Academic Advising Committee
2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: John Sanders

Overview
The committee met twice to discuss two different topics: gender pronouns and the Herrick Award. The previous chair had a number of helpful documents that the present chair collected. The chair will forward a batch of documents to the next chair. In addition, the present chair compiled a list of instructions for the process of selecting the Herrick Award winner. This document provides future chairs with the detailed information about what to do, when to do it, the criteria used by the committee, and voting procedures.

Gender pronouns
Meeting on gender pronouns November 1, 2018
One of the student members brought two concerns to the committee. It turns out that these concerns are not actually about academic advising. Rather, they are about a faculty-student issue. Nonetheless, we discussed them.
The two concerns were:
1. Some faculty members fail to use the gender pronouns that a student prefers.
2. Is it appropriate for students to compliment a professor about clothing and looks? If so, how should students do this without crossing inappropriate boundaries?

Doctors Gron and Sanders followed-up on these questions by meeting with Allison Vetter, our Title IX educator. Sanders sent an email about the findings from that meeting to the members of the committee. No action was necessary on the part of the committee.

Herrick Award
Meeting to select the award recipient, March 25, 2019.
The chair used the previously developed Survey Monkey questionnaire but modified the announcement that went to the students. The results were tremendous. This year 70 students nominated 45 different advisors. These are the most nominations ever received. Seven faculty members had three or more nominations. Eight members had two nominations. One person had seven and another had four.

After discussing the data along with anecdotal comments, we voted for our top two candidates and ranked them as our first and second choices. One person was the first choice of all seven members of the committee. That individual was the one with seven nominations—Laura MacDonald.

After the award was announced at the Honors Day convocation, the chair sent e-mail letters to each faculty member who was nominated to let them know that at least one advisee nominated them and to thank them for their work of advising.

Future work
The process for the Herrick Award has gone well for two years and there do not seem to be any pressing issues.

Academic Appeals Committee
2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Rebecca Resinski

The committee received only two formal appeals this year.

1. One appeal concerned a student's request that a particular course be allowed to count as fulfilling their SB learning domain. We granted the appeal.

Rationale: Although the course in question does not normally carry SB coding, the chair of the department explained that it does meet the SB criteria and that they had not requested the SB code for the course simply because students taking it have usually completed a prior SB course. The department in question supported the one-time SB coding for the student.

2. The other appeal concerned a student's request that they be allowed to count a W2 course that was completed prior to their successful completion of the W1 requirement, which would enable them to drop the W2 course in which they were currently enrolled. We did not grant the appeal.

Rationale: The majority of the committee decided that there were not any extentuating circumstances to justify granting the appeal.

A more detailed account of these appeals and rationales will be sent to Academic Affairs for their records.

In consultation with the Provost, Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, and the chair of the Committee on Academic Integrity, the committee also drafted, revised, and finalized an internal procedural document to clarify and guide committee processes. We implemented these processes as much as possible this year, and we look forward to following them fully in 2019-2020. I am sending the final version of the procedural document along with this report, as well as some suggestions for changes to the catalog copy regarding academic appeals.

The committee met in person three times in 2018-2019, twice in the fall and once in the spring. We had other meetings scheduled to accommodate possible appeals, but when no appeals were submitted and no other business presented itself, I cancelled those meetings.

Committee on Academic Assessment 2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Sasha Pfau

The Assessment Committee's work for 2018-2019 focused on continuing to develop targeted feedback for annual assessment reports from departments and programs, preparing for the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Site Visit in early March, and working on the holistic assessment of the Vision for Student Learning (VSL) as part of our Quality Initiative (QI).

In 2017-2018, the previous Assessment Committee Chair, Megan Leonard, worked with the Assessment Committee to create and apply a rubric to provide feedback to departments on their assessment reports. Departments were asked to provide a targeted response to that feedback as their Annual Assessment Report by May 31, 2018. In Fall 2018, with Megan's assistance, we developed a new rubric for the 2018 reports. The Assessment Committee met twice a month throughout the Fall semester to discuss each department's report using the rubric, and to determine which departments might need to meet with the Assessment Committee chair to help prepare for the HLC visit in March. The committee identified three departments needing focused preparation and the chair met with each of those departments. The committee completed their review of departmental assessment reports by November 2018.

At the same time, work was proceeding with the holistic assessment of the VSL. That work began with a presentation at a Faculty Meeting explaining the goals and process of the Junior Advising Meetings. We also created a handout to send to advisors, which explained that "During the 6th week of classes, faculty advisors will meet individually with junior advisees for the purpose of scoring the VSL I6 rubric according to how students respond to a short series of prompts. Advisors will receive an email to an electronic scoring rubric for each advisee. Students should not see the rubric during the conversation."

For our December meeting, the Assessment Committee discussed the data from the Junior Meetings. We determined that the direct assessment of our conversations with students suggested that we were in a fairly good position regarding goal I6, and we should present our findings to the Faculty at the February Faculty Meeting.

In the Spring semester, the Assessment Committee met twice in February and once in April. At our February meetings, we prepared for the HLC visit in March and discussed the new "Career Competencies" project spearheaded by the Associate Provost for Faculty Development and the Director of Career Services. We worked to ensure that this new language fit within our mission documents, especially the Vision for Student Learning.

In March, the Assessment Committee Chair sent out department and program Assessment Report feedback and requested the 2019 Annual Assessment Report. In this letter, department and program chairs were asked to provide three things:

1. A copy of the Rubric that your department developed at the 2018 Fall Faculty Conference.

2. An updated Student Assessment Plan.

3. A response to the Assessment Committee's targeted feedback.

Finally, the Assessment Committee met in April to determine which of the VSL learning goals would be targeted for assessment in 2019-2020. As part of our conversation, we also discussed the usefulness of the Junior Meetings for assessing our goals. As indirect evidence, the committee considered the data from the Senior Survey that asks students to consider their own accomplishment of our goals alongside NSSE data.

The committee unanimously agreed that we ask departments to use rubrics for I1-I5 and I8 for a Senior Capstone or another large project undertaken in the senior year. We determined the Junior Meetings would work best for the kinds of goals that are more difficult to discern in a student project. We identified WP3 and WP5 as goals that will be assessed in Junior Meetings next year.

For 2019-2020, we will continue our work with departments, responding to their annual reports and making recommendations on their updated SAPs. We will use the feedback from the HLC team report to improve our holistic assessment of the VSL and work with the new Assessment Coordinators to clarify where and how the assessment process needs to function on our campus.

Committee on Academic Integrity 2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Maxine Payne

Overview

The committee handled 26 cases of academic integrity violations during the 2018/2019 academic year. This is an increase from the 2017/2018 total of 15 cases. Like last academic year, the majority of the cases indicated some variety of plagiarism (14). The other majority of cases involved students cheating on exams and assignments (10). One case involved the use of technology to cheat (using a fake identity and posting the test online for classmates to access). This year we had a case that was about deliberately deceiving the classroom teacher by using materials created in other classes without significant revisions. We also handled more repeat offenders this year than ever before (3).

Case Processing & Outcomes

Of these 26 cases, 3 conferences were held and the other 23 were resolved with Letters of Agreement. In all of the cases the chair of the committee approved the accusing faculty's recommendation for sanctions. One of these conferences was an absolute desperation attempt by a student to stay at Hendrix, as he was on both academic and academic integrity probation. The other two cases were simply a battle of will on the part of the students. The number of cases solved with Letters of Agreement is consistent with last year and is hopefully the direction the committee will continue to move. I believe this can be contributed to 1) better communication with faculty regarding pedagogy (classroom management as well as communicating the Academic Integrity Policy to students), and 2) better communication to faculty of how the Committee on Academic Integrity operates. The presentation for the Fall Faculty Conference in 2017 helped with this significantly. It may be useful to incorporate a shorter presentation of the committee's work for future FFC's.

Issues Addressed and Changes Made

This year I met to review all of the policies and procedures with student members before cases began to come in. Once again, most of the student members had not heard much about the College's Academic Integrity Policy prior to serving on the committee. Because many of the student members are older, the unit in Explorations may not have been incorporated yet when they took that class. Hopefully we will see the effectiveness of that with upcoming student members.

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

We are continuing to follow the suggestions of the Associate Provost David Sutherland and the Registrar's office by assigning grades of a grade of "NR" when the committee has a case at the end of the semester. We only had to do this in two cases this year and the grades were then converted to letter grades within a week of the NR being assigned, therefore

having no impact on financial aid.

Future Work

While a significant amount of time was spent at the 2017 Fall Faculty Conference on Academic Integrity and pedagogy, there were a couple of instances this year when classroom management may have prevented violations. For example, leaving a classroom during an exam period and allowing students to use their own "scratch paper" during exams. There was another instance when the expectations of a senior capstone were not clearly articulated, or there was a gap of information as it related to a very specific component of a capstone (how much work that originated in other classes could be used for the capstone without significant edits), and I know that department has now clarified that for their students. Sometimes these issues cannot be imagined until we are confronted with them. This is often the case with emerging technologies and the ways students use it dishonestly. 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. The more examples we can share with the faculty of the ways in which students may violate the academic integrity policies at Hendrix, the more we can prevent violations from occurring in the future.

My work with Amanda Cheatham in the Provost's office to streamline and organize the archive of these records has been very beneficial. The shared spreadsheet between the Chair of the committee and the Provost's office is critical to this committee catching repeat offenders. It is critical that it remain accurate and consistent. Amanda and I have a very good system for the work of this committee. Now that Amanda is moving out of the Provost's office, I am very concerned this system will be broken. This work must remain confidential and cannot be assigned to a student worker. It also is very helpful that the tasks do not shift between too many people or too often.

It is critical that the Chair of the Committee on Academic Integrity vet the upcoming student members. Late this semester a student member received his second violation of academic integrity. Clearly, he should have never been placed on the committee but the Chair should also have the right to remove a student member. It will be necessary to articulate a policy addressing this issue.

Forms online also need to be regularly updated. This has been an unclear process. Often, I email Amanda Cheatham if I find that a form has not been updated and she does it, but I often have faculty telling me the form they have access to has not been updated. I believe this has something to do with how they get to the form on the internet. I would like to resolve this issue once and for all and always know the process I need to go through to keep the latest forms available to faculty.

Lastly, this year there seems to be more students who repeatedly violate the standards of academic integrity. Perhaps this is because the record keeping is better. Perhaps the penalties are not high enough. Perhaps these kids are just bolder, or do not learn from their mistakes. I am interested in seeing how this trend plays out and finding ways to address it.

College Conduct Council 2018-2019 Annual Report Chair: Jonathan Hancock

During the Fall 2018 semester, faculty and student members of the CCC met with Associate Dean Kesha Baoua on November 29, 2018, for a training session during the convocation period.

During the Spring 2019 semester, the CCC held one hearing for a case on April 4, 2019. In addition, faculty and staff members of the Gender-Based Misconduct (GBM) Panel met to review GBM policies and procedures, and members watched "refresher" videos on Title IX policy on their own time. The GBM Panel also met to deliberate on GBM cases, which no longer involve live hearings. The details and outcomes of CCC and GBM cases are confidential.

Curriculum Committee 2018-2019 Annual Report Chair: Gabe Ferrer

Frequency of Meetings:
The Curriculum Committee met a total of 13 times during the 2018-19 academic year.

Decisions Made:

Structure for Discussing Proposals: We devised the following structure for discussing each proposal. Once all curricular proposals are submitted and pass their respective area meetings, the Curriculum Chair assigns two committee members to be the primary reviewers of each proposal. The Chair strives to balance the quantity of proposals among all the committee members. The Chair, the Registrar, and the Associate Provost do not serve as primary reviewers. The Chair also prepares a schedule for when each proposal will be initially discussed.

Each primary reviewer completes a rubric for their assigned proposals. When the scheduled time for discussing a specific proposal arises, each of the two primary reviewers give their opinion about the proposal before anyone else on the committee speaks. Once both have spoken, the discussion is opened up to all committee members.

If there is a consensus to move forward with a given proposal, no further committee action is required. If there are concerns, the Chair conveys those concerns to the proposer, either in writing or an in-person conversation.

Curriculum Changes:

Courses followed by "*" indicate fast-track approval by unanimous agreement of the Chair, the Registrar, and the Associate Provost.

The following new courses were added to the catalog:

CHIN 290	Gods, Demons and the Supernatural in Chinese Literature	LS, VA, W2
DANC i21	Dance Performance Studies I	
DANC i31	Dance Performance Studies II	
ENGL 234	The Essay	LS, W1
EVST 310	Environmental Studies Colloquium	W2
GEND 251	Topics: Gender & Sexuality-Hu	
GEND 255	Topics: Gender & Sexuality-Soc	
GEND 351	Adv Topics: Gender & Sexuality-Hu	
GEND 355	Adv Topics: Gender & Sexuality-Soc	
HIST 309	Ecology and Culture in East Asia	HP
HIST 365	Designing History Games	HP, VA, UR, SP
MUSI 425	Composition	
PHIL 316	Environmental Ethics	VA, W2
POLI 203	Philosophy of Political Inquiry	
PSYC 270	Community Psychology	
PSYC 312	Human Aggression	
PSYC 397	Theories of Psychotherapy	
SOCI 355	Sociology of Immigration	SB

The following existing courses were removed from the catalog:

BUSI 340*	BUSI 410*	BUSI 580*	ECON 335*	ECON 370*	ECON 570*
ARTS 235*	GEND 267*	GEND 268*	HIST 285*	MUSA 1AS*	MUSA 1PP*
MUSA 1SS*	MUSI 101*	MUSI 201*	MUSI 240*	MUSI 255*	MUSI 302*
MUSI 340*	MUSI 350*	MUSI 360*	MUSI 370*	MUSI 380*	MUSI 430*
MUSI 440*	MUSI 470*	POLI 201*	POLI 243*	POLI 280*	POLI 333*
POLI 352*	POLI 357*	POLI 366*	POLI 400*	POLI 460*	POLI I30*
POLI 346*	POLI 369*	POLI 279*			

The following courses were renumbered or retitled:

BIOL 356	Renumbered 260
CSCI 230	Renumbered 322
CSCI 352	Retitled "Mobile Software Development"
ENGL 239*	Renumbered 339
ENGL 275*	Retitled "Human Natures in American Literature and Film"
FREN 320*	Retitled "Phonetics and Advanced Conversation"
HIST 308*	Retitled "Ecology & Culture in Native America"
HIST 342*	Retitled "Race, Gender, and Jefferson"
FREN 361*	Renumbered 461
MATH 120	Retitled "Precalculus"
MUSI 202*	Retitled "Diatonic Harmony"
MUSI 260*	Retitled "Popular Music Since 1900"
MUSI 270*	Retitled "World Musics"
MUSI 301*	Retitled "Chromatic Harmony"
MUSI 310*	Renumbered 405
MUSI 401*	Renumbered 311
MUSI 402*	Renumbered 312
PHIL 270	Renumbered 308
PHIL 370*	Retitled "Philosophy and Religion"
PHIL 380*	Retitled "Theories of Reality"
PHIL 385*	Retitled "Theories of Knowledge"
SPAN 310*	Retitled "Survey Spanish Literature to 1700"
SPAN 320*	Retitled "Survey Spanish Literature sn 1700"
SPAN 390*	Cross-list as LITR 390

The following courses added or removed Collegiate Center codes:

CHEM 120*	Add NS-L
CSCI 285	Add W2
CSCI 335	Add W2
CSCI 352	Add W2, drop NS
ECON 340	Add W2
ECON 380	Add W2
ECON 385	Add W2
ENGL 239*	Drop W1
MATH 320	Add W2
MATH 350	Add W2
PHIL 270	Add W2
PHIL 360*	Drop W2
SPAN 310*	Drop W2
SPAN 320*	Drop W2
SPAN 330*	Drop W2

The following courses added or removed prerequisites:

BIOL 365	Reduced prerequisites to Zoology/Botany plus a Statistics course
CSCI 230	Add CSCI 151
CSCI 235*	Drop prerequisite option of CSCI/PHYS 135; prerequisite CSCI 150 remains.
CSCI 320	Add CSCI 151, drop CSCI 230
CSCI 360	Add CSCI 151, drop CSCI 230
ECON 200	Drop MATH 120

ECON 210	Drop MATH 120
ECON 300	Add MATH 130
ECON 340	Add ECON 200
ECON 497	Add ECON 400
ECON 590	Add ECON 500
EVST 497	Add EVST 310, with co-requisite option
FREN 361*	Replace FREN 210 prerequisite with "LA Capacity complete"
PHIL 1xx	Only 1st-year students are permitted to enroll

The following courses had revisions to their catalog copy:

DANC i30*	FREN 320*	MUSI 100*	MUSI 202*	MUSI 260*	MUSI 270*
MUSI 301*	MUSI 310*	MUSI 401*	MUSI 402*	SPAN 310*	SPAN 320*
PHIL 270	MATH 120	MATH 130	MATH 140	CSCI 285	CSCI 320
CSCI 335	CSCI 360				

The following majors were revised:

ACCT	Re-organize major
CSCI	Re-organize major
ECBU	Re-organize major
ECON	Re-organize major
POLI/IR*	POLI 203 now required, replacing an elective
PHIL*	Replace PHIL 270 with PHIL 316 in ethics elective list
EVST	Re-organize major
MUSI	Re-organize major
SJSA	Add ANTH 230, 240; HIST 201, 250, 281; POLI 223 to elective list

The following minors were revised:

ACCT	Re-organize minor
ASIA	Re-organize minor
BUSI	Re-organize minor
DAAN*	Remove POLI 460 from elective list.
ECON	Re-organize minor
GEND	Re-organize minor
GEND*	Add POLI 242 to elective list.
MUSI	Re-organize minor

Rejected Proposals:

The proposal to prohibit non-first-year enrollment in PHIL 1xx was rejected by the committee but nevertheless placed on the Faculty agenda by AP and approved by the faculty.

The following proposal from the English department was rejected by the committee, pending feedback from the English department. No feedback arrived during the academic year.

Feedback was initially solicited on October 24, 2018. A follow-up invitation was sent on March 5, 2019.

Here is the text of the proposal:

Introduction: I respectfully request a change to the W1 writing requirement. The gist of the change is to separate W1 certification from the overall course grade (as we generally do with W2 certification).

Rationale: Students can receive W1 credit by receiving a C or higher in ENGL 110, ENGL 210, or one of the many Introduction to Literary Studies courses.

Introduction to Literary Studies. As these are both literature and writing courses, it is quite possible for students to receive a C or higher in the course, but NOT on their average paper grades (because of exams and other graded

requirements that are not formal papers). Yet our system demands either that they receive a W1 when they hadn't met that standard, or that the grade be lowered to a D, which they don't deserve.

ENGL 110 and 210. Some students ought to be allowed to earn a C but NOT receive W1 credit. They have not met that particular standard, and I do not want to signal to my colleagues that I think they are ready for more advanced writing work. They need another class. But they worked diligently and did good work in class in other ways (lesser assignments, participation, etc.), so I do not care to destroy their GPA with a D, and to damage their motivation to continue their studies.

Another way to think of this: If the course is truly developmental, what matters is that by the end of the term the student has demonstrated the required competency, even though the overall average grade for all papers does not reach a C.

Conversely, there are students whose essays demonstrate the W1 capacity, yet who have had problems with other assignments (and attendance, etc.) and actually deserve a D for the class. I would like to be able to certify the writing competency but not reward them with a C that they do not deserve.

The +/- problem. Students with a C- paper grades do not meet the "C" standard, but because we have no +/- system they would receive W1.

Current language:

Level I (W1). To meet the Level I writing requirement a student must

• receive a "C" or above in ENGL 110 Introduction to Academic Writing, or ENGL 210 Advanced Academic Writing at Hendrix; or

• receive a grade of "C" or above in a course at Hendrix from the category Introduction to Literary Studies (These courses are identified by the code "W1" in the Schedule of Classes and in this Catalog); or

• receive a grade of "C" or above on an examination in written English administered by the Writing Center at Hendrix and certified by the English Department.

Level II (W2). To meet the Level II writing requirement, a student must receive writing proficiency certification (including making a grade of "C" or higher) in a writing intensive

course offered by any department of the College. Writing intensive courses are identified by the code "W2" in the Schedule of Classes and in this Catalog.

Proposed language:

Please note the slight change to the W2 requirement as well, to clarify the parenthetical clarification.

Level I (W1). To meet the Level I writing requirement a student must either receive writing proficiency certification (by demonstrating the capacity to earn a "C" or higher on formal writing assignments) in a course identified by the code "W1" in the Schedule of Classes and in this Catalog, or receive a grade of "C" or above on an examination in written English administered by the Writing Center at Hendrix and certified by the English Department.

Level II (W2). To meet the Level II writing requirement, a student must receive writing proficiency certification (by demonstrating the capacity to earn a "C" or higher on formal writing assignments) in a writing intensive course offered by any department of the College. Writing intensive courses are identified by the code "W2" in the Schedule of Classes and in this Catalog.

We sent the following response:

Thank you for your proposal. It has been examined by the Curriculum Committee, and we have the following feedback to offer. As we discussed the proposal, it became clear to us that the situation regarding ENGL 110 courses was different from the 200-level ENGX courses. This memo summarizes our conversation.

None of us found the argument about decoupling the W1 from the course grade in ENGL 110 to be persuasive. As it is a writing course, with no other learning goals, the student's writing competency should be reflected in the final course grade.

With regard to the 200-level ENGX courses, several members of the Curriculum Committee empathized with the proposal. That said, we had to weigh that argument against the costs of instituting this policy. Students who fail to obtain their W1 credit will then have to take another W1 course, likely replicating the problems encountered earlier. Furthermore, this has the potential to greatly complicate course scheduling during the first two years, particularly if the W1 failure should occur during the second year.

It was observed that the LS learning domain itself has as a learning goal to "engage in the practice of written and oral

expression." Given that learning goal, some Curriculum Committee members expressed doubts even as to the feasibility of this separation.

The W2 policy is cited as a precedent for this proposal. The decoupling of the W2 code from course grades has been a major problem with graduation audits in the past. This proposed change to W1 has the potential to lead to similar problems.

Finally, this proposal represents a significant increase in complexity to handle a situation that admittedly only arises with a "handful" of students each year.

We would like to suggest that the English department consider a policy similar to what is done for students who are struggling in Calculus I. (They are allowed to be reassigned to Functions and Models at any point in the semester.) This idea was inspired by the observation that students are already segregated between ENGL 110 and ENGX 2xx based on prior demonstrated writing competency (also similar to what is done in Mathematics). An early writing assignment in ENGX 2xx could identify struggling students early in the semester.

At this stage, there are several ways we may proceed. The English Department is welcome to:

- Withdraw this proposal and consider other alternatives to address their concerns.

- Respond to this feedback, addressing the expressed concerns. This response should give a persuasive argument that the benefits of this proposed revision exceed the potential costs anticipated by Curriculum Committee members. In this event, the Curriculum Committee would once again discuss the proposal in light of that response.

- Decline to respond to this feedback. In this event, we will inform the Council on Academic Policy that we reviewed this proposal and that we recommend against it, for the reasons stated above.

At the convenience of the English Department, we would like for you all to meet and discuss our feedback about this proposal. Once you all have agreed to a position, we would like for Kristi (as the current department chair) to communicate to me which of the three options the department has chosen.

We hope this feedback is helpful to you all, and we thank you for your proposal.

Future Goals:

- <u>Revisions to Forms and Rubrics</u>: The forms and rubrics were largely effective. However, for simpler proposals the forms were at times needlessly burdensome. For example, unlike a new course proposal, there is typically no need for a course revision proposal to include a staffing justification. We plan to streamline the forms to take these insights into account.
- <u>Approval Chain</u>: Is an electronic signature necessary to show approval, or does placement in a particular electronic repository suffice? If the latter, we will remove the signature sections from the forms. This will significantly reduce the workload of the Area Chairs in the process.
- <u>Student Assessment Plan (SAP)</u>: The current SAP is inadequate and in need of revision. See Appendix B for details.
- <u>Action Items from Assessment Results</u>: See Appendix B for full details.
    - Revisions to NS and NS-L learning goals.
    - Reexamination and recertification of VA courses, especially with regard to the third Learning Goal. Given the age of the data, a new round of data collection may be in order.
    - Conversation with Computer Science faculty about QS learning goal 2.

Appendix A: Redesigned Submission Forms and Rubrics [Not included; available online.]

Appendix B: Learning Domains Assessment Report

At the request of the Assessment Committee, Curriculum Chair Gabriel Ferrer assembled an Assessment Report for the Learning Domains (and QS Capacity). This report compiled the assessment results produced by previous Curriculum and Assessment Committees over the last decade, and concluded with some recommendations moving forward. The entire report follows:

Part I: Student Assessment Plan

Overview of the Student Assessment Plan

Our current student assessment plan for learning domains is as follows:

- Each learning domain (and QS capacity) has a specified list of learning goals.
- Each year, one learning domain (or QS capacity) is selected for assessment.
  - The assessment consists of sending a survey to each classroom teacher who is teaching a course with that learning domain code.
  - The survey lists each learning goal for the domain under assessment.
  - The classroom teacher writes down the number of students who, for that goal, exhibit performance that is:
    - 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
  - The sources of evidence for these numbers is then requested; classroom teachers are asked to specify at least two of the following:
    - Grades
    - Papers
    - Presentations
    - Exams
  - The results of the surveys are compiled and analyzed.

Learning Goals

The learning goals for the learning domains (and QS) are as follows:

- **Expressive Arts (EA):** Either through the creation and performance of works of art or through the study of artistic creations within a context of time, culture, or style, students are able to:
  - Understand and respond to works of art in an informed manner.
  - Recognize the manner in which artistic content communicates ideas and feelings.
  - Comprehend the formal processes which go into the creation of selected works of art.
- **Historical Perspectives (HP):** Upon completion of a course in this learning domain, students are able to:
  - Understand some of the diverse ways in which human beings in different cultures and societies have responded to temporal change.
  - Examine contemporary issues from a historical perspective.
  - Use historical perspective to gain insight into their own convictions and actions.
- **Literary Studies (LS):** Upon completion of a course in this learning domain, students are able to:
  - Engage in the practice of written and oral expression.
  - Read a text critically to determine what meanings it holds, how and why those meanings are produced, and the effects of these choices.
  - Examine how literary works provide insight into the human experience.
- **Natural Science Inquiry (NS):** Upon completion of a course with the **NS** domain code, students are able to:
  - Understand and apply the scientific and mathematical principles of their discipline.
  - Understand the distinction between science and dogma.

- ○ Use basic scientific principles to place information in a larger context.
- ○ Understand how science does and does not work.
- **Natural Science Inquiry with Laboratory (NS-L):** Upon completion of a course in with the **NS-L** domain code, students are able to:
  - ○ Use the scientific method to gather, interpret and evaluate data.
  - ○ Employ tools to assess the validity of observations related to the natural world.
  - ○ Join scientific principles with critical analysis in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline.
  - ○ Relate their analysis and conclusions to those of the larger scientific community.
- **Social and Behavioral Analysis (SB):** Upon completion of a course in this learning domain, students are able to:
  - ○ Begin to understand human and social behavior through the use of appropriate disciplinary techniques.
  - ○ Use their understanding of human behavior and relationships to discuss policy and/or other interventions.
  - ○ Grasp how human experience is shaped by the social and institutional landscape.
- **Values, Beliefs and Ethics (VA):** Upon completion of a course in this learning domain, students are able to:
  - ○ Articulate an understanding of different value and belief systems that follows upon critical exploration of those systems.
  - ○ Express the commonalities discovered in value and belief systems that follows upon critical exploration of those systems.
  - ○ Express the commonalities discovered in value and belief systems across historical, philosophical, religious, and/or cultural boundaries.
  - ○ Demonstrate familiarity with ways of making reasoned value judgements.
- **Quantitative Skills (QS)**: Upon completion of a course with this capacity code, students are able to:
  - ○ Use mathematical/computing techniques to analyze and solve models.
    - ○ Quantitatively interpret results of analysis as they apply to real world problems.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Assessment Plan

The Assessment Committee lays out the following criteria for a strong Student Assessment Plan:
- Learning Goals
- A Mapping of Goals to Components (where or how do you make sure that students achieve these goals? For example, in the syllabus, course content, required assignments, parameters for receiving credit, etc.)
- Plans for Gathering Information:
  - ○ At least one form of indirect assessment (student survey, exit interview, etc.)
  - ○ At least one form of direct assessment (rubric for a capstone, common course, or learning goal, standardized exam, etc.)
  - ○ A planned cycle for assessment of the goals (i.e. you don't have to assess all goals every year)

Here is where our assessment plan stands in relation to each of these criteria:
- Learning Goals
  - ○ Our plan has learning goals.
  - ○ In the next section (Action Plan for Improvement) we will discuss the degree to which these learning goals have proven adequate.
- A Mapping of Goals to Components
  - ○ Our plan does not have any mapping of goals to components.
- Plans for Gathering Information
  - ○ We do not have any forms of indirect assessment.

- ○ Our survey of classroom teachers is a form of direct assessment, in that we ask each classroom teacher to assess achievement of learning goals from direct evidence of student learning.
- ○ We do have a planned cycle for assessment of the goals, in that our plan is to assess one learning goal per year. We must frankly acknowledge that this goal has not been consistently met.

Part II: Action Plan for Improvement

In this section, we discuss the following interrelated issues:

- Analysis of the data we have collected about each learning domain.
- Actions to take in response to the analysis of the data.
- The need to rethink and substantively revise our Student Assessment Plan.

We include one section for each of the learning domains (and QS), followed by a proposed action plan and concluding with a discussion as to how we might revise the Student

Assessment Plan. Note that all conclusions from our analysis are weakened by the lack of any indirect assessment.

Expressive Arts (EA)

Direct assessment data was collected in 2011-12. Here are the learning goals, followed by the percentage of students who had Satisfactory or better performance on those goals:

Goal	% Satisfactory or better
Understand and respond to works of art in an informed manner.	92
Recognize the manner in which artistic content communicates ideas and feelings.	93
Comprehend the formal processes which go into the creation of selected works of art.	94

From this, we can conclude:

- The EA learning goals seem to reflect well the content of the targeted courses.
- Course instruction is proving successful in guiding students towards achieving those goals.

Literary Studies (LS)

Direct assessment data was collected in Spring 2016. Here are the learning goals, followed by the percentage of students who had Satisfactory or better performance on those goals:

Goal	% Satisfactory or better
Engage in the practice of written expression.	80
Engage in the practice of oral expression.	83
Read a text critically to determine the meanings it holds.	88
Read a text critically to determine how and why those meanings are produced, and the effects of those choices.	76
Examine how literary works provide insight into the human experience.	77

From this, we can conclude:

- The LS learning goals seem to reflect well the content of the targeted courses.
- The goal of determining meaning from text is easiest to achieve.
- Courses are emphasizing written and oral expression at roughly equal levels.
- There might be room for courses to emphasize to a greater degree how literary works provide insight into the human experience.

Historical Perspectives (HP)

Direct assessment data was collected in Spring 2016. Here are the learning goals, followed by the percentage of students who had Satisfactory or better performance on those goals:

Goal	% Satisfactory or better
Understand some of the diverse ways in which human beings in different cultures and societies have responded to temporal change.	79
Examine contemporary issues from a historical perspective.	83
Use historical perspective to gain insight into their own convictions and actions.	77

From this, we can conclude:
- The HP learning goals seem to reflect well the content of the targeted courses.
- HP courses are doing a great job incorporating the examination of contemporary issues from a historical perspective.

Values, Beliefs, and Ethics
Direct assessment data was collected in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. Here are the learning goals, followed by the percentage of students who had Satisfactory or better performance on those goals:

Goal	% Satisfactory or better
Articulate an understanding of different value and belief systems that follows upon critical exploration of those systems.	87
Express the commonalities discovered in value and belief systems across historical, philosophical, religious, and/or cultural boundaries.	90
Demonstrate familiarity with ways of making reasoned value judgements.	68

From this, we can conclude:
- For some reason, one of the learning goals for VA ("Express the commonalities discovered in value and belief systems that follows upon critical exploration of those systems.") was not assessed. It does appear to be a combination of phrases from the preceding and succeeding goals. We will need to examine whether to remove that goal from our list, or to assess it explicitly in the future.
- The goal "Demonstrate familiarity with ways of making reasoned value judgements." shows considerably lower performance in comparison to the others. This is because several courses marked the goal as Not Applicable. Those courses are: three sections of RELI 110, CLAS 200, RELI 331, and RELI 339. If these sections are removed from the analysis, the percentage of students achieving this learning goal rises to 91%, which is similar to the numbers for the other goals.
- One particularly bizarre aspect of this is that two sections of RELI 110 were taught by the same instructor. In one section, the learning goal was marked Not Applicable, and in the other section most of the students were reported as meeting the goal.
- This outcome was reported to the faculty at the November 2013 faculty meeting. No further action was taken.

Quantitative Skills
Direct assessment data was collected in Spring 2019. Here are the learning goals, followed by the percentage of students who had Satisfactory or better performance on those goals:

Goal	% Satisfactory or better
Use mathematical/computing techniques to analyze and solve models.	72
Quantitatively interpret results of analysis as they apply to real world problems.	67

From this, we can conclude:
- Achieving satisfactory performance for QS goals seems to be more difficult than for the learning goals for the learning domains.
- Variances in satisfactory performance are extremely large, even when comparing different sections of the same course, sometimes even when those different sections were taught by the same instructor.
- The instructor for CSCI 150 marked the second learning goal as Not Applicable. The course does have assignments where students analyze real-world data, as well as constructing software that solves real-world problems. The instructor was reluctant to say that constructing these software artifacts qualified as "quantitative interpretation."

Social and Behavioral Analysis
No data is available at the time of this writing.

Natural Science Inquiry
Direct assessment data was collected in Spring 2018. Here are the learning goals, followed by the percentage of students who had Satisfactory or better performance on those goals:

NS Goal	% Satisfactory or better
Understand and apply the scientific and mathematical principles of their discipline.	71.9
Understand the distinction between science and dogma.	72.9
Use basic scientific principles to place information in a larger context.	69.4
Understand how science does and does not work.	68.4

NS-L Goal	% Satisfactory or better
Use the scientific method to gather, interpret and evaluate data.	73.3
Employ tools to assess the validity of observations related to the natural world.	78.9
Join scientific principles with critical analysis in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline.	64.2
Relate their analysis and conclusions to those of the larger scientific community.	80.6

The third NS-L goal is a clear outlier. The reason is that the goal was marked as Not Applicable for BIOL 150, a course which represents 18.5% of the students in our sample. 79.9% of the students not enrolled in that course completed that goal at a satisfactory level or higher, which is very much in line with the numbers for the other goals.

This outlier is particularly bizarre, because for this survey each instructor was asked to give a textual description of how the course achieves the learning goal, which the BIOL 150 instructor supplied for this goal.

Overall, from these numbers we can conclude:
- Achieving these goals tends to be more challenging than the EA/VA/HP/LS goals, but a bit easier than the QS goals.
- None of these goals seems particularly easy or hard in comparison with the others.
- These learning goals seem to reflect well the content of the targeted courses.

One instructor submitted the following noteworthy complaint about the split between the NS and NS-L learning goals:

"As we talked about in a curriculum committee meeting, the way the assessment rubric is divided between NS and NS-L simply does not work. My course assessment attached provides several examples. This spring, we had 3 sections of Cell Biology lecture and 4 sections of lab. Students in a particular lecture section can be taking any of the 4 lab sections. Furthermore, I did not teach a lab section at all. Most of the NS-L assessment rubric, as designed, comes from the lab

component. Thus, I had no way to assess my NS-L section as an NS-L, so assessed it as an NS.

In the next revision, it is my opinion that NS and NS-L classes should have the same core set of goals. Then one or two additional goals could be added to the NS-L courses to account for lab activities. There would still be problems with this approach, but they would be less egregious than the current model."

Proposed Action Plan

Based on the collected data, here are some ideas for responding to issues that arose:

- The EA, HP, and LS data suggests that those learning domains are largely functioning as intended.
- The VA data showed some significant problems with the third learning goal. There should be communication with the Classics and Religious Studies faculty about that learning goal, to see how it might best be incorporated into those courses. If the faculty decline the opportunity to incorporate it, the Curriculum Committee should consider removing the VA code from the pertinent courses.
- With regard to the second QS goal, there should be communication with the Computer Science faculty as to how that goal might be understood to make sense in the context of their courses, or whether the QS code is appropriate for those courses.
- The NS and NS-L data suggests that student achievement of the goals is solid. However, the presence of eight distinct learning goals is arguably excessive and assessment has become a bureaucratic nightmare for the pertinent faculty. It is recommended that the Curriculum Committee, in conversation with the pertinent departments, develop a streamlined version of these learning goals in which the NS and NS-L classes share up to three core goals, with one or two additional goals for NS-L.

Revising the Student Assessment Plan

In the Strengths and Weaknesses section above, we identified the following weaknesses of our current Student Assessment Plan:

- No mapping of goals to components.
- No forms of indirect assessment.
- An inconsistent cycle for assessment of the goals.

The 2019-20 Curriculum Committee will have to create an improved SAP that addresses all of these issues. It is intended that they will work in conjunction with the Assessment Committee in putting together a coherent plan.

With regard to mapping of goals to components, the NS and NS-L survey from Spring 2018 shows a possible way forward. Each instructor was asked to give a short narrative as to how their course addresses each NS/NS-L learning goal. Examining those narratives could yield some ideas for what a mapping might look like.

With regard to indirect assessment, perhaps each coded course could have incorporated into the Student Feedback Form suitable questions for the learning goals.

With regard to the assessment cycle, work will need to be done to reduce the overall workload of assessment. One idea might be to use something like Google Forms to enable instructors to enter the pertinent information. Google Forms will then generate a single spreadsheet of all the data. As it stands, the person analyzing the data must collate it from each individual spreadsheet submitted by each instructor. This burdensome workflow arguably has had a negative impact on the assessment cycle.

Committee on Diversity and Dialogue
2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Leslie Zorwick

As a committee, we had monthly committee meetings, we hosted monthly discussion hours, and the chair monthly check-in meetings with the VP for Diversity & Inclusion. This year, our committee had **eight** major areas of work.

1. **We prepared and facilitated six Diversity and Dialogue Faculty Discussion Hours** in conjunction with the Associate Provost for Faculty Development. The workshops covered our Title IX process, Emotional Labor, First Generation College Student Status, Diffusing Conflict in the classroom (with a focus on racial microaggressions), Socioeconomic Status, and student mental health. To prepare for these workshops, we spend a significant amount of time discussing issues on campus related to these facets of identity, we brainstormed potential topics, and this is a way for faculty, staff, students, and administrators to have a voice in the topics discussed. And, for our discussion hour about Socioeconomic Status and financial challenges, I wrote and administered an anonymous survey to students, so that students could share experiences with faculty. I've attached the handout based on this survey that I shared with the Diversity and Dialogue committee.

2. **We did lots of work to support our trans student community**. In the fall, the chair worked closely with members of the Trans@HDX group to identify the needs of our trans students, to make recommendations to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, to put together a useful resource for advisors, and to discuss challenges in the classroom that can arise for classes that address issues of gender and sexuality. This work also involved Tonya Hale in her new capacity as the Director of LGBTQ Student Services.

3. **We worked with the student head of Orientation to discuss gender-based and inclusion programming**. Max Parker, our incoming Student Senate President and student leader of Orientation, attended our meetings and we brainstormed ways to increase programming about diversity into Orientation.

4. **As Chair, I was a member of the Advisory Board for Education and Prevention of Sexual Assault (ABEPSA)**. This committee met every 2-4 weeks and we discussed campus programming, responding to the needs of our community, and increasing education about the changes to our Gender Based Misconduct policies. This direct line of communication between Diversity and Dialogue and ABEPSA was incredibly helpful and our committee invited Allison Vetter, our new Title IX coordinator, to our first faculty discussion hour. In addition, in my capacity as a member of ABEPSA and Diversity & Dialogue, I coordinated the visit of Dr. Renee MacDonald, who spoke about gender based misconduct and violence and who met with both committees during her visit.

5. **We participated in National Mix It Up Day**. Members of our committee participated in this event in October, during which people were encouraged to eat with different folks during lunch and to make new connections with folks on our campus and volunteers (including many members of the committee) were discussion leaders at tables in the cafeteria.

6. **Our committee had extensive conversations about religious diversity on campus**, in regards to the changing situation with Chi Alpha on campus, the need for clean and useful prayer rooms on campus, and in regards to faculty prayer. The president asked that we table discussions of faculty prayer until Spring 2019, and things again got delayed until the 2019-2020 year. We also continued conversations that started the previous year 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. I expect the chair to pick up on this work next year.

7. **We had extensive discussions about how to engage more coaches and representatives for athletics in our work.** We had discussions about how to make the coaching staff more aware of our work and to better utilize the resources of our coaching staff in supporting work for diversity and inclusion.

8. **We had extensive discussions about structural things we might want to see in regards to diversity and inclusion**. This included discussions of how to solicit topics from our community for the Diversity & Dialogue discussion hours, whether we could consider work in support of diversity and inclusion in professional reviews (both in annual reports and in promotion and tenure decisions), whether we could consider a faculty award (similar to the Advising Award) for those working to make a more inclusive community on campus, and adjusting the size and representatives on the committee.

<div align="center">

Results from Student Survey

</div>

Diversity & Dialogue emailed students to get information about their experiences. We told students about the Diversity & Dialogue lunch discussions and that this year we were discussing socioeconomic background and financial challenges. We told students that because financial challenges are often invisible to faculty (unless students share them), we hoped that students would share some of their experiences so that the voices of our students could guide our conversation. Below are the themes that emerged in student responses. Below, themes are *italicized* and next to a dark circle bullet point and specific student comments are in plain text next to a white circle bullet point.

Question 1: How have financial challenges impacted your Hendrix experience?

- *Financial challenges create a lot of stress and make students feel like they don't belong*
  - Worrying about how I am going to pay for college has made me really stressed and lead to a couple of panic attacks. It's only my sophomore year and paying for college is constantly on my mind. I can't even really begin to explain how stressful it is and how alone I feel.
  - Day-to-day expenses are not usually a problem. However, since work studies only pay monthly, towards the end of the month I begin getting anxious. What if I need gas or personal items? I worry about what I eat on Saturday nights. More pressing is the overall financial challenge of paying for college. Taking loans out gives me incredible anxiety. Paying for books is even worse. I don't understand why things are so expensive.
  - My family is on the poverty line, I am only able to attend Hendrix because of the many scholarships I managed to get. Socially, I was greatly limited to hanging out with my peers in anyway that involved money. Since most students are in a much higher economic class there was no way for me even try to follow along to their life style. Because of this I missed out on many bonding activities and was left behind by some friend groups. Academically, I would have to save all summer and winter to afford my textbooks for class. There were several times where I either never got the books in the first place because I figured I could manage without it or I would transfer out of the class because of the cost of entry (books, online course, art supplies) alone. Mentally and emotionally, well it just tears you apart. Not only do I regularly feel like I'm not enough for the people I'm around but, I also feel guilty for continuing my education in the first place.
- *It can be hard for students to take advantage of their meal plan when working*
  - Hendrix meal plans have been a downside to Hendrix for me because to be able to have a car, phone, food, etc. I have to work outside of school and often come back around 7, when the caf isn't serving the general dinner, and on Fridays is closing. This puts me at a disadvantage as I then have to eat something not as wholesome as the food that I pay for with my tuition. Also, not having dinner on Saturdays is negatively affecting low income students since we now have to pay for food outside of a full meal plan.
- *Financial challenges make time management really challenging*
  - My financial aid situation has had such a larger impact on my Hendrix experience than I ever could have thought. For the past three years I have held a pretty much full time job off-campus (around 30+ hrs a week or so) and at certain points held two jobs. I work because I have to, not just because I need extra cash. If I do not work I could not afford to go to school here. Initially, I thought I could balance the work and school alright. However, work has become increasingly burdensome on my academic life. I work days in a row, where I leave class, change and go to work not getting off until late night. This means I do most of my work around midnight or early morning. In the beginning, I would be able to pull off all nighters and get all my work done. However, as the workload increased, I have found my body unable to keep up. I am so tired physically and mentally. It is tough for me to be up at two in the morning trying to finish an assignment due at 9 am. If I don't do the assignment, my grades will suffer but I can't cut back on work hours. I feel like I am not doing as well as I could be in classes because I do not have the stamina and am losing the will to keep going through this cycle. It has also made me feel like a bad student in class. I am too tired to participate in lecture. There have been multiple classes where I have fallen asleep unintentionally. Falling asleep in class makes me embarrassed and self conscious.
- *Financial challenges prevent students from taking full advantage of the academic and co-curricular activities offered at Hendrix*
  - I have to work copious hours to earn enough to help cover my tuition which affects the time I have to study and do homework. I also find myself missing out on several chances to relax and have fun with my friends which I feel is a large part of the college and Hendrix experience. Additionally, this prevents me from being able to go on Odyssey trips often times because I simply do not have the money.
  - I worry about missing dinner in the SLTC over play rehearsal. I can't afford to buy food every night without late nights. It's made me consider whether I should continue in the theatre program here. I'm also stressed because I don't have a car or means of transportation, and some assignments require me to walk very long distances to get to required places or materials.
- *Financial challenges limit students' ability to engage in social life and extracurricular activities*
  - I feel as though I am limited to the extracurriculars that are on campus that may require certain funds. I have a love for sports, my favorite being basketball, and I almost couldn't play as a Lady Warrior because I did not have the funds to cover and athletic cost requirements.
  - I'm sometimes unable to participate in club activities because there are costs.
  - Finances prevents me from doing a multitude of activities and being a part of organizations on campus because I have to devote a majority of my free time to working an off-campus job.
- *Textbook prices are a big problem*

- o The largest impact of finial challenges is the mere cost of text books that are required almost immediately. Spending close to 500 dollars on stem field text books is an immense strain for the next month at home from everything from groceries to the ability to function. Materials needed for some classes is just ludicrous for instance 20 dollars for a notebook in gen chem lab that isn't really needed. It's nice but not needed.

Question 2: How can faculty play a role in helping you more effectively navigate financial challenges?

- *Multiple students said they know that faculty can't help with a lot of these issues and that they know faculty try help in the ways they can*
- *Students want faculty know that financial challenges create lots of stress*
  - o Just a basic understanding of the immense pressure and stress we face as students, paired with gentleness and maybe more flexibility would accommodate students better.
  - o Be available to talk, and actually listen to what we have to say. The financial burden of Hendrix is a constant stressor in my life, and in the lives of many other students, and sometimes it's overwhelming, especially when it's combined with the stress of other things involved with just being a college student. Be understanding and give us options when we're overwhelmed. Knowing that we have options can mean the everything and relieve at least some of that stress.
- *Students hope that communicating they have jobs off campus will help faculty be aware of the many things they are juggling, even if students aren't looking for any particular help*
  - o It is hard for me to think of active ways faculty could help me navigate these challenges. My financial issues are personal issues that I am not always keen to talk about. I cannot and do not expect faculty to be lenient with me on deadlines for assignments. Even though, it is hard for me to do things, I don't like using work as my crutch. I do not tell professors that I work because I do not want that to be seen as me already making excuses for any and all my work. I just would hope that they are aware that there are students that struggle, because even though I don't personally know of others, I am sure there are.
  - o Somehow ask at the beginning of each semester if the students have on or off-campus jobs, are on a sports team, come from a low-income family or the like. So, when a student looks more exhausted in class or they have not done their homework, this is something to consider.
- *Students want faculty to consider assignment structure for out-of-class activities and assignments with a really quick turn around may be challenging if they work at night*
  - o I think faculty should [know] having mandatory meetings outside of class is frustrating to students like me and how it feels awful when I can't attend due to my job.
  - o Requiring students to create projects that require a lot of items to buy or gas to travel should not be encouraged. If there is travel involved, campus resources or teachers should offer some kind of ride.
  - o Some faculty members have assigned homework to be done before the next day. This can be impossible for me if I work that night, decreasing the time I have for last minute homework that night. If faculty members could refrain from assuming that everyone has a free night every night that would be helpful.
- *Students want faculty to think about textbook costs and alternatives that might be more accessible*
  - o Please check textbook prices before assigning them. Often they are several hundred dollars all together for the newer versions or editions of texts. Additionally, avoid ones requiring access codes since these codes are one-time use only. It ramps up the price of books since we can't buy used copies. I had to buy an almost $300 textbook because I needed an access code that isn't sold separately. A used copy of the book itself would have been around $120 instead, but I had to spend more than twice that because of the access code. If there is a way to give links to your students with a free copy of textbooks (though admittedly it would probably be pirating) that would help immensely. Also, allowing students to use online copies either on their laptop or tablet helps because the they could afford to use an eBook copy or find a scan of the books.
  - o Assign textbooks that we can reuse for other classes. Don't assign textbooks that we won't use more than a few times if we even use them at all.
  - o Is it possible to have a few class room versions of the textbook so that students wouldn't have to constantly purchase them? I know that renting is still an option but it is still expensive to rent textbooks.
- *Students want faculty to be aware that it can be hard for students to talk about the stress that comes with financial challenges*
  - o I know it's hard for faculty to know who is struggling financially and who isn't. I'd like to say I am prideful when it comes to my personal life, especially financially, because I would rather not be told I "need help" and figure it out on my own. It's my fear of feeling pitied by another person because I can't do things with what I have.
  - o There is an overwhelming since of guilt and shame that comes from sharing these issues, especially if the student was raised in the environment and therefore relates asking for help as complaining and whining.
- *Students want faculty to know enough to be able to point students in the direction of opportunities, programs, and people who can help*

- They may be able to provide me with information on resources that would help my financial status or could lead me in the right direction on getting my financial status resolved.
- Perhaps they could offer insight into Work-study programs, internships, and jobs off campus.
- I think it would be really helpful for faculty to be acutely aware of how FASFA works.
- If y'all could find a way to explain the way our scholarships work, how to avoid being charged by the IRS for receiving scholarships, and how to navigate scholarships through the four years.

Enrollment and Financial Aid Committee
2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Daniel Whelan

After meeting with David Sutherland early in the Fall of 2018 to get some historical information and past committee reports, it was clear that the role of this committee is to function as a liaison between Enrollment and Financial Aid and the faculty. With that understanding, I decided to first meet with the *ex officio* members of the committee to seek their guidance as to how the faculty, through this committee, could work with them to achieve their goals: as advisors; a sounding board for new ideas; in recruitment, and so forth.

We met on the afternoon of September 7th in the Dawkins Conference Room. I explained my understanding of the historical role of the committee and how that seemed to have diminished in recent years. My goal was to let them know we were here to serve, but that I would prefer to have their guidance and direction with respect to how the committee could be best employed.

They agreed to give it some thought and send me some ideas by the next month, after which I would then call a meeting of the full committee to discuss their agenda and come up with an action plan for the year.

I never heard anything back from the *ex officio* members, and I did not press them on it. The full committee never met.

It seems that this committee as it is currently tasked (as a liaison to Enrollment & Financial Aid) has no discernable purpose. I recommend, therefore, that it be disbanded.

Committee on Honors
2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Britt Murphy

This year the Honors Committee was composed of new members Heidi Dahlmann and Josh Glick, and returning members Peg Falls-Corbitt, Amanda Moore, Bobby Williamson, and myself as chair.

Dr. Falls-Corbitt continued her appointment this year as the single 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. This year Dr. Falls-Corbitt had the administrative support of Rynnett Clark, who had started a position in Career Services as Coordinator of Career Connections. Dr. Falls-Corbitt gathered the liaisons in August to discuss how the Honors Committee and Distinguished Scholarships Coordinators might better support the faculty liaisons in their work. She also met with different liaisons throughout the year to communicate and keep current.

Dr. Falls-Corbitt coordinated several new events this year, including a session at Career Term in January, a booth at the Career Fair in March, and a writing workshop for rising seniors interested in applying for Watson and Fulbright in April. The Scholarships Tea in February was geared mostly towards promising juniors and sophomores who have interest in applying for the British Awards. Dr. Falls-Corbitt regularly reached out to faculty for recommendations of student applicants, created different tracking resources and documents for recruitment, and she 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. The Administration again 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.

The Honors Committee continues to support the Distinguished Scholarships Coordinator 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 connect with liaison

Marjorie Swann. We are indebted to the staff of Bailey Library who assisted greatly in preparing for this event.

This year was a success in nearly every category of award in which we mentored students, in that we got several students to the second round of competition, and many won awards. Megan Cassingham applied for a Marshall but was not interviewed. Daniel Whelan prepared three students for Fulbright Teaching Assistantships, and of those Meredith Warren (Senegal) advanced to be a finalist, but unfortunately she did not obtain the scholarship. Dr. Whelan tried new recruitment and interview methods, and was invited to attend the Fulbright Program Advisor Development Initiative in 2019. Based on the information he learned there, Dr. Whelan will adjust how he recruits and mentors student applicants for the Fulbright. The workshop also motivated Hendrix to select a faculty member, Dr. Michael Sprunger, to be Fulbright Scholar Liaison to recruit Hendrix faculty and staff for the Fulbright Scholars Program, as well as host visiting scholars.

We finally had success with the Watson Fellowship this year after a two-year dry spell. The Committee selected four Watson candidates from an initial applicant pool of twelve. The four candidates (Elizabeth Cumbie, Kaersti McLellan, Allison Monroe, and Grace Anne Odom) worked hard, and the Committee also worked diligently to help prepare their written materials by the November 7 deadline. With help from a few committee members, I coached the Watson candidates for their January 15 interview with Watson Foundation Representative Drew Thompson. The Ides of March revealed that Allison Monroe had won a Watson for her project *Building Agency through Bioliteracy: Modern Insect Conservation* to be carried out in Madagascar, South Africa, and Costa Rica. In April I invited Allison to help me promote the Watson at the all-student spring Watson meeting on April 15. The next day Allison and Meredith Warren helped Felipe Pruneda-Senties, Peg Falls-Corbitt, Daniel Whelan, and me in leading a personal statement writing workshop for rising seniors applying for a Watson or Fulbright.

We had a successful year at last with the Goldwater. Of our four nominees – Rachel Lance (MacDonald, mentor); Sarah Nicholson (Tinsley, mentor); Rebecca Parham (Hatch, mentor); Kate Sanders (Schneider, mentor) – Nicholson and Sanders received the award. Our gratitude goes out to all the faculty mentors and Goldwater Liaison Jennifer Dearolf for their hard work in preparing these bright students. The Truman was promising this year, but disappointing in the end. We were proud that Maddie Clendening obtained an interview, but unfortunately she did not get the award.

We again had wild success with our seniors who applied to the JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Program. As with last year, the credit does not lie with the Honors Committee, but with Gwen Stockwell and the seven talented students who advanced to the interview stage. Six students received awards: Alex Berner, Jazmin Calixto, Adrienne McGooden, John Tran, Katherine Verdaris, and Hueseng Xiong.

George Harper also shared the news before year's end that Hendrix senior Sarah Glass (a BCMB major) was awarded a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship. Sarah is just the third Hendrix student to receive this award while still enrolled at Hendrix. In addition, one Hendrix alum received an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, Alex Jones (also a BCMB major), who is now a graduate student at UC San Diego.

In the final business of the year, the Honors Committee evaluated four submissions for the Bennett Essay Prize, and awarded the Prize to Leyton Gassaway for her essay "The Price of Justice: A Critique of the Ethics of Forced Arbitration."

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
2018-2019 Annual Report
Submitted by Carol West

The deadline for nominations for honorary degree recipients was extended to September 15, 2018. At that date, three nominations had been received: two viable candidates, plus one self-nominated prospect with no apparent connection to Hendrix, Arkansas, or this region. On September 26th, the nomination information on all three candidates was circulated by e-mail to all members of the Committee, who were requested to respond to each other through group e-mails, in lieu of difficult-to-schedule meetings that inevitably put at a disadvantage any Committee members who were unable to attend. By October 9th, the Committee had reached a consensus that David Knight's candidacy was exceptionally strong, resulting in our unanimous approval that his nomination should be forwarded to the Provost. That step concluded our process of selecting an Honorary Degree recipient for the 2019 Commencement ceremony.

An additional item of business for the Committee on Honorary Degrees arose in February 2019, when Committee members received a document containing a proposed policy for the revoking of an honorary degree (with the purpose of Hendrix College's

having a standard procedure, should that situation ever arise in the future). Committee members were requested to examine the document and respond with any suggestions about content and wording, if applicable. On February 26, 2019, the Committee reached a consensus that the proposed policy was both clear and equitable; the document was approved in its original form. This action concluded the Committee's work for the 2018-19 academic year.

Committee on International and Intercultural Studies
20018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Chris Campolo

The committee reviewed applications and approved 125 students for study abroad. We awarded prizes to seniors who had made outstanding achievements in these areas. We met three times and did a lot of business by email. 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.

These are the prizes we award:

The Betty F. Bumpers International Leadership and Fellowship Award is given to student(s) who, during their final year at the college, have made the most significant contributions to international activities, concerns, and understanding within the Hendrix College community. There is normally a monetary stipend attached to this award.

The Dr. Inis L. Claude, Jr. International Studies Achievement Award is given to the graduating senior whose overall record in international studies courses both here on campus (e.g. in foreign languages, culture studies and other related disciplines of the College) and in overseas studies programs reflects the highest level of academic achievement. This award is generally accompanied by a book in the recipient's discipline.

Committee on Student Life
2018-2019 Annual Report
Chair: Hillary Looney

This committee met generally once a month for approximately an hour during the academic year. The issues facing the committee for this academic year included the following:

Body Cams on Hendrix Public Safety Officers: A pending item from the previous year was body cameras used for Public Safety officers. In April of this year Public Safety conducted a trial run of the cameras. After a successful trial run, the Senior Leadership team voted unanimously to move forward with body cams on the P-Safe officers.

Constitutions for new Student Organizations: The committee reviewed fewer constitutions than years past. Due to the lower volume, we were able to review each constitution as a group. Constitutions that were reviewed and approved this year included: Ethics Bowl, Hendrix College Trap & Skeet Team, HSDA (Hendrix Students Demand Action), NACC (Native American Culture Club). Constitutions that were reviewed and denied this year included: Hendrix Dance Society (determined to be more of an honor society than a student organization). Pending constitutions include: 3D Modeling & Design, Sierra Club

Advisory Board for Education and Prevention of Sexual Assault (ABEPSA): At the start of the academic year, an advisory board was created to address campus wide concerns about gender based misconduct. The advisory board was to work with both policies/procedures surrounding Title IX as well as create a series of education sessions on sexual assault on campus. The chairs of the Committee on Student Life and Committee on Diversity and Dialogue became a part of the advisory board. On a regular basis, information discussed with the advisory board was presented to the Committee on Student Life for feedback.

Other Issues Addressed: The committee provided clarity in the student handbook to the definition of over possession of alcohol.

Looking ahead: In the coming year, the committee plans to examine the process of external funding for student organizations.