

Fall 2018 Policy Campus Comments

Broad feedback from Policy Committee on ADA document format and track changes issues:

1. Final documents will be checked for ADA format.
2. Future review materials will be sent out in PDF format for all campus comment period.

Policy committee responses are in red. Faculty comments are in blue. Feedback from DE&I committee is in green. No feedback from other groups was received.

2.15 – Student Stipend Policy

There are no changes on this document. I had to download the file into Word to see the minor changes. This needs to be fixed ASAP so that the community knows what has been changed.

PDF format documents were sent in review reminder. Future review materials will be in PDF format with track changes.

Add Diversity & Equity Coordinator position in Subpart D

Where should this be added in Subpart D? What is the rationale behind this recommendation?

Review to make sure it lets students know where they can claim their funds/ sign for their funds after awarded because they only have 60 days to claim

Added that students should sign form in Student Life Office and collect payment from Accounting.

2.15.1 – Student Stipend Procedure

The policy in its current form was written by Student Senate. Can we please make sure that the current student Senate is aware of this history and is in full support of the proposed changes?

The Student Senate Legislative Coordinator, Priscilla, worked on reviewing this policy with Tarsha Davis.

3.1 – Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy

I have a comment on the Policy on Student Rights and Responsibilities.

I am uncomfortable with the wording that students have the right to see "corrected" examinations. Though I grade exams, and I usually write comments alongside student answers, I do not usually correct student work. Though I use a key when I grade, I do not "provide" it to students. (Many ways this can be abused by students, and at the least, it doesn't help much with learning.) I do explicitly talk over exam questions with students, explain the grading criteria and give examples of things that would be expected to be found in particular answers. Some instructors give back marked or even unmarked exams to students and ask the students to make a key or make corrections of their own tests and turn them back in, as part of the learning process. I hope it's just a word choice that we're differing about here but I don't think it should be a requirement that we "correct" student examinations. I would rephrase by using the word "graded." We agree. We changed the word to graded.

Subpart D, review word choice of "there" in the following sentence: The College President or designee may prohibit any forum when there is a likelihood of harm to individuals or damage to property if the event is held.

We are unclear on this comment. Inclusion of "there" is retained for grammatical reasons.

Look at defining academic standards, this is a question for the policy committee.

We are unclear on exactly what is being asked here.

Will a procedure be created for this policy? (this will help students navigate the concern process as it relates to academic concerns. many seconded the need for a procedure to follow this policy

The committee will discuss this in the spring 2019 session.

Subpart 1. Academic Evaluation- find better word choice for "solely"

The committee feels that the inclusion of the word solely is appropriate in this instance to indicate that students shall not be held to standards not identified in the course catalog, course syllabus, or student handbook.

Same issue as 2.15. I had to download to see changes. See note above.

- Part 1 Subpart B new language: "however" serves to negate the statement before. Suggest "The college respects . . . and students are responsible for demonstrating an understanding of the content of . . . "
 - We agree with the suggested change. Have modified the language.
- Part 1 Subpart G: extra space between "should be" and "available"; Extra space removed.
- recommend revising language to "Whenever possible, information about course materials should be . . ." Not all courses require textbooks, some require lab kits, art supplies, etc. We have updated this to say course materials.

3.35.1 – Prior Learning Procedure

Subpart A- Define/ spell out MOOC

Re-added definition of MOOC

The website listed at the end of the the sentence no longer exists. Change it to list both advising and registration so students can find it easier

Updated the phrasing to refer to Academic Advising and Records and Registration.

Same issue as 2.15 & 3.1. See note above.

New language in Subpart B is not in the same font. Otherwise, I support the changes. Font changed.

3.51 – Assignment of Credit Hours Policy

There is no mention about what online course faculty should do as far as final exams and how to conduct them. As it stands, they follow the in-class procedures but this should be added into the policy

Final exams in online classes are follow the language of "arranged" classes found on the final exam schedule <https://nhcc.edu/calendar/final-exams>.

Same issue with track changes. Otherwise, no issue. See note above

I have a comment on the assignment of credit hours policy regarding the final exam policy. I would like this campus to think about a “normal” schedule for finals week—one in which the course met at the regular scheduled times during finals week. I know that this would require some faculty to break their final exam into two parts but it would be a much more student friendly schedule. All of us have had students that set their work schedule based on the class meeting times and have to scramble during finals week.

So, my comment is, I think it’s appropriate to set aside time during finals week outside the Carnegie unit, but I don’t want the language of the policy to limit any future possibility of changing finals week to be more student-friendly. Perhaps the language could say a total (or a minimum) of 120 minutes shall be provided for finals week. That could leave the door open for fitting that time within the scheduled days/hours that class normally meets during.

Any changes to the proposed final exam structure would need to be taken to the Calendar Committee for recommendations to the Presidents of NHCC and MSCF.

On the Credit Hour Assignment Policy, subpart F. The second sentence does not make sense if I understand the first one. If the minimum is 1500, then why would it be said that it is "not needed" to exceed a number that is higher than the minimum? Perhaps the second sentence is intending to add information that if you are teaching the minimum in-class time, that you are encouraged to add out of class time to total up to 2250? In that case, it is not clearly written to say that.

For clarity, we have deleted the second sentence.

3.55 – Class Attendance and Participation Policy

Same issue with track changes. I can’t identify the change that was made to the Academic Calendar language, and that concerns me. See note above on track changes.

I strongly support the current wording and maintaining the distinction between mental and physical presence. The maintains academic freedom and also provides flexibility for different delivery modes. Clarity in definitions was added.

The attendance policy reads (in orange), "College should strive to accommodate life events regarding pregnancy and parenting in accordance with Title IX." -- Not sure what Title IX policies are, but I do know that if a student takes a face to face course with me and has a baby 1/2 way through the course, she cannot effectively makeup 1/2 the course from home.

Does anyone know what specifically the Title IX policies are and is there are way to make this more specific?

We will add a hyperlink to the specific Title IX language.

Important in the proposed policy’s wording: *student must contact faculty member to discuss available options*. This puts some onus on the student to notify and come up with a plan with faculty. As I read the proposed policy, a student who suddenly disappears, does not notify faculty, and does not respond to faculty’s attempts to contact her would not be fulfilling her responsibility.

We agree

I’m concerned about the lack of clarity regarding “life events” with regard to pregnancy and parenting. If a student can’t get a babysitter and misses an in-class assignment, am I supposed to come up with an alternative assignment? Is there a way to limit pregnancy “life events” so as to require a doctor’s excuse?

Title IX language is specific about medical documentation. The policy allows for individual faculty members to require documentation.

Based on the editing marks, I am not completely sure if I'm reading the intended text. Are we allowing faculty to fail or deregister students who do not attend the first day of a course? I am in support of that, if it is what is meant. I am thinking of the students who join lab classes late, through the drop/add week and miss the introductory lab with safety training. Currently, since I have understood that we must accept the students up to a week after the start of the course, we must take extra time with them to meet regulations for providing lab safety training, though usually these late-adding students and others who don't attend the first day for other reasons have a very high rate of not successfully completing the course.

The committee discussed your comment at length. We encourage faculty to contact students who do not attend the first class, especially if there is a waiting list for the class. The final decision about whether to drop a student for non-attendance after the first class remains with the Provost and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

3.6 – Student Conduct Policy

Same issue with track changes. Otherwise, no issue.
See note above.

About the Student conduct policy and procedure, I'm not sure if this is a comment or question, but I'm at a loss to figure out if public safety employees meet the definition of "conduct Officer" as the procedure is all about what actions the conduct officer can take.

The conduct officer at NHCC is Elton Dahn, so that line refers to him.

3.6.1 – Student Conduct Procedure

Change part 4 to read college Vice President instead of President

It had already read Vice President. This was updated to say Provost to reflect the newly created position.

Revisit who has the final decision making authority of the student outcome. Also, the appeal process is not consistent with the other processes... how can we make this better?

We feel the Dean of Student Development is appropriate as the final authority. We are unclear by what is meant by inconsistent with other processes.

Same issue with track changes. See note above.

I strongly oppose the addition of Subpart E, Subd. 2. While Board Policy gives us the ability to hold students accountable to activity off campus, this is beyond the purview of our mission. It's not our responsibility to police students when they are not operating as students. I do think that rewording should be considered to define when a student can be held accountable as a student and when a student is not accountable as a student. This will help clarify the list of actions. For example, #2 is not really off-campus conduct if it's college-sanctioned or sponsored activities. I'm also not a fan of "double jeopardy." If a student commits a crime, and the college learns about it, the college should report this to the appropriate authorities, but if it occurred outside of the context of the student being a student, then we shouldn't be applying additional penalties or sanctions.

The proposed language is copied from current MinnState Board Policy language. This policy is currently being reviewed at the state level. We will update the language in response to the MinnState updates.

4.9.1 – Faculty Evaluation Procedure

Same issue with track changes. **See note above.**

- The policy refers to “five methods identified in Part 3” in numerous places. Part 3 identifies six methods: classroom visit, LOA, peer eval, self eval, student feedback, other. LOA was originally intended as a form of student feedback, but I’m perfectly fine with it being it’s own. Regardless, if it’s student feedback, it needs to be subsumed under that Subpart. If LOA is a method, then the rest of the language needs to be changed back to “six.”

Edited for clarity. LOA is intended to be its own method.

- Who determines the methods of evaluation? In the previous policy, there was a clear rotation: classroom visit; self or peer eval; student feedback. Now, it’s just “cover five over six year,” but it doesn’t say who decides. If you want to keep the fuzzy methods, I recommend, “each year, the method of evaluation will be determined collaboratively between faculty and dean”

Will clarify again that this is collaboratively decided by faculty and their dean.

- Part 3, Subpart E: mechanical error, suggest “is part of the evaluation process” (delete “required for”)

Syntax corrected

- Part 3, Subpart F: current language does not really reflect what this Subpart used to say. The idea was to provide the opportunity for other forms of evaluation. Recommend, “faculty can coordinate with their supervisor to determine the materials used under this criterion,” or something like that. This is especially important if Subpart F is supposed to be one of the five methods of evaluation.

Edited for clarity

Part 6. The title of this part and the language for the different categories of faculty is inconsistent. Subpart A clearly lists what needs to be in the evaluation, but Subpart B sounds more like a mix of **process** and contents, and Subpart C sounds just like process. I’d recommend that this section be reworded to focus on the evidence of evaluation. **Part A refers to a single semester, a finite amount of time. The remaining parts refer to ongoing review processes, so more language on process was needed.**

My comment is about policy 4.9.1, in part 4 subpart a point 3, it sounds to me like faculty meet each year with the dean, but that is not explicit. I find the phrase "will be evaluated annually" to suggest that the dean files a report annually. If it is intended to mean that there is one specific semester that the particular evaluation type is due then that is unclear to me.

I appreciate the specificity of the rest of the new policy.

The annual evaluation can occur in any format, but there would need to be some form of a “touch base” during the year. Not necessarily in a particular semester, which is why that was left open. This is consistent with how staff and administration are evaluated annually.

In regards to NHCC Faculty Evaluation Procedure 4.9.1, I strongly disagree with requiring faculty to rotate through at least five of the six evaluation methods described in Part 3 over a six-year cycle (as stated in sub-part C of Part 6).

Did I read this correctly? AT LEAST ***FIVE***?

I have always been under the impression that it was a rotation cycle of three evaluation methods (student-answered course evaluations, supervisor classroom visits, and self-evaluations). It has always been possible to change this three evaluation method rotation upon discussion with one’s supervisor if a faculty member has a unique situation. But a five-method rotating evaluation requirement for “all other teaching faculty” is unwarranted unless a faculty member wants that and discusses it with their supervisor.

Additionally, why is it five evaluation methods in a six-year cycle? Shouldn’t faculty be evaluated every year?

I am perplexed as to why it doesn’t state “to rotate through at least three different evaluation methods over a three-year period.” That seems to be my impression of what faculty are already doing for evaluation purposes.

From a pragmatic standpoint, faculty and their supervisors struggle to keep track of three evaluation methods over a three year timespan. I cannot see how five evaluation methods over a 6 year timespan improves this.

The intent with saying 5 is that one of the proposed options is a peer evaluation, which we cannot require someone to complete per the MSCF contract. So, if someone chose to use student evaluations twice in lieu of the peer evaluation, they could do that. There would, however, still be an annual evaluation – one evaluation each year. The intent was to try to get a broad range of types of feedback because of unconscious bias in student feedback. The other part of that is that the committee didn't want someone to be able to avoid a type of evaluation that they didn't like by picking something else instead (e.g., trying to do a self-reflection multiple times to avoid a dean observation).

Clearly, that wasn't worded well. We like your suggestion of saying "rotate through at least three different evaluation methods over a three-year period." and have incorporated that language.

5.32 – Records Retention Policy

Link is to 5.32.1, not 5.32.

Corrected when reminder for review was sent.

5.32.1 – Records Retention Procedure

Same issue with track changes. See note above.

I'm fine with the language change for "Additional Custodians." I'm not okay with College Historian/College Archivist being replaced with "designee." Recommend changing "designee" to "Additional Custodians" or "relevant Custodians" or keeping as is. The point of the last sentence of Part 3, Subpart B was to ensure that a physical copy was maintained in the physical College Archives, so in this sentence, "designee" makes no sense. Given that the College is thinking about having electronic archives, this sentence may no longer be needed.

Changed to relevant custodians.

6.13 – Election Activities on Campus Policy

Same issue with track changes. No other comments. See note above.

6.13.1 – Election Activities on Campus Procedure

Same issue with track changes.

See note above.

Part 3, Subpart C, last paragraph: I think you need to clarify what you mean by titles. For example, "Dr" is part of my title. What you really mean is that employees cannot use their employment titles (in my case, "History Faculty"). I really prefer the older language, to be honest. Is this change being prompted by State Statute?

We have changed the language to say "employment titles."

The Review Action table is not up-to-date with all the bargaining units and the Diversity group.

Updated.