Academic Advising Committee
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Brett Hill

Overview
The committee focused almost exclusively on the Carole Herrick Academic Advising Award this year. We were prepared to address questions or concerns from Dr. Gron in Academic Advising but no compelling problems were raised. The bulk of the committee's effort this year was focused on improving the nominating process. With the help especially of our student members we were able to improve that process using social media and generate a more reliable number of nominations. I think using this approach in the future will be a good idea.

Carole Herrick Award
This year the committee attempted to address concerns we had about bias in the nomination process. In the first two years of this committee we only were able to generate 12 and 10 nominations, which gave us some concern about how reliably we were assessing student perceptions of advising. This year we discussed alternative strategies and settled on developing an electronic survey that could be linked to various media such as email, social media, websites, etc. This strategy proved very successful, raising our number of nominations more than fivefold. We ended up with 56 nominations for 30 different faculty. Sixteen faculty received multiple nominations with one professor receiving 5. We had a good discussion of several candidates but settled on 2 top contenders. Ultimately, we selected Dr. Rupert. We sent letters to the remaining nominees to congratulate them even though they were not ultimately selected for the award.

Future Work
I think we have made significant improvements to the system for soliciting nominations. This progress was attributable to our student members and underscores the importance of having strong participation from students on this committee. It is possible that the Survey Monkey instrument could be improved, but we did not detect any obvious flaws and we encourage future committees to consider using it as well. There was a little confusion about who should request a check for the winner and how it was distributed. I left it up the Provost's office but it might be something the committee chair could handle. More communication about that process will smooth it, but overall I think we have developed a functioning system to produce reliable candidates that should work into the foreseeable future.

Academic Appeals Committee
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Rebecca Resinski

I became the chair of the academic appeals committee in the spring semester of 2018. In the course of the semester we considered four cases. We voted to grant two of the appeals:

> One concerned a clerical error that affected the grading of an internship for credit only or a letter grade. We voted to allow the student to receive a letter grade for a completed internship. Both the student and supervising professor had conducted the internship assuming that it had been for a grade; however, the professor had inadvertently checked the wrong box on the internship form. Because it was the result of a clerical error, we do not consider this case to be a precedent for future after-the-fact conversions of credit-only internships to letter grades.
>
> One concerned a request to receive a W in a course even though the last day for dropping a course had passed. The student had thought they wouldn't be able to drop the course in the regular way because there was a business hold on their account. Because the hold was in place for a reason beyond the student's control and because the student undertook the appeal process promptly we voted to grant the appeal. We also informed the student (and their advisor) that such holds can often be lifted temporarily so that students can conduct their business before the fact rather than having to appeal for special dispensation after the fact.

We voted to deny two of the appeals:

> One concerned a request for switching to credit only for a current course after the last day for declaring the intention to take a class on a credit-only basis had passed. We did not think that the circumstances were sufficient to warrant overriding the set date for declaring CR.

One concerned a request for receiving CR instead of a letter grade for a recently completed course. We did not think that there was sufficient evidence that the student had tried to follow the procedure for declaring CR set out in the catalog.

All of these cases were deliberated upon via email. Three of them came to the committee too late for in-person deliberations to be possible. The other one involved a clerical error and so did not seem to warrant in-person discussion. Next year, however, the committee will have a set meeting time at regular intervals throughout the year which we can use to conduct business, relying on email only in extremely time-sensitive cases.

In the course of this year it became clear that this committee should have a procedural document for itself (outlining best practices) and that it should also make more information about the process of filing an appeal available publicly. These are goals for the committee's work next year, and toward that end I have already consulted Provost Bonebright, Associate Provosts Templeton and Sutherland, and Professor Payne (current chair of the committee on academic integrity) to hear their thoughts about the committee's functioning and how internal and external documents could clarify and improve its workings.

Committee on Academic Assessment
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Megan Leonard

With the upcoming HLC visit, the Assessment committee focused primarily on working with the Assurance Review Ad-hoc Committee (ARC) to facilitate the assessment cycle and fulfilling the project milestones of the Quality Initiative (QI).
In Spring of 2017, the co-chairs of the ARC committee created a conversation guide for department chairs to discuss changes in their departments, key areas of focus, departmental learning goals, and create a mapping of departmental goals to the Vision for Student Learning (VSL). While annual assessment reporting by departments has been common practice, departments have not received feedback on their annual reporting since the 2010-2011 academic year. The ARC committee co-chairs created a rubric for the Assessment Committee members to use to provide feedback to departments on their assessment plans. A sample rubric is shown below. Our twice-monthly meetings from October to March were used to discuss each department's report, go over the rubric, and note an area of strength as well as a suggestion for improvement for each department. The ARC co-chairs then used these rubrics and areas of strength and weakness to create response letters to each department. Based on feedback from the Assessment Committee, departments were asked to develop a specific narrative of strength and an action plan for improvement. Individual departmental evaluation letters as well as responses from departments can be found on the website. Letters to departments were sent in early March.

With this important task complete, the Assessment Committee turned to the completion of the QI timeline (attached).
The goals of our QI are as follows:

- Develop specific, measurable learning goals based on the new Statement of Purpose and the Vision for Student Learning;
- Develop an assessment plan, benchmarks, and measurement tools for evaluating the success of our general education curriculum in producing the student outcomes stated in the new Statement of Purpose;
- Begin the collection of data and start using the results to move our general education curriculum toward a more integrated approach rather than continuing to evaluate each curricular unit on its own.

Goal 1 was completed in January of 2017. The faculty discussed the VSL rubrics developed by the Assessment committee at the September faculty meeting. The rubrics were approved at the October 19th faculty meeting. The VSL has 13 learning goals, so the first task was to determine which of the goals would be the focus for the 18-19 academic year. In order to determine this, the Assessment committee examined the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to identify an area with room for improvement. The committee chose I6 as the first area of focus.

As the committee discussed goal 3 of the QI, we focused on how to achieve an "integrated approach." Using the rubrics to evaluate Senior Capstones was a possibility, but we realized the Capstone is not the ideal place to evaluate all of our goals from the VSL since they include both curricular and co-curricular as well as pieces from the collegiate center. We were particularly concerned because some of our Capstone experiences are so focused on mastery of a particular field. Given that we need to assess this at the level of an individual student, taking into account all of their Hendrix experience, the committee concluded that the best place to access this is through advising.

With the approval of Advising and Academic Success, the committee discussed how advisors might directly assess their advisees' ability to "make connections among different bodies of knowledge." The committee discussed what types of questions might

elicit the types of responses that we are looking for. With some possible questions proposed, the members of the committee beta tested the prompts with some of their advisees. Academic advisors will be asked to meet with their junior advisees during the 5th and 6th week of classes in F18 in order to assess VSLG I6. When we have preliminary data, the committee will determine benchmarks for this goal.

The college is on track to use the VLSG rubrics to collect data in the Fall of 2018 in accordance with the QI timeline. The Assessment Committee will work with the ARC committee to analyze the data and communicate the results to faculty in the Spring of 2019.

Sample Rubric

Rubric for Department Assessment Meeting Report			
Past decisions	Changes made were in response to evidence of student development	Changes were made using weak, anecdotal, or indirect evidence of student development	Changes were made with no reference to evidence of student development OR no changes were made
	☐ Meets/Exceeds Standards	☑ Approaches Standards	☐ Needs Attention
Looking forward	Area of focus is clearly defined and measurable	Area of focus is either unclear or cannot be measured	Area of focus is unclear and cannot be measured
	☑ Meets/Exceeds Standards	☐ Approaches Standards	☐ Needs Attention
	Evaluation Plan is evidence-based and evidence collected clearly speaks to area of focus and can be used in decision making	Evaluation plan is evidence-based but it is unclear how evidence collected can be used in decision making	Evaluation plan is not evidence based
	☐ Meets/Exceeds Standards	☑ Approaches Standards	☐ Needs Attention
Departmental Goals	Department has clear learning goals that reflect desired student outcomes	Learning goals are a work in progress	Department has no discernable learning goals
	☐ Meets/Exceeds Standards	☑ Approaches Standards	☐ Needs Attention
	Learning Goals are mapped to curriculum	☑ Yes	☐ No
Capstone	Capstone plays clear role in achieving departmental learning goals	Relationship between capstone and department learning goals is not clearly articulated	Capstone has no obvious relationship to departmental learning goals
	☑ Meets/Exceeds Standards	☐ Approaches Standards	☐ Needs Attention
	Departmental learning goals are evaluated through the capstone using direct and indirect evidence	Evaluation of departmenal learning goals through capstone is a work in progress	Assessment of capstone experience is unrelated to departmental learning goals
	☑ Meets/Exceeds Standards	☐ Approaches Standards	☐ Needs Attention
VSL	Departmental Learning Goals are mapped to the Vision for Student Learning	☑ Yes	☐ No

Quality Initiative Timeline

Table 2 - Initiative Actions					
Goal	**Semester**	**Project Milestones**	**Governance**	**Assess Progress**	**Action**
1	Develop specific learning goals based on the new Statement of Purpose and the Vision for Student Learning				
	Fall 2016	Development of Vision for Student Learning Learning Goals	Academic Assessment Committee	Associate Provost	Complete project
	Spring 2017	Discussion/modification of Vision Learning Goals	Faculty Academic Policy/Provost	Provost/Academic Policy Council	Expected Adoption by Faculty
2	Develop an assessment plan, benchmarks, and measurement tools for evaluating the success of our general education				
	Summer 2017	Workshop for Assessment Committee	Academic Assessment Committee	Associate Provost	Complete project
		Review/study of Critical Thinking Measures and Rubrics	Academic Assessment Committee	Associate Provost	Complete project
	Fall 2017	Development of Assessment Plan for new Learning Goals	Academic Assessment Committee	Associate Provost	Complete project
		Select Rubrics	Academic Assessment Committee	Provost/Academic Policy Council	Complete project
		Select Benchmarks	Academic Assessment Committee	Provost/Academic Policy Council	Complete project
	Spring 2018	Discussion/modification of Assessment Plan	Provost/Asociate Provost	Associate Provost	Expected Adoption by Faculty
		Discussion/modification of Rubrics	Provost/Asociate Provost	Provost/Academic Policy Council	Expected Adoption by Faculty
		Discussion/modification of Benchmarks	Provost/Asociate Provost	Provost/Academic Policy Council	Expected Adoption by Faculty
3	Begin the collection of data and start using the results to move our general education curriculum toward a more integrated approach rather than continuing to evaluate each curricular unit on its own				
	Fall 2018	Collect Data and Evaluate Data with Rubrics	Academic Assessment Committee	Associate Provost	Complete project
	Spring 2019	Prepare Report with Recommendations	Academic Assessment Committee	Associate Provost	Report sent to Faculty
		Presentation to Faculty	Academic Assessment Committee	Provost/Academic Policy Council	Expected Approval by Faculty

Committee on Academic Integrity
2017–2018 Annual Report
Chair: Maxine Payne

Overview
The committee handled 15 cases of academic integrity violations during the 2017-2018 academic year. This is a significant decrease in the 2016-2017 total of 41 cases. Like last academic year, the majority of the cases indicated some variety of plagiarism. All other cases involved students cheating on exams and assignments.

Case Processing & Outcomes
Of these 15 cases, 2 conferences were held and the other 13 were resolved with Letters of Agreement. This is a significant difference as well compared to last year when, of the 41 cases, 11 conferences were held and the other 30 were resolved with Letters of Agreement. In all of the cases the chair of the committee approved the accusing faculty's recommendation for sanctions.

Issues Addressed and Changes Made
This year the committee met to review all of the policies and procedures with members before cases began to come in. We wanted to consult the student members particularly about their knowledge of the College's position on Academic Integrity. Most of the student members had not heard much about the College's Academic Integrity Policy prior to serving on the committee. While many of them did say they recalled something being included in the course syllabus, this didn't necessarily resonate with them, possibly because of the often overwhelming information on course syllabi and nervousness over the start of classes, etc. We all agreed that a unit in Explorations would be a great place to make certain all incoming students at least are told there is a policy regarding academic integrity.

Additionally, Professor Templeton and I met with Amy Weaver to discuss the disproportionate amount of cases that involved student athletes. Although there was an announcement at a faculty meeting this spring from Chris Camfield suggesting he would be working with our committee to develop best practices for coaches to help their athletes understand Academic Integrity, I have not been asked to participate in those discussions. In our meeting with Amy Weaver we suggested there be a formal presentation of Academic Integrity Policy for all student athletes in late summer, before school starts, but when they are on campus for their team obligations.

We are following the same procedures I developed last year including: the use of check sheets, completely electronic files, and collaboration with the Provost's office in maintaining the electronic data base for offenses.

In late May I met with Rebecca Resinski, the new Chair of Academic Appeals Committee, to discuss ways that the two committees can communicate better about appeals decisions. This is critical for two reasons, 1) the records that are kept on file in the Provost's office must be updated and accurate and 2) if the appeal is upheld based on the procedures of the Academic Integrity Committee, we need to know that to avoid those mistakes. I believe Rebecca is open to these ideas and is working on ways to facilitate this. She and I will communicate again in the fall.

I have developed a handbook for future Chairs that outlines the policies and procedures in a clear and concise manner so they will not have to reinvent the entire process when they begin their term.

Based on a suggestion from Associate Provost David Sutherland and the Registrars office, when the committee has a case at the end of the semester that cannot be resolved, a grade of "NR" will be assigned to the student rather than an "I", until the committee process has concluded. This is because of how an "I" can impact a student's financial aid and because the delay is based on an administrative (committee) process.

Future Work

A significant amount of time was spent at the 2017 Fall Faculty Conference on Academic Integrity. We emphasized ways that changing pedagogy might reduce the number of academic integrity violations we have on campus. There were a few cases this year where a change in pedagogical practice would have clearly prevented the situation. We hope that faculty are learning from their mistakes through the process of the conference. But, it will be important to periodically update the faculty about the work of the committee, especially as it relates to information that they can use to avoid academic integrity violations from occurring. It is still the committee's opinion that, in some cases, a student doesn't understand that what they have done is actually a violation of academic integrity. Perhaps they were not taught this in high school and the faculty haven't articulated it clearly enough here.

I will continue to work with the Provost's office to streamline and organize the archive of these records. Of particular importance is the shared spreadsheet between the Chair of the committee and the Provost's office. It is critical that it is accurate and consistent. I will work to get this in a shared electronic format that can be edited and viewed regularly.

College Conduct Council
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Jonathan Hancock

The College Conduct Council (CCC) concluded a very busy 17-18 academic year. While the new points system for varying levels of conduct infractions helped to limit the CCC's caseload (this year there were no "regular" conduct hearings), the Gender-Based Misconduct (GBM) Panel held hearings throughout the year. The details and outcomes of these hearings are confidential.

The GBM Panel deals with cases related to Title IX infractions (a full list is enumerated and defined in the Student Handbook, but these cases typically involve non-consensual sexual contact, non-consensual sexual intercourse, stalking, and/or sexual exploitation). The CCC chair chaired this body, which was also composed of four College staff members. Each member of the GBM panel initially undergoes a day-long training in Title IX issues, followed by an annual half-day "refresher" training that includes updates to Title IX enforcement, which is especially important as federal directives have been in flux in the last few years and the College has recently changed its GBM policies and procedures. In addition, the CCC met for an orientation during a fall semester convocation period.

Significant changes to GBM hearing process and panel composition will be implemented at the beginning of the 18-19 academic year. Among those changes, there will no longer be live hearings involving the student complainants and respondents. In the absence of live hearings, there will no longer be a chair of the GBM panel.

Curriculum Committee
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Ann Wright

The 2017-2018 activities of the Committee on Curriculum are outlined in this report. The committee activities included curricular change recommendations, assessment of the NS and NS-L learning domains, and policy discussion on the topics of 1/4 –credit classes and how best to limit the combinations of majors or majors/minors that have significant overlap.

The Committee membership:

A. Wright (chair), D. Sutherland (ex officio), B. Adams (ex officio), J. Dearolf, M. Lopas, D. Skok, M. Sutherland, R. Thomas, Olivia Hardick (student), Jordan May (student), Ella Thomas (student), Adam Williams (student).

I. Curricular Changes

Courses followed by '*' indicate approval by Fast-track method.

The following new courses were added to the catalog:

Regular permanent courses:	ENGF 320 Cinematic Lives
	ENGF 330 Film Musicals
	TART 135 Voice and Movement for the Theatre
Murphy Scholars courses:	CLAS M2x, CLAS M3x
	ENGC M3x, ENGL M2x, ENGL M3x
	FREN M3x, GERM M3x, SPAN M4x
	LITR M2x
	TART M2x, TART M3x
Academia Dell'Arte courses:	ITAL i21
	TART i21, TART i27, TART i28, TART i29, TART i30
	TART i32, TART i37, TART i38, TART i39

The following courses were removed from the catalog:

ASIA 191*	EDUC 205	EDUC 450	PHYS 161 *
FREN 230*	EDUC 220	EDUC 451	PHYS 190 *
POLI 274 *	EDUC 360	EDUC 460	
POLI 282 *	EDUC 400	EDUC 461	
POLI 331 *	EDUC 431	TART 120	
POLI 356 *	EDUC 435	TART 150	
POLI 371 *	EDUC 438	PHYS 211 *	

The following courses had name or number changes:

BUSI 320 Taxation for Individuals *	New name
MATH 215 Introductory Statistics *	New name
PHYS 420 Electrodynamics *	New number (old=320)
PHYS 430 Quantum Mechanics *	New number (old=330)
PHYS 470 Thermal Physics *	New number (old=370)
PHYS 480 Classical Mechanics *	New number (old=380)
POLI 210 American Political Institutions *	New name
SJSA 200 Social Justice and Education	New name and move from EDUC
SJSA 300 Inclusive Teaching	New name and move from EDUC
ENGF 358 African Film *	Remove cross-listing with AFRI
ENGL 397 Imagined Vietnam *	New name
RELI 358 Embodied Mind, Language & Religion *	New name

The following course codes were changed:

BUSI 110	Add SB
POLI 202	Add QS
BIOL 205 *	Remove NS-L
BIOL 215 *	Remove NS-L

The following majors were revised:

POLI *	Move POLI 349 from Comparative/IR to Political Theory group
POLI *	Cross-list POLI 281 in Comparative/IR and American/Public Policy
POLI/IR	Remove MATH 215 Introductory Statistics requirement
POLI/IR	Re-organize major
EVST	Add ENGF 275 to major
MUSI	Require composition course for students including a SR portfolio
ENGL	Re-organize major
ENGC	Re-organize major
ENGF	Re-organize major
TART	Re-organize major

The following new minors were added:

SJSA Social Justice
MACX Data Analytics

The following temporary courses were approved:

TART 200 Special Topics: Performance
PSYC/RELI 2xx Racial Justice and the Bible

II. Policy Discussions

1. Double-counting Issue

Goals:

- To unify the way majors/minors may limit the major/major or major/minor combinations that have significant overlap.
- To use limits on combinations of disciplines rather than individual courses.
- To simplify the rules regarding combinations of majors and minors to benefit the student, the advisors, and the Registrar's office.

Current language:

AFRI - English majors and History majors may double-count only one course from their major toward the Africana Studies minor.

ASIA - In both concentrations, religious studies majors and history majors use only one course from their major toward the Asian Studies minor.

GEND - Students may count one course in their major discipline towards the Gender Studies minor, but this course will not count toward their major.

BCMB – cannot combine with a CHEM or BIOL major or minor

BIOL – cannot combine with a HESC major

CHPH – cannot double major or combine majors-minors in CHEM or PHYS

HESC – cannot combine with a BIOL major or minor

ECBU – cannot double majors or combine majors-minors in the department

ENGL – cannot double major in the department

MACS – cannot combine MATH major and APMA minor

SOAN – cannot double major or combine majors-minors in the department

SJSA - Students may count a maximum of **three** courses per discipline towards their minor and no more than **one** course for the minor can count towards their major. (approved this year)

NEUR - Students may not double-count more than four courses from another major toward the Neuroscience major. And Students may not double-count more than two courses from another major toward the Neuroscience minor. (submitted, but not approved this year)

Proposed new policy

The curriculum committee met on April 5 to discuss this issue and to brainstorm a possible proposal to send to the faculty.

Main issues

- It is difficult to program the unofficial audit for some rules.
- It is difficult for advisors to remember and enforce all of the different rules.
- It would be easier to have rules that limit major/major and major/minor combinations by discipline than it is to have rules about how many courses can count for each. Major/major and major/minor combinations can be checked by the registrar's office when the declaration form is submitted.
- We do not want the computer software to dictate our curriculum rules.
- We want to encourage breadth and interdisciplinary programs in the spirit of the liberal arts.
- We need input from the interdisciplinary major/minors regarding the motivations for the double-counting rules to aid discussions.

Action

Feedback was requested from representatives of the following major/minors: AFRI, ASIA, GEND, SJSA, and NEUR.

- Ruthanne Thomas (PSYC) reported back from the PSYC department regarding the NEUR major and minor overlap with the PSYC major/minor.
    - Without restrictions on course double-counting, students could get 7 of the 10 required courses for the PSYC major through the NEUR major. Students could get a PSYC minor without taking any additional courses from the NEUR major.
    - With the proposed restrictions on double-counting courses, a PSYC/NEUR double major would require 20 courses instead of 17.
    - The PSYC department does not want to restrict double majors with PSYC/NEUR.
- Michael Sprunger reported back from the Interdisciplinary minors (ASIA, GEND, AFRI)
    - General preference is to continue with current double-counting of course restrictions.
    - Faculty in these programs are willing to revise minors to comply if needed. They feel comfortable that they can accomplish the goals of these minors under the new proposed policy.
- No responses to the request were received from NEUR or SJSA representatives.

A second meeting on the topic was held on April 17, 2018. The committee voted to propose the following new policy:

Majors and minors may limit the combinations of their major/minor with other disciplines. No restrictions on courses counting toward more than one major or minor are allowed.

If this policy is approved by the faculty:

- The following major/minors will not need any modifications:

  BCMB, BIOL, CHPH, HESC, ECBU, ENGL, MACS, SOAN

- The following existing major/minors must be modified: AFRI, ASIA, GEND, SJSA. For SJSA, the discipline rule (Students may count a maximum of three courses per discipline towards their minor) is allowed, but the course counting rule (no more than one course for the minor can count towards their major) will need to be eliminated or modified.
- Any new major/minors must conform to the new policy. Any changes to existing majors/minors must conform to the new policy.
- All major/minors that currently have restrictions on counting courses will have one year (2018-19) to revise their major/minor. At the end of 2018-19, all existing course restrictions that are non-compliant with the new policy will be removed.

Because of the schedule of the AP and Faculty meetings remaining for the semester, and due to the committee's desire to allow the faculty time to fully discuss the topic without being rushed, the Curriculum Committee decided to not push this new policy recommendation to the faculty before summer break. Instead, detailed recommendations and information will be passed along to AP and to the 2018-19 Curriculum Committee Chair (G. Ferrer).

2. Partial Credit Courses

Two quarter-credit course proposals were brought to the committee this year.

- TART i21 Contemporary Performance Seminar is an Academia Dell'Arte course. This course was approved as an ADA course equal to one semester hour credit. This course will not transfer to Hendrix as a course due to the existing rule that every transfer course must be the equivalent of at least three semester hours. The course may still be offered at ADA, and was therefore approved for that catalog.
- CSCI 195 Programming Puzzles was proposed as a ¼-credit course for the Hendrix catalog. After considerable discussion, including additional feedback from the proposer and the CSCI department chair, the committee voted to not recommend this course for approval due to the fact that ¼-credit courses were troublesome in the areas of course load and compensation. The information was presented to the Provost and the Committee on Academic Policy. That committee voted to send the issue to Committee on Faculty. The result of the COF discussion is included as Appendix A to this report.

3. NS and NS-L Learning Domain Review and Assessment

The Committee on Curriculum was asked by the Associate Provost to review all courses in the catalog that held an NS or an NS-L learning domain code. Discussions were held with representatives from the Committee on Academic Assessment on best practices. A two-stage approach was selected.

In stage 1: The Curriculum Committee collected, reviewed, and analyzed data for each NS and NS-L course currently listed in the Hendrix catalog. The form asked the reviewer (a representative from the department that houses that course) to rate the degree to which the course met each learning goal associated with the learning domain. After each Lickert scale rating, the reviewer was asked to provide evidence to support the rating. Before the committee reviewed the data, they agreed that a course must meet the expected level for the learning goal (a score of '3-5' on the Lickert scale) for at least two of the four learning goals in order to maintain good status for the learning domain.

The forms and numerical analysis of the results are given in Appendix B.

Summary:

1. All reviewed courses passed the minimum requirement of "meets expectations" or better for at least two of the four learning goals.
2. The following actions were taken by department request as a result of this assessment exercise:
    a. NS-L codes were removed from BIOL 205 Anatomy and Physiology I (w/ lab) and from BIOL 215 Anatomy and Physiology II (w/ lab). Justification: students will have already earned NS-L from the pre-requisite course, so the code is not needed on BIOL 205 and 215.
    b. The following courses were removed from the course catalog: PHYS 211, PHYS 161, PHYS 190. Justification: the courses are no longer being offered.

The 2nd stage of this learning domain review is a request for a direct assessment of each NS or NS-L course being taught during Spring 2018. The Assessment form is included as Appendix C. This data is currently being collected at the time of this report. The data will be analyzed and the results will be shared with the chair of the Committee on Academic Assessment.

Appendix A: Quarter-credit class recommendation from COF

Appendix B: NS and NS-L Assessment Form and Results

Appendix C: Direct Assessment Form for NS and NS-L

2018 NS and NS-L
Learning Domain Review

Course	Course name	Dept	LD	Goal1	Goal2	Goal3	Goal4	AVG	STDEV	Median
BIOL 100	Concepts in Biology	BIOL	NS	4	4	5	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
BIOL 101	Concepts in Biology (w/Lab	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 102	Natural History (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 103	Biology of Human Body (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 104	Environmental Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 106	Neotropical Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 107	Biology of the Human Body	BIOL	NS	4	4	5	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
BIOL 108	Tropical Field Botany (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 110	Evolution for Everyone Lab (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 112	Nat Hist of the New World (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 150	Cell Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	4	3	4	3.8	0.5	4.0
BIOL 164/PSYC 164	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (no Lab)	BIOL	NS	4	4	5	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
BIOL 165/PSYC 165	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (w/Lab)	BIOL	SB	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
CHEM 100	Concepts of Chemistry	CHEM	NS	3	4	4	4	3.8	0.5	4.0
CHEM 101	Chemistry of Environment (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
CHEM 110	Gen Chem I: Struct & Prop (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	4	4	3	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
CHEM 150	Accelerated Gen Chem (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	4	5	1	4	3.5	1.7	4.0
CHEM 280	Environmental Analysis (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	5	5	4	5	4.8	0.5	5.0
CSCI 150	Found of Computer Science (w/Lab)	CSCI	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
CSCI 151	Data Structures (w/ Lab)	CSCI	NS-L	4	5	5	5	4.8	0.5	5.0
CSCI 352	Scalable Software	CSCI	NS	4	4	4	3	3.8	0.5	4.0
MATH 130	Calculus I	MATH	NS	5	5	4	3	4.3	1.0	4.5
MATH 140	Calculus II	MATH	NS	5	5	4	4	4.5	0.6	4.5
MATH 240	Discrete Mathematics	MATH	NS	5	5	2	4	4.0	1.4	4.5
MATH 260	Differential Equations	MATH	NS	4	4	5	3	4.0	0.8	4.0
MATH 270	Linear Algebra	MATH	NS	4	4	3	4	3.8	0.5	4.0
MATH 365	Mathematical Models	MATH	NS	4	5	4	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
PHYS 100	Introductory Topics in Physics	PHYS	NS	1	2	4	3	2.5	1.3	2.5
PHYS 160	Astronomy	PHYS	NS	3	4	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
PHYS 161	Astronomy (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	2	4	4	3.5	1.0	4.0
PHYS 170	Introductory Earth Science	PHYS	NS	3	4	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
PHYS 171	Introductory Earth Science (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 210	General Physics I (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 211	General Physics I (no Lab)	PHYS	NS	4	2	4	2	3.0	1.2	3.0
PHYS 220	General Physics II (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 230	Gen Physics I (Calc-based w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 235	General Physics I (Workshop)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 240	Gen Physics II (Calc-based w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 245	General Physics II (Workshop)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 305	Vibrations and Waves	PHYS	NS	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
PHYS 315/CHEM 410	Modern Physics (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	5	4	5	4	4.5	0.6	4.5

Average				4.0	3.8	4.0	3.6
St. Dev.				0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6
Median				4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

2018 NS and NS-L
Learning Domain Review

Course	Course name	Dept	LD	Goal1	Goal2	Goal3	Goal4	AVG	STDEV	Median
BIOL 100	Concepts in Biology	BIOL	NS	4	4	5	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
BIOL 101	Concepts in Biology (w/Lab	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 102	Natural History (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 103	Biology of Human Body (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 104	Environmental Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 106	Neotropical Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 107	Biology of the Human Body	BIOL	NS	4	4	5	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
BIOL 108	Tropical Field Botany (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 110	Evolution for Everyone Lab (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 112	Nat Hist of the New World (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
BIOL 150	Cell Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L	4	4	3	4	3.8	0.5	4.0
BIOL 164/PSYC 164	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (no Lab)	BIOL	NS	4	4	5	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
BIOL 165/PSYC 165	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (w/Lab)	BIOL	SB	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
CHEM 100	Concepts of Chemistry	CHEM	NS	3	4	4	4	3.8	0.5	4.0
CHEM 101	Chemistry of Environment (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
CHEM 110	Gen Chem I: Struct & Prop (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	4	4	3	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
CHEM 150	Accelerated Gen Chem (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	4	5	1	4	3.5	1.7	4.0
CHEM 280	Environmental Analysis (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L	5	5	4	5	4.8	0.5	5.0
CSCI 150	Found of Computer Science (w/Lab)	CSCI	NS-L	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
CSCI 151	Data Structures (w/ Lab)	CSCI	NS-L	4	5	5	5	4.8	0.5	5.0
CSCI 352	Scalable Software	CSCI	NS	4	4	4	3	3.8	0.5	4.0
MATH 130	Calculus I	MATH	NS	5	5	4	3	4.3	1.0	4.5
MATH 140	Calculus II	MATH	NS	5	5	4	4	4.5	0.6	4.5
MATH 240	Discrete Mathematics	MATH	NS	5	5	2	4	4.0	1.4	4.5
MATH 260	Differential Equations	MATH	NS	4	4	5	3	4.0	0.8	4.0
MATH 270	Linear Algebra	MATH	NS	4	4	3	4	3.8	0.5	4.0
MATH 365	Mathematical Models	MATH	NS	4	5	4	4	4.3	0.5	4.0
PHYS 100	Introductory Topics in Physics	PHYS	NS	1	2	4	3	2.5	1.3	2.5
PHYS 160	Astronomy	PHYS	NS	3	4	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
PHYS 161	Astronomy (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	2	4	4	3.5	1.0	4.0
PHYS 170	Introductory Earth Science	PHYS	NS	3	4	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
PHYS 171	Introductory Earth Science (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 210	General Physics I (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 211	General Physics I (no Lab)	PHYS	NS	4	2	4	2	3.0	1.2	3.0
PHYS 220	General Physics II (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 230	Gen Physics I (Calc-based w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 235	General Physics I (Workshop)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 240	Gen Physics II (Calc-based w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 245	General Physics II (Workshop)	PHYS	NS-L	4	4	4	4	4.0	0.0	4.0
PHYS 305	Vibrations and Waves	PHYS	NS	4	3	4	3	3.5	0.6	3.5
PHYS 315/CHEM 410	Modern Physics (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L	5	4	5	4	4.5	0.6	4.5

Average				4.0	3.8	4.0	3.6
St. Dev.				0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6
Median				4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

2018 NS and NS-L
Learning Domain Review

BIOL 100	Concepts in Biology	BIOL	NS
BIOL 101	Concepts in Biology (w/Lab	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 102	Natural History (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 103	Biology of Human Body (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 104	Environmental Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 106	Neotropical Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 107	Biology of the Human Body	BIOL	NS
BIOL 108	Tropical Field Botany (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 110	Evolution for Everyone Lab (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 112	Nat Hist of the New World (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 150	Cell Biology (w/Lab)	BIOL	NS-L
BIOL 164/PSYC 164	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (no Lab)	BIOL	NS
BIOL 165/PSYC 165	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (w/Lab)	BIOL	SB
CHEM 100	Concepts of Chemistry	CHEM	NS
CHEM 101	Chemistry of Environment (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L
CHEM 110	Gen Chem I: Struct & Prop (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L
CHEM 150	Accelerated Gen Chem (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L
CHEM 280	Environmental Analysis (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L
CHEM 410	Advanced Physical Chemistry (w/Lab)	CHEM	NS-L
CSCI 150	Found of Computer Science (w/Lab)	CSCI	NS-L
CSCI 151	Data Structures (w/ Lab)	CSCI	NS-L
CSCI 352	Scalable Software	CSCI	NS
MATH 130	Calculus I	MATH	NS
MATH 140	Calculus II	MATH	NS
MATH 240	Discrete Mathematics	MATH	NS
MATH 260	Differential Equations	MATH	NS
MATH 270	Linear Algebra	MATH	NS
MATH 365	Mathematical Models	MATH	NS
PHYS 100	Introductory Topics in Physics	PHYS	NS
PHYS 160	Astronomy	PHYS	NS
PHYS 170	Introductory Earth Science	PHYS	NS
PHYS 171	Introductory Earth Science (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L
PHYS 210	General Physics I (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L
PHYS 220	General Physics II (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L
PHYS 230	Gen Physics I (Calc-based w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L
PHYS 235	General Physics I (Workshop)	PHYS	NS-L
PHYS 240	Gen Physics II (Calc-based w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L
PHYS 245	General Physics II (Workshop)	PHYS	NS-L
PHYS 305	Vibrations and Waves	PHYS	NS
PHYS 315/CHEM 410	Modern Physics (w/Lab)	PHYS	NS-L

BIOL 100	Concepts in Biology	BIOL
BIOL 101	Concepts in Biology (w/Lab	NS-L
BIOL 102	Natural History (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 103	Biology of Human Body (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 104	Environmental Biology (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 106	Neotropical Biology (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 107	Biology of the Human Body	NS
BIOL 108	Tropical Field Botany (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 110	Evolution for Everyone Lab (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 112	Nat Hist of the New World (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 150	Cell Biology (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 164	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (no Lab)	NS
BIOL 165	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (w/Lab)	SB
BIOL 205	Anatomy & Physiology I (w/Lab)	NS-L
BIOL 215	Anatomy & Physiology II (w/Lab)	NS-L

CHEM 100	Concepts of Chemistry	NS
CHEM 101	Chemistry of Environment (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 110	Gen Chem I: Struct & Prop (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 150	Accelerated Gen Chem (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 280	Environmental Analysis (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 410	Advanced Physical Chemistry (w/Lab)	NS-L

CSCI 150	Found of Computer Science (w/Lab)	NS-L
CSCI 151	Data Structures (w/ Lab)	NS-L
CSCI 352	Scalable Software	NS
MATH 130	Calculus I	NS
MATH 140	Calculus II	NS
MATH 240	Discrete Mathematics	NS
MATH 260	Differential Equations	NS
MATH 270	Linear Algebra	NS
MATH 365	Mathematical Models	NS

CHEM 100	Concepts of Chemistry	NS
CHEM 101	Chemistry of Environment (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 110	Gen Chem I: Struct & Prop (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 150	Accelerated Gen Chem (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 280	Environmental Analysis (w/Lab)	NS-L
CHEM 410	Advanced Physical Chemistry (w/Lab)	NS-L

CSCI 150	Found of Computer Science (w/Lab)	NS-L
CSCI 151	Data Structures (w/ Lab)	NS-L
CSCI 352	Scalable Software	NS
MATH 130	Calculus I	NS
MATH 140	Calculus II	NS
MATH 240	Discrete Mathematics	NS
MATH 260	Differential Equations	NS
MATH 270	Linear Algebra	NS
MATH 365	Mathematical Models	NS

PHYS 100	Introductory Topics in Physics	NS	
PHYS 160	Astronomy	NS	Ann
PHYS 161	Astronomy (w/Lab)	NS-L	Ann
PHYS 170	Introductory Earth Science	NS	
PHYS 171	Introductory Earth Science (w/Lab)	NS-L	
PHYS 190	General Physics I (no lab)	NS	Ann
PHYS 210	General Physics I (w/Lab)	NS-L	Ann
PHYS 211	General Physics I (no Lab)	NS	Ann
PHYS 220	General Physics II (w/Lab)	NS-L	Ann
PHYS 230	Gen Physics I (Calc-based w/Lab)	NS-L	Ann
PHYS 235	General Physics I (Workshop)	NS-L	
PHYS 240	Gen Physics II (Calc-based w/Lab)	NS-L	Ann
PHYS 245	General Physics II (Workshop)	NS-L	
PHYS 305	Vibrations and Waves	NS	
PHYS 315	Modern Physics (w/Lab)	NS-L	

PSYC 164	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (no Lab)	PSYC	NS
PSYC 165	Comp Animal Behav-Tropics (w/Lab)	PSYC	NS-L, SB

Direct Assessment Instrument for **NS, NS-L** Coded Classes

Course Number and Title:
Semester/Date:
Number of Students in Class:
Instructor:

Rubrics: Type in each box the number of students in the class whose performance relative to the listed Learner Outcome is described by the label at the top of the column.

Strong (STR) = outstanding performance in course; exceeds expectations of course performance

Satisfactory (SAT) = performance that meets the expected level for the course

Needs Growth (NG) = some need for improvement, although overall performance meets expected level for the course

Unsatisfactory (UNSAT) = overall performance not acceptable for the course

Not applicable (NA)= this learning goal is not applicable to the course

Upon completion of this course, students were able to:

STR	SAT	NG	UNSAT	NA	Learner Outcomes
					NS
					1.Understand and apply the scientific and mathematical principles of their discipline.
					2. Understand the distinction between science and dogma.
					3. Use basic scientific principles to place information in a larger context.
					4. Understand how science does and does not work.
					NS-L
					1. Use the scientific method to gather, interpret and evaluate data.
					2. Employ tools to assess the validity of observations related to the natural world.
					3. Join scientific principles with critical analysis in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline.
					4. Relate their analysis and conclusions to those of the larger scientific community.

Descriptive Evidence of Performance: Please check all data used to complete this form. Feel free to add to the list. Multiple measures must be used.

☐ Grades ☐ Papers ☐ Presentations ☐ Exams

Other (please list):

Assessment Instrument for NS Learning Domain Goals

Spring 2018

Course Number and Title: _____

Directions: Please use the following scale to help evaluate the application of each learning domain goal to the course. For each score above 1, please write a sentence or two that describes how the course addresses the goal.

Upon completion of the course…

5 Students in the course consistently master the learning goal.

4 Students in the course become proficient in the learning goal.

3 **S**tudents in the course show overall performance that meets the expected level for the learning goal, but show some need for improvement.

2 **S**tudents make little or no progress in the learning goal.

1 The learning domain goal is not applicable to this class.

Goal #1: Understand and apply the scientific and mathematical principles of their discipline.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Goal #2: Understand the distinction between science and dogma.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Goal #3: Use basic scientific principles to place information in a larger context.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Goal #4: Understand how science does and does not work.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Assessment Instrument for NS-L Learning Domain Goals

Spring 2018

Course Number and Title: _____

Directions: Please use the following scale to help evaluate the application of each learning domain goal to the course. For each score above 1, please write a sentence or two that describes how the course addresses the goal.

Upon completion of the course…

5 Students in the course consistently master the learning goal.

4 Students in the course become proficient in the learning goal.

3 **S**tudents in the course show overall performance that meets the expected level for the learning goal, but show some need for improvement.

2 **S**tudents make little or no progress in the learning goal.

1 The learning domain goal is not applicable to this class.

Goal #1: Use the scientific method to gather, interpret and evaluate data.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Goal #2: Employ tools to assess the validity of observations related to the natural world.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Goal #3: Join scientific principles with critical analysis in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Goal #4: Relate their analysis and conclusions to those of the larger scientific community.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5

How does this course address this goal?

Partial Course Credits							
Course ID	**Course No**	**Description**	**Grade**	**Instructor**	**Fac Load**	**Stu Load**	**Fees**
PACT	Axx	Aquatic PACT	CR	Adjunct	No	No	$40
PACT	Dxx	Dance PACT	CR	Adjunct	No	No	$40
PACT	Fxx	Fitness PACT	CR	Adjunct	No	No	$40
PACT	Lxx	Leisure PACT	CR	Adjunct	No	No	$40-$100
PACT	Txx	Team PACT	CR	Adjunct	No	No	$40
PACT	IND	Alternative PACT	CR	Adjunct	No	No	$40
PACT	xxx	Athletic Team	CR	Coaches	No	No	$0
MUSA	2xx	Ensembles	Letter GR	Fac & Adj	Yes	No	$0
MUSA	3xx	.25 cr Lessons	Letter GR	Fac & Adj	Yes	No	$200-$300
MUSA	4xx	.50 cr Lessons	Letter GR	Fac & Adj	Yes	No	$200-$600
TARA	P21-P24	Practicum	Letter GR	Fac & Adj	Yes/No	No	$0
DANA	A30	Ensemble	Letter GR	Faculty	Yes	No	$0
LBST	101	*Explorations*	Letter GR	Fac & Adj	No	No	$0
MATH	195	Prob-Solving Sem	CR	Faculty	No	No	$0
For Comparison							
		Laboratory Course Sections		Fac & Adj	Yes	No	$0-$40

Comments

1 PACT courses and *Explorations* support the Collegiate Center and have no overlap with any majors or minors.

2 MUSA ensembles and lessons support the liberal arts mission. The only overlap with a major or minor is music where the activities are the typical approach in music. The vast majority of participants are not music majors or minors.

3 TARA practicums are the way that theatre arts and dance students document the standard learning that occurs in developing productions. The practicums are required for theatre arts majors and minors as well as dance minors.

4 The DANA dance ensemble support the liberal arts mission. The only overlap with a minor is in dance where the activities are the typical approach in dance.

5 The MATH Problem-Solving course orginally argued the point that problem-solving is an activity similar to activities in the performing arts. However, it appears less likely to serve a broader liberal arts function for the nonmajor than do MUSA and DANA courses. This course seems closer to the TARA courses which are also geared more to majors and minors. However, the TARA activities support productions that take place outside the academic day and serve a broader liberal arts goal of encouraging the performing arts.

6 The Odyssey Program developed as a way to encourage student engagement. Odyssey provides an opportunity for students to develop an experiential transcript in addition to the typical coursework transcript. The activities in TARA, DANA, and MUSA as well as the MATH seminar are available for Odyssey credits as well as partial course credits. The first three types of activities are traditionally considered as part of the course curriculum where other types of activities and experiences might not typically receive course credits at many colleges. It may be that the MATH seminar might have more in common with Odyssey program engagement activities

rather than partial course credits.

7 All of the activity courses--except *Explorations*--can be transferred in after approval by the Registrar. Whole credit courses of less than three credit hours may NOT be transferred into Hendrix.

Issues for Students

1 Partial course credits for the performing arts is a widely accepted practice for students in those programs.

2 Partial course credits for the performing arts is a successful way to encourage students who are not in those programs to participate in a way that supports the goals of a liberal arts curriculum.

3 PACT and *Explorations* directly support requirements in the Collegiate Center.

4 The mathematics activity almost entirely supports majors and minors in mathematics. The proposed computer science activity would do the same for computer science majors and minors. The goals could be achieved by a new whole credit course in the discipline or through an Odyssey project. Academic clubs can also support these activities in ways that give students more

a Do we want to add additional credit pressures to students with full loads?

b Should we add partial course credits to strengthen the majors or minors?

c Do we need to support the tendency that students should be awarded credit for any major or minor related activity?

d How would the proliferation of major related activities affect student loads and pressures to receive credit?

Issues for Faculty

1 Activities taught by classroom teachers who are not members of the Faculty are either paid a stipend (if they are otherwise employees of the college) or an hourly wage.

2 *Explorations* classroom teachers receive a stipend.

3 MUSA and DANA activities taught by members of the Faculty have recognized load counts for these activities that are part of their total teaching loads.

4 TARA practicums are connected with the production activities of Faculty in theatre arts that are related to course equivalencies in their teaching load.

5 Members of the Faculty who teach laboratory courses have those courses counted as part of their total teaching loads. Classroom teachers who are not members of the faculty receive a stipend.

6 The MATH seminar is the only example of a partial course credit that does not count in Faculty loads nor do not include a stipend. In the way, the seminar is more similar to a club, co-curricular activity, or Odyssey project.

CONCLUSION:

Based on the above observations, the Committee on Faculty does not think partial course credits in addition to those in MUSA, PACT, DANA, TARA, and *Explorations* should be approved for partial course credits.

Committee on Engaged Learning
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Mark Goadrich

Frequency of meetings
For three months out of the year, CEL reviewed numerous Odyssey Funding proposals. In October, 25 requests were received that totaled $76,080. In February, 49 requests were received for $199,468. And in April, 53 requests were received for $175,507. Each committee member critically reviewed each proposal in each cycle and recommended in favor or against funding, as well as decided on a funding amount. These recommendations were then compiled by the Odyssey office, leading to a 2-hour discussion meeting to try and find consensus across the proposals. Following this meeting, each committee member reviewed their recommendations and submitted a second vote. One final vote was requested via email from members once the individual votes were consolidated into a single spreadsheet. This spreadsheet was then forwarded to COF for final approval.

Outside of the funding cycles, CEL met during orientation week for a 2 hour overview session, met for 1 hour with outside reviewers of the Odyssey program, and for 1 hour to discuss circumstances surrounding service to the world and proselytization, as well as the current stipend amount for UR and PL projects.

Decisions made
In the three Funding cycles, we voted for the following number of projects and funding total.

October, 22 projects were awarded $45,246.11.

February, 40 projects were awarded $156,327.

April, 37 projects were awarded $112,814.

We also discussed and voted to add language to the Odyssey Guide pertaining to Service to the World projects that intersect with faith-based organizations. We recommended to students that they follow the guidelines found in the "Hendrix College Religious Life Ethical Framework," and that projects that include a proselytizing component cannot intrude on the client's religious freedom. We believe this will help students understand the expectations of the Odyssey office for funding proposals, in a similar way that we outline guidelines for internships involving medical work in foreign countries.

Future goals
The committee will continue to review Odyssey Funding Proposals, and advocate for maintaining or increasing the level of Odyssey funding. Each year, multiple quality proposals are unfunded due to limited resources, and while PL internship stipends are in line with other institutions at $10 per hour for 30 hours over 8 weeks, this is far below a standard REU stipend for a national science research program. Also, next year CEL should plan to review the recommendations from the external review of the Odyssey program to determine where CEL can assist with any proposed changes to the program.

Curriculum actions approved
EVST 497 – SP and UR Coding
PSYC 366 – SP Coding

Committee on Diversity and Dialogue
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Leslie Zorwick

This year, our committee had **seven** major areas of work.

- We prepared and facilitated five Diversity and Dialogue Faculty Workshops – covering race, gender, religious identity, the Time's Up Hendrix activities related to sexuality, and student mental health – in conjunction with the Associate Provost for Faculty Development. To prepare for these workshops, we spend a significant amount of time discussing issues on campus related to these facets of identity, we brainstorm potential topics, and this is a way for faculty, staff, students, and administrators to have a voice in the topics discussed.

- We provided assistance to the Committee on Academic Policy *vis-a-vis* the issue of the prayer at the beginning of faculty meetings. In this work, we brainstormed questions as a committee, prepared and administered a survey to the faculty, discussed results, and then the chair presented those results to AP and the Faculty at large.
- We discussed the results of the student climate survey and served in an advisory capacity for the work of the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.
- We evaluated the proposals submitted for Mellon scholars of color, which were solicited by the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, and we made recommendations for who should be selected.
- We had extensive discussions about how to connect our work with the training that already occurs for the leaders of student organizations. Moving forward, it's likely that our committee will work closely with the Student Life staff, particularly Dominique Kelleybrew, to put together an SP Odyssey that involves a focus on leadership and community development and includes a large Diversity and Dialogue component.
- We had conversations about how to work closely with the cafeteria staff and the dietician to discuss food as an issue of inclusive community next year. We think this is an area of programming that could be fruitful and a concern came to us about the labeling of foods to ensure that the cafeteria is a space that works well for people with identity-related food restrictions.
- We spent a ***significant*** amount of time focused on the activities of the Time's Up Hendrix group. As the chair, I spent close to 50 hours working on this – including meetings with administrators, faculty, staff, and students. In addition, our committee spent 3 hours talking as a group about these issues and most individual committee members spent time attending events, gathering information, and sharing with the committee. This final area of our work was unexpected, but I am glad we were in a position to be part of the conversation because of the work that we do to envision a community that is inclusive and supportive for all members.

Enrollment and Financial Aid Committee
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Karen Griebling

The Enrollment and FA Committee met twice last fall after I had met with Sam on a couple of occasions to brainstorm about new directions for recruiting, scholarships, pricing, marketing, etc. He and I had discussions that seemed to be fruitful and positive so I had hoped to carry things forward with the committee and the administration working together to try some new initiatives to address the shortfall in enrollment and budget. We had two very stimulating meetings, but ultimately no decisions were made.

Committee on Honors
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Britt Murphy

Dr. Falls-Corbitt was newly appointed as Co-Coordinator of Distinguished Scholarships to take on the recruitment of Hendrix students for distinguished scholarships, and the management and support of faculty and staff liaisons for these awards. Dr. Falls-Corbitt gathered the liaisons each semester to discuss how the Honors Committee and Distinguished Scholarships Coordinators might better support the faculty liaisons in their work. Dr. Falls-Corbitt oversaw the Goldwater applicants, enlisting different science faculty members to mentor each applicant. She also coordinated events, including the Scholarships Tea, widening the invitation list to include not only juniors, but also promising sophomores. Dr. Falls-Corbitt regularly reached out to faculty for recommendations of student applicants, created different tracking resources, and worked with Dr. Maupin to mentor applicants through the writing process. Dr. Falls-Corbitt also made sure that the awards Hendrix students apply for have capable faculty liaisons who can put the requisite energy into this time-consuming process. In late spring the Administration approved a stipend for Felipe Pruneda Senties to work with potential nominees over the summer on their personal statements, and Dr. Falls-Corbitt coordinated with several liaisons (especially for Watson and Fulbright) to connect students with him.

Dr. Maupin, our other Co-Coordinator of Distinguished Scholarships, continued to mentor applicants in their writing. Dr. Maupin held writing workshops, including an "Early Start" essay workshop in the spring to assist students with personal essay writing skills. These were helpful for both students and liaisons, and she spent many hours working one-on-one with Udall, Fulbright, and Watson applicants.

The Honors Committee continues to support the Distinguished Scholarships Coordinators in reviewing applications and preparing Hendrix students for national competition, both in their written materials and oral presentations. In addition, we sponsored a scholarships tea in late February to recruit talented juniors and sophomores to apply for the British awards and consider other scholarships as well. We are indebted to the staff of Bailey Library who assisted greatly in preparing for this event.

This year was disappointing in almost every category of award in which we mentored students. No student applied for the British awards. Despite Daniel Whelan's valiant efforts to recruit and prepare eight Fulbright applicants, none made it to the second stage of the competition. Dr. Whelan has plans to change how he recruits and mentors applicants for next year, including being more strategic in selection of country for the ETAs, and in constructing the team that interviews and prepares candidates.

We had no success with the Watson Fellowship this year for the second year in a row – our last dry spell was 2011. The Committee selected four Watson candidates from an initial applicant pool of fourteen. Christy Coker and I coached the Watson candidates for their January 7 interview with Watson Foundation Representative Christophe Chung. In April I invited Hendrix Watson Fellow, Nathan Thomas '10, to present on his Watson year and help promote the Watson at the all-student spring Watson meeting on April 16. A week later Rose Thomson Gastler '12, a Walker Fellow, helped lead a brainstorming/listening/writing session for rising seniors interested in the Watson.

We also had an unsuccessful year with the Goldwater, with none of our four candidates receiving even honorable mention. The Truman also proved to be elusive this year. Despite having what we perceived as a quite competitive pool of two applicants, the Truman Scholarship reaped no fruit. Dr. Courtney Hatch, our Udall liaison, did a marvelous job in mentoring students for this tricky award, but our sole applicant did not receive the award.

Our only wild success with seniors in 2017-18 was the JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Program, and the credit does not lie with the Honors Committee, but with Gwen Stockwell and Aya Murata as well as the five talented students who advanced to the interview stage. Four students received awards: Pete Wills, Laela Zaidi, Lena Pham, Alexandria DerGazarian.

George Harper also shared the news before year's end that four Hendrix alumni received National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowships:

Harrington, Alison Hamlin	Life Sciences - Evolutionary Biology	University of Arizona
Higgins, Jacob S	Chemistry - Chemical Structure, Dynamics, & Mechanism	University of Chicago
Hildebrand, Laura Katherine	Psychology - Social Psychology	Purdue University
Wells, Rachel LeAnn	Life Sciences - Ecology	University of Louisville

There were no submissions for the Bennett Essay Prize this year.

An up-to-date list of Hendrix student award recipients can be found at https://www.hendrix.edu/academics/academics.aspx?id=53184.

Committee on Honorary Degrees
2017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Duff Campbell

The Committee on Honorary Degrees received five nominations this year along with one reactivated recent application. The Committee chose to forward the nomination of Jo Luck to the faculty with a recommendation that Jo Luck receive an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters. That nomination was approved by the Faculty and then by the Board, and Jo Luck received her honorary degree at Graduation in May 2018.

The only other activity of this committee was that the Chair, Duff Campbell, attended a meeting with Ellis Arnold and President Tsutsui where we talked ways to increase the number of applications for honorary degrees.

Committee on International and Intercultural Studies
20017-2018 Annual Report
Chair: Chris Campolo

The committee reviewed applications for study abroad and awarded prizes to seniors who had made outstanding achievements in these areas. We met twice and did a lot of business by email. A lot of this is fairly standardized, as to procedure. We kept the well-being of each student in mind as the highest priority, and we were confident about the decisions we reached as a committee.

Committee on Student Life
2017-18 Annual Report
Chair: Stan Rauh

The issues facing the committee for this academic year included the following:

Constitutions for new Student Organizations:
The committee reviewed several constitutions this year, continuing to use the streamlined approach implemented two years past. We began by reviewing the first constitution as a group to help new members grow accustomed to the process. Subsequent constitutions were then submitted to student/faculty pairs to review and advise in conjunction with the Assistant Director of Student Activities.

Constitutions that were reviewed this year included: Young Democratic Socialist Club; Computer Science Club; Art Club; Pre-Vet Club; Ping Pong Club; Meditation Club; Naturalist Club; and Japanese Language and Culture Club.

Sexual Assault Concerns:
In Spring Semester, Time's Up Hendrix began raising awareness about Sexual Assault on campus. Student Life Committee forged a bond with the Committee on Diversity and Dialogue to help work through some of these challenging issues. Committee chairs, both jointly and separately, spent the following weeks meeting with a wide variety of concerned constituents on campus. Student requests included greater clarity and sensitivity in the Investigation Phase, better training and more access for support, and consideration of current campus climate as it pertains to sexuality and sexual assault. The two committees presented on these topics during the April faculty meeting. The administration is currently at work on potential policy changes and documents planned for the start of the next academic year. The committee will continue to work through possible solutions during the next year as well.

Other Pending Business:
Two significant issues came to the committee's attention at the term's close, in April.

First, Michael LeBlanc brought forth a proposal to introduce Body Worn Cameras for the use of his staff in Public Safety to ensure student/officer safety and conduct propriety. After review, the committee endorsed a trial run for this proposal and further review and discussion for the next year.

Second, the committee received a request for a student organization based on skeet-shooting. This raised concerns among several members of the committee and has prompted a plan to review the campus fire-arm policy.