregon	Science – 3 years
University of Washington	*Lab science – 2 credits. At least one of the credits must be in biology, chemistry, or physics*

Private Universities

Selective private universities are less likely than flagship publics to make specific course requirements/recommendations for admission. They instead talk about the role of a rigorous high school curriculum in a holistic admissions process.

 Here is a small sample of private institutions in our approximate peer group:

Institution Name – Private University	Minimum Entrance Requirement in Natural and Physical Science
Boston University	Recommended: three to four years of laboratory science
University of Richmond	At least two units of laboratory science
Bucknell University	Engineering students are required to have one year of either chemistry or physics. 3 years minimum strongly recommended.

From: Brian Reed, Associate Provost for Teaching and Learning
To: Faculty Senate Executive Council
Re: Update and Initial Proposal for Moving Forward with Online Course Evaluations
Date: May 8, 2014
Cc: E. Thomas Sullivan, President
        David Rosowsky, Provost and Senior Vice President

_____

As you may recall, in the Spring of 2012 the Faculty Senate passed a motion to move from paper to online course evaluations. There was an RFP and extensive vetting process to determine the best vendor to provide a platform for online evaluations of academic courses at UVM. We had expected to contract with ConnectEDU for this purpose, however, it was announced on April 30, 2014 that ConnectEDU had filed for bankruptcy protection <http://shar.es/SHCVv>. Fortunately, the University had not yet entered into a contract with the firm.

I see this as an opportunity to regroup and reflect on where we are now versus two years ago, and where we want to go from here. I suggest we reframe online course evaluations in a broader context. The broader context is to develop robust, multidimensional models for assessing teaching performance in each school and college. **The goal is to provide meaningful formative and summative assessments of teaching without threatening academic freedom, jeopardizing academic quality/rigor, or having information be used for unintended purposes.** The process for developing these models needs to involve all constituencies: the deans, directors, chairs, students and the Faculty Senate. Our approach must make clear to students that they share responsibility for their education; and make clear to faculty that both teaching effectiveness and the creation of conducive learning environments are valued. This memo constitutes an initial proposal for the purposes of discussion about how best to move forward on the assessment of teaching performance.

The Process

Unit-Specific Models for Assessing Teaching Performance

The Provost will charge the academic deans to develop a model for assessing teaching performance in their college that includes, but is not limited to, the results of student evaluations of courses. Each dean, in consultation with their faculty and students will determine additional means for evaluating and assessing teaching effectiveness as broadly defined above. This might, for example, include an assessment of how course activities are tied to learning objectives and/or some form of peer evaluation of teaching. The key here is that a college cannot rely solely on student input. The model must comprise a broad and credible methodology for obtaining the proper information to assess teaching performance. The deans are encouraged to engage their faculty in a consultative manner to gather input and feedback on any supplemental assessment mechanism(s). A form developed for this purpose should be shared with faculty prior to implementation.

The Provost's Office will review each unit's proposed model on the basis of the guidelines noted above, and in consultation with the Faculty Senate. Once it has been approved by the Provost, the dean will be responsible for implementing the model. The process and procedures will be posted and communicated to all teaching faculty in the college prior to implementation.

Online Evaluations Revisited: A Common Set + Program-Specific Items

The deans will clearly communicate their goals for teaching effectiveness and the type of learning environment they wish to ensure within their colleges. The department chairs or program directors will then work with their faculty to develop a list of not more than twelve questions they would like to use in a new online tool for undergraduate student evaluations of teaching. The questions should be designed to provide information for specifically stated purposes including formative feedback to instructors, faculty performance evaluations and RPT decisions. Some questions could also be designed to assess certain phenomena, such as teaching effectiveness as a function of class size or prerequisites; or how specific learning outcomes are achieved as a function of teaching style or course format. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at Syracuse University has created a bank of valid, reliable items for online course evaluations (OIRA Item Bank) which may be very helpful.

All of the questions will be collected by the Provost's Office and analyzed for common elements. We anticipate a handful of questions will emerge as common to all or nearly all departments. The Provost's Office will then provide the Senate with a set of common questions, with data on the sources and, and seek approval for their use in an online course evaluation tool that would be augmented by any other department-selected questions. The common items plus unit-specific items will comprise the online tool for the evaluation of teaching, to be implemented on a web-based platform, yet to be determined. This will be one part of each unit's assessment model. United Academics will be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the set of common questions before they are implemented.

The data from online course evaluations will be used in the same ways they are currently used i.e. formative feedback to instructors, performance evaluations and RPT processes. Access to these data will be limited in the same ways it is limited at present – accessible only to the appropriate parties at program, department and college levels, and only at the appropriate times as defined by the unit's practices for providing instructors with course evaluation results and by performance evaluation and RPT guidelines. Any other proposed uses of the data must be included in a school or college's proposed model where it will be subject to review and approval as described above.

The Online Platform

During the time this process is going on in the schools and colleges, the Provost's Office, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, will seek a different vendor based on the recommendations of the Director of Institutional Research and the IT Security Officer.

Timeframe (To be determined)

mm/dd/2014	Deans engage their faculty to develop comprehensive model for assessing teaching performance
mm/dd/2014	Selection of an online platform
mm/dd/2014	Review and approval of models by Provost
mm/dd/2014	Departments develop survey items for online evaluations of teaching and learning
mm/dd/2014	Collection and analysis of survey items
mm/dd/2014	Determination of a set of common items in consultation with Faculty Senate
mm/dd/2014	Training in the use of online platforms for course evaluations
Dec. 2014??	Implementation of online course evaluations in all academic units

Standards for Undergraduate Certificate Programs at UVM

Description

Undergraduate Certificate Programs are a credentialed course of study focused on a particular topic germane to the mission and vision of the University of Vermont. These programs are for matriculated undergraduate students only, and constitute a category of certificate programs distinct from Post-Baccalaureate Certificates (including Certificates of Graduate Study), Continuing Education Academic Certificates, and Continuing Education Professional Certificates.

A distinguishing feature of Undergraduate Certificate programs is a capstone or other mentored learning experience that integrates knowledge and skills from prior coursework and in which students learn through innovation, creativity and reflection. Academic units have the freedom to design specific curricula for Undergraduate Certificates, but those curricula must conform to the minimum requirements set forth in this document.

Purposes

The purposes of undergraduate certificates are:
1. To broaden and enrich learning and life skills opportunities for undergraduate students without impeding the students' ability to complete their degree requirements in a timely manner.
2. To engage students in substantive learning experiences to which they would otherwise not be exposed.
3. To expand experiential and interdisciplinary learning options at the University of Vermont.
4. To promote integrative learning and offer students the opportunity to gain additional exposure to areas of particular interest.

General Guidelines

1. Undergraduate certificate programs should offer a unique learning experience that does not largely replicate or compete with existing academic minors

2. Each undergraduate certificate program is established and administered by one or more sponsoring academic units which will be responsible for maintaining program quality.

3. Undergraduate certificate programs must have a clearly stated mission, program goals, learning objectives and desired student outcomes. The curriculum is scaffolded in such a way as to foster developmental growth of the student over the course of the certificate program.

4. Undergraduate certificates are comprised of a minimum of 12 credits of academic core courses, at least 6 of which must be at the 100-level or higher, plus a significant credit-bearing integrative learning component.

5. The vehicles for integrative learning may include, but are not limited to, credited academic internships, service-learning courses, teaching, research, reflective essays, case studies or creative projects.

6. Prerequisite coursework may be required for enrollment in an undergraduate certificate program.

7. Special topics courses may be included in undergraduate certificate programs, although they must be reviewed for permanent status after three offerings in separate semesters, consistent with academic policies.

8. Undergraduate certificates are not to be required for any degree program.

9. No more than 50% of the total credits in the certificate program may be transfer credits.

10. Students enrolled in an undergraduate certificate program must maintain a minimum grade point average (GPA) and other performance standards as specified by the sponsoring academic unit(s).

11. Successful completion of an undergraduate certificate will be recorded in the student's official transcript. Unsuccessful completion of an undergraduate certificate will not prevent a student from graduating and will not be recorded in the transcript.

12. Each undergraduate certificate program will be included in the appropriate cluster of programs in the APR schedule.

13. The Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate shall review proposed undergraduate certificate programs with respect to these standards and criteria.

Operational Principles

1. Proposal Development and Approval: The sponsoring unit (Department, School or College) will prepare a proposal following the format described below. As with any new or substantially modified academic program, Undergraduate Certificate programs must undergo the established review and approval processes at the department, college, Faculty Senate and University levels, including the Board of Trustees.

2. Application and Admission to Undergraduate Certificate Programs: Admissions will be handled by the sponsoring unit(s). Students must apply to the sponsoring unit(s) by the date specified using a standard application form endorsed by the Curricular Affairs Committee. The sponsoring unit(s) will notify the student and the home unit (the college or school of the student's major) of acceptance or rejection.

3. Catalog Description: Undergraduate certificate programs will be described in detail in the UVM Catalog.

4. <u>Enrollment Limitations</u>: Because of enrollment limitations, some undergraduate certificate programs may not be accessible to all students.

5. <u>Commitment</u>: Sponsoring units will make a good faith effort to make curricular components available on a regular basis so that students can complete their undergraduate certificate programs in a timely manner.

6. <u>Advising</u>: The sponsoring unit(s) will develop and maintain an effective system of advising for all students enrolled in its undergraduate certificate programs.

7. <u>Certification and Student Records</u>: The student's home unit shall certify completion of the undergraduate certificate. The sponsoring unit is the only body authorized to make course substitutions for satisfying the certificate requirements and shall notify the student's home unit in writing regarding any substitutions. The student's major advisor is not authorized to make course substitutions in certificate requirements.   As with all credentialed academic programs, undergraduate certificates will be indicated as such in students' transcripts.

8. <u>Alteration of Undergraduate Certificate Programs</u>: Alterations to undergraduate certificate programs made by its sponsor and which meet or exceed the noted criteria must be submitted for review by the Curricular Affairs Committee as described in *Format for Proposals to Substantially Revise a Curriculum, Academic Program, Research or Service Endeavor* (Appendix B).

Proposal Format for a New Undergraduate Certificate Program

I. Title of the Undergraduate Certificate, participating faculty, responsible academic unit(s), and description of the academic certificate program as it would appear in the University Catalog.

II. Rationale for the Undergraduate Certificate Program
   A. Philosophic Goals Statement
   B. General and Specific Objectives

III. Web page content per standard template to be designed by the CAC and the Registrar; content to include a description of required coursework and integrative learning component(s).

IV. Relationship of this undergraduate certificate program to the current mission and long-range plans of:
   A. Participating departments, schools and colleges, and co-curricular units
   B. The University

V. Relationship to minors and undergraduate certificates offered currently

VI. Indicate any other minors and undergraduate certificate programs that are similar in title or content and illustrate how they may overlap or differ.

VII. Evidence of communication with academic units likely to be involved or affected by the undergraduate certificate program. Indicate the effect (cost, enrollments, etc.) the undergraduate certificate will have on other academic units.

VIII. If the proposed undergraduate certificate is to be jointly sponsored by more than one academic unit, indicate how the program responsibilities are to be shared across the units with regard to academic advising, course offerings, administration of course substitutions, integrative project supervision, etc.

IX. Explain the anticipated effect of the undergraduate certificate on enrollments. List required new courses or description of changes to existing courses.

X. Resources
   A. Faculty: anticipated appointments;
   B. Describe how facility and technology needs will be met;
   C. Library support:
      1. Library resources presently available to support the undergraduate certificate;
      2. Additional demands with estimate of dollar cost for additions.

XI. Cost estimates:
   A. First year costs in addition to current budget;
   B. Total costs for first five years in addition to current budget.

XII. Schedule: Proposed starting date

XIII. Endorsements:
   A. Department(s) of undergraduate certificate;
   B. School or College curriculum committee(s);
   C. School or College dean(s).