

AALT Meeting Minutes – December 1, 2016

On-line Teaching

Melba Acevedo was present to discuss on-line teaching. She presented a draft to communicate on-line teaching opportunities to faculty. There was discussion on the draft and the best venue to communicate these opportunities and for faculty to express interest.

Suggestions for the draft included:

More consistent wording throughout, clarity in reference to faculty 'eligibility' vs. 'preference' and the development of something similar to a job posting and to clarify what exactly is 'required' and what is 'preferred.'

Timing of the communication to faculty, the selection process and using caution in maintaining the fairest selection method possible to avoid potential grievances that could stem from both (timing and selection).

Other related discussion points:

We haven't been doing postings for every class opening. The union is looking for something where faculty can express interest only. Perhaps just an announcement (from CIT or another centralized area) as opposed to one particular department or division would be best to avoid idiosyncrasies. A suggestion was made that the posting should come from Bill's office (maybe co-sign with Melba).

There was previously a form that had been used for this; perhaps that form can be located and used as a reference moving forward. Recommendations of a revised form included that it be located on-line and that it goes to one designated place once submitted.

Other suggestions were to ask the questions, "Have you taken iTeach?" "If no, do you plan to take it?" This would give faculty an opportunity to take it; look at programs that are at 80% and determine which could be 100% on-line.

There was a concern raised about students who do not want on-line courses but instead, need face to face options or at least hybrid.

Learning Communities

Rebecca Rose is requesting to step down as chair of LC. As it is relatively small, it can be decentralized.

Professional Development

Kim Burns will oversee this area. The application process for funding will remain the same but be streamlined; applications will go to the Dean and the selection committee will review. Final selections go to Bill for approval.

FYS

There was a discussion a year ago with an organization called Year Up. There is now in discussion with the Boston chapter. Goals are to provide 6 mos. of academics and 6 mos. of internships for promising students who have financial difficulty; get them employed quickly and hopefully they will pursue higher ed. later. They are working with Fidelity. Will land here probably for Business or IT and maybe some gen eds as well.

ACA meeting – FYS vote

Bill's comments and observations of that meeting:

18 months ago there was a 50/50 split. At this meeting, there was a 63/38 split in favor of not implementing FYS as a mandatory course for all students.

FYS is the most meaningful to address attrition of new students and the data strongly supports this.

FYS was aimed at the large group we lose. Just because it got a 'no' vote, doesn't mean we will abandon it.

There was little conversation about what it was meant to do and rather, more discussion about the dislikes. We need to educate people more on FYS.

The proposal was offered in an old frame of reference that we have abandoned in the new AMP. There is an opportunity within the AMP to pursue a broader solution to the problem rather than making FYS mandatory for all.

What kind of data was gathered about why students left? Grace – most students on FA suspension do not return. Last fall to spring it was 364.

Janice – steering committee mtg to debrief. There's still interest in doing this. The vote was not against FYS but against requiring it for all students. Embedding FYS outcomes in courses not out of the question. Is resistance to programmatic approach and for every student to take the course? Not opposed to growing it and using it.

How do we engage faculty in this work? Nancy's area has good model for embedding. Can other areas like LA emulate this?

Perhaps ask for a retention plan for programs with low numbers but numbers seem to jump from year to year.

There was lengthy discussion on the 44.3 range. Who are these students? Data will be available for others to see at some point.

Master scheduling

Block scheduling - no decision has been made. Issues of mtg. times and club times needs to be made but the 4 day matrix will not be implemented next year because of renovations. Mtg. times need to stay the same for next year.