ADAC Meeting Minutes

April 24, 2017
Milton Hall, room 85, 2 hr.

Type of meeting: Regular ADAC Meeting
Facilitator: Monica Torres
Notes: Yvonne Mendoza

Attending: Hari Sankaran (for Kathy Brook), Kori Plank, Angelina Palumbo, Dacia Sedillo, Norma Grijalva, Greg Fant, Sonya Cooper, Enedina Vazquez, Rolfe Sassenfeld, David Smith Shelly Stovall, Karen Koper-Frye, Ellen Bosman, Mark Cal, Jeff Hawkney, Debbie Giron, Jerry Hawkes, Bill Serban, Andrew Nwanne,

Guests: Liz Ellis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to order</td>
<td>K. Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval of March 27, 2017 minutes—motion by Enedina Vazquez to approve the amended minutes, seconded by Sonya Cooper, all in favor, motion passed

Catalog Updates

Liz Ellis presented a revised/edited “Grading” section of the catalog. There was discussion of recommendations regarding the section. Below are examples of the recommended language and edits.

Changes to the first paragraph were made in order to introduce the topic/process to the student. The paragraph also states that the instructor may elect to use fractional grading in assigning final letter grade. There was discussion regarding a statement about use of fractional grading or letter grade on the course syllabus. The paragraph will stay as is, unless someone comes up with better verbiage.

It was stated that the group would do a second review on some of the language on the document. For example grade point average seems like it might be integrated with some other parts of the catalog; therefore a second review is needed.

The sentence before the grading table will read as follows, “The NMSU system for final grades is expressed in letters, which carry grade points that are used in calculating the cumulative grade-point average, as shown in this table.”

In addition, the sentence after the grading table is edited to read as follows, “Any course for which only CR, S or PR is awarded, but no traditional letter grade is given, will be included in the total number of earned hours but is not computed in the grade-point average. Traditional letter grades are those which are used in the grade point average determination: A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, and F. In computing the overall grade-point-average, the total credits in which grades of A+ through F have been assigned is divided into the total number of grade points earned.”

The midterm/early performance grade section heading will be changed to “Six-Week Early Performance Grades – (Midterm)”. In addition, the first paragraph has been edited and the second paragraph is completely new language that reads; “In courses numbered 300 or higher, the posting of early performance grades (midterm grades) is optional and may occur through the online course management system rather than the MyNMSU portal. However, prior to the last day to drop a course, upon request, instructors will provide information to students about their progress in the course.”

The section on “Retention of Grading Records” will be cross checked with the Records Management & Retention rules. The language has been edited to read as follows, “Individual assignments and exams that are not returned to students should be retained by the instructor or department through the end of the subsequent regular semester. The records used to compute individual final grades should be retained...”
for two years after the completion of a course. If a final grade has been appealed, these records are kept for at least two years after the completion of the appeal. Departments, colleges or the library may require that records be kept for longer periods.”

The section “C, D, and F Grades for Graduate Students” has been edited and will be moved towards the end of the document where it talks about graduate students.

S/U Grading section, new title and consensus on the section edits.

S/U Grading Option – Undergraduate Students, new title, and edited.

Election of the S/U Grading Option Election – Graduate Students, new title and edited, will be striking out the #3 of the section that reads, “No more than one course per semester may be taken under the S/U option.”

Incomplete Grade section has been edited with additional language. Example: unexpected military deployment was added to the examples of appropriate circumstances beyond the student’s control that develop after the last day to withdraw from the course. New language added to the section, “In no case is an I grade to be used to avoid the assigning of D, F, U or RR grades for marginal or failing work.” Additional information was added to the section regarding completion of the “I grade” form. Also the instructor must indicate whether the student will be given the option to complete the remaining coursework.

Liz will continue to work on this section along with the “Withdraw” section for the next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification of Teacher Education Degrees</th>
<th>E. Vazquez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modifications were proposed for several Education programs, by reducing the credits to 120. Not all programs can be reduced to 120. For example, the special education courses that are combined with early childhood, or elementary education or secondary is impossible because they are considered dual majors. Some of the reductions in credits are due to SB 329 and reflect a state requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education – 120 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education/Elementary Education – 129 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education/Secondary Education: Language Arts – 132 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education/Secondary Education: Math – 132 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education/Secondary Education: Science – 130 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education/Secondary Education: Social Studies – 132 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education – 122 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sonya Cooper asked why these modifications were coming before the group. It was stated that any curriculum changes should come before the group so that everyone is aware of the curriculum changes.

Shelly Stovall asked about the statement on the worksheets stating, “The College of Education requires a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5 for graduation and a minimum grade of “C” in all education, TEP pre-requisite, endorsement and teaching field courses.” Does the college mean a “C” or “C-”? Enedina stated the worksheets should state a “C-” and will review the documents and make sure they all have the same message. Shelly also stated that the paragraph on the Special Education Secondary Education: Social Studies, worksheet stating “Students who transfer in HIST 261 … “needs to be reviewed and changed due to it not being a transfer.

Motion to approve the packet of modifications of programs proposed by Enedina Vazquez, seconded by Beth Pollack, all in favor, motion passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Initiative Update and Proposal</th>
<th>S. Stovall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Stovall presented a video on improving student writing, and incorporating writing into courses. The video had a lot of different faculty perspectives on the writing program, and a lot of feedback from faculty members who have been through the program. A one-page proposal will be presented to the Deans tomorrow, April 24, 2017. The goal is a shared process for students to learn a shared responsibility, and recognition that it is not only a responsibility placed on the English department, or a particular faculty member or the discipline, but that we all have a shared responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 of the proposal is to continue with faculty development. A three-year commitment for faculty across campus is not realistic. Therefore, the approach being considered is to weave the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) workshops, and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
writing to learn program into a 1-year program. In addition, continue to meet with periodically with faculty who have completed the program. Also, work to develop a mid-level (200-300) writing course in each discipline. In addition, as we are having conversations on general education course reform, we can incorporate writing to learn practices, formally or informally.

**Phase 2**, given the timing on the General Education reform, involves beginning a conversation, to switch ENGL 111 to a 3-credit course and replace the 200 level writing requirement with ENGL 112, which would be a continuation of the foundational composition course. This would allow the students to be better prepared when they move into their discipline. Students take the 200-level course sooner than it was designed for them to take, and we find often they end up changing majors and they don’t have the solid writing skills. Faculty members have expressed liking the 200 level writing course as an elective. The anticipated reduction in the state Gen Ed core frees up 6 credit hours. If a program wanted to have their students take a 200 level writing course, there is the opportunity to recapture those 6 credits.

### Follow up on Articulation Agreements

**S. Stovall**

Active articulation agreements need to be submitted and will be maintained in the Provost’s office. Once submitted they will be placed on the registrar’s website, so that students can look at the specific agreements on transfers. There are agreements out there that are out-dated and not active. If agreements are older than 10 years, we can presume they are not valid. Available on the Provost website is a routing form for signature (contract).

Shelly stated that an email would be sent out after the meeting to all Deans stating that it is very critical that colleges and departments make sure that any Accreditation statements are updated and cleaned up for the new catalog.

### Engineering Technology Concentrations (Geomatics Technologies, Information Security Technology, Digital Forensics)

**S. Cooper**

There are three new concentrations in Engineering Technology.

- Concentration in Geomatics
- Concentration in Digital Forensics
- Concentration in Information Security Technology

**Motion** to approve the 3 concentrations by Sonya Cooper, 2nd by Rolf Sassenfeld, Discussion.

Beth stated she needs to follow up with C S 478 regarding student needs, and capacity issues. Sonya also stated that she had asked Kathy Brook to review BCIS 482 with the department; she has not received a response yet. Sonya also stated that they have already talked to the Geography department on course, GEOG 381 for the Geomatics concentration.

The group agreed to redo the motion.

**Motion** by Sonya to approve only the two concentrations Digital Forensics, and Geomatics, seconded by Karen Kopera-Frye, all in favor, motion passed

Sonya asked if concentrations were only 12 credits, and Kori stated that a minimum of 12 credits on a concentration, with 9 credits being 400 and above. Karen Kopera-Frye stated there were some concentrations with 15 credits.

**Motion** to approve the third concentration Information Security Technology pending the feedback from Business and Arst & Sciences on the impact of the prefix CS, BCIS, and Geo., seconded by Rolf Sassenfeld, all in favor, discussion.

Karen stated that what if the concentration comes back that capacity could not be met or handled.

Motion does not pass and will be placed on the next ADAC agenda.

### Centralized advising policies and procedures

**Group**

Next ADAC Meeting

### Nominations for Vice Chair of ADAC, 2017-18

**Group**

Next ADAC Meeting

### Round Table
**Angelina Palumbo** – Will be resending the revision of lower, and upper division of transfer of evaluation of credits. We have not heard from departments, so Deans will be copied in the email.

*Adjourn: 3:00 pm/ Adjournment followed by University Curriculum Committee meeting*