

Spring 2016 Policy Campus Review Comments March 14 – March 25, 2016

**The comments below were received from the campus community between March 14 and March 25, 2016. The Policy Committee reviewed every comment received and either made the requested change or responded to the comment. The result of the discussion at Policy Committee is in blue below each comment.

2.9.1 Satisfactory Academic Progress Procedure

No comments received at this time.

2.21.1 Privacy of Educational Records Procedure

Staff #1:

Hi. I seem to remember the photos of students which were taken by NHCC staff at NHCC were considered directory data. I did a quick read and word search of 2.21.1 Privacy of Education Records Procedure (pdf), but did not find this language. This provision is no longer part of the procedure, right? I can remember when it was added to the procedure back when Carmen was our Director of Communications and Marketing.

- Correct, this is no longer part of the procedure. Email was removed in January 2015 to protect students from unwanted solicitation.

System Office:

Your question raises several potential ways to address this:

- Employees (and 3d parties) could have access to private education records if they are acting as “school officials” with a “legitimate educational interest” and are under the college’s “direct control” (i.e., held to the college’s data-handling privacy and security standards). This really only works for those who are performing work on behalf of the college in some manner and would not work for 3d parties who are acting entirely for their own benefit. The college should have its own definition of “school official” and “legitimate educational interest” in its FERPA policy and may need to amend them to make sure any new proposed use under this provision is included.
- Use the “research” exception in FERPA at 34 CFR 99.31 (a) (6) – this is for 3d parties who may be doing research for the reasons listed in the regulation and requires a written agreement. This would be the most burdensome, administratively.
- You could declare student emails as “limited directory data” which you would only make available to identified parties for identified purposes, but not the general public. You would need to include that policy in your annual notice of FERPA policy

and permit students to opt out, like other directory data. There is information on the OGC website about this concept.

Hope that is helpful. Remember that you are not under an obligation to disclose private data under one of these options, you just cannot make decisions about who can use it based on improper factors, like discrimination, etc.

- The Policy Committee decided to use “for the purposes of scholarly research as approved and determined by the NHCC IRB” under Part 3 in the procedure.

3.3.1 Placement for Success Procedure

Faculty #1:

ESOL requests the following policy change: ESOL students have 60 minutes to write the essay (instead of 50 minutes), as requested in an earlier email.

- **Subpart A. Testing Requirements**
 - Allotted Time: The test session is untimed, however, students take an average of 2 hours to complete the entire battery of tests.
 - ESOL students have ~~50~~ 60 minutes to complete the written placement test.
 - The Policy Committee has made this change to the procedure.

Faculty #2:

Part 1, Subpart C. i

Should "will have developmental coursework evaluated" state who should evaluate the student work? (e.g. "evaluated by qualified faculty"). I'm not finding Faculty Permission to Override for the Composition Sequence (ENGL 0990)--only for Math. Do English faculty have the ability to ever exempt students from 0990 based on the writing sample many of us give the first day of classes?

- The English department should have a departmental discussion on this and forward a recommendation to the policy committee for consideration.

Faculty #3:

In the Placement for Success Policy, subpart C, “Waivers” - the grammar is awkward with the change. The proposed change would read “Waivers of all or part of placement testing are available through two separate processes: one that is initiated by the student completing the waiver form; college initiated through the transcript review process or the pre-placement test evaluation process.”

- The wording identifies 2 processes and begins with language labeling the first, but does not continue. It may raise the question of whether the review process and the pre-placement test evaluation process distinct from each other.
- Perhaps it could be edited to read: “Waivers of all or part of placement testing are available through the following processes: student completion of the waiver form,

the college-initiated transcript review process, or the pre-placement test evaluation process.”

- The Policy Committee has made this change.

Staff #1:

Exceptions – I think it would be clearer to state the “Placement Appeal Form” under subpart B, # 2 like in item #4 “Faculty permission to override mandatory placement” so that it is clear to students that both are forms.

Subpart B. Exceptions for Mathematics

1. For a fee determined by the college, students who do not believe their placement accurately reflects their true skill level may re-test once per semester.
 2. Students may appeal their placement level in mathematics by completing the placement appeal form. This form allows students to ask for a placement of one level above their assessed level provided students provide documentation and justification for the appeal and receive the approval of a full-time member of the math faculty and the Dean of Math and Science.
 - ~~3. If a student's math placement test score is more than 2 years old and the student has not yet begun work in the relevant skill area, the student must re-test.~~
 3. A student may retest once the mathematics developmental series has been started. New placement is effective the following semester, though a course exchange may be approved with approval from the faculty member and academic dean. A new placement will not exempt a student from the financial and academic obligations of their current course. Tuition refunds will not be issued.
 4. Faculty should complete a “Faculty Permission to Override Mandatory Placement Level” form if that semester’s coursework merits exemption from the next course in the skill sequence.
- The Policy Committee has made this change.

Staff #2:

The procedure regarding waivers, starting at Part 1, Subpart C, does not address the time-limit we have on waivers. (the time-limit is a concern that I have. We are going to discuss this at the next TAG meeting, as well.) It has always been assumed, and has been past practice, that waivers do not expire since they are based on previous coursework. However, due to the limitations of ISRS and the way we encode waivers into ISRS, waivers here do expire. English and Reading waivers expire after 3 years. Math after 2. This expiration does not affect a lot of students, but to those it does, it is really inconvenient and frustrating for them. Is there a way we can change the expiration? If not, I think we need to add it to the procedure language. My preference would be that waivers based on completed coursework should not expire.

- The Policy Committee agrees with this change and will confirm with the TAG committee and Placement Committee.

TAG Committee:

The Transfer Advisory Group was able to discuss the new Placement for Success Procedure in regards to waiver expiration based on completed coursework. The group was in agreement that if a waiver is based on completed college-level coursework, it should not expire. We recognize

that the new edit used in ISRS could make this challenging, however, we believe that technology should not supersede the equitable treatment of our incoming transfer students. Additionally, having waivers not expire is also more pertinent if the college ever moves to using reading-level prerequisites on more of our classes, such as liberal arts courses.

- The Policy Committee supports a waiver for college-level coursework from other institutions not expiring.

Placement Committee:

Just a couple of comments; they both shared that they did not think that there should be an expiration attached to course evaluations. Those comments were from Math and ESOL. There are always those conversations about what degree the student will be successful if their prior coursework was years ago. The MnSCU Policy 3.3.1, Part 5., Subpart A, 4. leaves out dates associated with exempting students based on Post-Secondary education, but the language states that the decision should be made so that the student has a “high probability of success” in the entry-level college course that replaces a test score.

- The Policy Committee supports a waiver for college-level coursework from other institutions not expiring.

3.4.1 Admission Procedure

Staff #1:

Do you want to remove the histotechnology admission?

- Yes, histotechnology is now removed.

Staff #2:

Noticed a few items in the 3.4.1 Admission Procedure that should be updated (small changes):

- Subpart E. International Admission - under step 2, the first bullet point should be broken up into two bullets. The second bullet would be 'F-1 Student Contract form', which is included at end of first bullet.
 - The Policy Committee has made this change.
- Subpart H. Histotechnology Admission - is this still needed...not sure of the status of the program to be included in this procedure.
 - The Policy Committee has made this change.
- Part 6. Placement for Success - the last line of the first paragraph mentions 'Disability Access Service Office' - should be changed to reflect new name.
 - The Policy Committee has made this change.
- Part 7. Orientation - type 2 mentions Pathways Orientation - should be removed to reflect new orientation process.
 - The Policy Committee has made this change.

Staff #3:

Unfortunately and honestly there will be additional changes come over the next year. There are significant changes happening with concurrent enrollment and likely contract- neither of which are mentioned. We will likely keep the vague, however they should be mentioned.

- When these changes are needed, we can reopen the policy for review.

3.32 Faculty Credentialing Policy

Faculty #1:

Comment on policy 3.32 (faculty credentialing). Minimum quals "...may also include related occupational experience..." If professional experience counts, then in my program's case it contradicts the pending HLC requirements for a Masters degree. I'd like to speak with you again about the quals for Graphic Design faculty into the future relative to those HLC mandates, and a recent email from Lynda Milne at the System Office about the quals for graphic arts and/or commercial art being an ASSOCIATES DEGREE (?). In short, I'm getting mixed signals from the System Office, and also want to follow up about pros/cons of where the design program lives relative to the quals requirements for future faculty in the program.

- No change to policy/procedure needed.

Faculty #2:

Part 2 Definitions

- "for to" looks like a typo.
 - Corrected.

Part 5 Exceptions

- Do we also have additional credentialing exceptions? Don't we make exceptions for GSTC?
 - Exceptions can only be made in special circumstances and should only be rarely done. Global Studies does not have a defined credential field, so we can set our own requirements locally.

3.38 & 3.38.1 Career Information

No comments received at this time.

4.4 & 4.4.1 Class Cancellation

Faculty #1:

Hi Landon, my feedback regarding the cancellation policy is that I would like to see more consistency in the policy. For example, I don't think it's fair if someone that teaches hybrid can "not count it as a sick day if they give an additional assignment", when the face to face instructors give additional assignments when they are sick, but we have to count it as a sick day.

I don't know if this is included in this policy change, but I just wanted to send some feedback for either now or the future.

- The Policy Committee agrees that once the policy/procedure are finalized that they should be applied consistently. Added language clarifying that face-to-face courses have the same option available to them.

Faculty #2:

Part 4 is "reassignment" the right terminology?--perhaps "substitution" would be more apt.

- Reassignment is the correct terminology.

Part 5 "must collaborate with students"--perhaps "will work with students"

- Changed to "must work."

Faculty #3:

Item #4 talks about rescheduling and no sick day required. #5 states it is up to the dean whether or not a sick day is required when the class was rescheduled. No need to say it twice and I would stick to the sentence in #4, not #5.

- Part 4 was meant to refer to Blended/Hybrid, and Part 5 was meant to refer to Face-to-Face. We added language to clarify.

Faculty #4:

What should happen in this case:

- Class meets Tuesday & Thursday, faculty gives a research assignment for one or both days. The instructor does
 - Not plan to come to campus; but, assigns a library assignment. Is there a plan for that situation?
 - This procedure refers to class cancelation due to unforeseen situations, not to the above situation. This procedure is not intended to mandate how faculty design their courses to best meet the course outcomes. We are likely to be developing policy and procedure on working from home.
 - We all have a different work ethic; so, I think expectations need to be clear. It happens more with courses marked blended/hybrid. Although, if it is acceptable, it should apply to everyone.

Faculty #5:

Looks pretty good. A few minor things. I think part 3 of 4.4.1 may be problematic in that it assumes that faculty have access to SharePoint and internet from home.

- Added language to address this scenario

Are the references to the Carnegie Units really necessary here? I think the policy could be more clear and concise without any reference to how much work is to take place in classes, although perhaps these are some of the concerns you've heard about from faculty and/or administration.

- Both faculty and administration have articulated concerns about maintaining the integrity of the Carnegie Unit. That's the main reason it's included.

Part 2, subpart a, paragraph 2: there are foreseen circumstances that may not be covered in the class syllabus. For example, a committee commitment that comes up after the syllabus has been distributed. Are faculty required to amend their syllabi for this circumstance? I'd suggest striking the words "that have been worked into course syllabi"

- Added language to address this concern. The intent is to recognize the difference between unanticipated situations that arise and situations that are known in advance of the semester.

The first sentence of Part 1: the verb "articulates" sounds like Reinke-speak and grates on my ear. But that's likely just me. Perhaps "defines" or some such. Also, isn't this document the procedure rather than the policy. The first sentence says it's a policy.

- Modified language for consistency (it's a procedure).

Lastly, we need to decide whether the term is Hybrid-blended or Hybrid-Blended.

- Modified all references to read blended/hybrid to remain consistent with the current designation on the Schedule of Classes.

I'm so glad that someone looks at these so that I don't have to.

Faculty #6:

I looked at those yesterday and the only worry I have is about the part that says we must apply for leave within 24 hours of canceling class. I can foresee situations with a severe illness or injury in which that is not feasible. People don't necessarily take their computers into the emergency room or hospital. Furthermore, what is the course of action for a case in which someone is suddenly hospitalized and can neither cancel class nor apply for leave?

I worry about not having language to grant leeway in more extreme situations than a 24-hour stomach flu.

- Modified language to require notification of absence on the day of the absence, and providing leeway to complete necessary paperwork.

Faculty #7:

Does this imply that when I am out sick that I have to have an online activity to make up for lost time??

- No, just that you have the option to do so in a blended/hybrid course.

Faculty #8:

We need to honor the online class assignment as equal as the onsite class assignment. The tuition is the same, our pay is the same, and the state and governing bodies in higher education recognize them as the same.

- Added language to indicate that the Carnegie Unit is consistent regardless of deliver method.

So if I miss a day where I have 1 on site class, but I still work on my online courses, I should only have to take at most 1/2 day.

I also think "a spade is a spade" in regards to hybrid classification of classes. If we are not allowed to utilize the benefits of hybrid by moving the class online (or to some other external site, such as "go to a museum this week in place of class on Thursday"), then it is not a hybrid class. Hybrid should be fluid.

- Current procedure language would allow for this.

So my recommendation is the language should say, "If a class is designated as hybrid, faculty are free to schedule activities either online or on site. The work assigned must be equal to the seat time the online or external activity replaces."

- Added language to address this.

If there is push back, then add, "Faculty will submit to their supervisor a plan for replacement external or online activities whenever physical class will not be held."

Regarding the leave, my feedback is:

"Faculty will submit requests for personal leave up to 1 day in advance of their scheduled activity. For sick leave, faculty will submit requests for sick leave up to 7 days after their absence. In circumstances where there are successive sick days, faculty will submit their leave up to 7 days after the last occurring sick day."

- The committee discussed this request and proposed "within the pay period" due to logistical challenges of processing payroll.

Faculty #9:

Thanks for the reminder email. I was going to email you because I could not remember which policy(ies) you mentioned in the meeting the other day that you wanted feedback on. I only found two places where I have significant comments – see below. Thanks again Deanna for the reminder.

Within 24 hours of the class cancellation, faculty are responsible for completing the necessary applications for the appropriate leave (sick time or personal leave).

I am not in favor a 24-hour turn-around time for submitting the leave paperwork. Sometimes people are out for more than one day and if you are out for one day and comeback, I am often scrambling to figure out how to make up lost time from classes cancelled. I think it is reasonable to have one week to get leave requests submitted. That is what I would like.

- [See above on similar comments.](#)

Faculty will consult with their supervisor to request reassignment from the scheduled classroom delivery to the alternate delivery method.

I do not really understand this sentence. As long as the 'Carnegie Units' are maintained, what does it matter how that is done?? Is there now going to be a particular form that my dean will have to submit stating I have changed from a classroom setting to and alternate delivery method and describe it? This seems really arbitrary and unnecessary to me. But then I do not know the history behind all these revisions for class cancellation policy, so there might be a reason for this of which I am unaware.

- [Fixed this section to clarify that consultation only needs to happen for face-to-face classes. This would make face-to-face courses consistent with online and blended/hybrid.](#)

Faculty #10:

I had some concerns with it in regards to the 24 hours needed to get leave request in to supervisor. I find this a bit unrealistic for those that are extremely ill, and/or in my case I suffer from chronic migraine. It's over stimulating to look at a computer screen, talk, listen, do anything when I am in a bad migraine cycle, and to have to worry about that within 24 hours is unrealistic; especially if I am in a 3-4 day cycle. It's more realistic if it's listed as upon return to work.

- [See above for similar comment.](#)

I also had some issues with the hybrid-blended statement dealing with requesting re-assignment and approval of the alternate delivery format. Well if it is already blended/hybrid, and if we have control over our class schedule and the academic freedom to change it as we see fit, why the need for our supervisor to approve? It seems ridiculous to have to take a personal or sick day for something like that.

- [See above for similar comment.](#)

Faculty #11:

I am most concerned about #2. If I have to cancel a face-to-face session of a hybrid class, I usually put course materials online for that missed day. Because I am teaching online that day, I feel that I should not have to take a personal/sick day. If I had to take a "personal day" for the missed face-to-face class, I would not put materials online. That doesn't feel like a service to our students.

- In both cases, faculty have the option to make up missed time and not take leave, or not make up missed time and take leave.

I am concerned that we would both be taking a day off yet still having to put course materials in Brightspace for an online session. That would not be a "day off."

I hope this makes sense!

Faculty #12:

While I'm in favor of faculty having the academic freedom to choose how they approach their subject matter—and that includes f2f, online, and hybrid—and I understand that some faculty might be abusing the hybrid-blended scheduling (for example, I've heard of faculty stopping their classes extremely early in the term and saying the remainder of the class is the online portion of hybridization simply to avoid actually having to hold classes), but it seems to me, without knowing all the details, that this is not a significant occurrence, and thus should not be used to regulate the freedom of hybrid courses. From a student perspective, though, faculty should not cancel a class and call it an online portion unless there is ample notification and online education taking place (although, again, I don't think this warrants a policy change).

- Agreed. We feel that faculty abuses should be addressed by their supervisors, not in policy.

Faculty #13:

Part 3. Within 24 hours seems extremely quick especially with an emergency.

- See comments above

Part 4. We have to contact our Dean to move one meeting of a hybrid class from face-to-face to online? This seems micro-managing to me. I concur with <name removed>'s comments.

- Clarified language, see above.

Part 4. It states "as soon as faculty are aware..." then faculty should use SharePoint to notify students. The timing of this could be very problematic. For my hybrid courses, I do not want to tell students that we will not be meeting for class #8 (and work will be completed online) when it is only class #1 or 2.

- Included language to cover as wide a variety of situations as possible.

Faculty #14:

For the Class Cancellation Procedure, are there any guidelines for how/under what circumstances approval of the alteration might happen? How is a measure of consistency in the approval of such requests maintained?

- Yes, there is language in the procedure and once approved, it will be expected that deans consistently apply across divisions.

Human Resources #1:

Part 4, Subpart A. Part 4, Subpart A is worded, “In the case of courses designated as blended/hybrid, faculty may alter the delivery method in lieu of canceling the class.” A faculty member could continue to cancel class effectively changing the delivery of the class from a hybrid to a fully online class. My recommendation is that this should be done in consultation with the dean or at least with a notice to the dean. That way if class is continually cancelled and moved online, the dean can step in to protect the originally intended delivery method.

- Added “This situation requires notification to the appropriate academic dean” after the sentence above.

Staff #1:

Has a typo (delivery):

Part 4. Cancellation-Alteration of Deliver Method

- Typo corrected.

4.4.2 Weather and Short-Term Closing Procedure

Faculty #1:

I’d be fine with amending the procedure to state that use of pre-approved sick and personal leave will follow bargaining unit contracts. In cases where the issue is not explicitly addressed in bargaining unit contracts, employees will not be charged for sick or personal leave.

- Part 5, subpart B, paragraph 4. Changed to “Employees with pre-approved sick and personal leave will follow bargaining unit contracts. In cases where the issue is not explicitly addressed in the bargaining unit contracts, employees will not be charged for sick or personal leave.”

Staff #1:

What does this mean below (it’s the **ENSURE** part that I am concerned about)? If I am here on campus, and we are closing, I walk around my building and tell people we are closing. I don’t have any way to reach out to students who would be coming to campus – Is that really what this policy means? If I am on campus, I might be able to think about which faculty are teaching in the evening – am I expected to contact all of them to let them know things are close? I think the role of the academic dean here should be clarified. What if I am off campus (sick or vacation)? Who would be responsible for this notification? I rely on the security announcements (via PA, phone, email, StarAlert, etc.) to notify everyone who is on campus and who may be coming to campus to be the responsible party for these types of notifications. I think I would rather it said something like: “Deans will assist with sharing the notifications of campus closing details.”

~~Academic Deans of Instruction~~ will ensure all staff, students, and late-arriving faculty and students in their area are notified of all details related to the cancellation or closing (including duration).

- Changed to “Deans will assist with sharing the notifications of campus closing details.”

NH V.02.06 Surplus or Discarded Property Procedure

No comments received at this time.

NH II.08 Community Advisory Board Policy

No comments received at this time.