



FACULTY SENATE

**Executive Council**

December 10, 2018 4:00 – 5:30 pm  
Waterman 427A

**Minutes**

**Present:** Professors Almstead, Barnaby, Beckage, Burns, Carney, Chittenden, Eyler, Giangreco, Harrington, Paris, Stickle, Toolin

**Absent:** Professors Prue

**Guests:** none

---

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m. in Waterman 427A

1. **Approval of November 12, 2018 Minutes.** President Paris moved to approve the minutes as written. The motion was seconded and carried.
2. **Degree Corrections.** Laurie Eddy presented a degree correction requested by the College of Arts and Sciences.  
**Motion:** Evan Eyler moved to approve the degree correction as presented.  
**Vote:** 10 Approve, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain
3. **Chair's Remarks** – Cathy Paris opened a discussion on the revised report from the ad hoc committee on Faculty Senate Processes. The ad hoc committee will present their report to the Faculty Senate at the December 17, 2018 meeting. There will be a 30-day comment period for Senator feedback beginning in January. Comments to be considered on this report will be received and reviewed by the ad hoc committee and the Executive Council.
4. **Topics for Focused Discussion at Spring Senate Meetings.** Suggestions included:
  - A call for ideas from Senators
  - February – discuss comments received in response to ad hoc committee report
  - March/April – SAC will bring two items forward: 1) electronic course evaluations recommendation, and 2) academic calendar discussion
5. **CAC Consent Agenda.** Laura Almstead presented three items for the CAC consent agenda:
  - New Bachelor of Science in Anthropology (CAS)
  - New Pathway into Existing MA in Psychology (CAS)
  - Name change of the Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics to Department of Romance Languages (CAS)**Motion:** Cathy Paris called a vote to approve the consent agenda as presented for inclusion on the Faculty Senate November agenda.  
**Vote:** 11 Approve, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain

6. **FPPC Resolution on Funding Residential Learning Communities.** Andrew Barnaby presented a document (attached to these minutes) for discussion. The document outlines principles around funding for the RLCs. Andrew will presentation these guiding principles to the Faculty Senate at the December meeting. The FPPC will request comments regarding the financial mechanism most conducive to producing the best outcomes for the most students.
7. **Agenda for P&P Meeting Thursday, December 13, 2:00-3:00 p.m.** Items suggested for the agenda included the FPPC's blueprint for RLC funding. Additional agenda suggestions should be sent via email to Cathy Paris.
8. **Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting of December 17**
  - Minutes of the November 26 Senate meeting
  - FS President's Remarks, Cathy Paris
  - UVM President's Remarks, Tom Sullivan
  - UVM Provost's Remarks, David Rosowsky
  - Report of the ad-hoc committee on Faculty Senate Processes, Tom Borchert
  - Curricular Affairs Committee Report, Laura Almstead – Laura will provide edited documents for report
  - Quantitative Reasoning Update, Rosi Rosebush
  - FPPC Resolution, Andrew Barnaby
9. **New Business** – none at this time
10. **Adjourn** – The meeting adjourned at 5:41 pm.



The University of Vermont

November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Faculty Senate President Paris, the following candidate from the College of Arts & Sciences has completed all requirements for their degree.

I move that the Senate recommend this candidate to the Board of Trustees for the awarding of the appropriate degree and consider them as a September 2018 graduate. After review of their record, they have completed all necessary graduation requirements. The rationale has been included below for the student.

The College of Arts Sciences strongly sponsors this request.

**Bachelor of Arts**

Julia Rose McCarthy

Demarest, NJ

Transfer credit was received after the initial list was due that completed their missing degree requirements.

DRAFT Proposals for Senate Meetings and Procedures  
Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Revise Faculty Senate Procedures  
11-26-18

This ad-hoc subcommittee was formed in Fall 2017 and officially charged by Faculty Senate President Cathy Paris to broadly examine Faculty Senate process and procedures and make recommendations that would support increased faculty engagement in Senate operations. Towards this end, we surveyed members of the faculty Senate and met with individuals that presently (or historically) have played leadership roles in the Senate's leadership both at the full Senate and in its various Standing Committees. From these efforts, two major and inter-related themes emerged as underlying barriers to Senator engagement:

- 1) Information relevant to senate meetings is not always disseminated in the most efficient manner, resulting in the majority of the meetings being consumed by "report out" or informational agenda items rather than true discussion/debate.
- 2) An implicit cultural expectation that items under Senate consideration should be expediently voted on and/or approved without being given ample time for discussion and debate.

As a result of our analysis of the Faculty Senate survey results, our individual meetings with various Faculty Senate stakeholders, and internal discussions, this ad-hoc committee has outlined below a number of explicit proposals that are intended to improve both efficiency and engagement of Faculty Senate membership. These items are being presented to the Senate body for consideration as guidelines for Senate "best practice". After Senate discussion we will ask for the Senate to vote to approve these guidelines. We bring these proposals for Senate consideration as a single body, with the understanding that individual items may be modified as a result of Senate discussion prior to vote.

Faculty Senate Meeting Procedures and Engagement "Best Practice" Proposal.

1. Establish a New Senator Orientation open to new and existing faculty on an RSVP basis.
2. Limit presentations by administrative offices or committees to those items for which Senate input or vote is required. When such presentations are necessary, provide context and mark on agenda as "Senate Education".
3. "Report out" agenda items, such as committee reports that do not require Senate action, should be disseminated electronically and not put on the formal agenda unless otherwise proposed for discussion by the Senate floor.
4. Provide sufficient time for discussion before a vote takes place. Ideally issues should be discussed at one meeting and brought to the Senate for a vote the next meeting.

5. Provide a brief, dedicated “New Business” item on each agenda to appear early in the agenda as opposed to the end.
6. In order to more clearly link the work of the Senate and the Standing committees, a representative/s from each committee should be invited at least once a year to generate discussion on current committee-related issues that may benefit from broader participation/brainstorming from the senate floor and to answer questions. These are not to be “progress reports” which can be handled and viewed electronically.
  - a) At least once a semester, the FPPC provide the Senate membership with a presentation about the budgetary matters relevant to the Senate.
7. We welcome interaction with the President and the Provost, but we request that they address the Senate no more than once a semester, unless events require them to address a specific issue.
  - a) In addition, once a year we request an open forum where the President/Provost would field questions from the Senate floor.

Eyal Amiel, CNHS  
Thomas Borchert, CAS  
Chris Callahan, CALS/Extension  
Julie Roberts, CAS

## Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

**To:** The UVM Faculty Senate

**From:** Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, Laura Almstead, Chair

**Date:** December 7, 2018

**Re:** Approval of a proposal for a new Bachelor of Science in Anthropology submitted by the College of Arts and Sciences

---

At its meeting on December 6, 2018, the Curricular Affairs Committee approved the actions recommended in the following memo.

---

The Curricular Affairs Committee approved a proposal for a new Bachelor of Science in Anthropology from the Department of Anthropology in the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS). The new program will be overseen by the Director of Undergraduate Studies in the department, currently Scott Van Keuren. If approved by the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees, the new program will be offered starting fall 2019.

### ***Program Description and Rationale***

The proposed Bachelor of Science in Anthropology is an academically-intensive degree program that focuses on scientific and quantitative approaches to the anthropological study of human diversity and change. With an emphasis on analytical training, quantitative methods, as well as data collection, management, and interpretation, the proposed Anthropology BS will provide advanced training for undergraduates interested in fields that rely on scientific methods to analyze human biological and cultural diversity. Students completing the proposed BS in Anthropology will be well-positioned to compete for several local and regional career paths, including archaeological research, museums, forensics, and health services fields. The BS will also provide a strong foundation for students seeking graduate training in anthropology.

Anthropology is a diverse discipline that includes cultural, linguistic, biological, and archaeological fields. Due to this diversity, anthropology graduate programs do not outline specific undergraduate courses that applicants should take. However, students applying for graduate studies in Anthropology are expected to take coursework to prepare them for specific fields. Although the existing BA in Anthropology prepares students for graduate programs in cultural anthropology, it is not as effective at guiding students who will go on to pursue fields in archaeology, medicine, forensics, and biological anthropology. The proposed BS in Anthropology will fill this need, as well as catering to anthropology majors completing a pre-medicine curriculum or pursuing other career paths in lieu of graduate school.

### ***Relationship to Existing Programs***

There are no comparable BS programs at UVM. Although the existing BA in Anthropology provides options to concentrate in either Archaeology and Heritage Management or Global Health, the proposed BS will offer a more formal and expanded degree option for advanced students interested in graduate studies or post-

baccalaureate careers in anthropology and related fields. The proposed BS in Anthropology offers greater depth and breadth within the discipline and tracks students through specific coursework exploring the scientific study of archaeology, biological anthropology, and medical anthropology. Additionally, the BS requires more rigorous training in the natural sciences and in statistics to support research methodologies within these subdisciplines in anthropology (see Curriculum section). A student graduating with a BS in Anthropology will possess a range of technical skills for use in laboratory and field settings.

Nationally, the proposers indicated that almost half of the 50 departments listed in the 2011 National Research Council rankings of graduate programs in anthropology offer BS degrees (<https://www.chronicle.com/article/NRC-Rankings-Overview-/124703>). In developing the proposal, the proposers evaluated Bachelor of Science programs in nine highly-ranked anthropology departments at four-year public and private institutions (e.g. Pennsylvania State University, University of Florida). All nine departments offer both BA and BS degrees. The proposers indicated that the BS programs emphasize exposure and training to scientific and quantitative analyses and require mathematics (or statistics) and natural science courses to supplement anthropology offerings. Despite the availability of anthropology BS degrees nationally, there are no comparable programs at universities that engage in regional participation with UVM. The Department of Anthropology at UVM is one of the largest undergraduate-focused programs in the nation. Unlike comparable departments at other institutions that focus on socio-cultural anthropology, UVM's Anthropology Department is unique in its degree of commitment to the four subfields: archaeology, biological anthropology, sociocultural anthropology, and linguistic anthropology. This interdisciplinarity distinguishes it from other undergraduate-only departments, as well as other university departments its size. Therefore, this proposed BS in Anthropology will be well-positioned to attract prospective students who might be surveying other programs in the Northeast.

### ***Evidence of Interest, Anticipated Enrollments and Impact on Existing Programs***

At a Town Hall meeting with Anthropology faculty last spring, the proposers indicated that Anthropology majors expressed overwhelming support for a BS program. The proposers stated that a subset of majors (25/135) with interests in the biological and archaeological sciences, pre-medicine, and cultural or biological approaches to medical anthropology have enrolled in two relatively new, optional concentrations: Global Health and Archaeology/Heritage Management. Based on these numbers, they estimate that approximately 8 to 10 students will enroll in the BS program during the first academic year and hope to eventually grow to a total of 18 to 20 students in the new program.

The proposers do not anticipate inauguration of a BS in Anthropology will affect other programs. The proposed BS would appeal to a subset of students that would have previously pursued an Anthropology BA. Advanced students in the department already seek out additional courses in statistics, biology, etc. The chairs of Math/Statistics, Biology, Chemistry, and Geology all provided memos of support.

### ***Curriculum***

The proposed BS in Anthropology will require 41 to 43 credits in anthropology courses (see table on the following page) as well as two courses in the same foreign language (6 credits) at an appropriate level. Additionally, students will take six credits in statistics including STAT 141 and either STAT 183 or STAT 200, plus two four-credit BIOL, BCOR, CHEM, or GEOL laboratory courses. Other statistics courses may be substituted with approval from the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

## Required Courses

<b>INTRODUCTORY COURSES (12 credits)</b>	
ANTH 021	D2:SU: Cultural Anthropology
ANTH 024	D2:SU: Prehistoric Archaeology
ANTH 026	D2: Biological Anthropology
ANTH 028	D2: Linguistic Anthropology
<b>INTERMEDIATE COURSES (18 credits)</b>	
Four courses in anthropology at the 100-level and two additional anthropology courses at any level. At least 12 credits must be selected from the courses below.	
ANTH 040	Parenting and Childhood
ANTH 089	D2: Global Health Development & Diversity
ANTH 104	D2: Archaeology of the Americas
ANTH 106	Preserving the Past
ANTH 127	Modernity & Material Culture
ANTH 134	Prehistory of North America
ANTH 135	Prehistory of the US Southwest
ANTH 136*	Topics in Archaeology
ANTH 140	Primates and Anthropology
ANTH 141	Death, Burial, and Culture
ANTH 143	Forensic Anthropology
ANTH 146	Topics in Biological Anthropology
ANTH 160	D1: North American Indians
ANTH 164	Indians of the NE: Vermont
ANTH 172	D2: Gender, Sex and Culture
ANTH 173	D2: Foundations of Global Health
ANTH 174	D2: Culture, Health, and Healing
<b>Both of the courses below (1 credit each; 2 credits total)</b>	
ANTH 105	Introduction to the Major
ANTH 205	Senior Proseminar in Anthro
<b>ADVANCED COURSES (9 – 11 credits)</b>	
Three 200-level ANTH courses, with two of three selected from the courses below.	
ANTH 200	Fieldwork in Archaeology
ANTH 210	Archaeology Theory
ANTH 240	Human Osteology (4 credits)
ANTH 242	Research Methods Human Diversity (4 credits)
ANTH 245	Laboratory Archaeology Topics
ANTH 250	Museum Anthropology
ANTH 288	Anthropological Research in Global Health
ANTH 290	Methods of Ethnographic Fieldwork

\*New Course: ANTH 136 (Topics in Archaeology) will be established to phase out the use of the generic special topics courses (ANTH 195/196) and is at the public comment level in Courseleaf.

Only three credits from the following independent research courses may count toward the major: ANTH 192, 198, 292, 298; HON 202 and 203. Only three credits of the following practicum courses may count toward the major: ANTH 093, 191, 193, 291, and 293.

### ***Admission Requirements and Advising***

The proposed BS in Anthropology will open to all UVM undergraduates. All courses for the major must be taken for a letter grade and enrolled students must maintain an overall 2.0 grade-point average. Students will be assigned an advisor in the department that most aligns with their interests (e.g. archaeology, bioarcheology, medical anthropology). The Director of Undergraduate Studies will be available to advise anthropology minors and other non-majors who are interested in the program.

### ***Assessment***

The program will be evaluated by the department's Assessment Committee in concert with the department Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies. In addition to monitoring enrollment and retention in the program, the department will use a similar assessment plan established for the BA program, which employs indirect and direct means of assessing student satisfaction and outcomes, to evaluate the new BS in Anthropology. Since there is considerable flexibility in our plan and BA students will be allowed to take these classes, these assessment measures are suitable for the BS as well. A more specific means of assessing satisfaction and outcomes in laboratory courses and for the program overall will be added.

The department faculty will rely on student feedback collected during exit surveys, the annual Town Hall Meetings with majors and minors, and assessments of course content at various levels. The program will be formally assessed during the department's next Academic Program Review (AY 2023-24) based on protocol established for this process.

### ***Resource Requirements***

No new resources are required to launch the proposed BS in Anthropology. Present staff assignments may be adjusted depending on the number of students who pursue the new BS. Current faculty teach a range of lower- and upper-level courses that include area studies, anthropological theory, special-topic, and laboratory and field studies, and offer relevant courses to staff our BA Concentration in Anthropology of Global Health and BA Concentration in Archaeology and Heritage Management. These should adequately support the new program with no significant changes.

The department has recently remodeled both its seminar and laboratory spaces to enhance student training and research experiences. Further laboratory expansion is planned when the department acquires the photography lab on the fifth floor of Williams Hall (Rooms 505, 506, and 507).

### ***Evidence of Support***

The proposed BS in Anthropology was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and by the College of Arts and Sciences faculty. Additional memos of support were provided by the chairs of the Departments of Geology, Mathematics and Statistics, Biology, and Chemistry.

**Summary**

The proposed BS in Anthropology will provide students with an option to study in greater depth within the discipline, particularly in subdisciplines of archaeology and biological/medial anthropology. Students will receive more analytical training and emerge better prepared for careers in archaeology, medicine, forensics, and biological anthropology. The new program makes use of the diversity in academic interest of the Department of Anthropology faculty to offer a well-designed curriculum that allows students to gain knowledge in all of the core areas of Anthropology. There is evidence of interest from students currently pursuing a BA in Anthropology. Given that there are no comparable programs at universities that engage in regional participation with UVM and the aforementioned interdisciplinarity of the department, the proposed BS in Anthropology is well-positioned to attract prospective students surveying Anthropology programs in the Northeast.

## Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

**To:** The UVM Faculty Senate

**From:** Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, Laura Almstead, Chair

**Date:** December 7, 2018

**Re:** Approval of a proposal to change the name of the Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics, College of Arts and Sciences

---

At its meeting on December 6, 2018, the Curricular Affairs Committee approved the actions recommended in the following memo.

---

The Curricular Affairs Committee approved a proposal from the Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics (College of Arts and Sciences) to change the name of the department to the Department of Romance Languages.

In 2009, the Department of Communication Sciences (now Communication Sciences and Disorders) moved from the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) to the College of Nursing and Health Sciences. At the time, the two linguists in that department moved to the Department of Romance Languages (subsequently renamed Romance Languages and Linguistics) along with the previously approved Linguistic Minor as the fit for linguistics within the health sciences was problematic. In 2010, the department launched a Linguistics major, which has grown significantly since then. Although Romance Languages provided a much-appreciated home for linguistics, the needs, curricula, and, for the most part, interests, of a humanities program and a social sciences program are different. This was noticed by the external reviewers during the department's recent Academic Program Review. The external reviewers recommended addressing the lack of intellectual coherence between the Romance Languages and the Linguistics tracks, and suggested splitting Romance Languages and Linguistics apart as a possible solution.

For these reasons, the department decided to establish a Linguistics Program, similar in structure to other programs housed outside specific departments (e.g. Neuroscience). The independence of both the Romance Languages Department and the Linguistics Program will allow faculty to better focus on the growth and development of both entities. This restructuring was supported by all faculty in the department and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, who agreed to provide the necessary budgetary support, which is minimal. The CAC was also asked to consider the restructuring and voted in approval. Faculty involved in the Linguistics Program will retain their faculty appointments in the Department of Romance Languages, but may seek to change their primary faculty appointment to another CAS department at their discretion.

As a consequence of establishing a separate Linguistics Program, the department requested to change the name from the Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics to the Department of Romance Languages. The department code (currently RLL) will also be reverted to the previous code, ROM.

## **Funding blueprint for first-year courses in Residential Learning Communities (RLCs)**

**\* NOTE:** Two exceptions:

- a) courses taught in the Honors College
- b) courses taught as part of learning communities that for the most part aim to enroll students from just a single college (e.g. Dean's Signature programs in CAS)

### **A. Basic Principles**

1. In the interest of equity, roughly the same amount of money will be made available to the RLCs on a per student basis. The precise formula needs to be worked out. The distribution of money could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student. To achieve this equity, there must be some method of pooling the money that is generated via algorithm 1.
2. In the interest of equity, we must ensure that no degree-granting college (Responsibility Centers in IBB lingo; hereafter RCs) gets a disproportionate share of available revenue. An RLC that enrolls more students would necessarily still draw in more total \$\$\$. But even in this case, the revenue generated following algorithm 1 should be used by a sponsoring college only to pay for the costs associated with sponsoring an RLC. In short, the revenue should not be drawn off by a RC in support of other college needs.
3. Besides equity in itself, the funding model aims to guarantee that every RLC effectively has a dedicated source of revenue. That said, any RLC that fails to attract students in sufficient numbers might be disbanded.
4. We aim to avoid a "one-size fits all" concept for the RLCs. We expect that students would choose to enroll based on personal interest.
5. We assume that certain activities or programs offered through the currently operational RLCs would be of benefit to all students (though precisely how to identify these is to be determined). The funding for these should fall under some "general programming" model (most likely run through Residential Life).
6. For the time being, RLCs are being imagined primarily in terms of their residential organization (students living in dorm-based communities). That means the curricular element is best understood as co-curricular (or perhaps more akin to PE courses).
7. To be discussed: making some of the revenue available to the undergraduate degree-granting colleges in support of other initiatives with similar recruiting and retention goals: e.g. academic-, career-, or peer-advising.

## B. Specifics ... but a first-draft so subject to revision

1. RCs receive revenue at the value of ONE student credit hour for every first-time / first-year (FTFY) student who enrolls in that unit\*. Under the IBB model, this revenue is generated by all the students signing up for a **1-credit course “offered” in the unit in which they are enrolled in their first semester at UVM.** *See Section C below for further discussion of the nature of this course.*

\* The Honors College (HC) is not included because it is not an RC (and it is funded as a Support Center). But students enrolled in the HC would still be included in the headcount for the purposes of setting the revenue for FTFY students per RC.

2. Of that revenue, under one of the cost algorithms (7c?) the RCs are assessed at a rate of 60%\*; that money is directed to Residential Life (RL) as a “student fee”\*\*. (So, for example, if the value of a student credit hour were set at \$500, \$300 would go to RL.)

\* This is just an example; the percentage could be higher or lower.

\*\* There needs to be a FYE committee set up with oversight authority over this money.

3. RL allocates two-thirds\* of its funds\*\* to the RCs sponsoring RLCs and thus offering RLC-affiliated courses; the money is allocated with the understanding that the RCs will use the funds in support of instruction, staffing (e.g. Academic Directors and Program Directors), and associated programming in the RLCs.

\* This is an estimate (amount could be higher or lower). But based on the example above, \$200 of the original \$500 would be allocated by this method.

\*\* As noted under the “Basic Principles,” the money should be allocated so that each RLC roughly gets the same \$/student. (Again, this could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student.)

4. Whatever else an RLC does by way of programming, it will offer a 0-credit (or non-credit bearing) course to students who join it. The course will be graded pass/fail.

5. The remaining one-third\* of the funds directed to RL will be used to support general programming / staffing covering all the RLCs. See #5 under Basic Principles (above).

\* This is an estimate (amount could be higher or lower). But based on the example above, \$100 of the original \$500 would be allocated by this method.

6. The portion of the original revenue not directed from RCs to RL (in example above, \$200 of \$500) would be used to support other initiatives aimed at recruiting and retaining undergraduate students, especially first- and second-year students. See #7 under Basic Principles (above).

**C. one way of imagining the 1-credit course that all the FTFY students register for through their home colleges**

\* NOTE: since all FTFY undergraduates would be enrolled, we might imagine this as the same basic “course” for everyone (e.g. UVM 001). But we might make the funds available directly to the undergraduate degree-granting colleges, and they could run their own courses: so CAS 001 and CALS 001 and RSEN 001, etc.

I here offer part of the suggestion from the SGA (undergraduate) representative on the FPPC:

... require ALL students to take a 1 credit course that combines elements of the advising center, career hub, internships coordinator, wellness environment/living well etc. “College 101” if you will. That way it would be more equitable and the students who need these various services most would be “caught in the net cast wider” so to speak. Taking money from this venture (and perhaps dipping into other pots) would benefit not only students but also the efforts of faculty + staff. An incredible tool for the Provost’s favorite words “recruiting & retention” directed at all the things students need to be academically successful in their college career. The course I took at Elon [student started there and transferred to UVM] was somewhat like this, perhaps UVM could take the lead and combine elements of this with some of the wellness environment & career center stuff: <https://www.elon.edu/u/academics/koenigsberger-learning-center/elon-101/>

## Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

**To:** The UVM Faculty Senate

**From:** Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, Laura Almstead, Chair

**Date:** December 7, 2018

**Re:** Approval of a proposal for a new direct entry option into the existing Master of Arts in Psychology submitted by the College of Arts and Sciences in conjunction with the Graduate College

---

At its meeting on December 6, 2018, the Curricular Affairs Committee approved the actions recommended in the following memo.

---

The Curricular Affairs Committee approved a proposal for a new direct entry option into the existing Master of Arts in Psychology from the Department of Psychology (College of Arts & Sciences) in conjunction with the Graduate College. The Department of Psychological Sciences, College of Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee and Dean, and Dean of the Graduate College all voiced support for the new direct entry option. If approved by the Faculty Senate, the option will become available in fall 2019.

Currently, students pursuing a PhD in Psychology must earn a Master of Arts as part of their requirements. The Department of Psychological Sciences in conjunction with the Graduate College requested to add a stand-alone direct entry option for the MA in Psychology, with concentrations in General/Experimental Psychology and Clinical Psychology. Since the MA in Psychology will use the existing curriculum and UVM already grants a MA in Psychology, this does not create a new degree program. Students in the doctoral program will still continue to earn a MA in Psychology as part of their requirements.

The new entry pathway is aimed at students who wish to strengthen their credentials in order to be competitive for doctoral programs, students who wish to pursue careers that require research skills, or students who wish to gain an understanding of research as it pertains to intervention and prevention. A main goal of a new direct entry option for the MA in Psychology is to create a standalone Master's program to complement the PhD program, training select students who may be interested in a PhD program at UVM or elsewhere. An additional goal is to be able to offer an Accelerated Master's Program\* for select UVM undergraduates. Few accelerated Master's programs in Psychology exist at our regional competitor institutions. However, undergraduate students are increasingly interested in taking an extra, fifth year and finishing with both a Bachelor's degree and a Master's degree. Thus, a direct entry option for the MA in Psychology is likely to help attract and retain high-quality students.

*\*The program cannot request an AMP until there is a direct entry to the existing MA in Psychology. Once requested the AMP will undergo the usual approval process for such programs (unit-level and Graduate College Executive Committee).*

## **Funding blueprint for first-year courses in Residential Learning Communities (RLCs)**

**\* NOTE:** Two exceptions:

- a) courses taught in the Honors College
- b) courses taught as part of learning communities that for the most part aim to enroll students from just a single college (e.g. Dean's Signature programs in CAS)

### **A. Basic Principles**

1. In the interest of equity, roughly the same amount of money will be made available to the RLCs on a per student basis. The precise formula needs to be worked out. The distribution of money could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student. To achieve this equity, there must be some method of pooling the money that is generated via algorithm 1.
2. In the interest of equity, we must ensure that no degree-granting college (Responsibility Centers in IBB lingo; hereafter RCs) gets a disproportionate share of available revenue. An RLC that enrolls more students would necessarily still draw in more total \$\$\$. But even in this case, the revenue generated following algorithm 1 should be used by a sponsoring college only to pay for the costs associated with sponsoring an RLC. In short, the revenue should not be drawn off by a RC in support of other college needs.
3. Besides equity in itself, the funding model aims to guarantee that every RLC effectively has a dedicated source of revenue. That said, any RLC that fails to attract students in sufficient numbers might be disbanded.
4. We aim to avoid a "one-size fits all" concept for the RLCs. We expect that students would choose to enroll based on personal interest.
5. We assume that certain activities or programs offered through the currently operational RLCs would be of benefit to all students (though precisely how to identify these is to be determined). The funding for these should fall under some "general programming" model (most likely run through Residential Life).
6. For the time being, RLCs are being imagined primarily in terms of their residential organization (students living in dorm-based communities). That means the curricular element is best understood as co-curricular (or perhaps more akin to PE courses).
7. To be discussed: making some of the revenue available to the undergraduate degree-granting colleges in support of other initiatives with similar recruiting and retention goals: e.g. academic-, career-, or peer-advising.

## B. Specifics ... but a first-draft so subject to revision

1. RCs receive revenue at the value of ONE student credit hour for every first-time / first-year (FTFY) student who enrolls in that unit\*. Under the IBB model, this revenue is generated by all the students signing up for a **1-credit course “offered” in the unit in which they are enrolled in their first semester at UVM.** *See Section C below for further discussion of the nature of this course.*

\* The Honors College (HC) is not included because it is not an RC (and it is funded as a Support Center). But students enrolled in the HC would still be included in the headcount for the purposes of setting the revenue for FTFY students per RC.

2. Of that revenue, under one of the cost algorithms (7c?) the RCs are assessed at a rate of 60%\*; that money is directed to Residential Life (RL) as a “student fee”\*\*. (So, for example, if the value of a student credit hour were set at \$500, \$300 would go to RL.)

\* This is just an example; the percentage could be higher or lower.

\*\* There needs to be a FYE committee set up with oversight authority over this money.

3. RL allocates two-thirds\* of its funds\*\* to the RCs sponsoring RLCs and thus offering RLC-affiliated courses; the money is allocated with the understanding that the RCs will use the funds in support of instruction, staffing (e.g. Academic Directors and Program Directors), and associated programming in the RLCs.

\* This is an estimate (amount could be higher or lower). But based on the example above, \$200 of the original \$500 would be allocated by this method.

\*\* As noted under the “Basic Principles,” the money should be allocated so that each RLC roughly gets the same \$/student. (Again, this could either be a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled in the RLC or fixed dollar amount per RLC + a fixed dollar amount per student.)

4. Whatever else an RLC does by way of programming, it will offer a 0-credit (or non-credit bearing) course to students who join it. The course will be graded pass/fail.

5. The remaining one-third\* of the funds directed to RL will be used to support general programming / staffing covering all the RLCs. See #5 under Basic Principles (above).

\* This is an estimate (amount could be higher or lower). But based on the example above, \$100 of the original \$500 would be allocated by this method.

6. The portion of the original revenue not directed from RCs to RL (in example above, \$200 of \$500) would be used to support other initiatives aimed at recruiting and retaining undergraduate students, especially first- and second-year students. See #7 under Basic Principles (above).

**C. one way of imagining the 1-credit course that all the FTFY students register for through their home colleges**

\* NOTE: since all FTFY undergraduates would be enrolled, we might imagine this as the same basic “course” for everyone (e.g. UVM 001). But we might make the funds available directly to the undergraduate degree-granting colleges, and they could run their own courses: so CAS 001 and CALS 001 and RSEN 001, etc.

I here offer part of the suggestion from the SGA (undergraduate) representative on the FPPC:

... require ALL students to take a 1 credit course that combines elements of the advising center, career hub, internships coordinator, wellness environment/living well etc. “College 101” if you will. That way it would be more equitable and the students who need these various services most would be “caught in the net cast wider” so to speak. Taking money from this venture (and perhaps dipping into other pots) would benefit not only students but also the efforts of faculty + staff. An incredible tool for the Provost’s favorite words “recruiting & retention” directed at all the things students need to be academically successful in their college career. The course I took at Elon [student started there and transferred to UVM] was somewhat like this, perhaps UVM could take the lead and combine elements of this with some of the wellness environment & career center stuff: <https://www.elon.edu/u/academics/koenigsberger-learning-center/elon-101/>